

be the most reliable man. Under this clause the department has ample power to deal with the matter and the amendment only protects innocent people from molestation at the hands of any spiteful person.

Question put and passed ; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Nos. 15, 16—agreed to.

No. 17—Add the following new clause to stand as 242l :—“All proceedings under sections 242a, 242b, 242c, 242d, 242e, 242f, 242h, 242i, 242j, in any court shall be heard *in camera* ; and it shall be unlawful to publish in any newspaper a report of any such proceedings. Penalty : For a first offence, One hundred pounds, or imprisonment with or without hard labour for not exceeding six months ; for any subsequent offence Five hundred pounds, or imprisonment with or without hard labour for not exceeding twelve months” :

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD : I move—

*That the amendment be agreed to.*

Mr. GILCHRIST : What is the reason for this amendment ? Will there be any safeguard to protect those who are being proceeded against ? Proceedings *in camera* against a person are always dangerous, although I understand the necessity for keeping these matters confidential. I presume a full and clear account of the proceedings will be kept for reference at any time ?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD : I think the amendment is advisable. After all, people will not be charged with crimes under this measure. In the event of the department possibly making a mistake, it would be very inadvisable to have it published in the newspapers that a woman, say, had been charged under this measure. Even if the proceedings were justified, publication would be altogether undesirable. The children's court is conducted much on the same lines as are laid down for the court under this measure.

Question put and passed, the Council's amendment agreed to.

Nos. 18 to 21—agreed to.

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

### DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, Orders of the Day,—Mine Workers' Relief Fund Bill (second reading), and Nos. 10 and 11, Attendance of member before select committee of Legislative Council (Council's Messages), were discharged from the Notice Paper.

*[House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.]*

## Legislative Council.

Thursday, 18th November, 1915.

	PAOR
Papers presented .. .. .	2553
Bills : Road Closure, report, 3a. .. .	2554
Land Act Amendment, report, 3a. .. .	2554
Supplementary Loan, £1,300,000, 2a. .. .	2554
Health Act Amendment, Message .. .	2554
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment, 2a. .. .	2570
Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, Message .. .	2571
Sale of Liquor Regulation, Message .. .	2571
Sale of Liquor Regulation (No. 2), 2a. .. .	2572
Permanent Reserves (No. 2), 2a. .. .	2577
Select Committee, Money Bills Procedure, to adopt report .. .	2578
Adjournment, special .. .	2580

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Fremantle Harbour Trust, report of Commissioners for year ended 30th June, 1915. 2, State Children Act, amendment of regulations. 3, Health Act (a) regulations *re* meat inspection and branding,

(b) food and drug regulations. 4, Perth Public Hospital, rules and regulations. 5, Moora local board of health, resolution adopting model by-laws. 6, Jetties Regulation Act, regulations.

#### BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

Report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

#### BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

#### BILL—SUPPLEMENTARY LOAN, £1,300,000.

##### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.6] in moving the second reading said: The fact that this Bill asks for authority to raise a sum of £1,300,000 must not be taken as indicating that no loan moneys are available. The balance under the previous Loan Act at 30th June, 1915, available for flotation was £2,250,376. That was the balance of the authorisation, but portion of that authorisation was earmarked to the Commonwealth loan. The sum thus earmarked was £1,291,669 less £202,600, the amount of Treasury bills being paid off. Thus the net amount available for flotation under authorisation already received from Parliament was £1,361,000. As is always done in the case of Loan Bills, provision is made herein to cover requirements up till March, 1917. Of course the Loan Estimates provide only for anticipated expenditure until the close of the financial year, 30th June next. The Loan Bill, however, covers an additional period beyond that, of nine months, so nearly as such future expenditure can be now forecasted. The returns submitted will show hon members that practically no new items are included, that the chief object of this Bill is to secure an extension of existing

authority to permit the completion of works authorised under previous Loan Acts. The schedule sets out the specific works, the Bill itself being merely an authority to raise funds for those works; the Loan Estimates, on the other hand, authorise the expenditure. Members will no doubt desire to know something as to the public debt of the State. The total at 30th June stood at £37,022,622; at the close of the previous financial year it was £34,420,181. The sinking fund at the respective dates stood at £3,692,103 and £4,068,888. Thus, while the public debt increased during the year by £2,225,656, the sinking fund rose during the same period by £376,785. Local stock to the amount of £85,840 fell due during the year, and of this £78,185 worth was renewed for a further period, the balance having been found from the sinking fund. At the close of the last financial year the public debt per capita was £101 12s. 10d. The per capita indebtedness may, however, be further reduced by £11 6s. 1d. in respect of loan indebtedness incurred for specific purposes in regard to which the money will eventually be repayable to the Treasury, of course with interest. Such indebtedness is represented under the headings, Agricultural Bank, £2,675,611; assistance to settlers, £602,110, and workers' homes, £533,876. Seeing that the repayment of those moneys is provided for, the public indebtedness in this regard may be looked upon in a different light from other loan moneys; it does not represent loan indebtedness in the same sense as other expenditure. There is one item in the Loan Bill in connection with which hon. members may require some information, although I have very little information to add in respect of it to that which has already been supplied to the House. I refer to the item of £200,000 for State steamers. In January, 1914, it was decided to dispose of the "Western Australia" as soon as a suitable opportunity presented itself. The Government having come to that decision realised that it was necessary to look about to secure a suitable vessel to take

her place and the decision was that we should buy no more second-hand ships, but that we should build a ship, and we got into touch with Sir John Biles, an eminent authority, and on information supplied to him by Mr. Stevens and his staff, Sir John Biles drew a rough plan of a steamer which would be suitable to replace the "Western Australia," as a passenger and cargo steamer with space for live stock and with provision also for easy conversion into a chilled meat ship. Soon after that the war occurred and the matter was allowed to drop, but about eight months ago we had many inquiries in regard to the "Western Australia," and we were strongly advised by Sir Newton Moore and one of the leading ship brokers of London to send the "Western Australia" to London. Then the question of building a ship to take her place again came into prominence, and Sir John Biles was supplied with further information in respect to the matter and he was asked to prepare designs for a new ship. The class of ship that the acting manager of the State Steamship Service required was a Diesel engine vessel. Sir John Biles made inquiries with the result that he stated that in consequence of the war it would be several years before one could be built. I think he said it would be four or five years before a Diesel engine vessel could be built. Then it was decided to alter the plans so as to provide for an oil-fired ship with geared turbines that could have been built within 12 months after the end of the war if the order had been given four months ago. Subsequently Sir John Biles cabled that there was a Diesel engine ship being built, but he could not recommend it; it was not the class of ship suitable to replace the "Western Australia." Mr. Stevens, after getting some particulars, came to the same conclusion that this vessel could not suitably replace the "Western Australia" on the north-west coast. After giving the matter some consideration and recognising that we were erecting freezing works at Wyndham, Mr. Stevens asked for fur-

ther particulars in regard to the vessel. He ascertained that she was capable of carrying 6,700 tons dead weight, that she had 800 tons of oil storage, that her oil consumption was nine tons a day, that the price was £140,000, that her grain carrying capacity was 6,200 tons of wheat in bulk and, after going carefully into the matter and making calculations on the basis of freights as they were some months ago, he arrived at the conclusion that she would make a profit on a round trip between Western Australia and London of £40,000, the idea being to utilise her—pending the completion of the Wyndham works—in the oversea trade and as soon as the Wyndham works were finished to put her on between Fremantle and Wyndham until the new steamer proposed to be built had been completed. Then she would be taken off that line and placed between Wyndham and London.

Hon. J. Duffell: Did you say £14,000 for the round trip?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, £40,000.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: For the round trip or for the year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: For the round trip. The question of finance arose. We thought, in the present condition of the finances, it would be unwise to involve the State in such a large expenditure if we had to pay cash down, and we ascertained that one of the insurance companies of London would be prepared to finance the deal. When the offer was submitted to us through Sir John Biles, there was a provision that there should be no publication of sale. They would not give an option over the ship, as is shown by the file, but they agreed to hold it open. Consequently we had to decide at once whether we would purchase the ship or not. We could not submit it to Parliament because there was a direct prohibition to the effect that there should be no publication of sale.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The Government should not go into that class of business.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no option over the ship. They

simply held her open. The necessity for providing a ship for the Wyndham works had to be considered. We could not proceed with those works unless we had a ship available to bring down the product after it had been treated at the works. It was admitted by Sir John Biles that the price of this vessel was high, but he said it was not unreasonable and we simply took over the contract. A Danish firm had given the contract to Harland & Wolff and the Government simply purchased the firm's contract.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: At the price they were going to pay?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. The usual method adopted in connection with the building of ships is not to state the figure at which the ship will be completed. One has to deal with reputable firms and they make provision for the purchaser to pay the cost of all material and all wages and then they tender on a percentage basis, 18 or 20 per cent. on top of the cost. That is the basis and what we did was simply to take over the contract which had been entered into between the Danish firm and Harland & Wolff. I may be asked how it is that the Danish firm did not take over the ship. The Board of Trade would not permit them to do so. They could not take delivery of the ship, being aliens. That is the position as we discovered it when the "Western Australia" went Home. Previous to that, so long as the vessel was not likely to get into the hands of the enemy, the Government had no objection to the transfer, but by the time the "Western Australia" reached London the regulations had been made more stringent, even so stringent as this, that the transfer would not be permitted to people of countries in sympathy with us and who have shown their sympathy. I cannot go further in explanation of the situation. Mr. Kingsmill said he was under the impression that we intended this boat should replace the "Western Australia" and he came to that conclusion from my replies to questions in this House. He insinuated that when I gave those replies it was the intention of the

Government to use the Diesel ship for replacing the "Western Australia." I would like to refer to the questions and the replies. The hon. member asked—

Have the Government sold the s.s. "Western Australia" or are negotiations in hand to that end? If so, will she be sold by public tender?

My reply was—

The "Western Australia" has not been sold, but she has been placed with a firm of shipbrokers for the purpose of sale. Public tenders will not be called, as it is not customary in the shipping business to dispose of boats by that method except for breaking up, and the Government are satisfied that the firm of brokers employed is in touch with likely buyers of a steamer suitable only for special work. A reserve has, however, been fixed.

