

## SELECT COMMITTEE, WHALING LICENSE.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that the Hon. J. M. Drew had been authorised to attend and give evidence before the select committee.

*House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 4th March, 1915.*

	PAGE
Questions: Deficit .. .. .	1885
Maize Importation .. .. .	1885
Bills: Income and Public Entertainments Taxation, 2s., defeated .. .. .	1885
.. Appropriations, 2s., Com., 3s. .. .. .	1896
.. Loan, £2,850,000, 2s., Com., 3s. .. .. .	1898
.. Road Closure, 2s., Com., 3s. .. .. .	1903
.. Permanent Reserves, 2s., Com., 3s. .. .. .	1909
Papers presented .. .. .	1910
Adjournment, special .. .. .	1910

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

## QUESTION—DEFICIT.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (without notice) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, From what sources has the deficit of £1,118,548, now overdrawn by the Government, been obtained? 2, How is the amount made up, and has it been obtained from any bank or savings bank, or from moneys taken from any loan or other trust fund, and in the latter case from what specific funds has it been taken? 3, Have the Government any bond, Treasury bill, or other security, for the whole or any portion of this £1,118,548? 4, In the event of any portion being taken from Loan Funds, from what particular item has it been taken? 5, What specific works are being retarded by reason of

this immense amount of £1,118,548 being taken from the moneys voted for these specific works? 6, Has Parliamentary approval been obtained for these moneys being deviated from the purpose for which Parliament voted the money to other purposes? 7, Has the Audit Act as to the expenditure of loan moneys been observed and complied with?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: I can hardly believe that the hon. gentleman is serious in asking such a string of questions without notice.

## QUESTION—MAIZE IMPORTATION.

*As to costs, duty, etc.*

Hon. W. PATRICK asked the Colonial Secretary: Referring to the 6,000 tons of maize imported by the Government,—1, What was the amount paid for freight and insurance? 2, What was the amount paid for duty to the Commonwealth? 3, What sum was paid, or is payable, for wharfage and other landing charges? 4, Have the Government applied to the Commonwealth for remission of duty? 5, If the Commonwealth have agreed, or agree to remit duty, will the purchasers get the benefit of such remission?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The freight amounted to £8,359 18s. 5d. The insurance was paid in London, and details of this as a separate item are not yet to hand. 2, £10,031 18s. 6d. 3, The ship has not finished discharging, but at schedule rates, wharfage, handling and harbour improvement charges will cost approximately £3,000. 4, Yes. 5, Yes.

## BILL—INCOME AND PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENTS TAXATION.

*Second Reading—Bill defeated.*

Debate resumed from the previous day. The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.37]: This is a Bill to impose a special tax on incomes and entertainments, but there has been introduced into the discussion a

variety of subjects, all interesting, but many of them having no bearing whatever on the subject of the Bill. It is my intention, during the course of my remarks, to depart from the proper path in order to pursue some of the assertions which have been made by hon. members, and which have been damaging to the Government. An ingenious endeavour has been made by some hon. gentlemen to mystify the public and to divert attention from the main issues involved. The Government justify this Bill on two grounds, firstly, that there is great distress in the community owing to the existence of two national calamities, and, secondly, that there are inadequate funds with which to relieve this distress. No attempt has been made by any of the speakers to controvert these propositions. They have been either conveniently side-tracked or have met with flippant assertions which are contrary to the facts which stare almost everyone in the face. It has been said by a number of speakers that this is a Bill to impose taxation in the interests of one section of the community. This is a most heartless sentiment to which to give expression when a question of the alleviation of human suffering is involved. I will go further and characterise it as a cruel and callous utterance, which one would not expect under the conditions obtaining at present. Yet that utterance came from the lips of not one or two hon. gentlemen, but of several speakers. Who comprise this one section of the community? The men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow; men who are not asking for charity but are prepared to give their labour to the State in return for any assistance they receive, the bread-winners of families who go to make up this country. I am surprised at the attitude of many members. It has been indeed a splendid display of patriotism and a magnificent exhibition of self-sacrifice at a time, too, when self-sacrifice is not a virtue but a duty of every member of the community. I contend that this will not be a tax on one section of the community. The wage-earner will be called upon to contribute under this measure. In the coastal districts the labourer will, to a large extent, be exempt, but all

skilled workmen will be included in the taxation provisions of the Bill. On the Eastern and Murchison goldfields, and in the North-West, every worker will be hit by this tax. The goldfields people in particular will have to pay very heavy contributions, although they are not suffering from the effects of the calamities which are existing at the present time. There are 17,000 men engaged in the gold-mining industry in this State and all these men will be taxed under this Bill. In every instance, I believe, they receive more than £156 per year. Taking the average wage on the goldfields at £3 15s. per week, the workers there would have to find under this measure no less a sum than £16,571. And they are prepared to do it; they have no objection to the Bill. In fact when the Income Tax (War Emergency) Bill was under consideration, and when the Government, on the expiration of Parliament, went to the country, the people throughout the whole of the goldfields who would have had to bear the burden of that great tax endorsed it unanimously. They are prepared to support this Bill and to pay the tax demanded by it, although they can hope to receive nothing in return. They have everything to lose and nothing to gain by the operation of a measure of this kind. But they endorse it because they have a practical sympathy with human suffering. It seems to me they have set a noble example of self-denial and immolation, which I regret to say is not likely to be imitated by many of the wealthier classes of the community represented in this Chamber. We are told that the Government are responsible for the condition of affairs which has arisen. Will any intelligent or unprejudiced person in Western Australia support that statement? Every one knows the cause of the unemployment. Every one knows that there are unemployed in every town and every district of this State, and every one is aware, also, that this is not the fault of the Government. During the first week of the war a general funk set in. The building trade became paralysed; and a great majority of the masons, bricklayers, carpenters, painters,

plumbers and others engaged in the construction of buildings and residences were turned adrift straight away. One would conclude from the evidence afforded that there was a general impression that Kaiser Wilhelm would soon control this territory. Then again our factories did not exactly close down but they discharged hands in large numbers. The timber mills slackened their operations, mines closed down and the unemployed trouble set in. On top of this came the drought; the farmer dismissed his men but he himself was soon in need of financial assistance. It was not long before he was a suppliant to the Government for even the necessities of life. The whole of this burden fell on the Government. They could not allow the farmer to starve, and they had to find means of employment for the workers. They recognised their responsibilities, and as long as they could they lived up to their responsibilities. They fed the farmer, and they provided work for the labourer. In doing so, no doubt they have added to the deficit. That is a fact which cannot be denied. The Government could have closed down the implement works, which would have meant that from 400 to 500 men would be thrown out of employment. We could have shut down the sawmills, and we could have ignored the sleeper hewers' appeal, and thus we would have thrown 1,300 more men upon the Labour market. No doubt, that would have pleased Mr. Colebatch, but I think most people will admit that it certainly would not have been in the interests of the country. These men are giving value to the country. If they are increasing the deficit, it is only a temporary increase. They are giving value to the country, for the money which they receive. Taking the City of Perth and only a small section of workers, a very alarming position is disclosed. I have here a cutting from the *West Australian* of a week or so ago, indicating that the position we are faced with is no imaginary one. I intended to read the statement published in the *West Australian*, but in that matter I was forestalled by Mr.

Millington. The statement was made up a fortnight ago, I think, and the position may have become intensified since then. However, at that time it was shown, as a result of reports from 15 unions in the metropolitan area alone, that 1,367 men were unemployed and 1,400 men on reduced time. How many women and children, I ask, are affected by this deplorable state of affairs? But it does not seem to concern members of this House very much. I am afraid they have not studied the question deeply; otherwise we would not have heard many of the remarks to which utterance has been given in the course of this debate. And to all appearance the situation is becoming intensified as the days pass by. The position must be relieved. It cannot be relieved without more funds, and the object of this Bill is to provide those funds. Several members stated that the Government had a Loan Bill of £2,800,000 coming down. I would remind hon. gentlemen, however, that the Loan Bill simply seeks the authority of Parliament for the raising of money. Without that Bill, the Government could not borrow money. We must always have an authorisation before we can raise money by way of loan. The Bill is coming down purely for the purpose of enabling the Government to borrow money when the time comes, when money will be available. No one can tell when that time will come. No one can foresee that. It may be in 12 months' time, or it may be in three years' time—no one can predict. And the Loan Bill does not provide for the expenditure at the present time of a single pence. Its purpose is simply, as I have already indicated, to enable the Government to borrow money when it is available; and I lay the greatest stress upon that word "when."

