

electors. Is that reasonable or constitutional; is it commonsense or common courtesy? For what might happen in Committee I will not be responsible. The point is the second reading, and members will not allow the Bill to be taken into Committee.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Who said so?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The hon. member and others. If I have made any impression on the minds of members I will continue.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I am afraid not.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Sir Edward Wittenoom is one of the oldest and most experienced men in this Chamber. He has held high offices locally and in the centre of the Empire and knows something of his Imperial, Federal, and local responsibilities, but he is such a jester—he would even jest at the cannon mouth or go down in an earthquake with a jest on his lips. The hon. member called this a momentous question; Mr. Colebatch called it a little, fiddling taxation Bill. If I could snatch one vote from the hon. member, I would not care whether the Bill was called momentous or petty.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: You are making a lot of inroads into my determination.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I wonder if that is a jest. The finances of the country constitute a serious matter, and I cannot understand how any member, knowing all the circumstances, would shut the door to any further negotiation as regards this Bill. Let the measure go into Committee and then everyone can fight to get what he wants. I do not know that the Government are tied to any portion of the Bill. If it is re-casted in Committee that may be welcomed by the Government, and they will be given an opportunity to reconsider their position. By the rejection of the second reading, they will be deprived of that opportunity. We have all the power in our hands to find out how far the Government are prepared to go and what the Country party are doing and apparently, we are to be refused the opportunity to learn what this

is. I am not responsible for the Government of the country. I have studied the politics of Western Australia closely for the last 20 years, and am more than ever convinced that the day we entered Federation we were, financially speaking, lost. Apart from the Labour Government, the drought and the war, when Western Australia entered Federation we were financially doomed, and what has occurred since has only hastened the day which must inevitably have come. Western Australia will have to go in for unification as the only possible solution of its present state of affairs. This is my answer to the hon. member who asked for my alternative. If we look ahead we must realise that unification is the only solution for our troubles, but so far as this Bill is concerned, constitutional Government, commonsense, and common courtesy to the Government demand that the second reading at any rate should be passed.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.36 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 3rd March, 1915.

	PAGE
Questions: Unemployed and Charitable relief ..	1837
Military Forces and relief for discharged soldiers ..	1837
Crown Leases, Federal taxation ..	1837
Leave of absence ..	1838
Assent to Bills ..	1838
Select Committee, Whaling License ..	1838
Bills: Vermin Boards Amendment, Conference of Managers ..	1838
Loan £2,850,000, 1s. ..	1838
Appropriation, 1s. ..	1838
Income and Public Entertainments Taxation, 2s. ..	1838
Roads Closure, 1s. ..	1876
Permanent Reserves, 1s. ..	1876
Adjournment—Special ..	1876

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

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYED, AND CHARITABLE RELIEF.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH asked the Colonial Secretary: Will he place on the Table of the House information in respect to the unemployed members of the community at present receiving charitable relief from the Government, showing—(a) the total number in receipt of relief; (b) the number of married men and the number of single men; (c) the ages of the recipients of relief; (d) their usual occupations; (e) their last places of employment?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: (a) The total number in receipt of relief, 744. (b) Number of married men, 442; number of single men, 302. (c) Ages of recipients of relief (figures re ages for Perth only), attached hereto. (d) Their usual occupation, attached hereto. (e) Their last place of employment. No record.

UNEMPLOYED.

Number.	Ages.	Number.	Ages.
4	18	17	42
5	19	16	43
5	20	15	44
7	21	23	45
10	22	19	46
8	23	9	47
6	24	18	48
16	25	11	49
11	26	20	50
9	27	6	51
20	28	7	52
13	29	5	53
22	30	7	54
6	31	6	55
26	32	3	56
10	33	3	57
17	34	3	58
16	35	4	59
23	36	5	60
12	37	1	61
20	38	1	62
13	39	1	63
21	40	2	64
15	41	1	65
		517	

QUESTION—MILITARY FORCES, RELIEF FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is it a fact that men who have been discharged from the military forces for drunkenness and other misdemeanour are receiving unemployed relief? 2, If so, how many have received such relief?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, Six were assisted, having been discharged for being absent without leave. When the matter came to the knowledge of the Minister, assistance ceased.

QUESTION—CROWN LEASES, FEDERAL TAXATION.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Do the Government consider the Federal Taxation of Crown leases illegal under Clause 114 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which says, "Nor shall the Commonwealth impose any tax on property belonging to a State"? 2, If so, what action do they intend taking to conserve the State's interests?

UNEMPLOYED.

Trade or Occupation.	Total.	Trade or Occupation.	Total.
Labourers ..	467	Horse-drivers ..	19
Boatbuilder ..	1	Hairstressor ..	1
Baker ..	1	Hotel Hands ..	3
Blacksmiths ..	3	Kitchenmen ..	7
Brickmaker ..	1	Lumpers ..	1
Bricklayers ..	12	Miners ..	8
Bootmakers ..	3	Orchard Hands ..	2
Bushmen ..	17	Orderlies ..	1
Barman ..	2	Plate-layer ..	1
Butchers ..	1	Painters ..	6
Builder ..	1	Plasterers ..	6
Caretakers ..	3	Plumber ..	1
Carpenters ..	24	Printer ..	1
Cooper ..	1	Saw-mill Hands ..	4
Compositors ..	2	Saddler ..	1
Clerks ..	12	Station Hands ..	4
Cooks ..	10	Strikers ..	2
Chauffeurs ..	2	Stone Masons ..	4
Dairymen ..	2	Seamens ..	10
Draughtsmen ..	2	Waiter ..	1
Engine-drivers ..	5	Yardmen ..	5
Farm Hands ..	27	Sleeper-cutters ..	4
Fitters ..	5	Mechanic ..	1
Firemen ..	5	Storemen ..	2
Gardeners ..	10	Tailors ..	3
Grooms ..	2	Teamsters ..	8
Mod-carriers ..	2	Wood Turner ..	1
Handy Men ..	5	Wagon Builder ..	1
Handy Boys ..	2	Wheel Wright ..	1
630		Total ..	744

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: As there is a possibility of this question being raised in the Courts by one or other of the States, it is not desirable to express an opinion at this stage.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. Sir E. H. WIT-
TENOOM leave of absence for six consecutive sittings of the House granted to Hon. F. Connor (North) on the ground of urgent private business.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Industries Assistance Bill.
- 2, Lunacy Act Amendment Bill.

BILL — VERMIN BOARDS AMENDMENT.

Conference of Managers.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly acquainting the Legislative Council, in reply to Message No. 36, respecting the holding of a conference on the Vermin Boards Act Amendment Bill that the Legislative Assembly will be adjourned over Tuesday, 2nd March, the day appointed for the said conference, and requesting the Legislative Council to agree to the conference being held on Wednesday, 3rd March, at the same time and place.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central [4.40]: I have discovered that it would be more convenient for the Legislative Assembly that the managers for that House in connection with the Vermin Boards Act Amendment Bill should sit at 5 o'clock instead of 4.45 to-day. I move—

That in reply to the Message No. 41 from the Legislative Assembly, a Message be sent to the Legislative Assembly fixing 5 p.m. instead of 4.45 as the time for the meeting of the conference on the Vermin Boards Act Amendment Bill.

Question put and passed.

Report of Managers.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.55]: I beg to report that the managers for the Council met the managers for the Assembly, and after discussion they were unable to agree on the matter in dispute between the two Houses.

SELECT COMMITTEE—WHALING LICENSE.

Request for Member to give evidence.

Message received from the Assembly asking the House to authorise the Hon. J. M. Drew to attend and give evidence before the select committee on the Whaling license.

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

That leave be granted, and a Message returned to the Assembly to that effect.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Loan, £2,850,000.

2, Appropriation.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—INCOME AND PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENTS TAXATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.42]: It is with the greatest reluctance that I rise to speak on the Bill, seeing that it has been so thoroughly discussed by members of this Chamber. If economy was exercised in controlling all our public concerns one would have no hesitation in assisting the Government to get through any taxation measure within reason. But when we find the position, as it stands now, that so much money is being squandered, I cannot for a moment agree to the imposition of any fresh burden upon the thrifty part of our community. I maintain that Government institutions should, as far as possible be self-sup-

porting. There is a lot to be done in that direction. We have many institutions in Western Australia at the present time that are a drag upon the State, and have no right to be. As an illustration of this I may mention the conditions of our South-West country. Our position to-day is that we are importing something over a million sterling worth of butter, and a large amount of potatoes and other commodities, which could be grown in that part of the State. Unfortunately, however, they cannot be grown there for lack of capital. Then, on the other hand, we have Government institutions, an instance of which is the Fremantle prison where men are locked up by the hundreds who could be far better employed in clearing these South-West lands. I know what some hon. members will say, namely, that this would be doing away with labour. Not one bit of it. When we imprison a man it invariably follows that we inflict an injustice on those dependent on him, and there are lots in prison to-day who have dependents living on charity or are eking out an existence in the best way they can. I do not say we should indiscriminately allow all classes of persons to go out, but there are those who have been sent to prison for short or for long terms who, if allowed out in gangs under capable men—and I am sure the Government will not say that they have not capable men at the head of their prisons—could be sent to the South-West to clear areas of 20 acres for individual farmers who would be charged the ordinary rate on extended payments. The result would be that those who are in prison to-day would be engaged in a healthy occupation out of doors and the tendency would be to make them better men. I have no hesitation in saying that 75 per cent. would become good and useful citizens. They would be earning something for themselves because they would have to be paid, and in that way they would be able to keep their dependents going. Though a man may deserve imprisonment, it is not always right that those dependent on him should be made to suffer. Therefore, why should we not do something for them by compelling

the men in prison to engage in a useful and healthy occupation, and earn something at the same time, while the State would also derive a considerable benefit. Then, when the term of a man's imprisonment had expired he could be turned loose on society with some money in his pocket. A percentage of his earnings would, of course, be kept and handed to him on his release with the result that he would have something to go on with, and there would be no need for him to commit another felony in order to get bread and butter. As a matter of fact we would find that quite a number would become good citizens by taking up land for themselves. I do not intend to labour the question. There are a lot of institutions run by the Government which should be self-supporting, and this is merely an illustration which I have given. As regards the administration of Government departments, one cannot get away from the fact that thousands of pounds are being squandered. With a few exceptions, our trading concerns are an incubus on the State. They have not resulted in a benefit to the State. Take the steamship service. We were told one evening that the "Western Australia" had made a profit of £500 odd. On what? Above all things, on the consumption of liquor in the bar of that steamer, and we know very well that the Government pride themselves on being against the liquor traffic.

The Colonial Secretary: Have the steamships shown a deficit since last June?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not know that they have shown a profit yet. At any rate, we can never expect to get a profit from the "Western Australia," a steamer which was built for the tea trade and which is not at all adapted for the use the Government of this State are putting it to. We know that in endeavouring to establish records when that steamer was engaged in the tea trade, its very machinery was knocked to pieces. With regard to the railways, we all know well that there has been a reduction in the train service, but we do not find that there has been a reduction in the staff.

We still have the same number of men employed. In previous years, when we had harvests to gather, the employees were kept busy. We still have the same employees. I do not say that we should put those men out of employment, but there is any amount of profitable work we could engage them in instead of allowing them to remain in the railway service and become a drag on the State. Let me quote an instance. During the 1913-14 harvest the Pingelly station was manned by a station-master and a porter. This year, when there is no harvest, practically speaking, there were five men on duty at that station. Can it be said that that is economical administration? Can we ask hon. members to support a tax to assist in carrying on this kind of business? Take our own position as regards the Land Act Amendment Bill. We were promised in this Chamber that that measure would be put through this session. Now we learn that it has been dropped. It was one of the pleas put forward that if we assisted to carry through another measure, we should be given the Land Act Amendment Bill. Now we know to what extent the farmers are suffering, not only those who have purchased virgin forest, but those who have purchased improved properties, some of them paying £200 per annum on 1,000 acres and who were to have obtained relief by the passing of the Land Act Amendment Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: I hope it has been dropped for ever so far as I am concerned.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is what we might expect from the hon. member. The proposed tax is, we are told, to be imposed for the purpose of benefiting the unemployed. My sympathies are with the genuine unemployed but I do not sympathise with the way the Government are dealing with the unemployed question. Is it right that we should pay away £1,000 in cash and get absolutely no return? The Government started a good scheme by sending a number of unemployed to clear the land at the Yandanoorka estate. That was a step in the right direction. Why was it not con-

tinued? We should select from the ranks of the unemployed the good men, those men who are capable of doing good work and who are anxious to work, and I am sorry to say that there are quite a number of them in the ranks of the unemployed. There are also men in our midst who go out into the country and engage in contract work; then when they come into town they spend every shilling of the cheques which they have earned and subsequently throw themselves on to the charity of the State. Is it right that the thrifty part of the population should have to carry this class of people on their backs? Again, there are others with money in their pockets accepting two meals a day and a bed from the State and they are determined on having a good time, taking care that they will not go back to any kind of employment. When we speak of the unemployed it is natural enough to look around and see whether employment can be found for them, and when we see two able-bodied men like the two leaders of the unemployed movement, I maintain it is the first duty of the Government to find positions for them. What is the position in the country districts? In spite of the bad harvest we find that wages have increased and it is a difficult matter for farmers to secure labourers. I want to wipe out the idea from the minds of members who believe that artisans or clerks cannot engage in farming work. Some of the best men employed on my place have been clerks and artisans. If we go on to the labour market we will find that no man will think of going into the country for less than 25s. If times were normal, and the man on the land had a chance of getting bread and butter, no one would hesitate to pay that amount. For skilled labour the average price paid is 35s. a week. But when we find that some men who go out as farm labourers have to learn everything that has to be done about a farm, the wages they ask is too big a price to pay, more particularly when no return is coming from the property.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Thirty-five shillings and keep?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, and sometimes 45s. a week and keep.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Some are worth it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There is not the slightest doubt about that, but my advice to the genuine unemployed is to go into the country where plenty of work can be found. The unemployed should not make exorbitant demands in these days when they are searching for work and when they know that the farmers are with difficulty meeting their liabilities. Union principles are all right, and there is no one more in favour of unionism than myself.