The hon. member further asked—

Is it the intention of the Government to purchase a steamship to replace the "Western Australia"? Are negotiations proceeding for that purpose?

The reply was—

The Government are considering the question of placing an order for the building of a ship to replace the "Western Australia," and at the same time convey chilled meat from Wyndham to Fremantle; but have been advised that even if the orders were given now, it would be impossible to complete same earlier than within 12 months after the end of the war.

That would have been a complete reply to the question but I gave further information which I need not have given, as follows:—

In view of this and the necessity for making provision for dealing with the product of the Wyndham meat works, the Government have taken advantage of an opportunity which offered to secure a twin-screw Diesel engined steamer, on the report of Sir John Biles, the eminent naval architect. Until the works are finished, the vessel will engage in the carriage of Western Australian produce to London, return-

ing with Government material and general cargo. She will then be insulated to carry chilled meat to Fremantle; and afterwards, when another ship—which will be absolutely necessary—has been built to take her place on the Wyndham run, she will be utilised for the carriage of frozen meat from Wyndham to London.

Every word of that answer was absolutely correct and is correct to-day, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit it.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It is, unfortunately, too true.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is satisfied but I will deal with his second set of questions.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I have intimated that I am more than satisfied.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member asked—

1, With what firm of shipbrokers has the steamship "Western Australia" been placed for sale? 2, What is the net amount involved in the purchase of a steamship to replace the "Western Australia"?

The replies were—

1, Gilbert J. McCaul & Co., Wallbrook, London, E.C. The senior member of the firm, Mr. Tredwen, is chairman of the Australian Merchants' Association in London, is a member of Lloyd's, the Baltic Shipping Association, and of the Government Committee appointed to fix the rates of freight for chartering ships for Admiralty purposes. 2, £140,000. It is presumed the question refers to the new Diesel ship and not to the vessel proposed to be built later, as outlined in answer to question given on Tuesday last.

That is fair.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: More ingenious than ingenuous.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I explained that it referred to the Diesel engine ship and not to the vessel proposed to be built later, as outlined in the answer to the question on the previous Tuesday. The £200,000 in the Loan Bill not only represents a sum to cover the vessel which has been purchased, but also

an additional sum to provide for the vessel which is to be built.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: After the war?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: After the war. That vessel is to be a passenger and cargo ship with provision for 300 head of livestock and 700 chilled carcasses. No order has been given yet; we are awaiting the consent of Parliament and, if the order be given, it will be a long period after the termination of the war before the vessel can be constructed. The Premier has given an assurance to the Assembly that no action will be taken in regard to the building of this ship until authority is secured from Parliament. The Loan Bill simply gives authority to borrow the money. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [3.28]: I do not intend to oppose the second reading but there are one or two items to which I would like to direct attention before the Bill is passed. The Colonial Secretary has made reference to the existing position of the loan fund. It is worth while pointing out that the loan indebtedness of the State at the end of June, 1915, had risen to a total of £102 per head of the population. Since then it has been increasing at the rate of about £250,000 a month and the population unfortunately has not been increasing, and I do not know that there is any immediate prospect of it increasing. If we add on to the £102 per head of the population at the end of the last financial year, the loan indebtedness accruing during the last few months and the amount now provided for, it will be found that very shortly our loan indebtedness will be over £100 per head, even if we deduct the £11 per head to which the Colonial Secretary has referred as being money we are likely to get back at no very distant date. It is worth while noticing, too, that in the last four years since the present Administration have been in power, the loan indebtedness per head has increased to the extent of £30; that is, an increase of £30 for every man, woman and child in the State. During the previous four years the in-

crease was from £68 per head to £73— from £68 19s. 6d. to £73 10s., or an increase of only £4 10s. per head for the four years under the previous Administration, whilst under the present Administration there has been an increase of £30 per head for a like period. When this loan money has been raised and spent, it will mean an increase of £30 per head even if we allow for and deduct the £11 per head advanced through the Agricultural Bank and the Workers' Homes Board and by way of assistance to farmers. In this connection I should like the Colonial Secretary, when replying, to give us some information regarding the Agricultural Bank; because the Agricultural Bank is one of those institutions for which no provision is being made in this Loan Bill. I should like to have some assurance that the Agricultural Bank is properly provided for, and that there is money in this Loan Bill for the bank to carry out its ordinary obligations; because I am strongly of the opinion that if that is not the case it will be wise for the Government to knock out some of these items and substitute an advance to the Agricultural Bank. Whichever way it goes it will mean money spent in the State; and I am quite certain that the money spent through the Agricultural Bank by the settlers in this State will yield more permanent good results to Western Australia than will money spent by the Government themselves, no matter in what direction. Another point on which I am sorry we have not had more information is the prospect of raising this money. We understand that conferences have been held in Melbourne, but apparently nothing definite has been arrived at. The latest information we have is that the State Treasurers will probably get about half the amounts they require. If that is the case, I think Parliament ought to be consulted as to which half of this proposed loan expenditure should be knocked out; because, obviously, if we get only half the money we require, then only half of these works can be put in hand. Do the Government contend it is right, in circumstances

like those, that the matter should be left entirely to the discretion of the Government? I do not think so. If the Government ask for authority to spend 1½ millions or two millions, as the case may be, in 12 months, and outline to Parliament the works on which it is proposed to spend the money, well knowing that they cannot get more than half the amount, surely that is equivalent to not consulting Parliament at all, because it is left entirely to the whim of the Government to say which of the works shall be proceeded with and which shall be hung up. In those circumstances it is to be regretted that we do not know what the prospects are of raising this money, because I contend that if there is no prospect of raising the whole of the money, then the Loan Bill should provide for what is likely to be raised, and the expenditure for the year should be distributed in accordance with the sum likely to be raised and not in accordance with the sum the Government would like to borrow. Take, for instance, Item 8 on the First Schedule: it is proposed to spend £80,000 between now and March of 1917 on the Esperance Northwards Railway and also £42,000 on the Esperance jetty—a total of about £122,000. There are a number of other railway votes on the list, and I ask, if the Government do not get the whole of the money authorised by this Loan Bill, which of the works are to be given preference? I have already contended that certain of our settlers, and particularly those depending on the continuation of the Yillimining-Kondinin Railway, have been seriously prejudiced by the removal of the railway plant to Esperance and the commencement made with the Esperance Railway. I contend that not only the interests of the settlers, but also the interests of the State as a whole, have been prejudiced by that proceeding. There can be found in the area to be served by the Yillimining-Kondinin extension two or three individual farms which, combined, this season will produce more than the whole of the Esperance district will produce. I say without hesitation—and am prepared to back

my contention by facts—that one could pick three farms in that area, which has been deprived of its railway, that together will produce more freight for a railway this year than the whole of Esperance district will produce; and as the seasons go by it will be borne out that the Government have done a very wrong thing in delaying railway communication in that highly productive centre in order to give rapid railway communication in a place which is rather of political than of economic importance. Then there is another item, that for the electric power station at East Perth. During the year ended on the 30th June, 1915, £148,000 was spent on this work. In addition to that considerable expenditure, it is now proposed to spend £182,000 on the power station, bringing the total to be spent by the end of next year up to £330,000. Then, £25,000 is to be spent by the end of March, 1917. In all, for this particular work the total will be something over £400,000, about £430,000. It was never contemplated by Parliament when this undertaking was entered upon that it was going to cost such a huge amount, and I trust we shall have from the Colonial Secretary some assurance that this is going to be the end of the expenditure and that the work will shortly be completed for that amount. Then there is the item of Perth tramways. First we had the loan of £550,000. Then there was a further amount of £52,000, and now there is yet another amount of £42,000, making a total for the Perth tramways of £644,000 to be spent by March, 1917. And what is that expenditure going to do in the way of giving us the cheap fares and all the things we were promised by the Government when they wanted to buy the trams for £475,000? That amount of £475,000 has grown to £644,000; and the latest balance sheets of the tramway system indicate that the surplus of income over expenditure is not sufficient to pay interest and depreciation on the money expended. The deduction is that, as was stated at the time the Government proposed the purchase, the price paid for the trams is about double what

they were worth. There is another item on which I should like some information, and that is the State smelter at Ravens-thorpe, which is down for £50,000, "advances on ore and working expenses." It seems to me a curiously unbusiness-like proceeding to borrow money for the working expenses of an enterprise of that kind. I should like to know exactly what is meant by it, and what prospect there is of getting this money back. Is it a good scheme to borrow money in order to pay working expenses?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Yes, when it is recouped immediately.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: If the money is recouped immediately, probably the scheme would be good; but what are the prospects of immediate recoup in this case? Then, I think it is fitting we should have some information regarding the expenditure on the Wyndham jetty and the Wyndham Freezing Works. Apparently what the Government contemplate spending by the end of March, 1917, is far in excess of what this House was the other day led to believe the undertaking was going to cost. The other day we had a statement—an official statement, I understand—that the Government fear now that they have lost the 1917 season. Before this vote is passed we should know something as to what the total cost is going to be and when the works are likely to be completed. Then in regard to the increased vote for the State Implement Works. We are told that last year there was a loss on these works of £30,000—an enormous loss considering the comparatively small nature of the undertaking. We are told that there is a loss of £30,000 after taking account of all indebtedness to the works and of the value of all materials on hand. Since then it has been stated by the late manager of the works—I do not know with what knowledge or authority he speaks, but he has freely circulated the statement amongst members of Parliament, many of whom, myself included, have received a letter from him—that the loss since the beginning of the year has been

at the rate of £10,000 per month. So far, that assertion has not been denied; and in support of it we have the statement of the Minister controlling the works, in reply to a question as to the particular articles the works were producing at a profit, that everything the works were making was causing a loss.