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Does not the Loan Bill cover the Commonwealth advances?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is another Bill which covers the Commonwealth advances up to date; and portion of the funds to be raised under the present Loan Bill may come from the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That money is available month by month.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: So far, we have all the authority which we require when we are securing money from the Commonwealth. Later, it may be necessary to obtain further authority.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But that is three millions.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is quite true that we are financed by the Federal Government, but the amount we are receiving from that source is only sufficient to meet the conditions of normal times. If there were no failure of last harvest, and if private enterprise were not unloading its employees on the Government, the amount which we shall receive from the Federal Government would be ample for all necessities. But the amount to be received from the Federal Government is, I contend, inadequate to meet a situation which is unparalleled in our history. Out of the moneys we receive from the Federal Government, we have to finance the farmer to the extent of £850,000 up to the end of June next; and we have to find a further £200,000 between that date and the end of next harvest. This means £1,100,000 for one industry alone. All that money does not drop from the clouds. That money represents portion of the sum which we have been receiving and shall receive from the Commonwealth. With the funds we have already obtained, we have been able to keep public works going at a fair pace. All the railways authorised prior to the present session of Parliament are either completed or approaching completion, with perhaps one or two exceptions. Yet Sir Edward Wittenoom stated in the House the day before yesterday that all the moneys obtained by the Government had been wasted. That is the class of criticism we are used to from many hon. members in this Chamber—that the money raised in the past has been wasted. A statement like that could not be made before any unbiassed and intelligent assemblage. Mr. Colebatch speaks in a

similar strain. He tells us the Government propose under this Bill to take money out of channels where it is providing work and to direct it into channels where it will be wasted. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman means that money spent in the construction of feeder roads to our railways would be money wasted; but that is one of the purposes to which the Government propose, if this Bill be passed, to devote some of the revenue obtained under it. Mr. Colebatch should also be perfectly aware—and he must be perfectly aware—that there could be no expenditure on any work without the consent of Parliament having been previously obtained. Moreover, the only instances of waste submitted by the hon. gentleman to this House and to this country were the State sawmills and the State implement works, both of which undertakings are being conducted at a profit, and each of which has given employment to hundreds of men who would otherwise be thrown out of employment and so intensify a position that already appals those who are responsible for the conduct of the affairs of this State. Mr. Colebatch informed the House that the Government would get no money under this Bill until next July. He must be cognisant of the fact that, if this Bill be passed, the Treasurer would anticipate, and would in the meantime provide from loan funds the necessary money. Ultimately, the revenue would be recouped from moneys raised under this Bill. Even if we could not get in any revenue before July, which point I dispute, and will deal with later, that would be no argument whatever against the Bill. Money will be as much needed in July as it is now, and perhaps more needed. But if the Bill be passed, then it may be possible to stave off a condition of things which we see looming in the distance. Mr. Colebatch's remarks about Commonwealth exports and imports have no bearing whatever on this measure—no more bearing than the assassination of President McKinley had on the recent rebellion in South Africa. Mr. Colebatch should be the last to speak about exports and imports. For two

years the hon. gentleman blocked the passage of the Irrigation Bill, the main object of which was to reduce the quantity of imports into this State by establishing the dairying industry in our midst and thus saving £800,000 a year to our people. And yet now, in connection with this measure, and altogether off the subject, the hon. gentleman in offering his arguments in opposition to the proposals of the Government introduces the question of Commonwealth imports and exports. His opposition to the State implement works in the same speech makes one doubt whether the hon. gentleman would not prefer to see hundreds of men out of employment in this State, hundreds of men now engaged in manufacturing machinery in the State. Presumably, he would prefer to see those men out of employment and money going out of the State for the importation of machinery which can be more cheaply and more satisfactorily manufactured within our own territory. The hon. gentleman complained because certain questions he asked last Thursday were not replied to until yesterday. He asked for a return which I could have obliged him to proceed for by way of motion. The hon. member should not have asked a series of questions: he should have moved this House for the production of a return. The hon. gentleman wanted the ages of all applicants for relief. Evidently, he is under the impression that the Charities Department takes the date of birth of every man and woman applying for a meal ticket. He also wanted to know the last place of employment of each recipient of relief. He may be also anxious even now to know the names of the unfortunates. At any rate, he is curious to know where last they worked. I fail to see the object the hon. gentleman could have in ascertaining the whole of this information, and why he should make an attack up on the Government because the information was not forthcoming. The whole of the staff of the Charities Department were engaged from Thursday last up to about 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon, in collecting this information.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: It should not have taken them 10 minutes, if they keep proper records.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are not keeping an office for the registration of dogs, where every detail is necessary, including colour and pedigree. Mr. Colebatch said single men should not be relieved and he asserted that they could get work at reduced wages and that they should take such work. By that one statement the hon. member lets the cat out of the bag. He is seeking, as many others are seeking, a wholesale reduction of wages. The attitude of the Liberal Press and the manoeuvres of prominent Liberal politicians strongly indicate that there is an underground movement in progress for the lowering of the wages of the workers of Western Australia. Mr. Colebatch said that these men should accept work at £1 per week and food. That is a rate of wage which has not obtained in Western Australia for, I think, the last quarter of a century.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Do not you think that is better than living on charity?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Now if the Government could only be forced by financial necessities to lower the wages and salaries of their employees, and thus furnish an example to those engaged in private enterprises, there would be great rejoicing among a certain section of our community.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Are not private persons losing their profits at the present time?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: However, such a step as that will never be taken, I can assure hon. members, by the present Government. If ever there was a time when the wages and salaries being paid, and which were adopted during a period of prosperity, should be maintained, it is the present time, when the cost of living has been considerably increased. "If this Bill passes, we can only conclude," says the hon. member, "that preference to unionists will obtain." Then he devotes some caustic criticism to preference to unionists. All things being equal, the Government

undoubtedly believe in the principle. It is only fair that those who give up their rights under the Arbitration Act should get something in return. It is only just that they should be afforded some measure of recognition; but the occasion for the enforcement of that principle is not when funds are being raised to assist distress. That is no fitting occasion for the enforcement of the principle of preference to unionists. We have relieved hundreds of cases through the Charities Department since the inception of the war, and no one can urge against us that we have asked the question "Are you, or are you not a unionist?" No questions have been asked, but in every deserving case assistance has been rendered. If it were otherwise we would find the Press teeming with criticism of our inhumanity. Mr. Colebatch strove to point out the effect of the Bill on the primary producer. He stated that the farmer has been three years without an income, and that now when he is likely to get an income the Government are going to take it away from him. If the farmer has been three years without an income, he has been living during that time on the State because no one else has supported him during those three years. He has had to depend on the present Administration, for it cannot be shown that any private firm or company has come to the assistance of the farmer and provided him with the necessities of life for three years. If, without income for three years, the farmer is still continuing his operations, it is due to the fact that the present Government have stood behind him.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: What about the storekeeper?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The storekeeper did hold on to the farmer as long as he could, and the storekeeper deserves all credit for that; but the time came when the storekeeper could no longer continue to render assistance to the agriculturist, and then the Government went to the rescue. If the farmer has had no income during the last three years, the State has had to carry him during that period.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: What about the private banks?

Hon. D. G. Gawler: And private firms?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I contend that hundreds of farmers have been kept going by the Government for over three years. The Government recognised that it was their duty to the community to render the farmer this aid. Now, if the farmer is going to have a good crop, it is his duty to turn round and say, as I believe he would be prepared to say, "I am quite willing to bear this tax in order to assist the unfortunates in circumstances similar to those I have experienced during the last three years of my occupancy of the soil." But Mr. Colebatch was not fair in his statement of what the farmer would have to pay under the Bill. He gave us an example of a farmer with a crop of 350 acres, averaging 15 bushels, and 50 acres of hay.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: And stock.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is impossible to rely to an assertion like that unless the hon. gentleman mentions the number of stock. Mr. Colebatch said that such a farmer would have to pay over £40 in taxation. Evidently the hon. member did not make the necessary deductions: he was taxing the farmer on his gross income.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: No, nothing of the sort.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The sum of £40 would not cover the whole of the farmer's tax.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member has made no allowance whatever for the production of the crop. Under Section 30 of the Act of 1907—the Bill must be read with the principal Act—under the principal Act the taxpayer is entitled to deduct, in respect to his annual income, (1) Losses, outgoings and expenses actually incurred in Western Australia in the production of his income; (2) sums expended in repairs of premises let to tenants; (3) premium of life insurance, etc.; (4) repairs or alterations of machinery, implements, etc., used in connection with the business; (5) wear and tear and depreciation; (6)

for the services of his sons and daughters over 16 years of age; (7) £10 for each child under 16. All these provisions apply in connection with the Bill now under consideration. The Bill must be read in conjunction with the principal Act.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Every one of those deductions has been made.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If all had been made it would not be possible for the farmer to pay £40 in taxation; something like £17 per annum would be nearer the mark. Then we are informed that at the last elections the Government were beaten on the question. In the first place it is not the same question as that submitted to the consideration of the electors.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It is worse.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is a very different proposal. The present measure is a considerable modification of the war emergency tax. Nor were the Government beaten. They were returned on a small majority of only two, but a majority all the same. And it must not be forgotten, as Mr. Kirwan pointed out, that the Liberal party, who opposed that measure, came back to the Assembly without any addition whatever to their number.

Hon. J. Cornell: They came back one short, and very dejected.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The war emergency tax struck every elector, and struck him with force. It certainly lost the Government many votes, and we realised it from the very introduction of the measure. But, as I said before, this Bill is a different proposition altogether, and it comes here with the endorsement of a tremendous majority of the representatives of the people in another place. It is rather unfortunate that the Kellerberrin branch of the Farmers and Settlers' Association has passed a resolution of protest against the Bill; that should be quite sufficient to seal the doom of the measure. Strange things happen in some country constituencies. For instance, the York branch of the Farmers and Settlers' Association a few weeks ago carried a motion of protest against the leader of the Country

party for supporting the Government in putting through legislation in the interests of the farmers. And the same branch applauded the Council; for what?—for delaying the Foodstuff Bill until the price of wheat had gone up from 5s. to 7s. 4d.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You know that is false; you know the Council did not delay that Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This statement was made at a meeting of the York branch of the Farmers and Settlers' Association, the statement that the Council were entitled to every respect for having delayed the Foodstuff Bill until the price of wheat rose from 5s. to 7s. 4d. per bushel. The report appeared in the *West Australian* two or three weeks ago.