Hon. J. Cornell: When it suits you.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If I did not have more ability than the hon. member who interjected I would not be in the position I am occupying to-day in employing labour. The system of providing free meals and beds for the unemployed is very bad. Up to date the Government have spent something like £4,000 in that direction. That sum of money would have cleared over 5,000 acres of land which would have been an asset to the State. Every man who is taking advantage of a free meal and a bed would surely rather work for it. I have that much faith in the people of Australia to say that all, if they had the opportunity of going out to work, they would do that rather than accept charity from the State. I am surprised to find that there are men here who have not more backbone than to hang around Perth depending on the Government for support, especially when they know that the Government have no cash to waste. What has Victoria done? That State started relief works but they did not start them in the way some hon. members would have done here. The unemployed in that State were prevented from herding about the town; they were sent out to earn what might be said to be a living wage, so that they could occupy their time there until more favourable opportunities for work at a higher remuneration presented themselves. I find that the total number of those receiving relief from the Government is 744. Of

that number, it is alarming to me to find that 302 are single men, and in addition to that 136 of these single men are under the age of 30 years. I do not think it is to the credit of men of that age, men who are in the prime of their youth, to depend on the Government for charity.

Hon. J. Cornell: It may be through misfortune.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In a young State like this where there is so much employment going begging, no one can tell me that it is through misfortune I do not hesitate to say that any able-bodied man, not tied down by marriage, can go into the country, and if he cannot get permanent employment right away, he can get enough to keep him going, because I have yet to learn that any farmer will turn away a man from his door. There is any amount of work in the country to be done. It is very interesting to me to look through the report. There is no record of the last place of employment of these men. Surely there is one thing the department should look into when giving charity to men, and that is to see what class of employment they have followed in the past and where they were employed. There are relief works for the unemployed. The Colonial Secretary, if I am not mistaken, said that the Government intended to construct feeder roads; in what way I do not know, but I take it he means under the old system that has been carried on for the past three years, that of day labour. A worse system cannot be carried out in any State, and I will prove that statement. In connection with one board, of which I was chairman for a number of years, we received a grant of £2,000 to carry out necessary works, and feeder roads were portion of the necessary works. When the Government came into power they commandeered — and I use that word because the Government compelled the Greenhills board to return the £2,000, with the result that the board only got £1,100 worth of work done for the £2,000. In making this statement I am saying what I know to be true. Men who took contracts from the Greenhills board made very good money. Can this

kind of business be carried on? Is this Government in a better position to carry on work of this nature than the local governing bodies? And yet they take it into their hands. When the Government were putting that work through and withdrew the £2,000 grant from us they agreed to accept recommendations from the board, but how far did they take these recommendations into consideration? The fact is the Government absolutely ignored any recommendations the board made. As a matter of fact the foreman of the gang had on the work six big draught horses, some of the best in the country, tied up to a tree and eating chaff costing £5 10s. a ton, and he also had scoops and ploughs and other plant to put down a road just as good as Hay-street is to-day. And for whom? One man, myself? I objected to it, yet they carried it out. In addition, they put up a structure, costing £85, along my road, though I had no need for it and I objected to it. Surely, when we find that work of this nature is objected to by the chairman of the board in the first place, and by the only man who is going to use that road in the second place, there is no need to carry it out, and yet the work was done. Further, there were three miles of road which had been cleared a quarter of a chain wide. I objected in the first place to the Greenhills board spending that money, because there was already a good track going through my property and the existing track was good enough. But they spent the money and cleared the road. That was, however, not so bad; but on top of this a gang came along with authority from the Government and increased the width of the road to half a chain. Do we want fresh taxation for this kind of business? I say, no, decidedly not. I, for one, will not assist them to get it. The hon. Mr. Cornell in speaking last night, said that we could establish relief works. If these are on a par with the relief works carried out by the State in the past we should not touch them at any price. Let us take the Jennaberring area, on which a lot of money was spent on behalf of the unemployed. The hon. member remarked that there

never was such a serious position as there is to-day, but we find there are only 744 persons receiving relief here. A lot of work had been done on this area, one hundred per cent. more than was being done around about it. But that amount was saddled on to the men who came along and took the land up. These have lived to curse that system to-day. The money spent there has not been an assistance, but, on the contrary, a hindrance to them. I know what I am speaking about, for part of the Jennaberring area formed a portion of my pastoral lease, and I know every particular in connection with it. There are certain relief works which can be carried out. After clearing land and effecting improvements it is necessary to follow the work up, otherwise it will be of no value. The hon. Mr. Cornell suggested road making. I ask if this is the time to commence that class of work? We want to spend every penny available on work which is going to return revenue to the State. Will road making return anything to the State? Road making is certainly a convenience to the public and it is nice to have good roads. To suggest road making in the metropolitan area, however, is, to my mind, useless, although I sympathise with those living there if they have bad roads to travel upon, although they have done fairly well in the past. Every pound we have should be expended on works which will give an early return for it.

Hon. J. Cornell: What sort of work will that be?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am afraid the hon member's intelligence will not be able to lead him out of his difficulty. There is no better proposition in this young State than that of clearing our lands. The first money so spent is only a beginning in respect to the labour which will have to be employed on the land. In the early part of my speech I referred to the acquisition by the Government of the Yandanooka estate. They may have bad luck and not do too well out of the scheme, but I am ready to support them in it, and I think they are taking a step in the right direction. In supporting

them in clearing so much of this estate, however, I do not say I am going to support them in clearing, indiscriminately, thousands and thousands of acres. Is it not far better to make advances to individual farmers?

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Very much better.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: This can very easily be done, if the Government are sincere in trying to push the State forward. It does not matter what load the farmers are carrying. The Government can always arrive at some scheme whereby they can finance them in order to clear another 150 acres or so, for farms that they approve of. What does that mean? In clearing they absorb labour in the first place. But this is only a commencement of the work. Look at the amount of labour which will be required afterwards in the farming of the land. The actual work of a farm comes in after the clearing has been done. Let us consider the amount of revenue which the expenditure of money on this class of work would return. That is a most vital point and one which we, as legislators, must not lose sight of. From the revenue point of view there is no better proposition than that of putting money into the clearing of the land. No money is going out for plant, and the whole of it is being spent in labour, and there is the labour to follow after the land is cleared. I recommend the Government to take steps in this direction.

Hon. J. Cornell: They will not follow your advice.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is characteristic of the Government not to follow good, sound, advice.

Hon. J. Cornell: It all depends on where it comes from.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In his opening speech the Colonial Secretary referred to the assistance given to farmers. I admit that the Government have rendered assistance to these people, but who is going to benefit the most? I say, the State, absolutely. The man who has had to receive assistance from the State could not otherwise have carried on, and would have had to leave his property. What

would that mean? Of the money advanced by the Agricultural Bank, at least nine-tenths of it has been advanced on property. This money would, therefore, be absolutely thrown away, and the properties would become overgrown like some other properties in the State to-day. When we talk of the assistance given by the Government to the farmers we must remember that it is only the distressed farmers who are taken into account, that is to say, only one section of them—though I admit it is unfortunately a large section. But what about the section which is not composed of distressed farmers, and members of which are not compelled to go to the mouth of the gun for assistance? With very few exceptions every farmer in the State has this year had to increase his overdraft. I have had to do it myself, and I am not ashamed of it. What have the Government done for these men? The Colonial Secretary stands up in this Chamber, and says the Government have done such and such a thing for the farmers. I say they have done nothing except to put extra imposts upon them, and now they want to go further by putting this extra tax upon them.

Hon. J. Cornell: You have had your share, so why complain?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We find on looking into the question that the Government in the first place increased the water rates payable by the farmers. The hon. member Mr. Cornell will say, when asked, "What has been done for the farmer?" I say, "What has been done for the goldfields in regard to their water scheme?" The people there can get their water taken up a distance of 400 miles for 2s. 6d. a thousand gallons, whereas the farmer who has the water carried only a quarter of the distance has to pay 8s. a thousand gallons. Is that rendering assistance to the farmers? How can hon. members stand up and say that this is right? Further, we must not forget that it is only surplus water farmers are allowed to take. The Government would not allow one pipe line to tap the main trunk line until such time as it had been proved that only surplus water would be

drawn through it. I am not opposed to the goldfields water scheme. It is a splendid thing, for, indirectly, it is developing our goldfields. I want those who talk about coddling the farmer to remember that there is such a thing as coddling the goldfields.

Hon. J. Cornell: I have not seen much of it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member could not see much of anything. What have the Government done for the farmer in regard to superphosphate? They placed a tremendous freight on a young community which was struggling with heavy burdens at the time. They put a crushing impost of this sort upon a section of the community which was striving to get ahead. This is one of the benefits they have given to the farmers. This is an instance of that spoon-feeding which some hon. members tell us we are receiving. Again, freights have been jumped up to an enormous extent on machinery and commodities used by the farmers. We cannot get away from the fact that the whole of the burden is being thrown on us continually. If the object of this was to bring the State out of the financial trouble into which it is plunged I would not mind. But when we have so much money wasted in the administration of the country I refuse to stand here and champion such a cause. Outside of all this we had a special rate for breeding stock, but the Government stepped in again and cancelled it. This is another example of the consideration we are receiving at their hands and of the spoon-feeding which in their generosity they are meting out to us. And on top of all this we have the super-tax to face. We, therefore, have a roads board tax, a land tax, an income tax, a wheel tax, a dog tax, and a Federal land tax, as well as a prohibitive Federal tax upon machinery and all commodities. These are some of the benefits we enjoy. This is the kind of spoon-feeding we are getting. Is it any wonder we are getting so fat? And now this super-tax, which my friends are treating so lightly because they do not understand it.

Hon. J. Cornell: We can afford to treat it lightly because we are not likely to get it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Last year the farmers got nothing. This year there is every chance of their having a good harvest. Indeed, I think we are going to have a good season. At the same time they want to impose upon us this extra impost. We have two years of liabilities to meet. A farmer's business, after all, is a business undertaking. Farmers will be faced with the position on account of their liabilities of having to pay a tax on paper only. They will not see any money at all. I should be mightily pleased if I could pay my last year's liabilities and those of this year as well out of the coming season. But I and others have to turn round and pay a tax on the profits of the coming season. It is absolutely unfair. The Government say they are out for the progress and betterment of the State, but their actions do not show it. As regards the latter part of the schedule, as to a tax on amusements, I may say that I am quite in accord with it. Any person who at the present time can see fit to spend his half guinea in going to race meetings, his shillings and sixpences in going night after night to picture shows and playhouses, thus indicating that he does not recognise the seriousness of our position, should be called upon to pay. How can we expect any community to recognise the seriousness of the position when they are told by the head of the Government that there is going to be no retrenchment. It does not matter whether we can find employment for those in need of it or not; such is the utterance of our Premier. Some eight months ago I drew attention to the fact that we had 14 houses of amusement in the metropolitan area. I think this number has since increased. These shows are going on nightly, and the very people who patronise them are those who later on will want assistance from the Government. This, in my opinion, is one direction in which taxation might apply, and heavy taxation at that.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I intend to refer to the schedule which provides for a tax on agricultural and horticultural shows. To those members who are not well versed in the conduct of shows I might state that for every hundred pounds which the societies gave in prize money the Government added a subsidy of 10s. in the pound. That was before the crisis, but since then the Government have seen fit to withhold that subsidy. It is a difficult task now for a society in any part of the State to conduct a show without it being a tremendous burden on those who are responsible for it. We have in power a Government who prides itself on extending educational facilities to every part of the State. Why then place an embargo on one branch of the educational system, and I contend that there is no better way of educating our producers than by holding these annual shows. The real purpose of a show is to educate and demonstrate what this great State of ours is capable of producing. To say that huge profits are derived from agricultural shows is all nonsense. Whatever profits are made are devoted to the improvement of the grounds on which the shows are held, and in that connection the grounds of the Royal Society are a credit to that body, and the efforts of that body should not in any way be discouraged. I am not objecting to the withholding of the subsidy, because I realise it is difficult for the Government to pay these amounts in the present days of stress, but I do object to the imposition of a tax of 8 per cent. on the takings. It is unreasonable. If the profits of the societies were going into the pockets of some people there would be some reason for the tax, but, as I have pointed out, that is not the case. Moreover, in very few instances are the officials of these societies in receipt of any remuneration. The secretary is invariably an officer on whose shoulders innumerable burdens are placed and he is very often an honorary officer. Therefore, the Government are doing quite enough by taking off the 50 per cent. subsidy. Mr. Cornell, in the course of his remarks, said that motor cars should be taxed. Although he is

not in the Chamber I cannot allow the opportunity of referring to this matter to pass. For that hon. member's enlightenment, I may state that there is already a heavy tax on motor vehicles. An ordinary four-wheeled vehicle carries a tax of 20s. and a motor car a tax of from £3 to £6 per annum. Surely the hon. member should acquaint himself with simple facts before making deliberate statements in the Chamber. The hon. member also threatened this Chamber by saying that if the Bill was thrown out there would be a day of reckoning. By whom, I would like to ask?

Hon. W. Kingsmill: We had one.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, and it absolutely supported this Chamber in every detail. Is the hon. member looking for another; if so, it will be one that he will not be altogether pleased with. The hon. member even goes further and states that this Chamber does not represent the taxpayer. Does he mean to say that the Legislative Assembly alone represents the taxpayer? We cannot get away from the fact that the 150,000 voters who are on the Assembly roll are made up to a large extent of irresponsible. I am not crying down those people; what I mean to say is that many of them are irresponsible to the extent that they have no stake in the country and they could put their belongings into a gladstone bag and leave the country when the first crisis occurred. The taxpayers upon whom falls the whole burden of a crisis are the people who are entitled to representation in this Chamber. Can any hon. member here say that the franchise for the Legislative Council is not a just one? Then why all this argument? It is amusing to hear any member of the Chamber talking such piffle, when he says that this House does not represent the taxpayer. What taxes are the irresponsibles paying to the State beyond the 25s. received; the Federal Government benefit on all other taxes. Mr. Kirwan referred to a party truce. I was one who agreed to that, but on what conditions? The conditions were that no legislation of a contentious nature was to be introduced. We have had, however, the most drastic Bill

which has ever been placed before the Legislative Council since the introduction of Responsible Government. I do not object to it because these are drastic times, but, if the Government submit contentious legislation, are we to sit here like dummies and allow the Government to do as they please just because we agreed to a truce on the consideration that there were to be no party politics? I have been sent here to represent the State and to do the best I can for it, but on no occasion will I be side-tracked. With reference to our unfortunate position as regards the unemployed, I have been taken to task for stating at Lion Mill that the position was not as serious as many would have us believe. I will prove that statement here. I know of an aged man, well in the seventies, who came to Perth a few weeks ago for a holiday. He intended to camp on the river shore and indulge in a respite from labour. All at once, however, he decided to return to work and within three days he secured a position in the country at 20s. per week and keep. What are the 136 able-bodied young fellows between the ages of 18 and 30 doing that they cannot get employment in the country when an old man of over 70 finds no difficulty in doing so? My comments may not meet with favour at the hands of the unemployed, but if they will only reason with themselves, they must come to the conclusion that it is better for them to go into the country and try and get employment than to hang around the town, as they are doing at the present time. In the Katanning district alone, I know that there are positions open for 18 farm hands and that the wages offering are from 20s. to 30s. a week. Is there any excuse therefore for any of these young fellows to be idling around the town depending upon charity? I know, too, that employment can be got in many other country towns of this State. Before concluding I want to draw attention to the fact that a section of the railway employees have already suffered a reduction of 4s. 6d. weekly. What have those people to say to that impost? It would be interesting too, to hear what their wives

have to say. The members of the Ministry declared on the hustings that they would reduce their salaries by the £300 which represents the sum they draw as members. If they are sincere, why do they not forego that amount and, if it is needed, though I maintain it is not, it could be devoted to the unemployed. I cannot support the second reading of the Bill, simply because of the waste of money which we find is taking place in the administration of Government departments. I think, too, I have proved conclusively that I have strong grounds for opposing the measure.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan [7.43]: Without repeating what has already been said by so many members who have dealt with this measure, I am left with very little to say. I intend to oppose the Bill because I think the unemployed difficulty is not as serious as the Government would have us believe. I am not in favour of taxing a certain section of the people simply to provide employment for another section and a very limited section at that, because I have not the slightest doubt that if the Bill were passed, and the money raised, the employment given would be restricted to unionists. When, the other night, the Premier was asked whether only unionists would be employed on these relief works, he evaded the question and said the policy of the Government was to give preference to unionists. It is easy to read between the lines and realise that non-unionists would have no chance at all on these relief works. I have a letter from one of my constituents, in which I am desired to put the question direct to the Colonial Secretary, and ask him to say straight out whether, in the event of this money being raised, preference will be given to unionists. My correspondent is a labourer himself, and he says he has no chance of getting work from the Government except he first joins a union. I am not going to be a party to raising money from the people in order to give employment to a special section. According to the figures given by the Colonial Secretary, there are 744 unemployed, of whom 302 are single men.