Hon. J. Cornell: The late manager of the implement works is a distant relation of Baron Munchausen.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: We have the statement of the Minister in charge of the works that everything they are doing at the present time is done at a loss. The late manager has been out for some time, and the Government have had ample opportunity to find out how the works stand. Surely we are entitled to some information before we pass additional loan expenditure in this connection. Then there is the State Fish Supply, for which there is an item of £4,000. Apparently £2,792 of that amount has already been spent. I do not know whether there was any authorisation of Parliament for it, but of this amount of £4,000 it appears that £2,792 has already been expended. I think probably, when we come to the item, the Colonial Secretary will be able to tell us what he is going to do with the balance, and will also be able to give us some idea of whether the venture is turning out profitably or not. An announcement was made the other day that the State fish stalls in the metropolitan area were to be closed, and that the reason was that certain members of Parliament objected to the scheme. That would be the only occasion on which the Government have shown the slightest inclination to take notice of the opinions or wishes of members of Parliament opposed to them. I think we are entitled to know whether that was the sole reason. Do the Government intend to close down the fish stalls merely because certain members of Parliament objected to them, or is it a fact that the fish stalls are losing so heavily that the Government are glad to jump at any excuse for shutting them up and there-

fore throw the responsibility on members of Parliament? Do the Government intend to make a cry at the next general election, "The Liberal members of Parliament whom you so foolishly elected have criticised the undertaking, and therefore we have been compelled to close it up"? Is that the real fact, or is it not a fact that the fish stalls are to be closed because it is considered injudicious in the present state of finance to keep on any more losing ventures than the Government can help? The only other item I intend to refer to is that for State steamships, £200,000. I hope I may be able to supplement to some small extent the information that the Colonial Secretary has presented to the House. But, first of all, it is curious to note that £145,000 of this amount is to be spent before the 30th June. Now, is that a fact? Is it not a fact that the Government bought this new ship for £140,000 or £150,000—I am not quite sure of the figure—at 5 per cent., and that in order to pay for it they handed over bonds to the amount of £175,000 at 4 per cent.? It appears to me as though that venture will deplete the amount of this loan authorisation by £175,000, and not by only £145,000. Of course, if the Government borrow the money at 5 per cent., probably that may not be the case; but if we assume that they are only going to spend that £145,000 by the end of June next—and that is what is intended on these Loan Estimates—are we not entitled to know what is going to be done with the remaining £55,000? It is to be spent between the 30th June next and March of 1917? That appears to be the present intention of the Government. What is the amount to be spent on? Is it contemplated that the existing steamers will need the expenditure of £55,000 from loan money to put them in order, or is it intended to buy another steamer? The £145,000 is to pay for the ship that we understand is already bought, and I do not know what the remaining £55,000 is for.

The Colonial Secretary: A new ship.



Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: If that is the case, is it not wise for this Chamber to take into consideration first of all the question of the ship that has already been purchased, and even if the Chamber is disposed—some members probably will not be—to vote the money for that purchase, are we not entitled to consider whether in view of that purchase it is wise to give the Government money and authority to buy another ship?

The Colonial Secretary: We have given an assurance that we will not take any action without consulting Parliament.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: But some other Government might come into power, who would use this authorisation without taking the Legislative Assembly into consultation. If the House vote this £55,000, I do not see how, when the matter comes up for discussion later on, they can refuse their sanction to the purchase of another steamer, having voted the money for the purpose. We were told that when this boat was purchased it was stipulated that there should be no publication of the negotiations. I can very well understand it. Members may be interested in learning that there were two ships being built at this time for the same company, the East Asiatic Company, of Copenhagen, Denmark. One was called the "Panama" and the other is now called the "Kangaroo." The "Panama" was completed at the end of March of this year. The "Kangaroo" was completed a month or two later.

The Colonial Secretary: About six weeks ago.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The "Panama" was completed in March of this year, and the "Kangaroo" was completed a few months later. The Western Australian Government paid for both these ships.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: And took their choice.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: No, they took the dinghy, and the other people had the big ship. The Western Australian Government paid the cost of building both the "Panama" and the "Kan-

garoo." I have here the facts in a trade journal.

The Colonial Secretary: What is your authority?

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The "Panama" has a length of 427ft.; the "Kangaroo" a length of 365ft. The "Panama" has a beam of 55ft. 2ins., and the "Kangaroo" a beam of 50ft. The "Panama" has a moulded depth of 38ft. 6ins., while the moulded depth of the "Kangaroo" is 26ft. 7ins. The "Panama" is designed to carry a dead weight of 9,035 tons, while the capacity of the "Kangaroo" is 6,700 tons. The "Panama" has a speed of 12 knots, and the "Kangaroo" a speed of 11 knots. The "Panama" has a horse-power of 3,500, while that of the "Kangaroo" is 2,250. The "Panama" is described as the last thing in cargo boats, as being one of the finest cargo vessels now in service, and the cost of the "Panama," completed in March, was £83,000. She is half as big again as the "Kangaroo"; she excels the "Kangaroo" in every particular.

The Colonial Secretary: Where did you get the information?

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I can supply it to the hon. member. She cost £83,000, and on that scale the "Kangaroo" would have cost not more than £60,000. The amount the Government paid for the "Kangaroo" was £140,000, so it will be seen that that money built both the "Panama" and the "Kangaroo." It may be said that in consequence of the war the value of shipping has gone up. But does that account for such a huge discrepancy? An infinitely better boat, with a carrying capacity of half as much again, and in speed a knot an hour faster than the "Kangaroo," costs £83,000.

The Colonial Secretary: You ought to state your authority.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: It is taken from a trade journal, the *Texaco Star*, published in Texas. It was given to me by a shipping man, who says he has no doubt the figures are correct. I can give the book to the Colonial Secretary. He is quite welcome to find out anything he can in regard to it. There are the facts

as stated, and as I say, a reputable shipping man has told me it is a reasonable price, and he has no reason for thinking it is other than accurate. And then there is another difficulty in regard to this boat, which does not seem to have been considered, namely, the matter of insurance. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary will be able to give us some information on that point. Another trade journal, the *Daily Commercial News and Shipping List*, of 31st August, discusses the question of the insurance companies' position in regard to the Diesel engines, and not unfavourably to the Diesel engines. It is rather a lengthy article, and I have no desire to read it all. But after stating that the insurance companies have awakened to the fact that the insurance of Diesel engines has hit them severely in the past, and have now become chary of this line of insurance, the writer sets out with the idea of suggesting some means by which the makers of Diesel oil engines and the insurance companies can arrive at a reasonable tariff, because the present position is that the companies will not take the risk, or else they charge an exorbitant premium. That is a matter upon which I would like the Colonial Secretary to enlighten us when replying. When the Bill is in Committee I intend to raise these few points which I have referred to, and I will also move for a reduction, if not for the striking out altogether, of this £200,000. I think we should strike out the lot; but even if we do not, if finally it appears that, the money having been paid, it would be difficult for the Government to get out of the deal, we shall still have to consider the position; even then we should strike out the £55,000, because voting this for the purchase of a new ship would be tantamount to expressing approval of the deal in respect to the "Kangaroo." We are told that the "Kangaroo" was sold because the English Government would not permit her to go to Denmark. Does not that suggest that the owners were forced to sell? It is usual when a person is forced to sell, the buyer is not forced to buy,

and he generally makes a reasonable bargain, he usually gets full value for his money. It is mostly in the other circumstances, when somebody is forced to buy, and nobody wants to sell, that we have to pay more than we ought to pay. In this case apparently they had to sell. How, then, does it come about that we paid the value of two ships instead of one? And on the question of the freight earnings of the "Kangaroo": If it is a fact—it seems to be the fact—that we paid £140,000 for a boat that ought to have cost not more than £60,000, she may, during the term of the war, be able to pay her way, but directly the war is over we will be in the position of having a £60,000 boat which will have to earn interest and sinking fund and depreciation on £140,000. It cannot be done. To my mind it appears to be one of the worst deals the Government have ever made. We see the reason why we were told there must be no publication. Naturally there must be no publication, no discussion. If there was publication or discussion, how could the Government have bought this boat for £140,000, when probably publication and discussion would have quickly revealed the fact that another boat half as big again, superior in every particular, had been launched a few months earlier at a cost of £93,000. I can see no other good reason why the sellers should have insisted upon this condition. Another point: We are told that the Government simply stepped into the place of the East Asiatic Company, but we have not yet been told, and I doubt if it is a fact, that the Government bought this steamer from Harland & Wolff. Did Harland & Wolff get the £140,000?

The Colonial Secretary: No. the Asiatic Company.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: That is exactly what happened. The Asiatic Company got the £140,000.

The Colonial Secretary: There was a contract between the Asiatic Company and Harland & Wolff to take over the boat.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: But Harland & Wolff did not get the £140,000?

The Colonial Secretary: I think they did.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: It is a point upon which I would like to be assured. The East Asiatic Coy. got the £140,000 for the "Kangaroo." The "Panama" cost £83,000 and, on the same scale, the "Kangaroo" would have cost them £60,000. So the position is that the Western Australian Government paid for the two boats and took the little one, while the Asiatic Coy. got what has been described as one of the finest cargo boats in service, for nothing. That appears to be the position.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: Is that a reflection on the Government's honesty?

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I am not questioning anybody's honesty. I am taking the facts. Sir John Biles said the price was high.

The Colonial Secretary: But not unreasonable.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: What does that mean?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Sir John Biles and Company said it.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Did not Sir John Biles also say that it was not to be understood that he was recommending the purchase of the vessel? It may have been represented to Sir John Biles that the Government were bound to have a ship, in which case he would report that although the price was high, as the Government must have a ship they had better take this one. Only the other day particulars were published of how the "Western Australia" came to be sent to London to be sold. The Government got the advice of the Agent General on the matter. And how? They sent a cable to the Agent General asking him to consult a well-known shipping broker in London, to secure his advice, and in turn to advise the Government whether or not to send the vessel Home.

The Colonial Secretary: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: It was published only the other day. I do not think the Colonial Secretary will deny that.