Hon. W. Patrick: This House had nothing to do with the delaying of the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was some delay in this House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will take serious steps if so many interjections are indulged in. The Colonial Secretary does not seem to be allowed to speak many minutes before they are showering in on him.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I fully realise this has nothing whatever to do with the Bill. However, the fault is not mine. I cannot permit it to be suggested that the voice of Kellerberrin should reign supreme and stifle the voice of the people as expressed by the overwhelming vote in another place. Sir Edward Wittenoom told us that the people would be in favour of the Bill if it were for the purpose of putting the financial affairs of the State in order. I well remember that when the war emergency tax measure was introduced into this Chamber one of the strongest objections to its passage was that the proceeds would go into revenue and tend to reduce the deficit. That objection was raised by more than one hon. member.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Not so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was a decided objection to the money going into revenue so 'hat it might reduce the deficit. Mr. Cullen did not oppose the Bill on those grounds, but other members now present did. I would like

to ask Sir Edward Wittenoom, if he were here, would he be prepared to support the Bill if the proceeds of the taxation could go into the general revenue with the object of remedying the financial position existing at the present time? If he is in favour of that, he could achieve his object by moving in Committee for the deletion of Clause 13. My experience in this House enables me to form an opinion of the value of such professions, and I am convinced that no measure of taxation, however skilfully or wisely designed, would receive the support and approval of Sir Edward Wittenoom. Mr. Cullen has said that the Bill is unnecessary, that the Loan Bill makes provision for giving work to the unemployed. The hon. gentleman should remember that the Loan Bill simply gives authority to borrow money; it does not produce a single sixpence itself.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: What about the Commonwealth money?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: So far as the Commonwealth is concerned, we have all the necessary authority; we are getting all the money we can, and we are spending it freely.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It ought to be enough.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Cullen's sympathy with the unemployed is extreme and unbounded, but unfortunately it is merely of the lip variety. Hon. members should bear in mind on an occasion like this, that words butter no parsnips, and that verbal sympathy cannot be transformed into something which will appeal to the butcher, the baker, and the grocer. Mr. Cullen's sympathy is very welcome, but I would much prefer that it went further. Why does not the hon. member do as the Quaker of old, namely, give his sympathy in concrete shape? Why does he not say "I sympathise with the unemployed to the extent of giving my vote in favour of the Bill designed for their relief"? The hon. member does not do that, and his sympathy merely consists of words. We could admire the nature of his commiseration, and appreciate his solicitude for the unemployed, if he permitted it to take a more practical shape. It has been said that

the money to be raised under the Bill will not be available until the first week in July. That has been repeated by several hon. members. I have already dealt with the question, but I intend to submit another point for consideration. I have explained that the amount likely to be raised by July can be anticipated by the utilisation of loan funds. As a matter of fact, a large proportion of this tax, if the Bill becomes law, will be available without very much delay. A large proportion of the contributions by the wages and salaried sections of the community, both in Government and private employment, will come in monthly or fortnightly, and I can assure hon. members that, in the opinion of the Colonial Treasurer, who has been in consultation with the Commissioner of Taxation, that should represent a fairly substantial sum. After listening to the hon. Mr. Baxter I should be sorry to think that he truly represents the views of the agriculturists of this State. In the whole of his speech there was not one spark of gratitude shown for the assistance—and more than assistance—rendered to the farmers by the Government at present in power. He launched forth in a wild and reckless statement, unsupported by one tittle of evidence. After listening to his lengthy speech, the only conclusion I can come to is that his one remedy for the present situation lies in sending down prisoners to the South-West to clear the land, and in replacing the staff at the Pingelly railway station. That was the sum total of Mr. Baxter's contribution to this important debate. The hon. Mr. Kingsmill tells us that State enterprises are State excrescences. He believes they are, and is entitled to his opinion. I am not disposed at all to quarrel with Mr. Kingsmill for the view that he holds, but when he states, as some others have stated, that the Government have wasted the money they have spent, I certainly think that he should furnish some information, if not to the House, at any rate to the country, in regard to his line of argument. He should have come forward with specific statements of the works upon which money was spent, and



in connection with which he considers that money had been squandered. No proof, however, was forthcoming, and the only conclusion we can come to is that no proof was available. Mr. Kingsmill further stated that the Legislative Council represented 95 per cent. of those people who would pay the tax under this Bill. I do not for one moment admit the correctness of his statement. It is not necessary that I should deal with it now. He implied, however, that inasmuch as 95 per cent. of those who would have to pay taxation were electors of the Legislative Council this House had more right to speak on this question than the other Chamber. That is a line of argument which I think runs directly counter to the spirit of the Constitution. The power to originate taxation rests solely with the Legislative Assembly, and, except for very strong reasons, this House has no right to interfere with the supplies which the other House considers necessary for the administration of the affairs of the country. If this House has superior claims to the other Chamber in regard to the imposition of taxation, then it can dominate the whole of the political situation, and government by the people will be reduced to a farce. Such a Constitutional anomaly could have no other end, and that end I will clearly explain, I hope, before I close my speech. The hon. Mr. Patrick rose exultingly to disprove the statement that the Government were confronted with a falling revenue. He quoted figures, but a little deeper investigation must show to that hon. gentleman the utter fallacy of his argument. The revenue has increased certainly since the present Government have been in power. There is a very intelligible explanation. It has increased owing to the establishment of the many State enterprises by the present Government; and owing to the whole of the income of the Metropolitan Water Supply going into revenue, and the whole of the proceeds from that work going also into revenue instead of into profits as before. This has been one of the causes for the expansion of the revenue, and represents a big item indeed. Further, owing to the purchase

of the trams, and the many other undertakings of the Government, the revenue has increased, while, at the same time, there has been a corresponding increase in the expenditure. Hon. gentlemen laugh; I do not think that before any intelligent public assembly they would jeer at a clear statement of the position such as I have made. In the establishment of all these trade enterprises naturally, if there have been any proceeds at all, there must have been an increase in the revenue—and there has been a big increase in revenue owing to these causes—but there has also been a corresponding increase in expenditure as well, so that the quotation of the increase of revenue during the time the present Government have been in power has no application whatever in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman. The establishment of these concerns has undoubtedly inflated the revenue. Taking, however, the latest figures—that is for January and February—supplied to me by the Under Treasurer, these show, without any doubt, that there is a substantial decrease in the revenue over that received for a corresponding period in last year. In January, 1914, the amount of revenue received by the Treasurer was £382,586; for January, 1915, the revenue was £369,026; a deficiency of £13,559. Now we come to the month of February. It is not of last year we are talking in connection with this Bill. We are discussing the state of affairs as they exist at the present time. What the revenue was in July or August or September last has no bearing whatever upon the question, except for the purpose of comparison. In February, 1914, the revenue was £469,424, and for February of this year it was £404,721, showing a deficiency in one month of £64,703. The total falling-off in two months was, therefore, £78,262. So much, then, for the attempt of the hon. Mr. Patrick to prove that there had been no falling-off in revenue.

Hon. W. Patrick: I took the whole year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We are not dealing with the whole year; we are dealing with the position as it is at

the present time, a position which has arisen purely owing to the war and the drought. The hon. Mr. Duffell is anxious to meet the Premier in conference with other hon. members of the House so that he may be able to give Mr. Scaddan the benefit of his judgment. I submit, however, that Parliament is the proper place for the hon. member to express his views in. He had an opportunity last night, but, in the course of his entire speech, he had not one practical suggestion to offer in regard to the unemployed, the seriousness of which position he admitted. All that the hon. gentleman can do is to offer his sympathy for the unemployed. As to how they were to be relieved, or how the position was to be overcome, was beyond the ability of the genius of that hon. gentleman.

Hon. J. Duffell: What about the metropolitan water scheme, and the accumulated funds?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: One of the reasons for the opposition of the hon. Mr. Carson to the Bill is that the Government have not introduced the Re-classification of Lands Bill this session. Mr. Carson has come to the conclusion that the farmers have been most cruelly treated in consequence. For years that hon. gentleman sat behind the Government which was responsible for the inflation of prices which the present Government have endeavoured to remove. He never uttered, so far as I know, one word of protest against the increase in values which had been imposed on the lands of the State by the previous Government. Because, however, the Scaddan Government have had their time so occupied not in framing industrial legislation, not in dealing with legislation affecting the mining, but with measures for the benefit of the agricultural industry, and because the Scaddan Government have for the last three or four months been so closely engaged in preparing to put through both Houses of Parliament legislation in the interests of the farmers and intended to save them from ruin and starvation, and because the Government have been unable to further prolong the session in order to put through this Re-

classification of Lands Bill, the hon. member accuses the Ministry of inhumanity.