It is disgraceful that in a young State like this single men should have sunk so low as to be willing to hang about the City and accept free beds and free meals, when there is any amount of legitimate work waiting for them. I have frequently had men come to my farm asking for work. Before they look at the work they want to know whether there is anything to eat, and, after providing them with food, it is difficult to get them even to look at the work. A farmer in my district told me the other day that at Christmas one of his hands, employed at 25s. a week, left his work notwithstanding that it was the middle of the harvest. As a result of his employment on that farm he took with him some £40. Only last month that man was seen lining up for free meals in Perth. Evidently he had spent his £40 and was not looking for any more work while he could get free meals and free beds. If I had my way with those 302 single men in the ranks of the unemployed, I would give them 24 hours' notice to get out of town and look for work in the country, and at the end of the 24 hours, if any of them were still left in the City, I would put them in gaol. I would then find them something to do which would make them jolly glad to get away. That is how I would treat them. As long as the Government keep on providing relief work the unemployed will prefer working for the Government to working for any private individual, because, naturally, the private employer expects some return for the money he pays, whereas under the system of Government stroke, there does not seem to be any obligation on the part of the employee to do a reasonable amount of work. In the Assembly the other night Mr. Mullany drew attention to the fact that men employed on Government works were not giving a fair return.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not allude to debates in the Assembly.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Perhaps I may state that according to the Press some member of Parliament stated somewhere that the Government were not getting a fair return for the wages paid, that

bricklayers able to lay 1,000 bricks a day were laying from 300 to 400 bricks; and that a certain member of Parliament said that if those men went on at that rate they would kill the goose laying the golden egg, that in their own interests they should try to do a little more. In these circumstances one cannot wonder at men being disinclined to work for private employers. Mr. Johnson, the late Minister for Works, speaking at the opening of the railway institute at Midland Junction, was reported in the *West Australian* as follows:—

He propounded the doctrine that there was less obligation on workers in private employment to be enthusiastic about their work than there was on those in the service of the State. After remarking that the establishment of the institute would be a boon to the railway employees, he said that he had always envied the State employees. Personally, he had always had the misfortune to work for private enterprise. In such a case one went away from his work for the day forgetting all about it. There was no special reason why a worker should be interested in his employer's business out of working hours, but in working for the State he was working for himself and to assist others. For that reason he should endeavour to get the best possible results himself and try to get others to do the same. After he left his employment for the day he should still go on studying and working, and the knowledge thus acquired he would be able to use for the benefit of himself and his fellow-men. He should have a great deal more enthusiasm in his work than the man who worked for a private employer. They wanted to throw themselves into their work with zest, for the welfare of the State depended largely on their energy and enthusiasm.

When we hear of their laying 300 bricks a day we can imagine that they would have the more energy to think about it during the evening, when, no doubt, they would consider the possibility of eking out the next day with the laying of 250 bricks instead of 300. As long as the Gov-

ernment provide works these men will prefer to work for the Government. That is one reason why we see so many unemployed refusing work from private employers in the country and coming into the City to find work under a system based on the Government stroke. When, recently, the railway Bills were before the House, the Colonial Secretary assured us that the Government had ample means with which to carry out those works. He said, in fact, the Government had ample means to carry on all public works until next October, and that it was the intention of the Government, while judiciously expending loan moneys, to carry on the construction of the railways. That was only last month. We were told the Government had plenty of money to carry on these works, but I have not noticed any particular anxiety on the part of the Government to set those works going. No advertisements have appeared calling for hands. Yet it may be asked, if the Government have the money to carry on public works until October next, why do they not get on with those works and relieve the market? The Government are doing nothing at all in that direction. When the leader of the House was comfortably assuring members of the possession by the Government of all the money required, he made no allusion to the need for special taxation. If there is any need for special taxation to-day is should have been known to the Government then. Why did not the Government at that time say they had not sufficient money to carry out public works, and that they required increased taxation? I do not admit that the unemployed difficulty is acute, but, if it is, it was just as acute three weeks ago. I am aware of the struggles of the ordinary business man and of the settler on the land. Every business man is having an anxious time just now. This is not a juncture at which to impose increased taxation, and I for one am not willing to raise more money to entrust to the Government, who would be sure to waste it on unproductive works, and that only in the employment of a specially

selected class of men who profess sympathy with the Government, and who, before they can get work from the Government, must be members of a union. When taxation is raised from the people as a whole there should be no restriction as to who is going to benefit by the money so raised. I would not trust the Government with any more money to spend, because I feel sure they would waste it. The enormous sums the Government have passed through their hands should, I think, be a lesson to us, clearly proving that they are not the best medium for the expenditure of money. Much better would it be to leave the money in the hands of the people who have it to-day, and so encourage them to provide employment, rather than to entrust the task to the Government. On the 20th November last the Premier, in reply to a deputation of the unemployed, enumerated a long list of works waiting to be carried out. There was the erection of a new building on the present town hall site, the extension of tramways, the regrading of railways, the cleaning out of reservoirs, the building of a new reservoir, sewerage extensions and numerous other works. If all those works are waiting to be carried out, and if the money is available until October next, why come down now and ask for increased taxation?

Hon. D. G. Gawler: There was no mention of taxation then.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: No, none at all. In any case what is £175,000 when we consider the huge sums the Government have expended? Another thing: The members of the public service are voluntarily contributing £11,000 per annum. They are only human, and if we impose increased taxation on them it is reasonable to suppose that they will immediately stop this voluntary contribution. They cannot be expected to contribute £11,000 out of their salaries and pay a super tax as well. So what we get on the one hand by this tax will be taken away on the other. For months past the Government have known of the unemployed difficulty. What steps have they taken to combat it? As far as I can see the only proposal they have brought forward

—and that only at this late hour—is for the construction of feeder roads. I have always held that when we are building new railways we should construct feeder roads. But that is a public work, and should be provided for out of loan money. The work runs side by side with the construction of a railway. If it is necessary to cross a sandplain to reach a railway, and it is impossible to cart goods over it, of what value is the line? Feeder roads must be constructed, but the money for this work should come out of loan funds, and should not be raised by means of a special tax to provide work for the unemployed. The work proposed under the Bill is merely for a certain section of the community. After listening to Government supporters one would be apt to conclude that the only men out of work are artisans. What about clerks and shop assistants, and employees of that kind? There is no suggestion to provide work for them. They are not staunch supporters of the Government like the trades unionists, and therefore are not to receive consideration. From the works proposed if the Bill passes—and I hope it will not pass—such employees will receive no benefit. If the money were left in the hands of the people and they were encouraged to go on with private enterprise, it would be far better for the State than if the Government insisted on carrying on socialistic enterprises, entering into competition with and under-selling those engaged in manufacturing, and on top of all ruining their businesses by imposing this super tax. I do not wish to occupy any more time, but I could not face my constituents if I voted for such a measure as this.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON (North-East) [8.2]: I support the Bill, and perhaps after the speeches we have heard it is well that I should do so, in order to introduce a little variety into the discussion. It is patent to all who have listened to the various speeches that a majority of the members object to the Bill in the first place on principle, but most of them have eventually wound up by

objecting to a good many little technicalities, and none of them has shown that the Bill is unnecessary or inequitable. It rests with the supporters of the Government to show that the Bill is absolutely necessary and that its object is a valid one. We have heard many statements to the effect that the time is inopportune, and that the object of the measure is insufficient to warrant this House in passing it. Numerous statements have been made by self-constituted statisticians that the unemployed difficulty is not so serious as some would have us believe. Mr. Colebatch stated that so far as he could gather there was no necessity for the Bill and that, though there was a certain amount of unemployment, he was positive anyone sufficiently in earnest could obtain work. It is all very well for members to offer opinions on the question of unemployment. Even the statistics available from the employment bureau do not indicate the real position. The explanations by supporters of the Government in regard to unemployment have underestimated rather than overestimated the real position. Since it has been contended that the state of the unemployed market is not sufficiently serious to warrant the passing of the measure—the only remedial one to date, though many alternatives have been suggested—I intend to deal with the question of whether this taxation is necessary, having in view the objects outlined by the Government. It is well that members should be in possession of the latest information regarding the unemployed, information officially compiled by those in the best position to procure accurate returns. Mr. McCallum, the secretary of the Labour Federation, not only for the metropolitan area, but for the whole of the State, has given figures which are far more reliable than those picked up at street corners by hon. members.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They must be reliable, seeing they are trades hall figures.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: These figures were officially supplied by the secretaries of the respective organisations. They refer to the metropolitan area only, and show that those who are unfortunate

enough to be unemployed at present are not a set of loafers unwilling to do a fair day's work, but men who in many instances have been for years employed in the metropolitan area. In order that there may be no mistake, I will quote the different organisations, which are as follows:—rubble wallers 43 members, 40 unemployed, three working broken time; tip dray drivers, 172 members, 20 unemployed, 86 working broken time; bricklayers 300 members, 118 unemployed, 22 working broken time; printers 173 members, 17 unemployed, 87 working broken time; boilermakers, 97 members, 10 unemployed, 61 working broken time; clothing trades 135 members, 45 unemployed, 70 working broken time; ironworkers' assistants 305 members, 40 unemployed, 200 working broken time; Australian engineers 150 members, five unemployed, 120 working broken time; carpenters 1,000 members, 750 unemployed, 100 working broken time.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What do you mean by broken time?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Men working casually, and not getting in full time. Out of a membership of 1,000 carpenters, 750 are out of work and 100 are working broken time, leaving only 150 in full employment. Butchers, with 205 members, have 48 unemployed and 10 working broken time; general workers 524 members, 84 unemployed, 400 working broken time; moulders 154 members, five unemployed, 112 working broken time, and so on with the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, the plasterers, tinsmiths, Perth lumpers, bookbinders, masons, and the baking trade. The horse-drivers have 500 members, 23 unemployed, and 100 working broken time. These figures have been carefully compiled, and do not include Fremantle or Midland Junction. Out of a total membership of 4,523 the unemployed total 1,491, and those working part time total 1,573. Working it out on a percentage basis, roughly one-third of the members are employed full time, one-third are working broken time, and one-third are unemployed. Thus the position is even more serious than the statistics of the Labour Bureau show.

The men concerned have been working in recognised trades in the metropolitan area for some time, and are well known to the officials.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you include those working 44 hours a week?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Those in the metropolitan area only would be included among the men working part time. The union secretaries, who compiled these figures, are the men who supply the information regarding industrial matters to the Commonwealth Statistician. If the position is not sufficiently serious to make members realise the urgency of this measure, I am at a loss to know what would impress them. Sir Edward Wittenoom last week referred to the position of Millars'. I presume he was not attempting to bluff the Government, and we may conclude from his remarks that there is a possibility of a very large number of Millars' employees being thrown out of work. The Government already have absorbed a great number of men who were put off by various timber companies. Mr. Colebatch criticised the Government for employing these men on what he considered was not directly reproductive work. The hon. member said it was not a good business proposition to employ these men on sleeper cutting, as sleepers were at present unmarketable. We have to remember that the Government had the responsibility of finding work for the men put off by private employers, and naturally provided such work as was available. Whether or not this was justified from the purely financial standpoint it was absolutely justified, so far as the Government were concerned, considering the position they were in and the responsibilities placed upon them. I have noticed that many hon. members who have severely criticised the Government for mismanagement in their conduct of the affairs of the State, also insist that a certain amount of responsibility rests upon the Government to find employment for those whose services have been dispensed with by private firms. Sir Edward Wittenoom made this very clear the other evening so far as private employers are concerned, that

if they give, say, 14s. a day for a labourer they expect to make a little profit on the deal. Hon. members who take that view, while insisting that the Government should properly conduct the affairs of the State and on business lines, also insist that it is their duty to find employment for those out of work, and, if they cannot do that, to find sustenance for those unfortunate persons. They all insist that the responsibility is on the Government and that the Government have to accept that responsibility. And whatever Government are in power I maintain that that responsibility rests upon them. So far as the Government are concerned, I believe they are quite prepared to shoulder these obligations, but are also, in my opinion, quite justified in stating upon what terms they are prepared to do so. We have repeatedly asked those who object to the taxation proposals to advance some alternative scheme, but up to date not one suggestion has been brought forward which would meet the present difficulty. Hon. members are perfectly well aware that they have been unable to propose any scheme which would in any way deal with the present position of affairs.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What is wanted is economic administration.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: There is a continual cry about economic administration. The Government have been practising economy for many months in every possible way. Furthermore, if it comes to still further retrenchment, the position will probably not be improved by those whom we hold responsible, not only to see that present employees are kept in work, but to absorb all those who are put off by private individuals. Right throughout the piece the Government have endeavoured, with the liberal means at their disposal, to conduct the affairs of the country as economically as possible.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: But they have had no luck.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: There are members who call out for economy. The hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, for instance, comes along with a counterclaim, which is about the coolest proposal which I have ever heard brought before