The Colonial Secretary: You stated that the Government asked someone to approach the Agent General.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I said nothing of the sort. I said that the Government cabled the Agent General and asked him to secure advice from a shipping broker in London; and I say that on the same day a Fremantle firm sent a cable to the same broker telling him that the Government were anxious that the Agent General should advise them to send the vessel Home. And I say further that the Government paid that Fremantle firm the cost of sending the cable. We can mostly get what advice we want if we go about it the right way, and if Sir John Biles was told that we must have a ship he might easily have said, "Well, the price of this one is high, but as you must have a ship, it is not unreasonably high."

Hon. W. Patrick: It might have been the company, and not Sir John at all, who advised.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The Colonial Secretary is welcome to all the information at my disposal, and if he is able to refute it, so much the better. As the position stands, it looks as if the Western Australian Government had paid for two ships, taken the smaller one, and allowed the East Asiatic Coy. to take the other fine ship, costing them nothing.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.59]: Mr. Colebatch dealt with the question of finance generally, and in the end confined his observations to an attack on the State Steamship Service. The remarks of the Colonial Secretary in moving the second reading hovered principally round the same subject, namely, the vote of £200,000 for the purchase of steamers for the North-West trade. As a representative of that province, and knowing the difficulties the people up there have to contend with, I am bound to see that any and every facility is given in order to meet their requirements. The North has never received the consideration that it should receive, either in this or in another place. Sooner or later this House must come to realise the possibilities of the northern portion of the State. Once they

realise these possibilities they are bound in justice to that portion of the State to give them facilities for the development of that area. I will admit that the Government tackled this proposition directly they came into office and endeavoured to provide facilities for marketing the produce from the North, such facilities as were never previously provided. They made an honest attempt to solve the problem. As to whether they have succeeded or not, we all have our own individual opinions. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in my opinion there was an honest attempt to cater for the *bona fide* requirements of the North. The Government having failed through want of capacity more than anything else consequently one has to be generous in discussing this proposition of State steamers in the development of the North by means of providing transport facilities, remembering that the Government did not know what action was required and would not consult those who did. I favour the policy of State steamers for the northern portion of the State, purely for the reason that there must be transport facilities in that portion of the State, for the people there cannot have the railways which are given to other people in the southern portions of the State. I have always favoured the proposition of State steamers in order to carry out that object, but I always have found, and will continue to find fault with the manner in which the State Steamship Service was established. It was established without the authority of Parliament and for that the Government deserve to be censured. They have been censured in this House and in another place, so far as votes and speeches will permit. The Government should clearly understand their duties, which are defined for them, and the powers of Parliament which are also defined. If they do not understand the position the sooner they attempt to do so the better. This Government or any other Government cannot be allowed to continue to flout the powers of Parliament and incur expenditure, and then come along subsequently and ask for an endorsement of their wrong-doing. There

are times, I admit, when Ministers must act promptly in the interests of the country and depart from the golden rule. When they do that they should, at the earliest opportunity, consult Parliament and tell Parliament exactly what they are doing and what they propose to do. It is no excuse, to my mind, to come along afterwards, as is their practice, and it does not appeal to me as an excuse when they say their predecessors have done the same thing. That is no defence at all. In discussing the Estimates in another place the only defence was that the predecessors of the Government had done the same thing. It is an excuse which ought not to be put forward at all. If one Government do wrong it is no justification for another Government to do wrong. It would be idle for me to stand up in the dock on a charge of murder and plead that someone else had committed a murder as justification for my also doing so, or stand up in the dock on a charge of theft and plead that someone else had committed a theft as justification for my doing likewise. It is no defence for the Government to say that their predecessors have flouted Parliament in the past and that they are justified in doing the same thing. In connection with the purchase of the "Kangaroo," even in that case, though Parliament was sitting and negotiations were going on for the purchase of the steamers and the Government, I understand, had a definite offer for the purchase, they did not intimate the fact to Parliament. Parliament, I say, was sitting at the time and the least the Government could have done would have been to have secured an option over the boat so that no one else could get hold of her, and taken Parliament into their confidence and seen whether Parliament would endorse their action or not. I am perfectly satisfied that, provided the boat is a suitable one, this House, if approached in a proper manner, and if the thing was fully discussed and understood, would have no hesitation in permitting the Government to purchase a suitable steamer for the development of

the northern portion of the State. My objection is not to the purchase of the steamer, but to the manner in which the purchase was effected, provided, of course, that she is a suitable boat for the purpose for which she is intended. It is an easy matter to justify the necessity for the provision of proper facilities for the northern portion of this country. There are millions of acres of pastoral areas at the present time up there inhabited by aborigines, country equal to that in any other part of Australia for cattle raising, but until proper facilities are afforded that country will remain inhabited by aborigines. Once given proper facilities for the marketing of produce from those areas, I believe we shall have stations established in the North-West portion of the State country which will provide much of the meat required for the world's market. I have already commended the Government for making the contract for the completion of the freezing works at Wyndham, and for arranging that those works should be completed by March, 1916. Where I differ from the Government is in regard to the cancellation of the contract, which was a good one, and under which the State was likely, according to the Government officers, to save at least £50,000, and at the same time to secure the completion of the work at a fairly early date. I believe that had Nevanas been left alone he would have completed the work according to the contract. He had made a good start and had bought the necessary material and had already got going, and was only prevented from completing the work by reason of the fact that the steamer which the Government had undertaken to give him for the carriage of his material was taken away from him. I commend the Government for making the contract, but regret that they cancelled it. These freezing works are mixed up with the purchase of the "Kangaroo" and the purchase of steamers for the North-West coast and the development of the North. We have to realise that we have to live upon our

exports for some years to come. In the past we have been living in a fool's paradise. We have been living on borrowed money. We know what it is in our own business. If we chose to sit down and do nothing so long as the bank manager passes our cheques it is all right, but when the bank manager sends for us there is trouble. For years past we have been living on borrowed money. If those who were getting money were earning it and we were getting value for the money, it would not so much matter, but they were getting the money and were not earning it. We have now reached a critical stage in our history. We cannot find money to provide for the construction of big works. We cannot go on, and the result is that we have to fall back upon our exports. Anything that is done to facilitate exports, be it meat, wheat, or anything else, is going to tend towards the prosperity of the country. In order to live upon our exports or upon what we produce we have first to produce the goods and live upon them afterwards. The policy we have been adopting in the past is to borrow money first and then trust to Providence as to whether we can ever pay it back. We have now to live upon our exports. I do not know of any export trade that would be better than that of producing exportable meat. Especially is this so for small men, if small growers will only go to the North and take up undeveloped country and develop it and produce cattle or sheep. If there is one thing that will assist in that development it is the establishment of freezing works at Wyndham, and also at other ports along the North-West coast. The establishment of these works will have the same effect upon that portion of the State as the establishment of similar works has had upon Queensland, and also have an effect similar to that which the establishment of freezing works had upon New Zealand. The Government were right in taking the furthest port of the State away from the market for the establishment of those works, the most difficult part of the State to get at. They were right in

tackling that proposition as they did, and in letting a contract, but they were wrong in cancelling that contract. They were right in establishing a fleet of State steamers in order to shift the produce which no other company was prepared to do. But they certainly should have, in my opinion, consulted Parliament. I believe that if Parliament had known the facts it would have endorsed the action of the Government. As to the necessity for transport service in the North-West, I need only mention one case that came under my notice this year. A man named Dillon, a small pastoralist, who had battled along in the Kimberley areas for several years and had lived the life of a blackfellow and had no capital to start with, finally reached the stage when he had 100 four-year old bullocks fit for market. The only market to which he could send them was at Fremantle. He could not send them under the age of four years because they could not stand the journey. He, therefore, shipped these 100 bullocks from Wyndham to Fremantle at a freight cost of £350. He landed 31 and lost 69. These bullocks at Wyndham, if the freezing works had been there, would have been worth £10 apiece, and they were worth £1,000 to that man who had battled for so many years to earn the money. He shipped his bullocks down, as I have said, and landed 31, which made the freight £14 a head, he got a good price for them, but having to pay the charges, freight, etc., on 100 bullocks, the result was that he lost his 100 bullocks and owed the agent £122. How can we develop the northern portion of the State in that fashion? The Government are quite justified in establishing these freezing works and in providing facilities, but they seem to go the wrong way about doing things. They will not listen to those who do know something about the matter. If they took this House into their confidence and got the honest opinion of this Chamber, instead of listening to a carpet-bagger like Nevanas, they would have got better results. They have not listened to advice in the past,

but I hope their recent experience will convince them that the proper system is to consult Parliament, where they will get an honest opinion from those who do know something about the matter. As to the necessity for providing shipping facilities for the North-West portion of the coast, this matter is becoming more acute than ever. Those who were engaged on the coastal trade have found much more profitable business for their ships elsewhere. They are not philanthropists. They have found a more profitable business in sending their ships abroad. They send them away where they can get the best return for their capital. The northern portion of the State will be faced this coming year with a more difficult position than ever owing to the fact that some of the ships engaged in the coastal trade will find, and have found, better employment elsewhere. The Government, having two boats on the coast, will relieve the situation to some extent. Even the two boats that are there will not meet the conditions that are likely to arise.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: They will want a couple more.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the Government want another ship, and they do want it, it would be unwise not to give it to them. I was hoping that the "Kangaroo" was going to turn out the right ship and that that would be the justification for her purchase. It appears, however, that she is not the right ship. What we want is such a ship as described by the Colonial Secretary, that is, a boat that will carry passengers, cater for the passenger trade between Wyndham and Fremantle, that will carry 300 or 400 live cattle and frozen meat as well. I was hoping that the "Kangaroo" would meet those requirements, but I find she does not do so.

The Colonial Secretary: The "Kangaroo" will bring down 5,000 carcasses.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We do not want 5,000 carcasses at a time. If we bring down 5,000 carcasses at a time we will need to have storage facilities for that quantity at this end.

The Colonial Secretary: This other ship would bring down 700.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What is wanted is a ship which will carry passengers on the main deck, live stock in 'tween decks, and frozen meat in the lower hold.