Hon. H. Carson: You had plenty of time to introduce the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. Mr. McLarty is of opinion that the financial requirements of the State would be met by a reduction in the salaries of members of £100 per year, and that of Ministers of £300 per year. That would save an amount of £9,800 which could go into revenue. Mr. McLarty is very optimistic. He does not take any gloomy view of the situation at all. All that is necessary to save the State and provide wholesale employment for those out of work is to cut down the salaries of Ministers and members of Parliament by that amount. Out of that amount he expects that we shall be able to finance the State out of its present difficulties.

Hon. E. McLarty: It will, at all events, help.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Strange to say, although the hon. member takes a very optimistic view of the situation—at any rate I thought he had before I perused my notes in full—he says, towards the close of his speech, that no one wants a dissolution of Parliament just now, and that no one is anxious to take on the Government of the country at the present time. Whether the hon. gentleman thinks that the position is such that no one would be prepared to accept it, with all the allurements attached to it, or what the meaning of his words is, I have not been able to discover, in view of his previous statement that the saving of £9,800 by a reduction in the salaries of members and Ministers will do so much to relieve the present situation. The hon. Mr. Allen admits that there is a great number of men in destitute circumstances in the State, but thinks that the amount likely to be raised under this Bill is inadequate to meet the position. He holds a view entirely contrary to that of the hon. Mr. McLarty, who considers that £9,800 would be amply sufficient. The amount which will be raised under this Bill—if it becomes law—is between £150,000 and £200,000. This may be in-

adequate, but that is not an argument against the Bill. Even if the incomes are derived only from the wages and salaried classes, and those who have assured incomes, this money would still represent a fairly substantial sum, and it would be calculated to assist the Government in doing a very large amount of good at the present time. To say that because the amount of £150,000 or £200,000 is regarded by the hon. member as inadequate, and that this is a reason why the Government should not introduce the Bill, is an argument which would not bear investigation. It is hardly a sound argument to urge that because one cannot get everything, and because one cannot do everything, one could do nothing. Mr. Allen also said that the funds raised under this Bill might be used for the purpose of providing competition against the industries to be taxed. The hon. gentleman surely has read the Bill, and must have seen that before any class of expenditure can be undertaken by the Government they must first proceed to obtain the sanction of both Houses of Parliament for the outlay.

Hon. J. F. Allen: They have anticipated that before to-day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government do not claim that the Bill is a perfect one. No measure ever framed was not open to criticism, especially a measure of taxation. It would be impossible to devise any measure of taxation that would be pleasing to all. It may be possible to improve the Bill by amendment, and the Government have no objection to reasonable and useful amendments. Indeed, I may say the Government would welcome such amendments. There has been no attempt to demonstrate that the unemployed difficulty is not a grave one. On the other hand, many hon. members have admitted that there is a crisis in that direction at the present time, and while opposition is shown to this Bill, there has not been one suggestion which would bear examination as to what sensible alternative course should be adopted. The only solution hinted at by Mr. Colebatch and Mr. Allen is that there should be an all-round reduc-

tion of wages, but that is a suggestion which will not be accepted by this Government or by the workers of the country. If wealthy men could get the workers' labour in this crisis at half the usual rates, there would be a wholesale release of capital which is now locked up. The Government have been informed from various quarters that all that is necessary is to reduce wages, and capital will rapidly circulate. There is not the slightest doubt about that, and it seems to me that the trouble in the whole of the industry, the suddenness with which men were discharged when the war broke out, was due to a desire to bring about a reduction of wages. Mr. Colebatch expects the worker to sell his labour for £1 a week and food. He made that statement in this House, but during the discussion on the Foodstuffs Bill he displayed extreme anxiety that produce salesmen should benefit by national calamities, and be able to sell their produce at a higher figure than was reasonable and just. Every consideration was shown by Mr. Colebatch for the man who had full and plenty, but there was no thought on that hon. member's part for the man who might not know where he would get the next meal for himself, his wife, and his children. The Government recognise fully the necessity for additional taxation at this particular period. The House which represents the people has also manifested in a striking manner its recognition of the position. I would be deluding myself if I failed to foresee the fate of this Bill, especially after the speeches I have heard during the last 48 hours. The Government, however, have done their part by introducing the Bill, but they cannot force the House to pass it. The Bill passed the popular Chamber and has come to this House, and if members here reject it they must take the full responsibility of that rejection. We have heard something about unification during the course of this debate. There is no doubt about the tendency in that direction, and it is growing every month and every day, and it will continue to grow. The Legislative Councils of the different States of Australia are entirely responsible for the growth of that feeling. The

day is past when the people as a body will consent to be dominated by one small section of the community. They will have one refuge, and they are bearing it in mind even here that they shall have that refuge from the Upper House. That refuge will be unification at no matter what cost. We blame the Federal Government for poaching on what are considered State preserves. We complain about their taxation proposals, but if we fail to utilise the sources of taxation at our disposal for the development of the State, it is not a matter for surprise if the Federal Government come in and exploit those sources. So it will go on with the consent and approval of a great number of people in Western Australia. Whenever an attempt is made to introduce legislation in accordance with their own particular views, in harmony with the opinions of the majority, to introduce that class of legislation to enable the administration to be carried on, this House, contrary to the spirit shown by other Chambers in the Empire, rejects those measures and prevents the Government from successfully carrying on. There can be but one end, and that is that the majority of the people in the State responsible for the election of members to the Legislative Assembly, which is continually being flouted by the Legislative Council, will use all their influence to bring about that unification to which so many of us are opposed.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	4
Noes	..	..	..	19

Majority against. .. 15

#### AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Cornnell
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	(Teller).
Hon. H. Millington	

#### NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom.
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller).

For—	PAIR.	Against—
Hon. A. Sanderson		Hon. C. Sommers

Question thus negatived; the Bill defeated.

[Several persons in the gallery called out "Shame."]

The PRESIDENT: I will leave the Chair for five minutes while the gallery is cleared.

## BILL—APPROPRIATION.

### Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.46]: It is not usual for the representative of the Government in this House to make any speech in submitting the Appropriation Bill. The Budget speech has been delivered in another place and hon. members have attended in that House to hear the speech, or have read the report in the newspapers. I have never known any instance where the introduction of the Estimates in this House has been preceded by a speech from the representative of the Government. I move—

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

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.48]: There is a matter of administration especially affecting the residents of the province I have the honour of representing that I wish to refer to very briefly. I desire to draw attention to the administration by the Industries Assistance Board under an emergency Act of legislation. Emergency legislation is peculiarly liable to results never dreamt of by its framers. The Industries Assistance Act is a glaring case in point. It was intended to relieve farmers whose crops had been reduced by drought from having to deliver more wheat than their crops had yielded. During its passage through the Legislature, the Premier, the Minister for Lands, and the Colonial Secretary explicitly laid down this object, and

repudiated as "dishonest" a proposed amendment to cancel all wheat contracts up to 1st October. The board started to administer the Act strictly on this interpretation. They made it known that they would apportion payments for wheat amongst the parties entitled to receive it—farmers getting the prices at which they had sold, and the purchasers getting the difference between those prices and the price fixed by the board. But in view of the fact that some farmers, who had sold at a very early date, were getting low prices, the chairman of the board expressed the hope that the purchasers would voluntarily divide their profits with the farmers, and the intention of using his influence where necessary to bring this about, as a matter of grace. Now, it appears that, swayed by some outside influence, the board is administering the Act on the very opposite interpretation, namely that the Act has cancelled all wheat contracts, not merely up to 1st October, but up to the passing of the Act, and that the whole of the price fixed by the board shall be paid to the growers of the wheat, regardless of any contracts they might have entered into. In other words, the Act is held to authorise what the Minister who piloted it through the Legislative Assembly declared to be "dishonest"—a declaration which was endorsed by the Premier and Colonial Secretary. It must be assumed that the board, in carrying out this interpretation of the Act, have been fortified by the approval of the Government. The position, therefore, is this: the Government have secured from Parliament the passing of an Act for a specific purpose, and on solemn declaration that they would not allow that purpose to be altered, yet, after the passing of the Act, they have approved of its administration in an entirely different way—in a way they declared in Parliament to be "dishonest." Ministers may perhaps say that their hands have been forced by legal interpretation of the Act. In that case surely it was their duty to bring in an amending Bill. They are now, through their board, operating an Act in the very opposite way to that declared

to be their intention when getting the Bill through Parliament. In plain English, the powers now being operated have been secured against the intention of Ministers and Parliament. If Parliament submits to such reversal of the intention of an Act, Parliament itself must suffer loss of dignity and prestige in the public mind. What about the effect on business morality? Two farmers, under exactly similar conditions, sell wheat at say 5s. per bushel for forward delivery. One honourably delivers and receives his 5s. per bushel; the other delays delivery till after the passing of the Industries Assistance Act, and gets 6s. 9d. per bushel, notwithstanding his earlier sale at 5s. Is this not putting a premium, under cover of an Act of Parliament, on breach of contract? It can only be hoped that farmers will refuse to take advantage of this miscarriage of legislation; but the temptation is very strong. Farmers might very naturally argue that since an Act of Parliament invites them to break their contract, they would be sinning under the highest authority. It is right that they should have the fact impressed upon them that neither the Government nor the Parliament had any such intention, and that this insult to business honour has no sanction except that of a legal flaw—a miscarriage of legislation. The intention of the Government and the Legislature was only to release farmers from such portions of their sale contracts as the drought made it impossible to fulfil. It may seem bad politics for the representative of a province, which includes practically all the farmers who have had wheat to sell, to urge these views; but representatives of the people must care more for their constituents' honour than for their votes. The honour of Parliament, and of numerous wheat sellers is at stake—no light game. What are Ministers and members going to do about this matter? Is it to go on the Parliamentary records and abroad to the world, that in Western Australia, in a rising market, sale contracts rank only as "scraps of paper"? This is not a question as between wheat farmers and merchants; it