the House, on behalf of Millars' company, which has declared large dividends in the past, and which is supposed to conduct its business on most improved lines. This hon. member knows perfectly well the condition of the finances of the country, and the position of the railways at the present time, and yet he coolly suggests certain rebates on the railways in regard to the carriage of timber, etc., and also suggests that the men should agree to take less wages, to such an extent that it will make a difference of 20s. a load on the timber produced by the company. When we find an hon. member coming along with a proposal for a concession which would be absolutely ridiculous in normal times, and telling the Government they ought to economise, naturally we are not going to take such criticism very seriously. I want to see a little more consistency displayed before I am going to accept criticism or advice from this source. In order to show thoroughly how necessary the measure is, it will be necessary to go into the finances of the State, but this question I am going to leave to the leader of the House. It is certainly necessary that the position should be explained to a certain extent, and that the Government should say for what purposes they require this money. Hon. members have had certain information supplied to them, but it is only right in matters of this description that a definite pronouncement should be made by the responsible Minister. What I have endeavoured to show is that in addition to the unemployment which undoubtedly exists in the metropolitan area, unemployment exists also in the farming districts, and even, I regret to say, upon the goldfields, despite the two or three positions which hon. members allege are at present open on some farms throughout the State. The State is in a most unfortunate position, and there never was a time in the history of Western Australia when there was so much unemployment as there is to-day. From what we can judge the position is likely to become even more acute. We presume that the Parliament of this State will shortly go into recess, and the Govern-

ment will then be faced with the obligation of providing, not only for those who are unemployed now, but for those who undoubtedly will be put off in the near future. Everything points to the position becoming worse.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: I suppose many men would be able to get employment if they were allowed to take less than the ruling rate of wage.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: That is one of the alternatives I hope to deal with later on. I am well aware that many hon. members consider that a way out of the difficulty is to reduce wages. In regard to the equity of the present taxation, I know that no taxation proposal will meet with the approval of the people of the State. No such proposal is going to be popular. It is all very well for those who can afford to do so to take the view at the present time that taxation is not warranted, and to set up the position that it is unfair to tax one section of the community for the benefit of another section. The arguments used in connection with the taxation proposals now before the House can be used in connection with any taxation that was ever proposed or introduced. We have heard the hon. Mr. Sanderson speak upon the incidence of taxation, and from what I could gather he was prepared to show that no taxation whatever would be equitable. As mentioned by the hon. Mr. Kirwan, if we waited until we had a tax which was absolutely satisfactory and equitable we would never introduce taxation at all. There is no taxation upon any statute-book in the world in which there are not glaring anomalies. If the schedule attached to this Bill contains anything to which hon. members take serious exception, if they can show that the incidence can be altered this can be done in Committee, but at the same time, I do not see that they have particularly attacked that portion of the Bill. At a time like this, we know it is necessary to tax only those who are able to bear the taxation. Despite what the hon. Mr. Colebatch has said with regard to the form which he prepared showing how it will affect the farmer, the fact remains

that, after allowing for reductions, a man is taxed on his income, and the man who has any income, as set out in the schedule, can well afford to pay the taxation provided for.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It may only be a paper income.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The hon. Mr. Colebatch certainly was not referring to a paper income. He was referring to the actual amount collected on every income of £700, and he almost shed tears because the man with an income of that amount would have to pay a tax.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: He would have to pay his debts first.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The hon. member is not objecting to the Bill because of the view that men would have to pay on incomes which only appeared on paper. If that was the only reason he could have said so. If he could have shown that there was any anomaly with regard to this he had an opportunity of pointing it out and suggesting a remedy. Hon. members who have objected to the tax have taken up the position that the Government do not require the money, and that they are not prepared to entrust them with it. They are, however, prepared to entrust them with the responsibility of dealing with the question. They are not going to remove the responsibility from the shoulders of the Government in regard to unemployment existing to-day, but have resolved to hold them responsible for what happens in the future. I am positive that the very ones who oppose this taxation will, right through the year, hold the Government responsible for those whom it is not deemed possible by private employers to employ. If people are going to hold the Government responsible, and the whole country appears inclined to do so, then they must give the Government the means of providing for unemployment, the means set out in the taxation proposal. Mr. Colebatch condemns the principle of the Bill and contends that it was conceived in a purely party spirit. After making this statement the hon. member did not proceed to show

that the principle of the Bill was wrong, that it was inequitable. What he set out to do was to show to his own satisfaction that the Government did not conduct the affairs of the State according to his way of thinking, and that they had refused to reduce wages and done many other things which he thought they should not have done. He, therefore, was not going to allow the new taxation to be imposed. The hon. member entirely failed to show that the incidence of this taxation proposal was unjust and that it would bear unduly hard on any one section of the community. I contend, therefore, that he did not make out a case, so far as showing that the Bill was wrong in principle. In reply to an interjection he stated that taxation was payment for services rendered. That is exactly the position, and exactly the trouble so far as Western Australian is concerned. I maintain that the experience of the last 12 years shows distinctly that in normal times people have not been paying sufficiently for what they have received from the Government. Mr Colebatch has admitted for once that we have had one fairly good season in the last four years. Is it to be supposed that at a time like this the affairs of the State can be carried on if the Government are not receiving a fair return for what they are giving to the people?

Hon. W. Patrick: Give an instance of unfair returns.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The Government are not receiving fair returns from the railways, for a start.

Hon. W. Patrick: Rubbish.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The hon. member ought to be a pretty good judge of that commodity, judging by the material he deals out.

Hon. W. Patrick: What you have said is rubbish, at any rate.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: It tends to make me more inclined to think what I say is right, when I hear the hon. member oppose it. In connection with many other services in this State, the taxation certainly is not adequate; and the whole of the revenue returns go to support that view. Naturally, in such circumstances

as these we feel the inadequacy of the returns for State services more than we feel it under normal conditions. At the present juncture the Government, as I pointed out previously, in addition to carrying on the ordinary functions of the State have to provide for unemployed; and they are called upon to perform this double task at a time when it is most difficult to finance two such propositions. As the Premier and his Ministers have stated, there is any amount of work to be done in this State—useful work, and work which will eventually justify its doing. The trouble, of course—and they make no secret of it—at the present time is that they should have additional finances to carry out the works I have indicated. An hon. member has stated that there is plenty of work available for single men. If that is so, then I am satisfied we have the wrong men in the Labour Bureau; for I am able to state that there are numbers of men, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in the country districts, and especially in the timber areas, quite prepared to accept any kind of work in return for fair remuneration. The suggestion, put forward by Mr. Jenkins, of sending all single men to the war, also appears to me to be a pretty cool proposition. The hon. member desires that the single men who are unfortunate enough to be out of work should, whether suitable for military service or unsuitable, go to the war and the hon. member is prepared to assist them to the extent of three cheers. The suggestion may be very well if the hon. member thinks it offers a way out of the difficulty. Personally, I consider it only amounts to a begging of the question; and the question is one that we have to deal with from the broad standpoint of providing for all who are out of employment and willing to work. I have observed that, apart from the general tendency to make venomous attacks upon the Government of the day, an attack has also been made by Mr. Colebatch, and I believe by Mr. Gawler, on the unionists of this State. Mr. Colebatch referred to the unionism obtaining in this State as almost a scandal. Mr. Gawler made a

rambling statement about what took place at a union meeting and what took place at an unemployed meeting, and wound up by reading something emanating from the Chamber of Mines.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: If it was rambling, it was, at any rate, pretty true.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: It may have been. It was very difficult to gather what the hon. member was driving at.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: It was true.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The position stands thus. Up till now the Government have rendered certain assistance to those in need of it, to those in distressed circumstances by reason of unemployment and from other causes; and I ask any hon. member of this Chamber to assert that any distinction whatever has been made as regards individuals who have received State assistance. I am confident that all in distress have received assistance from the State without any questions being asked.

Hon. C. Somers: So they ought.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Then is it not reasonable to suppose that when it comes to giving employment to the workless—probably the very same men who are at present receiving State assistance—the Government will equally refrain from making any distinction? No indication whatever has been given that any such distinction as suggested by certain hon. members will be made by the Government. Neither the Premier nor any other responsible member of the Government has indicated that when relief work is available for the unemployed, unionists alone are going to be employed. In disproof of what certain hon. members have said, I will give an illustration of what is actually taking place to-day in this respect. On the trans-Australian railway there is to be found the largest percentage, I believe, of unionists employed on any work in Australia. I have not the latest figures, but I can state that practically the whole of the men employed on the Kalgoorlie base, numbering 500 or 600, are members of unions. It is easy for hon. members to see that in the case of such a work unionists can do practically as they please, if they choose to put the

screw on. And still the fact remains that any man, whether he does or does not belong to a union, can go on that work and start.

Hon. C. Sommers: But how long does he stay there?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: That is not the point. The point is that any man can go on that work and get a start, irrespective of whether or not he is a unionist. If the unionists of this State intended to block a man from obtaining work because of his not being a member of the union—which, probably, would mean that he had not the money to join a union—then there would be some reason in the contention of hon. members opposing this measure. However, the fact remains that where unionism is strongest the unionists have made no attempt to put down their foot as those hon. members have suggested. The fact remains that there unionists are at all times prepared to receive any man and to allow him an equal opportunity, whether he is a unionist or a non-unionist.

Hon. C. Sommers: But he is not allowed to keep his work.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Another erroneous statement has been made in this connection. The matter is not one which, so far as I see, affects this Bill; but as you, Mr. President, have allowed an attack to be made on unionism, and on the methods of business adopted by the unionists in union affairs, I presume it is within my province to correct a misstatement on that subject. The misstatement was that every man who joins a union is compelled by the rules of the Australian Labour Federation to contribute to the political funds of the Labour party in this State. That statement is absolutely incorrect, and I wish to inform hon. members that the Labour organisation of this State is so constituted that the unions themselves are kept utterly apart from the political movement. All that unionists pay towards the political fund, they pay voluntarily. It is only a matter of 1s. 6d. per annum, and the rules of almost every union contain a proviso exempting any member who desires to be exempted, from the payment of that contribution of

1s. 6d. per annum. Indeed, many men have been unionists for years without paying that contribution. No unionist is under any obligation to pay it unless he chooses. Therefore it is an entirely erroneous allegation to say that in the first place the Labour party are going to compel men to join unions and then compel them to contribute to the political funds of the Labour party. That allegation does the Labour organisation of this State an injustice. Sir Edward Wittenoom has said that he would be quite satisfied if the proceeds from this proposed taxation were to be used to put the finances in order. We all know that the hon. member has the reputation of being a humorist; and the statement I have quoted certainly appears to me to be a humorous effort, considered in the light of the arguments used by Sir Edward Wittenoom, among several hon. members, when the Income Tax War Emergency Bill was under discussion. It was the hon. Mr. Holmes, I believe, who, designated that Bill "the deficit liquidation Bill." Mr. Holmes was quite satisfied that the sole purpose of that measure was to impose taxation for the purpose of liquidating the deficit. But on this occasion, when the Government bring forward a definite proposal for the raising of money to be paid into one specified fund and used for specified purposes—and there is no doubt that the need for the money is felt now, and will be more keenly felt in the very near future—we find Mr. Holmes and the hon. members sharing his view taking the very opposite stand. On the previous occasion, their objection to the Government's taxation proposal was that they considered it a wrong method to adopt of squaring the finances. On the present occasion, although the proceeds of the taxation are to be kept separate, and although every penny raised under this measure will have to be accounted for as set forth in the schedule to the Bill, they still object, and on that very ground. There was also an attempt by some hon. member—I believe it was Sir Edward Wittenoom—to prove that only those who paid taxes directly into

the Treasury were of any use to the State. Such assertions are frequently heard from purse-proud individuals. I refer to such phrases as "the flotsam and jetsam," and "the man without a stake in the country." The man without a stake in the country, we are told, is of no concern and of no benefit to the State. Having been on the Eastern goldfields as far back as 20 years ago, I remember there were on those goldfields many of the flotsam and jetsam, many a man who had not a stake in the country. I remember also that there were not many of the long-tailed, bell-topped gentlemen to be seen on the goldfields in those days. They came along afterwards. It was the flotsam and jetsam in those days that opened up this country. It was men without a stake in the country who were responsible for the development of Western Australia. The gentlemen who are prepared to sneer at the man without a stake in the country nevertheless thought the flotsam and jetsam good enough to develop this great State. Those now willing to batten on the pioneers, willing to derive their sustenance from the pioneers at this day, those who were quite willing to leave the pioneering work to be done by the flotsam and jetsam, now sneer at those pioneers. I cannot but feel and speak warmly on this subject. I wish on the present occasion to enter a protest against the assertion, continually made, that only the property holder, only the man with sufficient property to entitle him to have a vote for this branch of the Legislature, is worthy of consideration. Hon. members, of course, are quite at liberty to play to the gallery, if they think fit to do so; but the fact remains that the man whom they consider to be not a taxpayer merely because he is not a direct taxpayer, yet is indirectly paying taxation for those who pay it directly. In any case, whether a man pays taxes directly or indirectly, the fact remains that every citizen of this State is of value to the State; and no mathematical calculation such as was indulged in by Sir Edward Wittenoom can alter that position. Next, with regard to some of the alternatives submitted. It

is most remarkable, but Mr. Colebatch actually suggested that the deficit should be allowed to continue to pile up. Another of Mr. Colebatch's alternatives was that men should be induced to work for lower wages—and all would be well. Mr. Colebatch and those who share his views admit the position, and these are their alternatives to the taxation proposed by this measure. After all their argument about the waste of money, and the manner in which the affairs of the State have been carried on, deep down in their hearts they know that the position is serious and they come along with an alternative, and such an alternative. I remember on various occasions, especially at election time, having heard that the brains of the Legislature were wrapped up in the Liberal party. It is difficult for me to believe that an unbiassed providence should have given preference to Liberals in this respect. I find now that certain members of the Country party also claim that they have a monopoly of brains. If that is so, I must say that so far as the alternative propositions show, those gentlemen are very close with them, and they are not giving the country much advantage of the marvellous brain power they have advertised they possess. I like to see the man who talks so much about brains give an indication of the possession of them. It is not enough for a man to pat himself on the back and say, I have done so and so, and I have lifted myself to a certain position which indicates a preponderance of ability; he has to give some indication of it so that other people may recognise whether he really does possess brains or not. Mr. Colebatch, with his magnificent intellect, can only suggest two things. One is that the country should be allowed to slide and get into a worse position, and the other that those who have commodities to sell, namely their work, should take less for it than its value. Mr. Colebatch too, is the very man who on all occasions when anything has to be sold so far as the farmers are concerned, insists that they shall get the full market value. The next minute he turns on the workman who has only one commodity and

says that he shall take for that commodity less than its value. Mr. Jenkins' advice is "Go to the war, young man."