Hon. W. Patrick: Little and often.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We do not want a ship which will carry 5,000 carcasses at a time until we have the facilities down here for handling them. If we had those facilities we would have to hold much of the stock for too long a period. The remarks I have made prove conclusively that this portion of the State cannot be developed without proper transport. The reason, I understand, the "Kangaroo" was purchased was due to the fact that the Government had made a contract with Nevanas for the completion of the works in March next, and there were no facilities for getting chilled or frozen meat away. That is the position that presented itself to me as soon as I discovered that this contract was made. The difficulty that presented itself to me was that we would have frozen meat works ready for next season and we had not a ship on the coast to meet the trade. I went to the trouble to get into communication with people in the trade to see if they could provide facilities for bringing the frozen meat from Wyndham to Fremantle during the next year and they did not entertain the proposal at all. Whether they could get a better price for carrying livestock I know not, but they did not entertain the proposal at all, the fact remains that no effort was made on the part of other companies to provide facilities for getting frozen meat from Wyndham in March of next year. The Government, with more forethought than I gave them credit for, saw the difficulty and set about to solve the problem. They looked around to see where they could get a boat to carry the chilled and frozen meat from Wyndham to Fremantle, and the only boat offering that would be suitable was the "Kangaroo," and they started out and purchased it. If they had come to the House and told the House they intended to do this,

and had mentioned the difficulties, I think members would have consented to the purchase of the steamer, and avoided the trouble which has now arisen. It is only the Government's—I was going to say cussedness—in keeping the people's business to themselves. They fail to understand that this is a people's business and not a Labour party's business. The purchase of steamers for the carrying of produce in Western Australia is a people's business and the people should be kept in touch with what the Government are doing. The purchase of the "Kangaroo" was decided on in order to bring frozen meat from Wyndham next year. About this time the contract with Nevanas was cancelled and there was no necessity for the "Kangaroo" to be obtained for the frozen meat during next year. I have some doubts now as to when the works will be completed. First of all, it has to be remembered that the frozen meat works have drifted from a contract job to that of day labour. We know what happens down South here, where the climatic conditions are not so severe as in the North, when you drop the contractor and take up day labour. A doubt has arisen in my mind as to when the freezing works will be ready. One Minister has expressed a doubt whether they will be ready in 1917. When the steamer was purchased there was no way, as far as I can learn, out of the difficulty than by getting hold of the steamer "Kangaroo" and arranging to put her into the trade. Nevanas's contract was cancelled about the same time as the purchase of the steamer was completed. The cancellation of the contract did away with the urgency of the purchase of the "Kangaroo." If Ministers had been in touch as to what was going on in the different departments, this difficulty should not have arisen.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Perhaps they had to keep it secret from each other.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The fact remains that when the "Kangaroo" was purchased there was no idea as to the express date when the works would be completed and until they are completed

the usefulness of the "Kangaroo" cannot be availed of. My regret is that Parliament was not consulted. It would have simplified matters considerably, and justice would have been done to the northern portion of the State without opposition being created to the Government acting as they have done. It is an easy matter to make out a good case, not only in the establishment but in maintaining a steamer service for the northern portion of the State which deserves the consideration which it has never had in the past. One other matter I would like to mention in connection with the North-West area is the difficulty that is likely to crop up in connection with the mail service. The Government were carrying the mails in the "Western Australia"; the boat was purchased for that purpose. The "Western Australia" has been sent away and the "N2" has taken her place. This is an interned boat and as soon as the war is settled the Government will be ordered, presumably, to return the "N2" to some person. The Commonwealth Government are now calling for tenders for the carriage of mails to the North-West. These tenders are returnable on the 20th December. The contract is for three years. I should like to know if the Government propose to enter into a contract for three years without a boat to carry the mails, especially if the "N2" is taken from them, which is likely to be the case? If the Government do place themselves in this position the people in the North will also be in a very difficult position.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: They want more boats.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the Government want more boats they had better purchase suitable ones. If the "N2" is taken away the "Kangaroo" will not be able to take her place, as this boat cannot go in or out of the ports. She is too slow and too big a boat to carry the North-West mails and she cannot carry passengers. She is not speedy enough to do the round trip in the time. The "Kwinana" will carry stock as well as any boat in the trade, but she is not suitable for the carriage of mails and passen-

gers and the result will be a very difficult problem to evolve. The Government cannot take the "Kwinana" off the trade she is now engaged in and place her in the cattle trade, especially as she is more suitably employed elsewhere. If the Government enter into this mail contract for three years and the "N2" is taken away, there will be difficulty as to the northern mail service. The Government should consider this matter seriously and take the House into their confidence. .

The Colonial Secretary: We cannot enter into a contract unless provision is made for a ship.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The mail contract commences in March of next year and the Minister has told us that it will take a year after the completion of the war before the Government will be able to get a ship built. Tenders for the mail contract are returnable next month and the new contract commences on the 1st March next year. If the House gives the Government the money to purchase a steamer, they cannot carry out the contract which commences in March of next year. They cannot get a steamer built until 12 months after the war is ended. This is a matter which concerns my constituents and I want a definite expression of opinion from the Minister. I do not want the Government to go on and take a contract at a ridiculous price by squeezing private enterprise out, knowing that the only ship they have which is capable of carrying the mails is likely to be taken from them at any time. The introduction of oil versus coal is worthy of consideration. I have pointed out that we have now to live on our exports, and if we use Collie coal it would still help us to live on what we produce, but we have bought an oil vessel and we have to bring the oil from another part of the world. That will minimise the benefit to be gained by the export of meat. In order to use the oil steamer, we shall have to go to a big expenditure at Fremantle and also at Wyndham for we shall have to put in big oil tanks at Fremantle which will cost a huge amount of money, and these oil tanks will have to be isolated and will have to have some connection with



the wharf, so that the oil can be served direct to the steamer. This will involve a huge expenditure.

The Colonial Secretary: Not to the State.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Is the oil company going to put the tanks in then?

The Colonial Secretary: They have offered to do that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then the Government are in the hands of the company for all time for the supply of oil. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Government had, during the past year, provided proper bunkering facilities—

The Colonial Secretary: Would not the oil company be in the hands of the Government?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not think we need discuss that. We know how Nevanas handled the Government and we have a fair idea of how the oil company will succeed, if the Government come into competition with the oil company, and it is a matter of brains and conducting business. The bunkering trade has been neglected and if proper facilities had been provided for Collie coal the trade would have developed considerably. Year after year the Government set their faces against providing those facilities and instead of fostering the industry they blocked the export of the coal, or the use of it on the high seas, where it could do no damage and encouraged its use on the railways where it was likely to do damage. This is a matter that the Labour members would do well to note, namely, the introduction of an oil ship on the West Australian coast to the exclusion of coal. There is another matter that Labour members might well consider and it is the fact that the State Steamship Service is the first combination in Australia which has admitted that it has been compelled to squeeze out the firemen on their boats in order to run them properly. An admission of that description was made in the House the other night. The Labour Government have realised, and I honestly believe it has been instrumental in making them decide

in favour of the oil ship, that they cannot tolerate the firemen and local labour conditions.

The Colonial Secretary: We realise that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We hope that the Government will benefit by their experience. The fact remains that throughout the Commonwealth the first concern is to say that they cannot tolerate firemen and the existing labour conditions any longer is the State Steamship Service of Western Australia controlled by a Labour Government. It has been declared by the State steamship management "We cannot stand organised labour; we are going to substitute an oil for a coal steamer, and we shall have the oil laid on from a tank and we shall be able to charge the steamer by merely turning on a tap." That is the proposition which Labour members must consider. I mention it in case they have overlooked it. There is no necessity to labour the question further. All I desire to say is that the purchase of anything like a suitable steamer for our northern coast has my support. I know the difficulties which exist, and hon. members, when they realise these difficulties, will be pleased to extend the hand of good fellowship to the people up there. My objection is to the procedure which has been adopted. In justice to my constituents I am bound to oppose any proposal to wipe out the vote to provide for the payment of this or any other steamer which is likely to be an acquisition to the people on the north-west coast. I condemn entirely the manner in which the purchase was made. Privately owned ships are going into foreign waters, and there is a large quantity of livestock to be brought down from the North.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: This new ship will not take it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It will materially assist. I do hope that because the matter has been wrongly introduced to the Chamber and because members are incensed at not having been consulted, that the item will not be struck out. I believe that the purchase has been com-

pleted and that the expenditure likely to be incurred will be £145,000. The House will be prepared to pay for the steamer but it might strike out the additional sum and then insist that Parliament shall in the future be consulted before any purchase is made. I shall be with hon. members if they do that, but as this new vessel has been purchased and has to be paid for, I trust that there will be no opposition to the amount going through. If we refuse to pass the amount complications may arise.

The Colonial Secretary: Do you think it will be possible this year to purchase another oil boat.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I would not like to express an opinion on that point. I am trying to express an opinion on a matter that I know something about. I defy the hon. member to say at the present time whether he could or could not purchase another oil vessel. It depends entirely upon the duration of the war. The point I wish to make is that our local ships having gone into foreign waters, the recent acquisition by the Government is bound to be useful. The State Steamship manager told me, and he made no secret of it, that he could charter this new vessel out for three years and probably get back the purchase price. If that is the case we have not paid too much for it, but I would be sorry to hear that the vessel had been chartered out until we are satisfied that the products of the North can be moved South this year without her assistance. We cannot blame private enterprise for more profitably employing their ships in foreign waters when the opportunity arises. I repeat that the new vessel will be of considerable assistance on the North-West coast and I trust the amount will not be struck out.

On motion by Hon. A. G. Jenkins debate adjourned.

#### BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that the amendments made by the Council had been agreed to.

#### BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

##### *Second Reading.*

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This Bill which hon. members have before them is introduced by me more in the nature of a hint than anything else. Hon. members who have followed the course of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department for some time past, will know that a great deal of heart-burning is caused by that department by the manner in which their accounts are rendered to householders. In the first place householders who come under the operation of the department in question always state, rightly or wrongly, that they have been systematically overcharged for the work done on their premises. But the overcharge is not traceable to any particular item because the department in the past has been in the habit of refusing to give details of expenditure, and it is still doing so. It is true that these details have been extracted from them when it came to a question of the last issue, the refusal to pay unless details were furnished. The department made a rule that they would do last what they should do first, that is render a detailed statement of the expenditure on the premises. I dare say that the Act in question is susceptible of a good deal of judicious amendment in other directions, but I am taking the step of bringing this matter before the Government in a practical way, and as the result of certain questions which I asked the Government and to which I received eminently unsatisfactory answers, I am taking this step in order that the Government may see that I, at all events, am not inclined to play with the question any longer. It is quite within the province of a private member at any time, if the Government will not do so, to take action. We have waited practically through two administrations for such action to be taken, but nothing has been done, and therefore, I have looked upon it as my duty, as one

of the members representing the Metropolitan Province, to take such steps as may be necessary to bring the matter more cogently under the notice of the Government. The Act gives the Minister power in default of the owner or occupier not completing the sewerage or drainage of his house within a certain time to take such steps to complete that sewerage and drainage, and the proposed amendment in the Bill sets out that—

The Minister after taking any action authorised in the last preceding subsection shall deliver to the owner or occupier of the property on which the work has been carried out a detailed statement showing the cost of labour and material and of all other expenditure incurred in carrying out the work.

It is an endeavour to put the operation of the department on a businesslike footing. We know well that if in private life a tradesman were to come to our house and do certain work, and he were to put in a bill for a lump sum, we would immediately think that tradesman had something to conceal, that he was endeavouring to extort money from us by putting in the lump sum instead of giving the details of the expenditure. That of course is not a charge that could be brought against the Government, although many of my constituents who complain do ascribe those motives, as I know wrongly, to the department in question. It is a matter of self-defence for the department, as well as for the benefit and satisfaction of private individuals that I have brought in this Bill. I am not particularly anxious in view of the lateness of the session that it should go through at this time. There is no reason why it should not, but if there is any feeling on the part of the Government that it is a Bill which should not be introduced by a private member let me say at once that if my introducing the Bill will have the effect of making the Government submit a more comprehensive measure, I shall be perfectly willing to give them the honour of so doing, and I shall feel that I shall have carried out

part of my duty as one of the representatives of the Metropolitan Province in acting as I have done. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

#### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT CONTINUANCE.

##### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it saw no reason to depart from the decision conveyed in its previous message. The Assembly still held to the opinion that the amendments made by the Council were not within the Standing Orders of the Assembly, but were contrary to Parliamentary practice in the Assembly and the British House of Commons. The numbered paragraphs of Message 27 had no bearing on the question, inasmuch as No. 1 did not appear to be supported by fact, and No. 2 referred to a Bill of another character, since the measure amended was in itself an amending Bill as declared by its title and subject-matter, and the amendments made thereto were relevant to the subject-matter thereof.

#### BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION.

##### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that, while maintaining that the term "licensed premises" had not the restricted meaning of those words as used in the Licensing Act, 1911, but included State hotels, refreshment rooms, restaurant cars and clubs, as expressed in the interpretation clause, nevertheless requested the Council to lay aside the Bill with a view to the introduction of another Bill.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew), Bill laid aside.

# BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION (No. 2).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

## *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.51] in moving the second reading said: The principle of the Bill is identical with that of the Bill which has been laid aside, but some alterations were necessary. Under the previous Bill, provision was made for the use of Commonwealth rolls in connection with the referendum. Under this Bill we shall use the State rolls, because the referendum will be taken in connection with the Council elections in May next. If we used the Commonwealth rolls next May those rolls would be at least six months old, and it would be far better in the circumstances to use our own rolls.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The Commonwealth or the Assembly?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Assembly rolls.

Hon. F. Connor: Is not this a waste of printing?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.52]: I secured the adjournment of the debate on the previous Bill, and I intend to exercise my right now.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: To get your speech off?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. Mr. Holmes has the audience.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: To express my views on this most important question. I support the Bill, not because I approve of it in its present form, but because I welcome any opportunity to amend the liquor laws of this State.

*Member interjected.*

The PRESIDENT: I must ask hon. members not to interrupt. If they persist in interrupting, I shall take notice of it in accordance with our Standing Orders.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is no question of greater importance before the

State at present. We were told that three important measures to be enacted during the present session were those dealing with health, the liquor laws and the control of horse-racing, and now, with indications of the prorogation at hand, we have made no progress with the most important measure of the three, namely, the amendment of the liquor laws. As for the control of horse-racing, which a few months ago seemed to be of such importance, the Government have apparently lost interest in that entirely. I hope that, before we have finished with this Bill, we shall have a measure which will be a credit to both branches of the Legislature. It is a matter which should not be rushed. The House cannot give too much consideration to proposals to amend the liquor laws. I may hold pronounced views on the subject, but I look upon the liquor traffic as the enemy in our midst. We have sent our young men to foreign countries to destroy the enemy abroad, and I believe it is up to us who stay at home to tackle the enemy within our gates, and that enemy is drink. I do not suggest that the publican is worse or better than any other section of the community. From what I know of hotels throughout Australia, the publicans here conduct them as well as they are conducted anywhere. This is a legalised trade, and if we are going to interfere with it we must be just and equitable in doing so, and I hope this Bill will receive ample consideration, not only from this point of view, but from every aspect. I regret that another place did not accept the amendment we made to the Licensing Act Amendment Continuance Bill, but they did not even discuss it. If they had discussed it, it would have facilitated matters. In that Bill we expressed an opinion in order that another place might realise the consensus of opinion here. We fixed the hours of trading from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. and introduced a new principle imposing a penalty for shouting. It is regrettable that another place did not seize the opportunity to discuss these amendments in order that we might know their views, so that the combined intelligence of both Houses

could have produced a satisfactory measure. The clause dealing with shouting, though vague and crude, introduced an important principle which another place should have discussed, and, if necessary, amended and enlarged upon. I need hardly add that I am opposed to the proposed referendum.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is the whole Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am opposed to it at this serious stage of the State's history, and would take upon myself the responsibility of fixing the hours for the closing of hotels. If we must have a referendum, I will endeavour to have an additional question put to the voters, namely, "Are you in favour of shouting being a punishable offence?"

Hon. J. Cornell: That would be a gigantic question.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is a gigantic question. If there is to be no referendum, I have a clause taken from legislation in the old country which I shall endeavour to have inserted and, read in conjunction with our £5 penalty, it would make an excellent provision. It reads—

No person shall, either by himself or by any servant or agent, sell or supply any intoxicating liquor to any person in any licensed premises or any club, to be consumed on the premises unless the same is ordered and paid for by the person so supplied; nor shall any person order or pay for or lend or advance money to pay for any intoxicating liquor wherewith any other person has been or is to be supplied to be consumed on the premises; nor shall any person consume on such premises or club any intoxicating liquor which any other person has ordered or paid for or agreed to pay or lend or advance money to pay for; provided always that if such intoxicating liquor is supplied or served for consumption with a meal and is supplied at the same time and is consumed at such meal, the provisions of this regulation shall not be deemed to be contravened if the person who pays for such meal also pays for such intoxicating liquor.

That gets over the difficulty about the poor man being deprived of his beer with meals while the rich man can drink wine with his meals. That regulation incorporated in our legislation, together with the £5 penalty, will meet the shouting difficulty. To reduce the hours during which our hotels may keep open will certainly reduce the consumption of drink, but I pin my faith for reform to the putting down of shouting. If the opportunity is taken to impose a penalty for shouting, the benefits accruing would be such that, while this is a temporary measure we are dealing with, shouting would ultimately be permanently prohibited. I do not wish to say very much as to the manner in which another place evaded its responsibility of saying yes or no to our amendments, except that I do not think it was creditable to side-track over amendments. There are various reasons why we should not allow a referendum on such a subject as this to be taken at any stage, but there are very urgent reasons why we should oppose at the present time the creation of turmoil and trouble between the publicans and the temperance party. We should set our face against putting one section of the community against another by a referendum or by any other means. As regards the Federal referendums, whether the Federal Labour party found that they could not carry them or whether that party desired to avoid turmoil and tumult, the fact remains that they abandoned the referendums, realising the seriousness of taking referendums at this juncture. The same argument applies in favour of abandoning the referendum proposed under this Bill. Again, there is the consideration of expense. If the Federal Government cannot find money for the purpose of holding a referendum, I honestly think Western Australia cannot find money for a State referendum. I pass over the remarks of outside critics, some of whom will be prominent on the public platform to-night and probably saying hard things about Parliament evading its responsibility to amend the

Licensing Act. Hard things have been said by those gentleman, and hard things could be said in reply to those gentlemen. I believe the desire of this Chamber, at all events, is to enact a fair, reasonable, and equitable measure; and I resent criticism from people outside, some of whom abandoned the Church to go into hotel life and went back into the Church only when they found hotel life did not pay. However, I do not wish to stir up strife, and I merely mention that in passing. For the purposes of the referendum it is proposed to divide the State into four electorates. I will not be a party to making it a crime for a man to have a drink in Perth after 8 o'clock at night while the man on the goldfields can drink until midnight with impunity. I will not be a party to legislating for one section of the State. This House should legislate for the State as a whole, and not for four different sections of the State. One section may vote for 8 o'clock as the closing hour, and another for eleven; and then a crime is created at the dividing line, which may be the middle of a street, so that an hotel on one side of the street will close at 8 o'clock, its proprietor suffering heavy loss, while the hotel on the other side could keep open till eleven with the result that its proprietor would have his business doubled. I entirely approve of the hours being from nine to nine, or I would make them from nine to eight, or from eight to eight, or even from nine to six. The more obstacles placed in the way of obtaining liquor, the better, in my opinion; but if we are going to ruin the publican's business we must compensate him. The position is very serious. I look upon the drink traffic as the curse of Western Australia. When we find a community of 300,000 men, women, and children spending for last year just upon  $2\frac{3}{4}$  millions in liquor, we begin to realise the magnitude of the evil. And that  $2\frac{3}{4}$  millions is arrived at, not after adding the publican's profit, but simply by taking the figures of Customs and Excise. A community drinking to that extent can surely pay compensation to the man whose business may be ruined. One