is a question of business morality. I have done my duty by directing attention to this matter. A few days ago I endeavoured to gain the Colonial Secretary's attention, but he replied that he knew nothing about it. He is a very busy man, and possibly has not been able to ascertain the facts, but I have now detailed the facts, and I trust the Government will intervene.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [6.1]: The hon. member has stated that the Industries Board were swayed by some outside influence. I can assure the hon. member that they were not swayed by Ministerial influence.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I did not suggest that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I wish that to be distinctly understood. The Government have held no conversation with the members of the board regarding the object of their appointment since they were chosen. I know this, because a question arose among Ministers only a few days ago. It was discovered that through a misunderstanding the board had not been placed under any particular Minister. The Minister for Lands was under the impression that the board came under the Premier's department, and *vice versa*. It was decided to place them under the Minister for Lands, and Cabinet were of opinion that it was about time the board made a report. I casually heard the Premier make reference to a deputation who had approached him with the object of securing an amendment of the Act, but the Premier's version of the affair, although I cannot recollect the details, was entirely different from that of the hon. member. I believe the deputation requested something which the Government had never agreed to grant, something outside the present Act. When the Bill was introduced, it was clearly stated in both Houses that the farmer would be required to fulfil his obligations to the fullest extent possible. It was pointed out that if a farmer had wheat over and above the quantity requisite for his own needs, he should fulfil his obligations. If the Act can be interpreted in any other

way, I think there is an obligation to amend it so that it shall conform to what was represented to hon. members and to the intention of Cabinet before the measure was submitted to the Legislature. I will secure a copy of the hon. member's speech, and bring it under the notice of the Minister for Lands.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

## BILL—LOAN, £2,850,000.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.8] in moving the second reading said: This Bill gives authority to raise money for the specific purposes set forth in the schedule. On the 30th June last we still had authority to raise £2,018,670. A fair proportion of that money has already been raised through the Commonwealth Government. It will be necessary later on to have authority to raise more money to complete the works sanctioned by Parliament. There may be a difficulty in getting money, but members will agree that we should have the authority and be prepared to raise it when the proper time comes. Nearly the whole of the works referred to in the schedule, with the exception of freezing works at Wyndham, have already been authorised by Parliament. I move—

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

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [6.10]: I desire to enter a protest against the attitude of the Government towards the province I represent. When the Government took office they promised the people of Geraldton that their harbour would be considerably improved, and that better facilities would be afforded farmers to ship their produce. Not very long ago the Minister for Works sub-

mitted plans and specifications of work to be carried out at the port. There is no line in the schedule for these works, but £35,000 is provided for the harbour at Albany, and £14,000 for the harbour at Bunbury. This is most unfair. My province has not received a fair share of the loan money. It is an important province, and these much needed harbour works ought to be provided.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [6.11]: A sum of £200,000 is to be expended on freezing works at Wyndham. This seems to be an enormous expenditure for the Government to undertake, and the House is entitled to some information before it sanctions what I consider will be the squandering of such a large amount. Through the laxity of previous Governments, freezing works are being erected by the Commonwealth Government at Darwin. I have information showing that some of the largest supplies which would have gone to works at Wyndham will go to Darwin. I understand that the plans of the proposed works at Wyndham are being exhibited in Melbourne, but they have not yet been exhibited in this State. The works are to have an output of 500 head of cattle per day, but with the supplies of cattle on the stations surrounding Wyndham there will be sufficient to keep the works fully occupied for probably only two or three weeks of the year. It is extraordinary that the Government should propose so large an expenditure at this one centre.

The Colonial Secretary: All of it will not be spent on freezing works.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The Government have lost the opportunity of providing an outlet for much of the stock from Northern Territory stations, and they should now consider whether there are not other centres where such works could be more advantageously established. More cattle would be available at Broome and Derby than at Wyndham, and the expense of providing water supplies would not be nearly so heavy. The difficulty of providing a water supply has been a stumbling block in the past, and has been respon-

sible for the delay on the part of previous Governments. The proposed works should not be erected so close to the Federal works, but rather at a centre where there is likely to be a greater number of stock available. Had the Government embarked on such a policy as this instead of going in for State steamships, we would probably have been in a far better position to-day. The Government should seriously consider whether Wyndham has not ceased to be the most suitable port for these works, and whether the other ports I have mentioned would not present better propositions. Either Broome or Derby or one of the other centres would be far better. The Government could put up works at one-half the cost that works could be put up at Wyndham, and owing to the number of boats trading along the coast and the service along the North-West coast there would be a far better opportunity for a weekly supply of chilled meat to come down to the markets of the metropolitan area, than if we went further up the coast where they have not the same opportunities of shipping chilled meat. I am perfectly satisfied that a grave mistake will be perpetuated if works which are to cost the enormous sum of £200,000 are to be put up at one centre. I would ask the Minister to give very grave consideration to this question, and to give us an assurance as to whether inquiries have been made with regard to the output of stock available at Wyndham and the output of stock both from Derby and stations contiguous to Derby and Broome, and as to the advantages to be derived from works to be put there, because they are so much nearer to the city and so much nearer to the southern portion of the State where chilled meat would perhaps save a good deal of the mortality which is now occasioned by stock having to be shipped from those ports in a live state. There are many thousands more head of stock put out from the ports I refer to, than are likely to be shipped from Wyndham, and I certainly think—I, of course, have no informa-

tion as to whether the Government have made inquiries with regard to those other ports or not—that we are entitled to information on the point before we become a party to the passing of this £200,000 to be spent at this one port. We must make the best possible use of the expenditure of these public funds, and see that the money is utilised in the most judicious manner as well as to the best advantage of the cattle industry in the North-West.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [6.20]: I hope that we will have an assurance from the Minister in connection with this matter. I hope the assurance will be that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with those works as speedily as possible. A mistake was made that they were not undertaken when the House provided the money for them three or four years ago. For some unexplained reason these works were abandoned. The fact that freezing works are to be established at Port Darwin emphasises the necessity for the Government to proceed at once, otherwise this important industry will be lost to the State. The cattle will drift from the northern portion of our territory into the northern portion of South Australia, and Port Darwin, unless something is done to catch the trade which really belongs to this State. We know that we are not sending enough produce out of the country and that meat is scarce to-day. We know also that there has been a good season which has placed the northern portion of the State in a very prosperous condition, and that the North-West of this State will be literally teeming with cattle this year. There will, in fact, be too many for the local market to consume, and no means are provided for getting them out of the country. The hon. Mr. Hamersley suggests that the Government should come nearer home and start freezing works. The difficulty to-day is the difficulty of transport. We must begin at the furthest point north, between that point which is a producing area and this point which is a consuming area down here. You must begin at the furthest point north and catch the trade which really belongs to the State, and

having done that, must do as they have done in New Zealand and elsewhere, come on down the coast to the consuming area. But the fact is that the Federal Government are attempting to establish freezing works at Port Darwin and to catch the trade which really belongs to Western Australia. No matter how small an industry may be this State cannot afford to lose it. The meat industry, commencing as it does at Wyndham, is an industry which this State cannot afford to do without. The inadequate means by which we are carrying cattle to-day are a disgrace to Western Australia. The loss that goes on is enormous. Take the one ship which is trading to this isolated port, the "Kwinana." All the other boats belong to other firms which are catering for the ports lower down the coast. The "Kwinana" carried 800 bullocks on her first trip. The loss in value on those cattle, on a fair basis, from the time they were shipped at Wyndham until they reached Fremantle was no less a sum than £2 10s. per head, which means a total loss in value on the shipment of £2,000. Who pays for this? The public pay. Every time the ship comes in she comes in with stock valued at £2,000 less than they were valued at when she started from the North-West port. I hope we shall have some assurance from the Minister that those works will be gone on with at once. This important point has to be remembered, that this particular district is known as a tick infested area. The cattle cannot be brought down from that area except for slaughtering. From the ports further south, however, the cattle if they are deteriorating or are not fat enough for a market, could be sent out to pasture and fattened on other areas in the State. If the Government establish freezing works at Derby, or one of the other places further down the coast, cattle cannot be taken into Derby because they would be brought out of the tick infested area into a clean area. The fact of that being a tick area is evidence of the necessity for having freezing works at that point. We can take sound clean cattle into a tick-infested area to be slaughtered and no harm will accrue. If we bring



tick-infested cattle out of the Wyndham area into Derby we bring tick into that area and contaminate the whole of the herds. I am sorry that time will not permit of my dealing further with the matter as it should be dealt with. I hope we shall have an assurance from the Minister that the works will be proceeded with forthwith.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [6.26]: I do not desire to detain the House, but I feel it my bounden duty to offer a few remarks on the matter before us. Though I am a supporter of the Government I am not entirely wedded to their loan proposals. There are one or two items in this Loan Bill that I cannot agree with without some explanation that will satisfy me.

*Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. CORNELL: Before tea I announced my intention of venturing, though in no hostile spirit, a few remarks on the second reading of this Bill. One point which I desire to emphasise and to stress is the manner in which this House deals with the authorisation of a Loan Bill—not only on the present occasion, but on every occasion since I have been a member of this Chamber. We have here a Bill to authorise the Government to incur loan expenditure to the extent of £2,350,000. That is a great deal of money. On no occasion does the introduction of a loan Bill give rise in this House to any remarks derogatory to the Government's action in entering upon a policy of borrowing. No such criticism has ever been indulged in here, within my experience. But, having authorised loan expenditure without offering any derogatory remarks, this House consistently pursues the illogical course of condemning the Government for expending loan funds. Mr. Colebatch has even gone the length, on one or two occasions, of saying that the Government should keep their loan expenditure within the vicinity of a million and a-half.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I have never made any such statement.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Colebatch and other members have repeatedly attacked the Government for borrowing too much

money and for expending too much money. Mr. Kingsmill has attacked the Government for spending money on excrescences. The present, I submit, is the time for this House to take exception to items in this Loan Bill, and to use its undoubted right to eliminate items from the Loan Bill and thus curtail expenditure. If hon. members will not adopt the logical attitude of taking exception to the amount the Government propose to borrow, and the manner in which they propose to expend the amount when borrowed, then I say they should for ever hold their peace. Because as regards every penny and every million which the Government have borrowed, this House has been a factor in authorising the borrowing thereof; but this House has never been a factor in pointing out to the Government where they could mend their ways as regards expenditure of the loans which this House has authorised. I make these remarks with all due respect and deference, and I do hope that from this out some degree of consistency will be achieved and maintained. I do not desire to be too hard on hon. members, but in domestic life I think the man who fathers a baby of any description is supposed to stand by it and support it. That is all I ask hon. members to do when they father babies in the shape of loan Bills—to stand by those Bills. There is one item in the present Loan Bill which, as a goldfields member, I view with some diffidence. Ever since I have been a member of this Council, the Government have been urged to establish freezing works at Wyndham. It has been contended by Mr. Holmes, Sir Edward Wittenoom, and Mr. Connor that freezing works should have been established long ago. When a proposal to establish the works is brought forward in the shape of an item in the Loan Bill, we find Mr. Hamersley, who is interested to some extent in the pastoral industry, viewing that item with due deference. I have known Mr. Hamersley to father even such socialistic enterprises as the purchase by the Government of steamers to carry away the wheat of this State. The advocacy I refer to arose out of a proposal

for the erection of grain elevators at Fremantle. It was pointed out to Mr. Hamersley in the course of the debate that the Government might not be able to get freight room, whereupon the hon. member said that the Government should provide steamers.

*Personal Explanation.*

Hon. V. Hamersley: On a point of order—

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order the hon. member wishes to raise?

Hon. V. Hamersley: As to the statement which Mr. Cornell erroneously attributes to me.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, the hon. member is making a personal explanation.

Hon. V. Hamersley: I desire to make a personal explanation with reference to Mr. Cornell's erroneous statement that I advocated that the Government, in the event of their not being able to obtain freight room, should build ships to carry grain from this State. The occasion referred to was one on which I was advocating the establishment of grain elevators at Fremantle. An interjection by Captain Laurie, to the effect that no ships were available to take the grain away, led me to make the remark that Governments nowadays were so wedded to socialistic enterprises that they would probably build ships for this purpose. In any case, I said, there was very little doubt as to the State's ability to secure ships to carry wheat or grain, in whatever form we had it to send. I am still of the same opinion.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will not repeat his speech.

*Debate resumed.*

Hon. J. CORNELL: I will not stress the point except to say—

The PRESIDENT: I presume the hon. member accepts Mr. Hamersley's explanation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes; Mr. President. In viewing the proposal for the establishment of freezing works, we have

to pay regard to the benefit which would result to the State. From this aspect, the attitude of the anti-socialistic element of the House is somewhat remarkable. The hon. members I refer to are absolutely eager for the Government to enter into a socialistic concern, or a trading concern which private enterprise has not the pluck to embark upon or which does not offer sufficient inducement for the investment of private capital. If the establishment of freezing works at Wyndham is going to be such a great boon to the State as we are told, I am firmly of opinion that it would also prove a great boon to those who are interested in the cattle trade of the Kimberleys and the North-West. The three hon. members representing the North Province, where the works will be established, are all interested not only in the pastoral industry but also in large financial institutions; and those hon. members could get the necessary backing for the establishment of the freezing works. Sir Edward Wittenoom, I suppose, represents more powerful financial interests in this State than any other person in Western Australia. I am perfectly satisfied that if the freezing works represented a good scheme for the Government, as we are told is the case, if those hon. members were sincere in making that representation, there would have been no delay in this matter, but those hon. members would have found the money for the establishment of the works. I have heard, however, that one of the reasons why the necessary capital has not been found by those hon. members is that they were unable to bring about a sufficient degree of unanimity amongst the cattle interests. Be this as it may, I am going to view the enterprise from the standpoint of how the State will probably be affected if the works be established. I, at any rate, am of the opinion—although many other members are not—that the present occupants of the Treasury bench are not such fools as a lot of people believe them to be, or as a lot of people would desire to make them out to be. There is, however, this factor confronting us to-day. Mr. Holmes has said that one of the drawbacks of the cattle

industry of the North-West is insufficient means of transport. That is to say, the cattle cannot be brought down as they should be. On looking more closely into the question of the establishment of freezing works at Wyndham; it is seen that the Government of Western Australia in establishing such works would at once come into conflict with the Federal Constitution. The first paragraph of the Federal Constitution provides that one of the powers of the Federal Parliament shall be the control of trade and commerce with other countries and amongst the States. Though not posing as a Constitutional authority, I am perfectly satisfied that if the freezing works be established on the lines which some hon. members desire—that is to say, on the same lines as Government abattoirs are established in Western Australia to-day, the Government putting up the necessary buildings and the necessary machinery, and slaughtering and freezing the cattle brought to the works, and allowing those who bring them there to deal with them afterwards at their own sweet will—we shall come in conflict with the Federal Government. What would happen if that were done? It would end the prerogative of the Government, and those who brought their products to the freezing works could export them to other States or countries. That is the kind of freezing works some members would like to see established, but I do not think the present Government will tolerate it. If the Government establish freezing works at Wyndham they will, I think, keep control of every carcase that goes into the works until it is distributed in Western Australia. If there is a surplus, the Government may allow it to be exported. If the Government insist on that the establishment of those works at Wyndham will scarcely be received with open arms.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It will, as far as I am concerned.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am pleased to hear that. Although we differ on many questions, Mr. Holmes is a West Australian first and an Australian afterwards, and he will, I am sure, see

to it that the requirements of the people of this State are catered for. Not all hon. members would worry about that. One hon. member said that we cannot get a better market than Western Australia. I would remind him that in the manipulations of the beef trust, the world over, the surplus meat is sold in foreign countries more cheaply than it is sold on the spot where it is killed and distributed, the reason being that the home market provides the necessary profit, and the surplus beef sold elsewhere represents a surplus profit.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that not a good reason why the Government should control the works?

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is, and I am pleased to have the hon. member's assurance that he will support the Government in keeping control of the proposed works. I only wish I could have the same assurance from Sir Edward Wittenoom and Mr. Connor, two of the chief beef buccaneers in the State.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Nothing else is a business proposition.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is not the position taken up by some hon. members in regard to other State trading concerns. Even in respect to the timber industry it has been repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the House that the Government are making encroachments and taking advantage of State facilities and State funds to the detriment of private enterprise. I am afraid the same argument will be used on this occasion. Another argument used against the Government venturing into trading concerns is that by their action they are scaring capital out of Western Australia, that if the Government did not enter into these forms of industry private enterprise would. At last, however, the Government propose to branch out in a form of public utility which private enterprise has been afraid to enter into. While the Government are prepared to tackle something of a precarious nature, with a doubtful return, and leave to private enterprise better assured profits, a big section of the House will extend their benedictions to the Government. There is a point on which I

would like an explanation from the Colonial Secretary. I see here the item, Perth-Fremantle - road, reinstatement, £30,000. While I have no desire to criticise the Government, I am to an extent sorry that they have decided to reinstate this item. As long as the late Minister for Works stood out and said the local governing bodies should be responsible for this road, certain hon. members had a shibboleth to trot out against the Government. For several sessions we have two or three main subjects of criticism against Ministers. One was the State steamers, another the State butchers' shops, and a third the bad condition of the Perth-Fremantle road. One of these is now to go, and, judging by the improved returns from the State steamers, it will not be long before those hon. members find themselves at a loss for opportunity for pouring out the full measure of their criticism and abuse against the Government. As one representing a province as large as New South Wales and in which roads are practically non-existent, I desire to know if the Government have made adequate provision for the local authorities repaying to the Government the money advanced to them. If an answer is forthcoming I will be satisfied. I hope, indeed I am confident, that such provision has been made, because unquestionably the great bulk of the taxpayers of the metropolitan area are unsurpassed for their grabbing capabilities. Having expressed my opinions I will, so far as these Estimates are concerned, forever hold my peace.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West) [7.57]: I rise to congratulate the Government on their decision to erect freezing works at Wyndham. We have heard a good deal in the past about supplying people with cheap meat, and with this end in view the Government have entered into several undertakings which have been utter failures, and must continue to be so, because under present conditions it is not in the power of the Government to put meat on the local market at a cheap rate. This latest proposal of the Government represents a step in the right direction, and by undertaking these works