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Is that not an honour and a privilege? I suppose you think they ought to get well paid for it.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON. I hope the advice of the hon. member will be taken and that the unemployed will be as serious in taking it as he is in giving it. Mr. Sanderson has a suggestion which I rather favour—unification. I had ideas in that direction some time ago. After seeing the manner in which legislation is conducted in this State it makes a good many of us feel that our only hope lies in the Federal Government. The Federal Parliament is constituted on an adult franchise where a man is a man, and every individual has a vote. Naturally, therefore, we look with a little hope to the Federal Parliament to give us a measure of justice. As usual, Mr. Sanderson is fairly logical and he says that although at the present time this House has the power to dictate the financial policy of the Government, it cannot always be so, and we are gradually being placed in an impossible position. As to Mr. Gawler, we expected something from him. He took some trouble to acquaint us fully with the situation, and we thought that with his legal mind, and after the manner in which he referred to the conduct of unions—and by the way he forgot to tell us about his own pet union—we thought he would be in a position to give us something worth while. He made a rambling statement about something he read in a newspaper and something he heard on the Esplanade, with which he did not agree, and then he read a letter from the Chamber of Mines, a body which is not affected to a great extent by this Bill. After he read the letter he sat down. His alternative is, "We extend to the unemployed our sincere sympathy," I can assure the hon. member that the unemployed do not want his sympathy and they are very doubtful about his sincerity. The unemployed ask for work, and the hon. member says they have his sincere sympathy. Under these circumstances must they not doubt his sin-

cerity? They do not want to have anything to do with a man who makes such a statement about them and who has referred to them as men not worthy of consideration to any great extent.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Who referred to them as such?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: And he said if they were men who really wanted work they could get it. I am glad the hon. member has the grace to be ashamed of what he said.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: On a point of order; may I ask whether the hon. member is attributing those statements to me.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: If the hon. member is attributing them to me, he is making a mis-statement.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will, no doubt, withdraw the remarks.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: What statement does the hon. member object to?

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The hon. member made so many but one in particular was that he said I had declared the unemployed were unworthy of consideration. I made no such statement.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The hon. member said a section of them.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Millington had better proceed with his speech.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I have said sufficient from my point of view to show that the measure before us has been rendered necessary on account of the exceptional circumstances with which we are faced, also on account of the fact that everything in the future points to one conclusion, and it is that things will be considerably worse before they improve. The responsibility of meeting the special position rests with the Government, and realising this we are doing the best to make the necessary provision. If this Chamber refuses the Government the assistance sought in regard to collecting additional revenue, the responsibility must rest upon members here. Some hon. members, I presume, do not particularly mind having the responsibility placed upon them, but the fact remains that if they are prepared to adopt an

honourable course now they will not attempt to quibble in the future. It must be maintained that the Government are honestly endeavouring to meet the position. I do not think I need go any further. At the same time, although hon. members appear to have made up their minds that this Bill is not to go through, I am rather pleased to have had the opportunity of telling some of them what I think of them.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.53]: It is my intention to observe a course which I suppose will be taken by most hon. members who speak at this stage of the debate, that is, to keep my remarks within as brief a compass as possible. I have two reasons for doing this, firstly, because this House and another place are somewhat anxiously waiting for the division to take place, and secondly, because so many weighty reasons have already been advanced against the passing of this measure, that it falls to the lot of few hon. members to advance any more. Those defending the Bill take up the stand that the reasons which have been advanced against the passing of it are unworthy. I want to make my reasons fairly plain. I feel that, judging from the past performances of the Government, and judging from the present attitude which they take up, I would not be justified either personally or on behalf of my electors to supply the Government with any more money to waste. That, I think, is a perfectly legitimate reason, and it is one which, at all events, appeals to me, even to the dwarfing of other reasons, and there are many others which might be given if time permitted. If the Government showed an inclination to help themselves out of the difficulty, then they might reasonably expect this House to come to their assistance. There are, and the Government, in the bottom of their hearts know it, excrescences on the commercial life in the State which the Government should make an endeavour to lop off or amputate. I refer to the State enterprises. The Government must realise by this time that these excrescences are sapping the commercial life of the

community, and nothing is being done to put an end to them. If the Government came down and said "We want extra money, and to justify us in obtaining that money we are willing to, at all events, give some little respect to your opinions; we are willing to cease wasting money on what are after all nothing but fads of socialists"; if they were willing to do that, my attitude towards this Bill would be altogether different. When they show, on the other hand, the utmost unwillingness to follow that course, and when they state openly that it is not their intention to endeavour to mend their ways, which they must know are wrong, I am not willing to give them more money to waste, or help to do so. Just to show that the Government were not endeavouring to help themselves, I will give one instance. During last session the leader of the House, in controverting as he claimed he was doing, some statements of mine in regard to State steamers, admitted that the "Western Australia" was obviously unfitted for the trade in which she was engaged. I entreated him to save £12,000 or £14,000 per annum by passing the steamer on to the Imperial Government, and as an alternative I suggested that she should be taken outside Rottnest and sunk. In either case the State would have saved £12,000 a year. The hon. gentleman said "No, I will not take either course, but the Government are considering a proposal to exchange this steamer for another one more suitable." Has any effort been made in this direction? If so, has finality been reached, and if not, why not? The Government could give us valuable information which might induce hon. members to change their attitude towards this Bill. Take the State brickworks. They are, I believe, a monument of imbecility, although perhaps that is not quite right. I should say, a monument of extravagance, which the Government, I maintain, can never make pay. But there is a way out of the difficulty which the Government might take. If the Government said "We have erected at enormous expense and in a very long time State brickworks which are capable of turning

out a certain number of bricks per week;"—the late member for Kalgoorlie in the Assembly put down the profit at 13 million pounds per annum—"We will not run those brickworks ourselves, but will invite tenders for their leasing," I venture to say they would get a very much better return from the proposition than by running the works themselves. Again, why cannot the Premier be guided by the example of other States which, in some cases, are almost in a worse commercial position than is our own State. The Government of South Australia, and I think of New South Wales, realise that for two reasons the wrong time to tax a man is when he has nothing. It is obvious that at such a time a tax must be grievous to the man and unproductive to the Government. The Governments I refer to have said to the people of their respective States, "When better times come, as they must come, then you will be expected to contribute out of your wealth to the making good of the deficiency which has accumulated during your poverty."

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: This Bill will not tax the man who has nothing.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: No; but I would like to point out to the hon. member, if it is necessary—which I doubt—that the people who have money at present are nothing in number compared with the people who will have money in the future. The scope for taxation will undoubtedly be very much wider in a year's time than it is at present, and that will be the time to introduce taxation for the purpose of reinstating the State in the position from which she should never have fallen. The Government have already taken steps in some particulars to set themselves right, if only in a minor degree. I understand from observations made, and not contradicted, that it is the purpose of the Government to drop the Reclassification of Lands Bill. With the dropping of that Bill, and the beautiful facilities for putting on the screw afforded by the Industries Assistance Bill, the Government will be able to collect from the farmers a very much higher propor-

tion of rents than they would have got if the Reclassification of Lands Bill had gone through. The effect will be the further bleeding of a class already suffering almost to the point of death at the hands of the Government. With regard to the proposed tax on amusements, I suppose amusements may be divided into two classes, namely, those which are profit-making, and those which are not, and which are run for the purpose of sport. There are many profit-making amusements in our midst. There are, of course, theatrical entertainments, which are run, not for the good of the health of the impressario, but for the unashamed making of money. Then there is horse-racing, which I presume I am right in classing as a sport, although nowadays it seems to be rather more of an industry. If it is an industry then it is undoubtedly a fit and proper subject for taxation. I remember the attitude the Government took up when first they came into power, the mental horror with which they held up their metaphorical hands at the extent of the horse-racing going on in the State. They piously declared that the first thing they were going to do was to introduce a Bill to regulate horse-racing. I do not know how it was that they fell from grace; I think perhaps some of the racing clubs and associations began to make what the Americans called a fuss, of the members of the Government, and in consequence Ministers felt their good resolutions slipping from them. At all events, in view of this proposed tax, they must be rather glad that the slipping took place, because a very much wider field of taxation is presented to them to-day than they would have had if they had cut down racing, as they should have done. Instead of taxing racing in the manner suggested by the Bill, would it not be a good thing for the Government to increase the totalisator tax? They receive a fair amount per annum now from that tax, and if they made the tax greater—I do not say they should ask the racing clubs to pay the extra money required, but the people who go racing would not miss another 6d. in the £1 of the dividends they collect from the totalisator—they would collect a sum

which, with the extra amount they will be able to screw out of the farmers by the dropping of the Reclassification of Lands Bill, and the further amount they will be able to screw out of the same farmers by the judicious application of the Assistance to Industries Bill, would go a very long way towards meeting the loss of the money they have never had, but which they will lose if the Bill does not pass the second reading. I am very sorry to see that among the amusements they propose to tax are some of the pure sports of Western Australia. We have not many such sports left into which the canker of gambling has not yet eaten its way; but there are still some, and I am sorry to see the Government are prepared to tax those sports out of their very existence. I am sorry to see in the schedule of the Bill—not because I fear a schedule which will never come into operation, but because it reveals the spirit of the Government—such sports as tennis and cricket; football I will say nothing about, for fear of wounding the tender susceptibilities of the Premier. It is a wonder to me also that with the commercial minds the Government have, they have not, long ere this, stopped the immense amount of money going out of the State to Tasmania for what I understand is known as Tatts. It is a wonder that before this they have not started a State lottery. Let me say in passing I would not suggest this to any Government but the present; but, seeing that they have such keen commercial instincts and are so very much wrapped up in State enterprises, let me commend to them the suggestion that they should start State lotteries. It is an eminently suitable enterprise for them to engage in.

Hon. J. Cornell: You will have the wowsers after you.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The Government, I believe, stand so very strong with the wowsers that nothing they could do or say would offend those gentlemen. Let me allay the fears of my dear friend, Mr. Sanderson, who had considerable trepidation about voting against the second reading on account of the constitutional aspect of such action. I do not

think he need be frightened in that respect. There is an old axiom which obtains throughout political life the world over, namely, that there should be no taxation without representation. After all, it must be remembered that in respect to taxation it is the electors of this House, those men to whom we are responsible, who will pay, I suppose, 95 per cent. of the tax. If this is so, it is only fair that this House should have the last say, and if necessary, the most important say, on the subject of taxation. There are two chief elements in finance, namely that of getting and that of spending money. The Government have undoubtedly proved themselves among the greatest adepts in the element of spending which this or any other country has ever seen, but their way of getting money leaves a good deal to be desired. If 95 per cent. of the money raised by direct taxation is to be got from the electors of this Chamber, then this Chamber should undoubtedly have a good deal to say as to how that money is to be raised. Mr. Millington objects to anybody offering sympathy to the unemployed. I will not offer them sympathy on account of their position, but I do sincerely sympathise with them on the score that they have been most grievously misled in regard to the Bill. The Bill, if passed, would be of no more use to the unemployed than it will be if it remains the scrap of paper it is at present.

Hon. H. Millington: You are afraid to try it.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: No, but I do not see the utility of trying an expedient which I know is futile in the extreme. We know that no money can eventuate from the Bill for at least six months; that being so, how in the name of reason is it going to benefit the men who, unfortunately, want the money at once? I am not going to dispute the gravity of the situation in regard to the unemployed. It is only to be expected that we should have unemployed. If hon. members will read the statistics of Australia and of other countries, they will be forced to the conclusion that in any country where commercial activities of a private nature are

paralysed by the operation of a Government which terrorises those private activities, either by fear of unfair competition or of undue taxation, then unemployment must arise. It is a fact that unemployment is greater in every country which possesses a Labour Government; and so far as I can see it must always be so while Labour Governments hold the two rods of undue taxation and unfair competition over private enterprise, which, after all, must in any commercial country be the main factor of employment. If the Government do seriously tackle this unemployment question, if they put into effect the Loan Bill and the Loan Estimates, if they start those enterprises they say they are about to start, enterprises which are not trading concerns—fortunately they seem to have run their limit in the matter of trading concerns—

The Colonial Secretary: What about the freezing works at Wyndham?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I hope that is a public utility. I do not think you are there entering into competition with private people. If the hon. gentleman is, I misunderstand the object of those freezing works. The freezing works at Wyndham, if they are to be erected, will be more in the nature of a public utility than of a State enterprise. I maintain that under the Loan Estimates which we shall presently be asked to hurriedly consider, plenty of employment may be found if the Government carry their intentions into effect. Furthermore, I understand from public utterances which have been made that the Premier is satisfied he has sufficient money with which to carry out these works. If this is so, and a perusal of the schedule to the Loan Estimates will satisfy anyone that all the works likely to be reproductive are contained within the four corners of those Estimates, this unemployed difficulty must come to an end. In spite of what Mr. Millington has said the unemployed have my sympathy, not so much on account of their unemployment, as on account of their being grievously misled over this Bill. As I understand the Bill will be futile in its object, and because

I am not willing personally or on behalf of the electors I claim to represent, to entrust the Government who have so grievously mismanaged the affairs of the State with more money to waste, and for other reasons which I do not propose to dwell on now, but of which I may have a good deal to say when the day of reckoning comes, it is my intention to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. W. PATRICK (Central) [9.17]: The general principles of this Bill have been debated at very great length, and I wish merely to direct attention to one or two mis-statements which are of such tremendous importance that they strike at the very root of the matter now under consideration. Mr. Cornell and Mr. Kirwan yesterday stated that the Government were confronted with a falling revenue. Those hon. gentlemen were entirely incorrect in making that statement.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Will the hon. member read the figures?

Hon. W. PATRICK: I intend to do so.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The hon. member is quite wrong.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I shall have no difficulty in proving that the hon. member made a mis-statement when he said there was a falling revenue. A small book issued by the Commonwealth, deals with the revenue of the States. It shows that the revenue of Western Australia in 1912-13 amounted to £4,597,000, and in 1913-14 to £5,205,000. For the eight months ended 28th February last, the revenue totalled £3,036,975, and for the corresponding eight months of the previous financial year the revenue totalled £3,018,813, or £18,000 less than in the eight months just ended. These are official figures and are irrefutable.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Read the figures since the war started.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I have quoted figures for the period ended a few days ago.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The hon. member has the wrong figures.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I have quoted the official figures and they cannot be disputed. There is no doubt that the hon. gentlemen who constitute the Gov-

ernment have received from year to year a continually increasing revenue, but unfortunately the expenditure has increased at a greater ratio, and the result is the present financial position of affairs. Mr. Millington spoke about the limited means at the disposal of the Government. In addition to having a continually increasing revenue, the Government have spent twice as much loan money as any other Government ever spent in the State, and on top of that have piled up a deficit of over a million sterling.