thing must be remembered in conjunction with the other and we must have equity and justice. The Bill provides for a reduction in rent consistent with the reduction of trading hours. That is a fair proposal for the tenant; but there is no provision that there shall be a reduction of the license fee. If the reduction of hours will have such an effect upon the rental value, surely it will have some effect on the license value. While the owner is to make a reduction to the tenant, the Government do not propose to make any reduction in the license fee. The landlord or owner may at his present rental be getting only bare interest on the money invested. If we take away 25 per cent. of his rent, we may be doing him an injury. I say unhesitatingly that if we are going to ruin the trade of individuals in order to benefit the community, then a State which can spend  $2\frac{3}{4}$  millions in a year on liquor can afford to pay those individuals compensation. I do not know whether men will be ruined as a result of the passing of this Bill, but, if they are, then some provision should be made to compensate them. In previous remarks here on this subject I advocated the anti-shouting proposal, and I am pleased to know that that proposal has grown in public favour. I travel through the country. I have recently been north as far as Meekatharra, and have also been south. I was born in this State, and I know it thoroughly. I travel considerably and meet all sections of the community, and I have no hesitation in stating that the country, with the exception of the Goldfields, is in favour of putting down shouting. The goldfields representatives can speak for themselves; but I know hundreds of men—my own friends, too—who will be glad of the opportunity to say "Legislation prevents us from shouting." They only want an excuse. They realise the danger that is growing. I think this Chamber should in this measure give them that excuse. There are hundreds of men, strong men, men not addicted to liquor in any way, who only

want an excuse in order to embark on this new reform. They have not the moral courage to adopt that reform without an excuse. Knowing that to be the case, we can realise the difficulty of the man addicted to drink and wanting to give it up, when it is offered to him at every street corner. What happens to troops coming here—the finest men to be seen on God's earth, men going out to fight their country's battle? The one black mark is drink. Not that the troops themselves really want it. Looking them straight in the face, one can see that they are not drunkards. Many of them are too young for that. But hotels meet them at every street corner, and drink is forced on them by local residents. In my opinion, punishment could hardly be too severe for men guilty of forcing drink on the troops. I say it is the duty of this Chamber to put a stop to that practice. Only a few weeks ago I saw a battalion of men halting in Fremantle because there was a block in traffic. There was an hotel immediately opposite, and no sooner did the soldiers come to a standstill than civilians rushed into the hotel and brought out drink for the visiting troops, who were perfect strangers. An officer took a glass of beer from the first man who came out and dashed it in that person's face. I went up to the officer and said, "That was an incident." The officer replied, "I am afraid I lost my temper; I am an Englishman, and not used to this." I said, "I am an Australian, and I am proud of what you did; you treated that man as he should be treated." Our local people, of course, thought they were doing a good service to the visiting troops by carrying beer to them in the street. Personally I do not think any penalty too severe for such conduct. The officer rebuked the man in the only way he could. He splashed the beer in the other man's face and smashed the glass on the street. Yet we are asked to allow this pernicious system of shouting to go on. I am not speaking on behalf of the trade: I detest the trade, but I recognise that

it is a legalised trade, and that men have been induced to put their money into the business. If by legislation we should ruin some of these men in order to save others, others who are spending three millions of money on liquor, the least we can do is to give some compensation to those whom we may ruin. Only the other day I said to a friend of mine, a moderate drinker, "Do you know that the country is consuming nearly three million pounds' worth of liquor?" He replied "It is a disgrace to the country." I said "Two and three-quarter millions represents £9 per head. You have three adults in your house and four children. Seven times £9 is £63, or equal to 25s. per week. Will you tell me that you are getting through on 25s. per week?" He replied "No." I said, "Well, you are doing more than your share towards building up the liquor bill, and that without knowing it." And they never will know it until they stop pouring liquor down the throats of people who do not want it. If we have a referendum there is one question which should go to the people, namely, "Are you in favour of making shouting a punishable offence?" When we amend the Bill in Committee I hope we will strike out the provision for a referendum and fix the hours ourselves, for my part the earlier the better. If we proceed on those lines we will minimise the evils of the liquor traffic to the extent of from 75 per cent. to 80 per cent. The amount of money wasted in liquor must be brought home to the individual in order that he may see the waste that is going on. Let a man drink on his own and he soon tires of it. A man interested in the trade in the Old Country interviewed recently stated that, owing to anti-shouting legislation, where they once took hundreds of pounds they are now taking only a few pounds. On his own testimony liquor drinking, robbed of its social element, loses its charm. The same publican said that invariably when a man came in for a drink on his own he was content with the one drink, and did not have a second. I am certain that we

can do a considerable amount of good by amending the Bill in the direction suggested. When we were first called together we were told that this Bill was among the most important we would have to consider and it is now proposed to rush it through without consideration. I am quite prepared to give any time that may be necessary to solve an equitable Bill that will put down the enemy in our midst and bring about an essential reform.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.20]: If Ministers are really desirous of temperance reform they should have accepted the amendments in the Continuance Bill. At all events, if they had felt bound to stand by the challenge to that Bill which I understand was made by the Minister in charge of it, could they not have evolved something more workable than this crude thing sent up to us to-day? The Bill utterly overrides the most essential powers provided in the Licensing Act, and yet makes no profession of amending that Act, and contains no saving clause to cover that duplicating of legislation. The Licensing Act provides certain hours for the sale of liquor. The Bill makes no provision for amending the Act, but provides for the fixing of entirely new times. Is that the kind of Bill to send to this House? However, it is too late in the session to follow the example set elsewhere and indulge in what I call quibbling. The course I intend to pursue is this: I shall vote for the second reading and, in Committee, I hope that Mr. Colebatch will move the amendments to this Bill which he moved to the Continuance Bill. I will support him. Whatever excuse there may have been for devolving the responsibility of the Legislature on a referendum of the people, it has passed away. There was something in taking a vote in November to deal with the war emergency, but to propose to postpone it till May next, when, everybody hopes, the war will be over and the emergency passed, is an insult to the intelligence of the people. Why should Parliament refuse to face its duty of legislating? Why should members and, above all, Ministers

say, "We might offend the people if we fix the hours; let us pass it on to a referendum of the people." Is there a child at school so simple as not to know that a referendum of this kind would result in the most ridiculous anomalies? What would happen? The country districts would vote for an early hour of closing; the City would vote for the present hour, and the Goldfields, if the schedule permitted it, would vote for no closing at all. The result of a referendum would be early closing in the country districts, where the people have carried out a reform themselves. I speak from intimate knowledge of what is occurring in my own electorate, and I guarantee that there is not one-half the drinking to-day in the country districts that there was before the war. The people have carried out the reform themselves, and where there is little or no need for reform an early hour would be carried; and we would have the absurdity of a man coming from a country district where the houses close at, say, 8 o'clock, into the City, where he can drink until 11 o'clock, or, going to the Goldfields, where he could drink all the time.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: And pay for it.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The House has good grounds for complaining of the stultifying of those very-carefully-thought-out amendments in the Bill previously before us. I say that as gravely as I can. The refusal of those amendments and the sending up of this crude measure does not commend the question itself to the House. However, I hope the House will not be affected by the superficial and unjust criticism levelled against it from outside Parliament. The Continuance Bill, as returned to the Assembly from this House, represented the greatest advance in licensing reform that has been attempted in any part of Australia. Nowhere else has "nine to nine" been proposed and carried through the House of review, and nowhere else has an anti-shouting clause been accepted with, practically, unanimity. This House is the real leader in licensing re-



form. Yet what is the criticism levelled against it? It is that this House is opposed to licensing reform. And the Minister who takes a point gratuitously to get thrown out a Bill embodying those advanced proposals of this House is the Minister who leads those outside critics to regard this House as a difficulty in the way of licensing legislation. I say this House is the advanced House of licensing reform. But it is logical in its proposals. This House a few sessions ago carried an anti-barmaid clause and sent it to another place, where it was thrown out without consideration. I hope the House will not be influenced by this superficial criticism from outside, or by the crude action embodied in the Bill, and that members will try to do the right thing in licensing reform; that we shall put into the Bill the proposals of Mr. Colebatch and that we shall add to those proposals the anti-shouting clause. It happened that I had the honor of proposing it the other day, but I am quite willing to allow Mr. Holmes to take charge of it, merely advising him to get the Parliamentary draftsman to let his light shine upon it. I may say that if my own amendment was in a somewhat skeleton-like form, if I heard Mr. Holmes reading aright, his amendment erred on the other side.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It might have been my bad reading.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Or my bad hearing. I am sure the Parliamentary draftsman would be very glad to put in into form. No doubt the House will pass it and we hope it will be accepted in another place, and that the gentlemen who are posing as leaders of licensing reform from outside this House will be rational and ready to take the full responsibility for that reform. I hold it utterly unworthy of the legislature to postpone this question to May and yet call it a war-time emergency measure. It is unworthy of legislators to refuse to take their proper responsibilities and to make laws in the light of public opinion which they ought to represent.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.32]: I move—

*That the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.*

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	..	..	..	15
Noes	..	..	..	5
				—
Majority for ..	..	..	10	—

#### AYES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. F. Connor
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller).

Motion thus passed.