the Government will be doing something for the public which could not be done by any other means. The present methods of bringing down cattle from the far North are entirely obsolete. The voyage entails cruelty upon the animals, in addition to which there is enormous loss, not only in the value and weight of the stock, but also in the quality of the meat when it arrives in the market. Mr. Holmes referred to cattle in the Wyndham districts as being infested with tick, and gave other reasons why they should be slaughtered up there. We have regulations providing that when the cattle arrive here they must be slaughtered. I am sorry to say these regulations have not always been carried out as strictly as they should have been. I myself have suffered severe losses in consequence of neglect in this respect. It is impossible for every shipment of cattle which comes into the market to land here in condition for the shops. Under present conditions, whether or not they are fit for slaughter, they have to be killed and put upon the market, with the result that hundreds of beasts are slaughtered when unfit for human consumption. If these works are established at Wyndham, and the meat brought down in chilled condition, there will be no further risk to producers, who will be sure of their market, and, of course, the Government, I presume, will make regulations to recoup themselves for any delay. In addition, there are large numbers of cattle which will not pay to ship to the markets here. They are of light weight and unsuitable for shipping, but if they could be treated in canning works they would be turned to account and thousands of pounds' worth of meat, which now goes to waste, could be marketed. I do not agree with Mr. Hamersley that Broome or Derby would be a more convenient site for the works. The erection of freezing works at Wyndham is against my interests because I am chiefly concerned in shipping at Derby, and I look upon this proposal as bringing Wyndham cattle into competition with those of the West Kimberley, but I am not the least afraid that there is not plenty of sale for all the cattle which can be produced in the North-West.

If after supplying the markets here there is a surplus, an enormous demand for it exists in other parts of the world. I think the Government will find that this step should have been taken long ago, as it will bring about a cheaper and more regular supply of meat. Only during a few months of the year can shipments be made from the northern port on account of the extreme heat, but if freezing works are established at Wyndham, good beef can be brought down at any season of the year. During the last few weeks meat has been bringing an extortionate price and I am surprised that butchers have been able to hold on. It has lately been impossible for the Government, as well as private butchers, to make any profit out of the meat. I am satisfied this undertaking will be approved by the public generally, and the day will come when people will regard it as wise expenditure and will feel grateful for the supplies thus provided. The Government require money for many public works and this Bill is intended to authorise them to raise the money. I give the Bill my hearty support and again congratulate the Government on their decision to erect freezing works at Wyndham.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [8.3]: I am not satisfied at all that the present is the proper time to start works of this sort involving a good deal of expenditure. I quite agree with the last speaker that undoubtedly the establishment of these works will lessen much of the cruelty necessarily inflicted on stock being shipped to Fremantle. Furthermore, the establishment of these works will help inasmuch as the carrying of live stock by sea is always an economic waste, but there are other and strong reasons which have been brought forward by members over and over again during this and previous sessions why the Government should pause before they extend operations in this direction. What have we heard members like the hon. Mr. McLarty, Mr. Holmes, Sir Edward Wittenoom, Mr. Connor and a number of others say concerning the socialistic experiments of the Government? Have not they constantly referred to the fact that

the Government are running State batteries, State ferries, State hotels, State steamships, State implement works, State sawmills, State brickworks, State quarries, State meat and fish stalls? Yet the Government come forward now with this proposal at a time when money is very scarce and when they ought not to extend these trading concerns and it is received with eclat and is unanimously approved of by these very strong opponents of socialism. It seems a most contradictory position for them to occupy. I have never been wildly enthusiastic over State trading concerns. There are some of which I quite approve and which I believe will be brought to a successful issue, and there are others which I fear will not but I hope will prove successful. When hon. members have pointed to all these various concerns, I have thought that the Government had certainly got their hands pretty full in attending to them all. Consider the position of Ministers. The Colonial Secretary, for instance, has a number of State trading concerns under his control and now the very opponents of State socialism have pressed forward this particular scheme. The other night, when the hon. Mr. Kingsmill was speaking of State brickworks, a member made an interjection and he replied to the effect that the proposed freezing works were a public utility. I claim that this proposal of the Government is no more one for public utility than the State brickworks. I can understand what is meant by public utilities such as tramways and railways, but freezing works certainly do not come under that heading. However, these members have asked the Government to erect these works and I am sorry the Government have acceded to their request when private enterprise would not touch the scheme. I feel confident the Government will not be able to make it pay and yet all these hon. gentlemen, who are bitter in their opposition to socialism, laud this scheme to the skies just simply because it suits the purposes of a few individuals among them. I could give a number of reasons why the Government should pause, notwithstanding that I

have admitted the two points referred to by Mr. McLarty in favour of the erection of these works. I hope the Government will pause. Consider the distance that Wyndham is from Perth. Consider the difficulties of administering this scheme from Perth. It will be most difficult to administer. Mr. Cornell requires certain conditions in regard to these works. If these conditions are imposed, it will make the scheme all the more difficult to work. I feel sure this will prove a non-paying scheme and yet bitter opponents of socialism are lauding it. Lord Salisbury said we are all socialists nowadays and that is quite true. Every one is to a certain extent. It is all a matter of degree, but some hon. members who professedly have been opposed to socialism have gone far beyond me as a socialist in this matter. When it suits their own purposes, they sit calmly by and quietly submit to the Government going on with a work which, I am afraid, is almost certain to result in loss. The Government at such a time as the present should not proceed with a project of this nature. I am afraid the Government have already gone too far. If the Government try to take on too much at one time it will be more than their administrative powers are capable of. Anything of this kind must be done gradually. The Government, in their zeal to carry out their policy, and in their desire to do what they genuinely believe to be in the best interests of the country, I fear, have overreached themselves. It is advisable in the matter of State trading concerns to go slowly and to make those they have started successful before embarking on others. I am with all that hon. members opposite have said on this matter and I am surprised that they are not taking that stand now. Instead of that we find them congratulating the Government on the project. Presently this scheme, which private enterprise will not touch and which is certain to prove a failure, will result in loss to the Government and then those hon. members will sing a very different tune, and the Government will be left to get out of their difficulty as best they can. I appeal to the Government to

delay this project. It will be time enough years hence to say whether it should be proceeded with or not and I am extremely sorry that it has been included in this loan schedule.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [8.13]: I have just a word or two to say in reply to the remarks of the hon. Mr. Kirwan respecting myself. I am surprised at the surprise of the hon. member, a surprise which almost resembles chagrin. Are the hon. member and one or two of his colleagues the only ones who should applaud the Government when they do something good, or even when they do something bad? Should not the hon. member, instead of finding fault with the hon. Mr. McLarty and other members who have applauded the Government, rather have rejoiced at finding converts to the scheme of State socialism, of which he has always been so ardent an advocate, in spite of his somewhat late disclaimer. I draw a very distinct line between the Wyndham freezing works and the State brickworks. It is a matter of opinion and opinion is all we in this House have to guide us. I look upon the Wyndham freezing works as a public utility and may I be pardoned for saying that I look upon the State brickworks as a public futility. It involves a difference of only one letter but what a great difference it is! I have nothing more to say except that after finding fault for apparent inconsistency on my part, the hon. member furnished an explanation and he quoted the words of Lord Salisbury to the effect that nowadays we are all socialists and that it is only a matter of degree. The main fault I find with the Government is that they are unable to discriminate as to when the little letter to which I have alluded should be used. They are unable to see their way clearly enough to find out the difference between public utilities and public futilities. So far they have, in my opinion, struck a very great number of the latter spelt with the letter "f." I hope the explanation will prove satisfactory to the hon. member, although I should hardly expect any explanation I might make to satisfy him.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West) [8.15]: I congratulate Mr. Kirwan on his remarks. It is true that the Government had a mandate from the people to go in for socialistic works and I am delighted to find that Mr. Kirwan has realised that it is time to call a halt. All I can say is that I hope he is sincere and that the Government will take his views into consideration. I am satisfied that as soon as these enterprises are got rid of at the best price we can dispose of them for, the better it will be for the welfare of Western Australia as a whole.