Hon. H. Millington: What about the interest and sinking fund they have had to find?

Hon. W. PATRICK: Other Governments have had to provide interest and sinking fund, but these items will continue to increase so long as the present Government continue their present extravagance.

Hon. H. Millington: You authorise the loan money which is expended.

Hon. W. PATRICK: This House cannot refuse to approve of loan expenditure without dislocating the business of the State, and we are not likely to take upon ourselves that responsibility when the Government are responsible to the people for it. In spite of the enormous amounts of revenue and loan money expended, Mr. Millington said the Government were not receiving sufficient and that the present taxation was not heavy enough to enable them to carry on.

Hon. H. Millington: It cannot be if we are going into debt.

Hon. W. PATRICK: That is always the cry of the spendthrift. If an individual has an income of £1,000 and expends £2,000, he soon finds himself in the Bankruptcy Court and the State is moving rapidly in that direction. It is idle for anyone to think we have an unlimited fund upon which the State can draw.

Hon. H. Millington: The private individual can always go to the Government.

Hon. W. PATRICK: The hon. member remarked that rates on the railways were not high enough, and I interjected, "Rubbish!" Perhaps my remark was not

quite proper, but in the circumstances it was at least appropriate, because I felt considerably annoyed at the statement. The railway freights in this State are higher than in any other part of Australia and the hon. member ought to know it.

Hon. J. Cornell: Passenger fares are higher in New South Wales than here.

Hon. W. PATRICK: The hon. member knows perfectly well that I referred to freights. They are the important item from the point of view of railway revenue. If any one takes the trouble to look through the monthly returns it is easy to see where the money is going. We cannot find out to what extent we are losing money on special items, but there are spots here and there, some tremendously big, indicating losses of £10,000, £20,000, £50,000, £80,000 and £90,000. In the early part of this session, I directed attention to the fact that the implement works showed an expenditure of £80,000, and that the revenue was only £40,000. The leader of the House replied that, as one having some knowledge of accountancy, I must realise that the capital expenditure was probably the most important item. I should say that this sum represented the whole of the capital expenditure required in those works. Up to the 30th June there was a shortage of £40,000 which may have been due to capital expenditure, but during the eight months which have since elapsed the revenue from the implement works has amounted to £38,411 and the expenditure to £92,571.

The Colonial Secretary: The machinery is sold on the time payment system.

Hon. W. PATRICK: The machinery sold is insignificant in relation to the amount of money expended. I have no hesitation in saying that the State steamships and State timber mills will not be in it with these ridiculous implement works.

The Colonial Secretary: Are the steamships showing a deficit on revenue account?

Hon. W. PATRICK: The State had to find £50,000 for the one concern referred to in the space of eight months,

and this country cannot afford that sort of thing. This is one of the large spots in the monthly returns. If we examine the whole of these different mad schemes initiated and carried out by the present Government we can easily account for the greater portion of the enormous deficit which is now resting on the shoulders of the poor people of Western Australia who under this Bill are asked to provide more money by way of taxation, as if they are not already sufficiently burdened. Such an idea as this did not enter into the calculations of the Government at the opening of the present session. Apparently a month ago there was no such thought in their minds. I do not say this is a trumped-up agitation, but considering the manner in which the Government have run the affairs of the State, unemployment is only the natural and certain result of their policy. I will give one instance. In the town of Magnet a few days ago two men asked the railway stationmaster to supply them with a pass to Perth where they hoped to get work. The stationmaster pointed out that there was plenty of work in the ballast pits and around Magnet. Anyone acquainted with the district knows that men willing to work can make a fair living at prospecting. If a man has not a show of his own, he can easily get work on somebody else's show. The stationmaster could not supply a pass, and the men wired to the Premier who sent up a pass, and these two men doubtless at present form portion of the 700 unemployed. One of the greatest evils which will confront the people of Australia in the near future is the congestion of population in the cities and towns. In Western Australia the population is diminishing instead of increasing. According to the Commonwealth figures, there are 121,000 people in the metropolitan area alone. If we add the population of Northam, Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany and other towns it will be found that at least a half of the population of this State lives in the towns. This is not a manufacturing country, and those who reside in the cities and towns depend on the primary industries for their food,

clothing and wages. The greater the number of people who flock to the City and who are employed on relief works or otherwise, the worse it will be for the State. The object of the Government should be to provide work outside the City. They should proceed with the construction of railways for which loan money is provided. I do not think it is necessary to say anything further. I wish to draw attention to the fact that the revenue of the State has been going on increasing year by year, that more loan money has been spent by this Government than has been spent by any previous Government and that in addition they have drawn upon the future to the extent of over a million sterling. It is unnecessary for me to say any more than that I am going to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West) [9.31]: Although this matter has been thrashed out at some length, I feel I cannot give a silent vote upon it. What I desire to do is to mention particularly a number of points which have not been sufficiently emphasised up to the present. It is always held that a person who advocates some new scheme, some drastic measure, should prove right up to the hilt the necessity for it, or the desirability or urgency of it. After listening carefully to the debate, although I have heard some abuse, I have heard nothing that would justify me in voting for the measure. The position is practically this: the Government came into power pledged to non-borrowing except for reproductive works. To be charitable, we might admit that this means works which they considered would be reproductive, and we can give them credit for that accordingly. They have had a greater revenue than any other Government and have borrowed a greater amount of money than any previous Government, and yet they come along after all this and say, "We want this tax," which a majority of this House, with the country at its back, considers is an unjust and unnecessary tax. I would not object if I were sure that the money proposed to be collected under the Bill would be

spent judiciously. In the light of previous events, however, we have no alternative but to reject the proposal. So long as the taxpayers of the State will find money this Government will spend it. I object to the Bill on that account. My idea is—and I may be old-fashioned—that the Government of a State like this, and at such a critical time in its history, should be administered by men of exceptional business capacity, men who have had sound business training and are well adapted to the duties they will be called upon to perform. We feel now that such men are required. It was thought we had them. The community at large thought we had them. But it is found that, not only can they not run this State, but that they have undertaken a number of State enterprises which, I say advisedly, have disorganised the various businesses in the country. I need not mention any of them, because they have been so often mentioned that one becomes tired of the subject. The bare fact remains that we have gone to the bad, and a time has come when something must be done. Money has been recklessly spent, and money has gone without apparently having been spent, and has gone for all time. With regard to the unemployed question, many schemes have been propounded for the relief of the situation. I have a notion that down in the South-West, to say nothing of Yandanooka and other estates possessed by the Government, there is an opportunity for assisting the unemployed. There is, for instance, the Harvey estate, the northern portion of which belongs to the Government. Hardly a blow has been struck upon that, although there are hundreds of acres of good land there. The blackboys have not been chopped down and insufficient ringbarking has been done. Anyone who has a practical knowledge of the question knows perfectly well that one of the first essentials in a country like that is to ringbark the trees. If this is done the land will carry more feed, and is more easily cleared afterwards. My suggestion is not that the Government should send the unemployed down there to clear the land at so much per day, but that they should send them

down under such an arrangement that a man who is willing to work well can earn 15s. or 16s. a day. My suggestion, further, is that the Government should call for applications for the ring-barking of the trees and the chopping down of the black-boys on that area at so much per acre. They could then see how many men would be prepared to take on the work. I know there are many who are not physically fit for that class of labour, but I have yet to learn that out of, say, 300 young men in need of work, there are not many quite sufficiently fit to perform it. I know something about the work. I would say to them that I will give them such a price that they could earn 15s. a day if they were willing to do it. I would not send them down there simply under the day labour system. We have had experience of that, and we do not want a repetition of it. I have all along believed that the man who does the maximum amount of work should get the maximum amount of pay. In every instance I believe that the man who is willing to strain an extra point should get paid for so doing. The hon. Mr. Cornell emphatically states that an industry which will not pay a good living wage should be abolished. He is illogical in his attitude, and I am not with him. I admit that State enterprises have paid a good, liberal wage, in fact, a splendid wage. We do not object to that, but at what cost has this been given? This is the sort of thing which has brought about the present state of affairs. As a keen observer of things in this State, I say advisedly that the cost of production is too great in this State, and the sooner this evil is remedied the better. Take the case of the bricklayers, who the late Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) admits, so far as the artisans employed at Midland Junction are concerned, should be laying 300 bricks per day instead of the 300 they are laying, and for which they are getting full pay. I would have every man paid according to the work he does; then every man would get what is his just due. A man with ability will in time become an employer, and we shall then do away

with a lot of this sort of thing. Many of the unemployed are, to my mind, frauds. I will not repeat anything that has come to me as hearsay, but will simply mention what absolutely occurred and came under my notice. Not many days after war was declared I was staying in a little public-house in the country. Early in the morning there called upon me a fellow who was absolutely stranded. He could not get away from the place as a consequence. Unfortunately for him he came within a couple of feet of me and I had a whiff of him, which showed me what he had been up to. I suggested to him kindly that if he could find money to pour whisky down his throat, he could find money to get further along the road. I do not say that this is a typical case, but it is a case of the fly in the ointment which really spoils the lot. With ordinary judgment and ordinary business capacity on the part of the Government, this unemployed trouble should not have arisen. As remarked already, the Government have any amount of money to spend for the purpose of dealing with this question. It may be argued that every man is not physically able to chop blackboys down. But we understand that a number of carpenters are unemployed. There are two road boards in my district, which have the Collie river running between them. There is an old bridge which has been there since the early sixties, but which has become absolutely unsafe. Let the Government send the carpenters down there to rebuild that bridge. The road board cannot afford to do it, and I want to know who can afford to do so as the Government have withdrawn the subsidies from these local authorities. Has there been any real, genuine, or practical attempt to stay the drift which has been going on for these years past? In answer to that one can only hear echo say, "What have they done?" We are satisfied that they have not made any such attempt. One is indeed inclined to sing "It's a long, long way to Tipperary." We want to know how long this thing is going to continue. It is a serious affair. I want to say in justice to the Government that they were returned to power pledged to these socialistic works, that

they were within their rights in undertaking them, but that they over-estimated their capacity as business men. As honest men at the present time they should not do what has been done hitherto, namely, withhold from Parliament and from the country the information which Parliament and the country are entitled to have. It is up to them to let us know exactly how things stand. If they do know how they stand it is for them to say what they consider is the best thing to be done. I want in no uncertain voice to object to the taxing of a man who does not know which way to turn to carry on his business. Such a tax as this, far from proving of assistance, is going to intensify the question of unemployment at the present time. I shall oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.42]: I do not intend, after the remarks which have fallen from the various speakers during the debate, to prolong it to any length. I feel it my duty, however, to give reasons why I wish to oppose the second reading of this Bill. In doing so I would like to read a letter, which I received a few days ago on my return to the State after a brief absence, and to which I replied. It will assist me somewhat in confining my remarks to one or two particulars. The letter I refer to came from the Metropolitan Council of the Australian Labour Federation, and is signed by Alexander McCallum, secretary. The letter reads as follows:—

I am directed by the Metropolitan Council of the Australian Labour Federation to respectfully request the metropolitan Parliamentary representatives in both Houses to meet the executive committee of the Council in order that we may discuss the possibility of us co-operating in assisting the Government in some move to raise money in order to relieve the unemployed situation. The council have expressed the opinion that the best method of doing this is by graduated tax on all incomes, but if a better method could be suggested, I think they would be prepared to con-

sider any alternative. In practically all parts of the British Empire party politics have been sunk for the time being, and as the situation locally is so acute, I trust that the mere fact that you adhere to a different party than this Council will not stand in the road of an endeavour being made to work jointly in this matter. In order that as little time as possible should be lost, I am requesting Mr. Connolly, M.L.A., for the City, to confer with each of the metropolitan members and if agreeable arrange time and place for the suggested meeting.

In acknowledging the receipt of that letter I said,—

No one regrets more than I do that the necessity exists for finding some solution of the difficulties the State is at present suffering from, and I can assure you that no one is more anxious and willing to put aside all party feeling with the hope of reaching a satisfactory and sound basis. As you say, practically **all parts of the Empire** have already done so; and at the beginning of the present session I said I was quite in accord with the suggestion then made that we in Western Australia should do the same; and I am glad to know that your Council are also in accord. In my opinion, however, the only way this can be done with any real hope of success is for the Premier of the State to take members of all parties into his confidence and convene the necessary meeting.

I have listened with a great amount of patience to the various remarks offered by both parties represented in this House; and I contend, in the spirit of that letter, that we are wide of the mark when we attempt at this time to drag party feeling into any debate, and especially a debate which has for its object the enabling of this House duly to consider a Bill designed to tax a certain section of the community in order to relieve another. As I have said, I am opposed to the Bill. I am prepared to state here and now my reasons for opposing the measure. Those reasons, I may say, have already been

stated fully by various members; and therefore I shall be as brief as I possibly can. We know, as a matter of fact, that the Government have ways and means of remedying the present state of unemployment without resorting to the bringing down of a Bill for additional taxation. We know, as a matter of fact, that the Government have at their disposal two millions for works which can be put in hand, and which in themselves are sufficient to absorb the labour of every unemployed individual who desires work—of every such individual, not only in the metropolitan area, but throughout the length and breadth of the State. Do the Government desire us to make suggestions as to works which are needful? Then I have only to point to one of those works—a work for which, I contend, the people of the metropolitan area are justly entitled to demand consideration. I only wonder why the residents of the metropolitan area have not, ere this, risen in indignation to protest against the quality of the water they are compelled to use for domestic purposes, especially in the summer months. Every one of us is fully aware that the temperature of the water metered out to us through the reticulation system, for domestic purposes, is such as to render the water unfit for human consumption from a hygienic point of view. When objection has been raised on this score, the Water Supply Department have told the public that, although the water is not what the department would like to supply, although on its very appearance the water is not what people would wish to take into their systems, yet they, the department, can assure the public the water is wholesome notwithstanding. Apparently, the residents of the metropolitan area have taken that for granted. Still, I contend unhesitatingly that a new metropolitan water supply is one of the works which should be taken in hand, and which would absorb a large proportion of the unemployed now begging and praying for relief. I may say I am fully convinced that there are in our midst numbers of men crying in vain for work. I am leaving aside anything to which exception can be taken. I contend that

there is to-day a large number of people out of employment who, if the Government did their duty and exercised the powers they already have and used the funds at their disposal, could be afforded a considerable measure of relief without the introduction of a Bill of this nature at all. However, reverting to the spirit of the letter which I sent in reply to the communication of the secretary of the Australian Labour Federation, I contend that the present is not a time when we should chide any Government on the score of misdoings. All Governments, no matter of what political complexion, have at some time or other made mistakes; and, emphatically, the present is not a fitting opportunity for crying over spilt milk. We are face to face with a calamity; the situation must be taken in hand; and I say here and now that it is my intention to test the genuineness of the Government's desire to relieve distress by informing them, as I did in that letter, that I individually—and in this respect I feel sure I can speak for many members of this House—am prepared to sink all party feeling and meet the Government with a view to devising ways and means for overcoming the present difficulties. In the circumstances I contend that the Government, instead of proceeding with good feeling to devise relief measures, have dropped into this Chamber a bomb, which is bound to stir up strife.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not impute motives. I think that remark should be withdrawn.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Very well, Mr. President; I withdraw the remark.