*Sitting suspended from 5.35 to 5.50 p.m.*

### BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES (No. 2).

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [5.50]: I am sorry this matter should come on in the absence of the members of the province who are interested in this Bill. I confess I know little about it. It seems to me that insufficient reason has been advanced for the passing of the Bill. I understand the object of the measure is to give the Government power to grant a concession over a certain area of a class A reserve to a South Australian company for the purpose of making cement. I have also been informed that two Western Australian companies desirous of making cement in different parts of the State have been negotiating with the Government for quite a long time, not asking for any particular concessions, but asking to be allowed to get

on with this work. I understand that there is little opportunity for more than one company in this State, and if any one company is given a concession in front of the others it practically means that others must be shut out altogether. As the case has been represented to me—I know little about it myself, and would have preferred the members for the province interested should have dealt with this matter—it is that two different local companies are endeavouring to get the permission of the Government to commence cement-making, one at Lake Clifton and one at Dongarra. In the case of the Lake Clifton deposit, it was discovered two years ago, and the people interested have been endeavouring ever since to fix up matters with the Government. I have been shown the correspondence between the people interested and the Government, from which it appears that a month or two ago the Government were on the point of coming to some terms—it means no question of granting a concession—and then, all of a sudden, this South Australian company comes on the scene. I have not looked into this measure, I have been relying on the members for the province to give it consideration, but I understand the object of the Bill is to enable the Government to take a portion of a class A reserve and give over that portion a concession to a South Australian company to make cement. For a long time local people in the two cases I have mentioned, the one at Lake Clifton and the one at Dongarra, have been negotiating with the Government for the purpose of getting the right to use lands for the same purpose, not in a class A reserve, but on land over which the Government could grant consent. A couple of months ago the people interested thought they had fixed up the matter with the Government, and then these people from South Australia turned up and the local people have got no answer since. I do not know what has been done. Their applications have been hung up, and these people from South Australia are to be given a preference, which does not seem to me to

be a right thing, particularly after the way in which we see that these carpet baggers, as Mr. Holmes has called them, come along and seem to get the better of the Government. I do not feel disposed to make it easy for the Government to grant this reserve to a South Australian company unless it is shown that negotiations with the local people will not be prejudiced. I am sorry I do not know more about this matter, but I hope Parliament will not pass this Bill in the absence of the members of the province concerned.

On motion by Hon. F. Connor debate adjourned.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE, MONEY BILLS PROCEDURE.

*To adopt report.*

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [5.55]: I move—

*That the report of the select committee be adopted.* - -

I do not propose to occupy more than a few minutes of the time of this Chamber on this question. Members know that the position with regard to the consideration of amendments to money Bills have several times formed the basis of disagreements between the two Chambers of the Legislature, and these disagreements have taken place in the class of Bills which are not money Bills in what could be termed the true sense of the word. But the disagreements have taken place on non-financial classes of Bills which happen to be called money Bills, and which are supposed to have financial clauses contained therein. The Council are desirous of making it impossible for such Bills to exist in the future; insofar as an agreement has been reached between the Committee of the two Houses, this conclusion has been arrived at. They are of opinion—both branches of the Legislature—that steps should be taken to make any Bill that comes before the Legislature either a money Bill or not, so that it is recognisable at the first glance. In order that this may be done, the committee recommend that the procedure which is adopted under the Federal Constitution should be adopted in

this State, that is, that a Bill dealing with the finances such as an appropriation of revenue or loan, or the imposition of taxation, should deal with that subject only and not contain administrative clauses which might be liable to amendment, and over which disputes might arise, because it may be maintained that such clauses are clauses of money Bills. We have not far to go to find instances in local legislation where this principle has been adopted. I will refer members to the two Bills under which the land and income taxes are imposed and collected in this State. Members know that what is known as the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act is purely a machinery measure. It contains the principles and directions to the department to collect the revenue from those concerned. On the other hand, what is called a purely money Bill is the little Bill which we pass from year to year imposing the tax. That principle is embodied in the Federal Constitution, that Bills appropriating revenue or loan funds, or imposing taxation, shall deal with finance only and that other subjects shall be dealt with in a separate Bill. Under the procedure recommended by the select committee a money Bill would be a measure such as we have before us now dealing with the Revenue Estimates and the Loan Estimates. In the proposed Bill which the committee recommend should be introduced at as early a date as possible, Bills to impose taxation are dealt with as follows—

Bills imposing taxation shall deal only with the imposition of taxation and any provision therein dealing with any other matter shall be of no effect and shall deal with one subject of taxation only.

If the deliberations of the two committees had stopped at that stage, the committee of the Council think that an admirable conclusion would have been arrived at, but unfortunately the committee of another place wished to introduce an amendment which would have the effect of perpetuating this very class of Bills, over which all the trouble has oc-

curred, and which we desire to get rid of. As a disagreement has occurred, it only remains for the two committees to recommend, as they have recommended, and which recommendation I hope will be endorsed by the House, that so much of the deliberations of the committees as have resulted in an agreement shall be embodied in the Bill, a draft of which is published with the report and that the other part of the deliberations, that is the perpetuation of this class of hybrid Bill shall be left to the discretion and decision of Parliament. If, therefore, a draft Bill is introduced to this House—which is not probable—it will have clauses dealing only with what is dealt with under the draft Bill which hon. members have before them, and I presume in that case, if another place thought fit so to do, they would introduce clauses rendering it possible for the existence of these hybrid Bills which I have sought to deprecate in the eyes of hon. members. If however a Bill were introduced in another place, then I presume it would be the draft Bill with the addition of the clauses I allude to, and when such Bill came before this House, the offending clauses would be struck out. I hope an agreement will be arrived at between the Houses on the basis laid down in the draft Bill, and if hon. members will support the draft Bill, a great deal of friction which has arisen at different times between the two branches of the Legislature will cease in the future. I have every confidence in commending the report for the acceptance of hon. members, and I sincerely hope and trust that some decision will be arrived at which will make the relations between the two Houses more easy running in the future than has been the case in the past. There are enough points of difference, enough avenues of disagreement between the two Houses without adding to them, and if we can place, so to speak, a little lubricant on the various points of friction, I think the committees will not have sat in vain.

Question put and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.5]: When I moved in the direction of extending the hours of sitting, I stated that I would not ask hon. members to sit on Friday unless it was absolutely necessary. It will be necessary for the House to meet to-morrow. The Legislative Assembly has practically cleared its Notice Paper and will be waiting for business from this House. It is necessary that the Sale of Liquor Regulation Bill should be considered as quickly as possible, and also the Appropriation Bill and Loan Bill. Therefore, I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 p.m. to-morrow.*

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [6.5]: I do not think the leader of the House has given adequate reasons why we should sit on Friday as well as on the ordinary sitting days. We are now only in the middle of November. It has not been customary in the past for Parliament to go into recess until just before Christmas, and it seems to me it is our duty to sit as long as there is important business to transact. There is one important reason why Parliament should not rush into recess. There is a matter of extreme importance to the whole of Western Australia at the present moment awaiting decision, and that is the arrangement to be made between the Commonwealth and the State Governments in regard to the marketing of Australian wheat. The details of that scheme have not yet been finally agreed to unless the Minister has had word to-day. I do not think that the Minister is in the position to say that when arrangements are finally made it will not be necessary to introduce State legislation in order that the scheme may work satisfactorily, and in order that the interests of the producers may be protected. I am strongly inclined to think that legislation will be necessary, and it seems imperative that Parliament should continue in session until we know all about the arrangements made for marketing the wheat. So far as I am personally con-

cerned—although it is a matter of some inconvenience for me to remain here—I would cheerfully give up my time if I were satisfied there was necessity for doing so. It seems to me that Parliament must sit next week, and unless the leader of the House can give us a stronger reason for sitting to-morrow, I think he is unnecessarily imposing upon members in asking them to meet on Friday.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [6.10]: It seems to me from the remarks of the hon. member that he is attempting to direct the policy of the Government and the work of another place. He wants to sit next week in order to discuss the wheat question. Some weeks ago, when I was moving to extend the hours of sitting, I also stated that I intended to move for an extension of the sitting days and I would ask members to sit on Friday whenever it was necessary to do so. I had the word "Friday" inserted in the motion, but it was removed by the Clerk Assistant of the House, who considered it was unnecessary, as I could move on Thursday that the sitting be adjourned until Friday, and that is what I now ask the House to do. There was no necessity whatever for the adjournment of the debate on the Sale of Liquor Regulation Bill to-day, because the measure has already been before this House.

Hon. V. Hamersley: There is a big meeting to-night.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: To-morrow would have been an opportune time to consider that Bill, and seeing that another place has got through all its business and is waiting for Bills from this House, it is an unfair attitude for members to adopt to ask that the sitting should be adjourned until next Tuesday.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: We cannot finish to-morrow by any means.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	..	..	..	9
Noes	..	..	..	12

Majority against .. 3

AYES	
Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	(Teller).

NOES.	
Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller.)
Hon. J. J. Holmes	

Question thus negatived.

*House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 18th November, 1915.*

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat harvest, arrangements for handling ..	2581
Fremantle Harbour Trust, Annual report ..	2582
Papers presented ..	2582
Bills: Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, Council's Message ..	2582
Sale of Liquor Regulation, Council's Message ..	2585
Sale of Liquor Regulation (No. 2), all stages ..	2586
Road Closure, returned ..	2589
Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments ..	2589

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

### QUESTION — WHEAT HARVEST, ARRANGEMENTS FOR HANDLING.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture: Whether he can make a statement to the House with regard to the arrangements made for the handling of the harvest so that the producers and others

interested may know exactly what they have to look forward to.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I quite recognise that things are somewhat unsatisfactory owing to the fact that the harvest is now being reaped and the farmers are not in a position to know definitely what is going to happen. For that the Government are not responsible. The work of formulating the scheme was not completed in Melbourne when it became necessary for me to return to this State, and the best I could do was to leave Mr. Sutton, who had accompanied me, in Melbourne to assist in finally completing the details of the scheme. Since then I have been in close touch with Mr. Sutton. The conference is still sitting, it is sitting to-day. Until the work is completed it will be impossible for me to make a definite statement in regard to it. This morning the matter was considered by Cabinet, when the Premier pointed out the necessity for the making of a statement so as to relieve the existing uncertainty. It was then decided that I should notify the Chamber that in the event of the House not being sitting at the time the completed scheme came to hand we would call members together in order to explain the scheme, or alternatively, if that could not be done, I should make a statement through the Press.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I assume the Minister is not yet in a position to judge whether legislation will be necessary. It may be necessary for us to pass some machinery Bill in connection with the scheme when it is decided upon. I suppose the Minister is not in a position to say anything about that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It may be considered necessary to pass legislation. Only this morning I wired to Mr. Hughes, pointing out that in Western Australia we had no machinery—we had the machinery until another place removed it—and that the only way we can put the scheme into operation will be by Federal action. I have explained to Mr. Hughes that if any legislative action becomes necessary the Com-