Hon. E. M. McLarty: May I explain that the view I take is that the Government, having entered into the meat trade have utterly failed because they began at the wrong end. Now they are taking the right course and I congratulate them on doing so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (in reply) [8.18]: The question of the freezing works at Wyndham has only reached its present stage after very mature deliberation. The Government have been considering this matter for over three years, viewing it from every aspect and dealing with every possible objection that might arise. The Government were afraid to make a start in this direction, but after reviewing the matter from time to time they have come to the conclusion that it is a wise step to take. The Government have even gone to the trouble of making sure that the chilled meat which would be brought down here would be consumed by the people. We had a series of experiments extending over several trips which were made by the "Western Australia," and as a result we satisfied ourselves that the chilled meat from Wyndham is better than the meat which comes down here on the hoof and is sold here. Last year I sent a fairly large quantity of chilled meat to Parliament House and gave instructions that members should be informed so that they might sample it. I have not received one word of complaint in regard to the meat, which clearly shows that members might not have been aware that they were eating the chilled article. The matter has been fully gone into and the position has

reached an even greater stage of advancement than might have been expected. Negotiations are not yet complete, but all the preliminaries have been taken in hand and we are perfectly serious in the matter. Hon. members can rest assured that whenever the Government put their hands to the plough in matters of this kind they never look back. We are convinced that this is really a work which will be in the interests of the country as a whole. It will have the effect of reducing the price of meat; it will give a better price to the grower and will lead to the settlement of a greater portion of our Northern territory. The State steamers have been instrumental in settling in the last three years an additional nine million acres of pastoral country. Although the steamers have been run at a loss this excellent result has been obtained. With the establishment of freezing works, pastoral settlement will increase to a large extent because the grower will be sure of a market and it will be possible to bring chilled meat down and sell it at less expense than is incurred at the present time. We must come to the conclusion that whichever way we view it this work should be directly and indirectly of considerable benefit to the community. With regard to Mr. Carson's complaint about the small amount of money provided for the Geraldton harbour works, it is of no use providing money unless it is proposed to expend it, and in order to commence these works at Geraldton it would be necessary to spend no less than £25,000 in the purchase of plant. There is no plant available at the present time, and that large sum of money would have to be spent in machinery, and the Government just now, when it is essential that work should be found for the unemployed, consider it would be unwise to spend £25,000 in buying machinery. Moreover, if dredging operations were undertaken now, the probabilities are that silting would take place, and when we were ready to start operations the dredging would have to be done again. We can, however, put men on to quarry stone for the harbour works and as soon as the machinery is

available, and conditions are normal, the Government will make up for lost time and go speedily ahead with the harbour works. Mr. Cornell asked a question with reference to the Fremantle road. Ample provision has been made by the Government for repayments, and if the different local authorities do not contribute their proportion it is intended to deduct the amounts they owe from their annual subsidies.

Hon. J. Duffell: They are not getting any.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

### BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

#### *Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.24] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill making provision for the closure of certain streets or roads in various municipalities. One is portion of Lefroy-street in the municipality of Collie. The Collie Council has applied for the closure of that portion of Lefroy-street shown in red on the litho. I have laid on the Table of the House, in order that the land comprised therein may be included within the adjoining park reserve. There is no objection by the Lands and Surveys Department. The second is portion of High-street in the municipality of Fremantle. That portion coloured red on litho. No. 2 has been included within the survey of the land resumed for railway purposes, and, as the road has been fenced off, it is necessary that it should be closed, as it now forms part of the railway lands. The municipal council agrees, provided a 12ft. footway be left open, which is allowed for accordingly in the Bill. The third is portion of Kensington-street in

the municipality of Perth. The city council is desirous that the portion of Kensington-street shown in red on litho. No. 3, Perth, should be closed to enable the council to run a siding into the proposed new site for the gas works, subject, however, to the provision of a 10ft. pathway down to the river. There is no objection by the Lands and Surveys Department, and the closure has been agreed to by the Minister for Lands. The fourth is the closure of Jarrah-road, Victoria Park. The Military Department has requested the Victoria Park council to close Jarrah-road, shown in red on litho. No. 4, as this road crosses the firing line of the proposed South Perth rifle range. The council has agreed to the closure, provided that the land be added to its endowment lands, but this is a matter that can receive consideration later. There is no departmental objection to the closure of the road. The fifth is the closure of a right-of-way near Beenup. The Public Works Department has purchased the land shown in green on litho. No. 5 for a school site. As it is intersected by a 25 links right-of-way, it will be necessary to close the latter, but as this is a private right-of-carriage-way, granted to the purchasers of land in the subdivision, the easement can only be removed by parliamentary authority. On the advice of the Solicitor General this right-of-way has, therefore, been included in the Street Closure Bill. There is a further street closure. The Roman Catholic Church holds the four blocks coloured red on the litho., and they have started to erect a church, approximately in the centre of the four blocks. This will necessitate the closure of the right-of-way coloured green on the litho., and the church has agreed with the Town Properties of Western Australia, Limited, who hold most of the other blocks in this section, to grant the strip coloured blue on the litho. for the purpose of a right-of-way in exchange for the strip coloured green. The Perth road board has agreed to the proposal, but as there is no provision under the Roads Act for closing a right-of-carriage-way granted under the Land Transfer Act, it is necessary that this devia-



tion should be effected by Act of Parliament. I move—

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

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [8.30]: I desire to call the attention of the leader of the House to the Kensington-street proposition, and to ask him if he will give an assurance to the House that if it is found that an injustice has been done to the owners of property in Kensington-street the Government will hold their hands in this connection. I may say I am speaking without any recent information, but I have reason to suppose, from what I heard some time ago, that owners of the property in Kensington-street might possibly be victimised by this Act of Parliament. If that is going to be so, it would be easy at a future date to bring forward a Bill repealing this closure, and I hope the Government will look carefully into the matter before any steps are taken which will ensure irremediable injury to those persons whose properties abut on Kensington-street.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [8.32]: I desire to inform the hon. member that the matter to which he has called my attention will receive every consideration.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

## BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES.

*Second Reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.35] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced for the purpose of enabling the West Australian Conference of Seventh Day Adventists Incorporated, to surrender to the Crown its lease of reserve "A" 12391, Subiaco, on the demise by the

Crown of other land in exchange. On this land being surrendered it shall cease to be dedicated to the purpose of a church for the Seventh Day Adventists, and may be reclassified as a Class "A" or Class "B" and dedicated to such public purpose as the Governor may think fit. The hon. Mr. Duffell knows more about this Bill than I do. I have not been supplied with any notes, and he has promised me that he will explain the reason for the introduction of the Bill.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.37]: For the information of hon. members, I would like to say that the Subiaco Municipal Council some time ago decided to continue the road known as Hamilton-street right through the reserve to the Subiaco-road, and in going through that reserve they left a strip of ground on the east side about 86 feet in depth, running through from Mueller-road to the Subiaco-road. This strip of ground was of very little use to the municipality, and overtures were made to the Minister for Education with a view to inducing the Government, through him, to make certain roads, to wit, the road from the new cutting to Hamilton-street, and also down alongside the Modern School. This would save the municipality the cost of making these roads, and would mean an improvement to the Modern School in the direction of an enlarged playground. The Government, in its wisdom, did not see its way clear to make the exchange of this piece of land. Since then the Children's Hospital Committee considered it advisable, if they could make an arrangement with the Seventh Day Adventists, to acquire the land upon which the church now stands, and deemed it necessary for the requirements of the hospital to make the purchase of this piece of land referred to in the second clause of the Bill and make an exchange with the authorities of the church of the Seventh Day Adventists. The exchange is of mutual advantage to the authorities of the Children's Hospital and the Subiaco municipality and I think also the Seventh Day Adventists. Members, from these few remarks, will readily

understand that the road referred to will be made up from the proceeds of the sale, and I have every confidence in recommending this Bill for the favourable consideration of the members of the Council.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Road Board Act, 1911, (a) scale of trespass and poundage fees, Gnowangerup Road Board; (b) of the West Arthur Road Board; (c) Roebourne Road Board, by-law relating to water at Cossack. 2, Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, (a) By-law 36 of the Cottesloe Municipal Council; (b) By-law 64 of the Municipality of Geraldton.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) : I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 1st April next.*

Question passed.

*House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 4th March, 1915.*

	PAGE
Papers presented .. .. .	1910
Gold Mining Leases, renewal .. .. .	1917
Questions: Agricultural Bank and Industries Assistance Board .. .. .	1910
Agricultural Bank Foreclosures .. .. .	1911
Railway, Kalgoorlie-Fremantle, alteration of gauge .. .. .	1911
Rabbit-proof fences damaged .. .. .	1911
Maize importation, Customs duty .. .. .	1911
Water Supply, Wheat Belt extensions, increase of rates .. .. .	1911
Land Act Amendment Bill .. .. .	1913
Wheat seizures, payment to farmers .. .. .	1913
Select Committee, Whaling License .. .. .	1913-1926
Bills: Licensing Act Further Amendment, discharged .. .. .	1913
Land Act Amendment, discharged .. .. .	1914
Trades Disputes, discharged .. .. .	1926
Resolution: Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway, discharged .. .. .	1924
Bills returned from the Council .. .. .	1927
Adjournment—Special .. .. .	1927
Complimentary Remarks .. .. .	1927

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

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Papers relating to the renewal of gold-mining leases (ordered on motion by Hon. J. D. Connolly).

By the Attorney General: Amendment of regulations of the Education Department.

By the Minister for Works: 1. By-laws of the Gnowangerup, Roebourne, and West Arthur Roads Boards. 2. By-laws of the Municipalities of Geraldton and Cottesloe.

#### QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK AND INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE BOARD.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that Mr. Paterson, Trustee Agricultural Bank, said that the clearing need not be done out of their money by the settlers, as they could get an order from the settler on the Agricultural Bank? 2, Is he aware that settlers in the Quairading District, who have had work done by clearers, have had their orders returned on the ground that assistance was being given to settlers by the Industries Assistance Board? 3, Further, is any money earned under the auspices of