The PRESIDENT: I understood the hon. member to say that the Government introduced the Bill for the purpose of creating strife.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Perhaps I am wrong, Sir, and I withdraw that observation; but the fact remains that we here are prepared to sink all party feeling and to meet the Government in conference, either as a body or by representatives. I have no doubt the Country party would also be prepared to meet the Government similarly, in an endeavour to

arrive at a solution of existing difficulties. At all events, such is the spirit with which I view the present situation. I shall not enter into the misdeeds of the Government. I do not intend to speak of the maladministration of the Government. I am prepared to leave all that out of the question, for the time being. I have on previous occasions voiced my opinions in that respect with no uncertain sound. Therefore, although hon. members of the Ministerial party have indulged in remarks not conducive to the creation of a spirit of compromise, I am even willing to overlook anything of that nature uttered in the course of this debate. I sincerely hope that hon. members of this Chamber will vote against the second reading of the Bill, because the measure is unnecessary. As I have acknowledged, the unemployed we have with us; but there are better ways and means of dealing with the situation than to tax those members of the community who at the present time are struggling with might and main to keep their employees fully employed. I think a good deal of commendation is due to those members of the community, even from Ministers. The members of the community to whom I refer have up to the present time sacrificed their own comfort and their own pleasures for the benefit of their employees, in order that the full rate of wages obtaining prior to the outbreak of hostilities in Europe may be maintained. In conclusion, I wish to say that there are sections of the community, that there are quarters, which can stand some additional taxation. If the Premier is prepared to meet us, I shall be prepared to go into those matters with him, and give him the benefit of my experience and of my judgment, with a view to bringing about a settlement in that direction. At this late hour I do not propose to repeat anything which has been said by other speakers, but I consider it my duty to stand up here and give my reasons for opposing the second reading of the Bill. I have made myself plain, I think. I oppose the second reading because I do not consider it is necessary to bring such a measure before

Parliament at this juncture, when the Government have a very much wider scope in the funds at their disposal for public works, than would be provided by this Bill, if passed.

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [9.58]: I recognise that this measure has been fully discussed, but not wishing to give a silent vote on such an important Bill I desire to advance some reasons for the attitude I adopt on it. The incidence of the proposed taxation I acknowledge to be equitable. There may be some few anomalies in the Bill, but, generally speaking, the form of taxation it proposes is equitable. Again, I am afraid that fresh taxation is inevitable. The question, however, is, will the House act wisely in passing at this juncture a measure imposing further taxation? Personally I think not. I am unable to forget the opening of the present session of Parliament, when we had a demonstration of unemployed, in spite of the fact that no effects of either drought or war had yet been felt, and notwithstanding the fact that for over three years we had in office an Administration which received more revenue, and raised more loan money, than has been at the command during a similar period of any other Administration in the history of Western Australia. These facts, I think, must indicate to the most casual observer, and to the least reflective of thinkers, that the administration of the affairs of this State has not been carried on economically. Therefore, before adopting any further taxation proposals, this House should insist on closer and more careful supervision of the affairs of State. Undoubtedly to my mind the day labour system as carried out by the Labour Government is the principal cause of the present financial condition of the State. One cannot help thinking that this measure has been forced upon the Government. It was only within the last fortnight that we heard anything about further taxation, and during that fortnight the represen-

tatives of the Labour organisation and the representatives of the unemployed had conferences with the Government, and practically told the Government to introduce a measure of this character. It is not long since the Premier refused to receive a deputation of the unemployed, and it will be remembered also that the Honorary Minister rather unsympathetically told a deputation also from the unemployed to wait until the weather broke. It is common talk even amongst Labour members that they do not want this measure to pass. They are quite satisfied with the stage it has reached, because it went through the Assembly by a big majority. They have satisfied those who asked them to try and get it passed. They knew well that the Council would object to it. It has been pointed out that it would not be possible to collect a tax for some time to come and use it for the purpose described by the Government. By the time it was raised a good season would probably be with us, and there is every indication in that direction, and there will probably be no need for the money. There are those who say that it will not hurt the farmer, but if we get a good season the farmer will be hit harder than other folk, and instead of allowing the farmer who has suffered considerably during the past three or four seasons to have the use of all that he might make in the approaching season, so that he might redeem himself for the losses of the bad seasons, he is to be asked to pay further taxation. I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill because the time is most inopportune for its introduction. Next session, when we are dealing with the amendment to the Land and Income Tax Act, we can, if necessary, revise the existing tax. One other reason why I intend to oppose the Bill is because the Government have not made an effort to pass the Land Act Amendment Bill which they introduced to the Assembly. Hon. members will remember that when the Industries Assistance Bill was before this House I asked members to vote for the clause dealing with the payments of rents, and pointed out that if the Land

Act Amendment Bill was passed there would not be so much taken from Loan funds. The Government promised the Bill. They appointed a commission to inquire into the state of affairs in the dry areas. The commission made its report, and on that report Mr. Bath, the then Minister for Lands, prepared a statement for Cabinet, and advised that the land should be reduced in price. I interviewed the present Minister for Lands a few weeks ago, and he gave me a definite promise that he was going to introduce the measure. The maximum price of the land was to be 13s. on the basis of a 30 years' lease, the 12s. 6d. land 25 years, and the 10s. land 20 years. Thus, no selector would have to pay more than sixpence an acre a year for his land. The Government recognised that the pioneer settlers of the dry areas had not been treated fairly in regard to values, and that was why they intended to introduce the amending Land Bill. The Government have been deceptive to hon. members, and they are cruel in the extreme to the men who are battling in the dry areas, and who are endeavouring to make this a prosperous State. I have already stated that I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill, and I hope that the measure will be rejected. It will be time enough to deal with further taxation proposals when we are considering, next session, the amendment to the Land and Income Tax Act.

Hon. E. McLARTY '(South-West) [10.8]: At this late hour I shall not occupy the attention of the House for many minutes. It will be difficult indeed for me to address myself to the question without repeating what has been said over and over again. At the same time, I desire to give my reasons briefly for the conclusions I have come to, and which have actuated me in the course I intend to adopt in regard to the Bill. I regretted to hear Mr. Millington say that the unemployed difficulty did not need sympathy. I think sympathy is a great thing at any time, and the world would be dead without it. I think everyone has genuine sympathy for those people who

really want work and are capable of doing it, but who are unable to obtain it, more particularly those who have families depending on them. With the money the Government have available, I feel that under proper administration sufficient work can be provided for all those in need of it. I have some doubt as to whether a genuine effort has been made on the part of a good many of the unemployed to secure work. I refer more particularly to the single members of the unemployed. Only to-day I was told by one employer who had made applications for 20 men that only three responded. I am also acquainted with a settler who came to Perth a few days ago and went to the labour Bureau to find men suitable for the work that he had on hand. These men asked him what wages he was prepared to pay, and he told them that he would give 30s. a week with keep, and if the men were suitable he would increase the pay to 35s. That employer was insulted. He was told to go to a hot place and take his 30s. with him. I cannot therefore but come to the conclusion that many men who are on the unemployed list in the City at the present time could find work if they were disposed to take it at a fair rate of wages. We have heard a good deal about hon. members wanting to reduce wages. I do not think it is anyone's desire to do that. No one is anxious that a man should do a fair day's work without receiving a fair day's pay, but, under these exceptional circumstances, it would be better for many men to take work that might be offering as a temporary expedient rather than depend upon the Government to provide them with meals and lodgings free of cost. During last session a member of this House, in the course of a speech, said, that if the Labour party were returned to power they would leave the Liberal party a certain portion of their garments, and certain members would go on their knees and pray to God to give them a Liberal Government. That was an extreme thing to say, and I regretted to hear it. In the present position, if it were possible for members to come to the rescue, I am sure they would

do so. As a small farmer I employ a fair number of men. I have ten engaged, and six have families to provide for. They are working under fair conditions, and I think they are perfectly satisfied, but I am quite convinced that if this Bill be passed, it will be necessary for me to dispense with the services of six out of the ten, and they will probably be forced to join the ranks of the unemployed. Hon. members seem to have lost sight of the fact in connection with the introduction of this measure, that there are many other taxes which have to be paid. The Labour party talk about making those who are well off provide for those who are not so well off, but the position is that those with small incomes have very heavy calls to meet at the present time. For my own part, I am paying nearly £100 a year as a road board tax alone, and the whole of that money goes to the working man. There are also the State land tax, Federal land tax, and income tax, and those who are in receipt of incomes from City properties are paying at the present time about 6s. in the pound. I should like to see the Government rise to the occasion as quickly as possible, and put men on to do some of the works which have already been authorised by Parliament. We have passed four or five railway Bills, and the work in connection with those lines has not yet been started. A section of the unemployed could be put on at least to do the clearing work, and make preparations for the undertakings to be completed later on. Mr. Sanderson last evening warned the House of the result which would follow if the second reading of the Bill were not passed. I take it that members here are fully sensible of their responsibility. Mr. Kirwan referred to another place as the people's House, and declared that the members there had been returned recently with a mandate for further taxation. I contend that if that House is the people's House this House is representative of three-fourths of the taxpayers, and they have some right to representation. The Bill, if passed, will not meet the purpose for which it is in-

tended. No schedule of works has been prepared, and we simply have the suggestion thrown out that the men may be employed on feeder roads. After the speech of Mr. Millington, who tells us that hundreds of carpenters and large numbers of book-binders and other tradesmen are out of employment, one wonders what show of work they would make on road construction. The Government would be at their wits' end to employ those men. They would be in the position of the manager who, having a large number of men to employ, and no particular work to give them, instructed them to remove a stack of bricks to another position. After they had removed the stack they came along and asked, "What is the next job?" whereupon the manager replied, "I have decided to leave those bricks where they were; you had better carry them back again." That would be the position in which the Government would find themselves. If the Labour party are earnest in their desire to assist the unemployed, why do they not do something themselves? In these straitened times members of Parliament should themselves come to the rescue. I would be glad to see every member of Parliament give up £100 of his salary for this year to relieve the situation; but when this was suggested in another place the representatives of Labour, to a man, voted against any sacrifice at all. If members of Parliament were to forego £100 and Ministers £300 it would be of great assistance to those now seeking employment. It has been suggested that this House will reject the measure with a view to bringing about a dissolution. So far as I am aware, such a thing was never thought of until the Premier suggested it; nor do I think that any one else is anxious for office just now. There are many works upon which men might be employed. A few men could do great service at the Mandurah bar just now. The river is drying up to such an extent that the stench all round the shore is becoming unbearable. If the Government would send a few unemployed down there for a week or ten days a passage could

be opened through the bar at the river mouth and the present uncomfortable state of affairs relieved. For several reasons I do not intend to support the second reading. In the first place I consider the people are already taxed as much as they can bear. It is all very well to say that one having no income will not be required to pay. But those who have small incomes are already paying four or five taxes, and, as the last straw breaks the camel's back, so I think if there is any further taxation some of those people will be reduced to a parlous condition. Most of us are doing our best for the unemployed. I am keeping on more men than I have any work for, but I am not going to set any of them adrift while I can possibly keep them in their places. Again, I am not prepared to impose on the people further taxation which I think is unnecessary, and which would not meet the object in view. We will have the winter upon us very shortly, when there will be a great deal of work offering in country districts, and no doubt the Government will start some of those public works at present awaiting attention, and which will absorb a greater number of men than are looking for work. I have great sympathy with the married men residing in Perth. It is hard for them to leave their homes and tramp round the country looking for employment; but I have no doubt that the single men could all find work if they wanted to. I know many instances of employers looking for men, and I know instances of men leaving good work in the country to come to Perth and enjoy free meals. That is a very undesirable position, and I am afraid it would be accentuated if the Bill were to pass, and a great many who are now earning fair wages would be added to the unemployed list. I do not intend to support the second reading.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West) [10.22]: As the only member for the West Province in this Chamber who has an opportunity of expressing his opinions, I feel I would be wanting in my duty if I did not attempt to justify the attitude I take up in regard to the Bill. Notwithstanding

what has been said by members supporting the measure I approach the question from a non-party point of view, and I give a most emphatic denial to the assertion that we are here as the selected representatives of a certain party. I, at any rate, am not the selected representative of any party, nor was I the selected candidate of any party. Certain bodies may have decided to support my candidature, but I am not bound by any pledge on any question. I have not been approached by any member of the House in regard to the Bill, although I have been approached by people outside the House, both by those who support the Bill and those who would try to influence my judgment against it. I have considered the Bill purely and simply in the light of what would be good for the State. We as Liberals have been accused of banding ourselves together to oppose any legislation the Government might bring down. That is incorrect. For the benefit of those who make such assertions I may say the Liberals are not banded together for the purpose of opposing legislation, but merely for the purpose of seeing that all legislation is for the benefit of all the community, and not for any section thereof. To the party responsible for the measure, and who claim to be democrats, I would like to say that democracy does not merely consist in simply exercising the franchise at election time in order that certain candidates may be returned. It implies equity in taxation. Taxation is for the purpose of raising revenue for the support of the Government, which is the expression of the people for the purpose of controlling their own affairs. All the laws on the statute-book are simply agreements between the individual units of the community for the control of affairs in the interests of all parties concerned. Any legislation which does not aim at that is untrue to democracy and to our Constitution; any legislation which is contrary to this requirement is contrary to the best interests of the people and is, therefore, to be condemned. For the benefit of Mr. Millington I would like to summarise the reasons why I am opposing the Bill. That hon. member said he

had not heard any definite reasons why the Bill should not be passed. The reasons I have for voting against the measure, leaving out points of disagreement to be met in Committee are, first, that it is unnecessary for the purpose. As already pointed out, ample provision is made at the present time for the Government to absorb all the unemployed. Works have been authorised which should be put in hand forthwith. The unemployed could thus be absorbed without any necessity for this proposed taxation. My second reason is that the tax is not equitable. It is contrary to good Government to tax one section of the people for the benefit of another. All our laws are agreements between the individuals of the community, and when any tax is introduced contrary to that principle, when one section is to be taxed for the benefit of another, it is contrary to the principles of democracy and of good Government. My third reason is that the amount to be raised would be absolutely inadequate for the purpose for which it is intended. We have been advised that something like £150,000 would be raised during the 12 months. From my knowledge of the commercial interests I very much doubt whether any such amount would be raised. The stagnation which exists in business circles to-day has so reduced the incomes of the people that it would be impossible to raise £150,000 under the provisions of the Bill. If we deduct from the amount to be raised the cost of the raising, a very small amount would be left in the hands of the Government for the provision of relief work. From the figures given us by Mr. Millington regarding the number of unemployed, which I understand were taken from the books of the trades unions and which, therefore, leave out all the non-unionists among the unemployed, I venture to say that under the most favourable circumstances the amount to be raised by the tax would keep them all employed for not more than two months out of the 12. And when we realise that the proceeds of the tax would not be in the hands of the Government for many

months to come, we see that the position would be so acute by that time that other steps would have to be taken to meet the difficulty. Another objection I have is that the amount of money which would be taken from the taxpayers would be withdrawn from the industries of the people. I know that a great number of people have been keeping on their employees, even at a loss to themselves, partly for old association's sake, and partly to avoid swelling the ranks of the unemployed. To reduce the funds in the hands of private individuals would be to reduce the spending powers of the people to exactly the same amount as the Government would receive, and from our knowledge of the manner in which the Government have expended their funds in the past this money would be much more useful in the hands of private employers than in the hands of the Government. Another objection I have to the measure is that, knowing the manner in which the funds have in the past been handled by the Government, it is possible the funds taken out of the industries of the State to-day might be used by the Government in industries in opposition to those being taxed. This is a very serious factor which should be taken into consideration. The moneys taken from the pockets of the people running the industries of the State might be used by the State itself in opposition to those very industries which are providing the sinews of war. Another objection I have to the Bill is that it aims at the relief of only one section of the community—the manual labourer. At this time I am sure that the greatest suffering amongst our people is not amongst the manual workers, but amongst the small business men who are at present endeavouring by all means to make both ends meet and whose lives must be a veritable hell in striving to attain that object. My last objection to the Bill is that it is contrary to all economics to charge against the people in a distressful year like the present the relief required for the distress existing. If it is necessary to relieve distress, that relief should be spread over more than

one year. Mr. Cornell has pointed out that in his opinion one good harvest will not place the farming industry on a sound footing but that two or three harvests will be required. If this is so in connection with the farming industry, surely it applies far more strongly in regard to all the trading concerns throughout the State, and the cost of the relief for the unemployment which we are told exists should therefore be spread over more than one year. If it is not done by means of loan moneys, I see no other way of doing it. To tax the people at present is an impossible method to adopt, and I see no other means than the utilisation of loan funds for this purpose. As I have already pointed out, the Government have authorisations enough in this direction to use moneys for this purpose, and they should use them in this way and so spread the cost of the trouble over the years to come. There have been many inquiries as to whether preference to unionists would be insisted on by the Government if this Bill were passed. We have not been assured that preference to unionists would not be enforced. We know that this measure is the outcome of certain resolutions by the unemployed and by the party behind the throne—the Trades Hall party—and when we remember this, it is only fair that we should inquire how this party has acted in other directions. In Europe, owing to the stress of war, the country of Belgium is suffering untold miseries. The miseries which our people are suffering are as nothing compared with those of the Belgians who are being crushed under the iron heel of the German invaders. I have a paragraph from one of the local papers which makes interesting reading. It states—

Dealing with an appeal from the trades union centre of Holland, the State Executive of the A.L.F. notified the Metropolitan Council that they proposed to open subscription lists for the relief of the trades unionists of Belgium, and that they had started the list by voting £16. The Executive requested all district councils to circularise unions in support of the appeal.

At a meeting of the council last night, it was decided to comply with its suggestion.

If the Trades Hall party can exercise such a principle as preference to unionists in connection with the charity they dispense to a country so stricken as Belgium, what can we expect from them in this State if funds are raised by such a tax as this for the benefit of the unemployed?

Hon. J. Cornell: The Belgian Government have entrusted the trades unions with the distribution of relief in that country.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN: If the unionists of this State are prepared first and only to assist their unionist brethren in Belgium, we can expect no better treatment from them in the disposal of funds granted for the relief of the unemployed. Mr. Cornell referred to the much quoted expression—the necessity for taking from the pockets of those who have to assist those who have not. This may be a very laudable desire and it is the duty of those who have to assist those who have not, but when it comes to a question of bleeding the fat man, as we have heard it expressed on more than one occasion, we should inquire who is the fat man and how did he obtain his wealth. I will refer to the reputedly most wealthy man in the world, Mr. Rockefeller of New York. He has been condemned throughout the length and breadth of the universe because he stands behind millions of money and yet, what has he done in return for the millions he has accumulated. By his industry, ability, and administration he has obtained control of the greatest portion of the oil trade of the world, but in return he has given to the world cheaper and better oil, and surely for the service he has rendered to humanity in that direction, he is entitled to some reward. Let us take the instance of the late Joseph Chamberlain, head of the Nettlefold screw industry. Mr. Nettlefold introduced the wood screw which is used by builders, joiners, and artisans the world over. Every man who uses that screw and every person in whose interests it is used derives

a benefit from the invention of Mr. Nettlefold. When we recognise that we have received benefits by the introduction of these ideas, surely some reward should be reaped by those responsible for the inventions. Mr. Marconi introduced wireless telegraphy. Probably before his day the principles of wireless were known in the laboratories, but the scientific mind was not the commercial mind, and it remained for Mr. Marconi to bring commercial intelligence to bear to make the invention a commercial proposition. Who shall say that even if he accumulates a million of money at the expense of humanity, he is not deserving of it? Probably thousands of lives have already been saved by the use of wireless, and is it not worth some reward to the man who introduced the invention? To come home to our own country, shall we say that men like the Macdonalds, the Duracks, or the Forrests, who blazed the tracks of civilisation throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia and made it possible for the people now here to live and prosper, and that men who went out into the wilds and deserts and suffered starvation and thirst to discover the gold-fields are not worthy of the rewards they reaped? We are reaping the benefit of their enterprise, and shall we grudge them what they possess and treat them as fat men and bleed them because they sacrificed so much for the accumulation of their wealth? This is an attack on thrift and industry and on the initiative of the human race. When their initiative has built up and made possible the things we enjoy to-day, surely they are entitled to something in return and to equitable treatment from us. If it were not for the personal initiative of these private enterprises, I venture to say that the race which to-day is progressing upwards would soon begin to go downwards. Instead of its being the ancestors of the hon. Mr. Cornell who lived in caves, it will be a case of the progeny of those ancestors who would be doing so, or they would live in trees like his present remote cousins who eat the roots and other foods nature provided them with to the accompaniment of aimless and unreasoning

chattering so common to their kind. It has also been said that the House exists for the purpose of blocking the Government from placing on the statute-book that which they desire. I will admit that sometimes it is necessary to oppose these measures. We are here for that purpose. We are here for the purpose of seeing that nothing but just and equitable laws are placed on the statute-book of the State. We would be wanting in our duty if we failed to do this. When we sometimes disagree with the Government on any measure, as we are disagreeing with them in respect to this measure, or disagree with any portion of a measure, as we have done in the past, I say we have a perfect right to do so and are justified in the attitude we take up and in the vote which we cast upon the convictions we hold, and with that courage with which the Almighty has endowed us. Any measure which comes before me, whilst I am a member of this House, will be dealt with according to my judgment, irrespective of any influence which may be brought to bear upon me by other hon. members who may entertain opinions different from those I hold myself. Although I am opposed to this Bill, I do not wish hon. members to think for one moment that I am not in sympathy with the unemployed. I believe that a great deal of distress does exist in the State in this direction, and I believe that there are many who are in very destitute circumstances, but the Bill does not provide for these. It is useless. Before this Bill can come into effect and before the money proposed to be raised under it will be available, these men will be not only on the verge of starvation but will be beyond the power of resuscitation. The only way in which relief can be given is for the Government to proceed with those works already authorised. I do not intend to indulge in heroics as was the case with the leader of the Country party in another place. It would be easy to do so and win the approbation of the masses. We have a duty to perform, and we have to consider what is best in the interests of the people of the

State, and we have to deal with all measures without fear of any party or any section of the community. I will vote on this occasion, as I have done on other occasions, purely as I think fit and as I think will be in the interests of the people as a whole. Something has been said about the rate of wages. Wages in Western Australia are exceptionally high. They are high for two reasons. One is because of the natural fertility of the soil and the wealth which lies beneath the surface of the ground in Western Australia, and the other is the fact that there is an enormous amount of borrowed capital here, greater in proportion to the population, I believe, than in any other State of the Commonwealth. And the expenditure of these loan funds added to the natural richness of the country, has placed the wages of Western Australia at a much higher level, possibly, than they ought to be. But the day is coming when this will cease. The day is coming when the borrowing capacity of Western Australia will have to come to an end. What will be the result? The motion moved by the Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom last week in connection with the timber hewing trade is to my mind the first muttering of the approaching storm. The day is coming when this country is going to suffer even more distress than it is suffering at the present time. Our natural industries are not going to thrive under wages as they exist to-day, and under the higher wages to which we are tending. The day must come when wages will find their proper level, that level which the country can afford to pay. Wages depend entirely upon the productivity of the country in which they exist. When wages rise past a certain level they will throttle industry. The natural industry of the State, and the natural productivity of the State must fix the rates of pay. When the time comes that loan funds are no longer bolstering up wages in the manner in which they have done in the past, the day of reckoning will arrive. It is a statesmanlike action for us to look forward at this juncture, and not to cavil at the fact that wages should

not be reduced. Wages cannot be artificially fixed; they must fluctuate with the productivity of the country. We must look forward to the time when these difficulties will have to be met, and we must not aim at high wages simply because they are high wages. We must take the natural industry of the country as a basis and our wages must be paid accordingly. That is one question we must face in the future. We shall have to realise the fact, that no country can make 25s. out of a sovereign, and if the country can only produce from its natural resources a million sovereigns, that we cannot pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ million sovereigns in wages. This is going to fix the rate of pay in the future. A great deal has been said in regard to fostering our industries. Secondary industries can only be fostered at the expense of our natural industries, which are, after all, the basis of our prosperity, although at the present time some of our gold mines on account of their richness are paying a high rate of wages, and so are fixing the rate for the State. The cost of living could be lessened in many directions. If a margin between the cost of living and the rates of pay received could be maintained, some of our gold mines could be opened which at present are closed, and a great portion of our lands which at present are considered to be unfertile could be utilised. This would all make for a reduction in the cost of living. I have indicated what the Government should do to provide for the unemployed. It may be advisable to be a little more specific. There are many works in the State which we know are necessary and which could be put in hand. The leader of the House has referred to feeder roads. I quite agree with those who have gone before me that these works could be carried out better by local governing bodies, if they received subsidies from the Government. The cutting off of these subsidies has accentuated the unemployment difficulty in no small degree. The party to which the leader of the House belongs is not altogether in favour of local governing bodies. The

same party in power in the Federal House has recently appointed an administrator for the Northern Territory, which by the way is not represented in Parliament, and in which no man has a vote in the affairs of the country in which he lives. This is a democratic principle which is controlled by the Federal Labour Government. This particular district had at Port Darwin a town council elected by the people for the purpose of carrying out local affairs. There was also a local board of health elected. The Federal Government first wiped out of existence the district health board, because it was interfering with the operations of the administrator, who is the absolute despot of the Northern Territory. The latest move on the part of that Government has been also to wipe out the town council, because it chose to object to the attitude of the administrator in regard to the construction of certain roads within their boundaries in opposition to the wishes of that council. The Minister for Home Affairs, after dealing with the matter, said it was time to wipe this town council out of existence, and they have therefore decided to do it. In its place a nominee board has been appointed, three members of which are placed there by the Government and two by the people. This is the way in which the Labour party deal with elected bodies throughout the Commonwealth. We see in their attitude, possibly, the same reason why subsidies are held back by this Government from local governing bodies, in order that they may spend this money themselves, instead of allowing the local governing bodies to do so. Another work which could be utilised for the employment of men in need of work is the Fremantle harbour. The necessity for this work has been urged by the Harbour Trust and has been admitted by the Government. I understand that the Government have made up their minds in which direction that harbour shall go. That work might be put in hand at once, and could answer a double purpose. It would employ a great number of hands on the spot, and would also give the State sawmills something

better to do than cut a large number of sleepers merely to make them into a stack. They should be cutting timber for wharves and buildings, towards the future extension of the Fremantle harbour works. I would also suggest to the leader of the Government that railway propositions which have been authorised by Parliament might be put in hand. The Government have the sleepers, I understand, already stacked at the sawmills, so that all that would be necessary is to import the rails; the earth works can be constructed by the unemployed. There is another solution of the difficulty which lies before us. These are the suggestions I should like to make. I will not labour the question further; but I think the time has come when all these carping differences of party should cease, when the leader of the Government in this State should meet the leaders of parties in this House and also the leaders of parties in another place, all of them forgetting that they are party men. They should forget that they are here as the representatives of one section of the community. They should forget that, from a party standpoint, they have only one section of the people to consider. They should remember that the interests of the State as a whole require their undivided attention. We who are in Parliament to-day are but fleeting figures upon the stream of life. The day will come when we shall go out and others will take our places. But the effects of work we do to-day will be perpetuated. The work which we are doing to-day is the laying of the foundations of the future State of Western Australia. Our work to-day will decide whether Western Australia shall move on lines which will assure its future prosperity, or lines which will lead to a condition of continuous depression. Therefore, I would suggest to the Government that the party questions which they are continually bringing up, and the measures they introduce from time to time, all dealing with what are but passing phases, should cease, and that a policy should be laid down and carried out which will have far-reaching beneficial effects on the future of Western

Australia, and enable this country to develop in the manner in which we must desire it should develop, so as to become, in the words of our American cousins, "God's own country."

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

Received from the Assembly.

First Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [10.52]: In connection with this Bill, I desire to inform hon. members that I shall lay on the Table a litho. showing the various roads and streets affected by the measure. Hon. members will have an opportunity of examining that litho. I move—

That the Bill be now read a first time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES.

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [10.55]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.