

with the amendments recommended by the select committee.

Bill passed through Committee *pro forma*, and ordered to be reprinted with the amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at eight minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 31st October, 1907.

	PAGE
Papers: Trust Funds (Illingworth Inquiry) ...	445
Star of Aberdare Forfeiture ...	445
Free Passes to Civil Servants ...	445
Questions: Railway Firewood Freights ...	445
Municipal Accounts, Government Audit ...	445
State Batteries ...	445
Police Force Rewards ...	446
Municipal Subsidies overpaid, sel. com. ...	446
Bills: Nedlands Park Tramways (Crawley extension), 2s. debated at length ...	446
North Fremantle Municipal Tramways, 2s. ...	479
Land and Income Tax Assessment, 2s. resumed, adjourned ...	484
Marine Insurance, 1s. ...	490

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Annual Report of Metropolitan Waterworks Board.

Trust Funds (Illingworth Inquiry).

The TREASURER (Mr. Frank Wilson) said: The member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown) has written to me asking for certain papers in connection with the transactions between Mr. Illingworth and the Lands Titles Office. Search has been made for these papers, and I have two files which I ask leave to lay on the table.

Papers presented, and ordered to lie on the table.

Star of Aberdare Forfeiture.

Mr. Collier having given notice to move for papers in connection with the application for the forfeiture of the Star of Aberdare lease—

The MINISTER FOR MINES said he was prepared to lay the papers on the table.

Papers presented, and ordered to lie on the table.

Free Passes to Civil Servants.

The Premier, in reply to Mr. Scaddan, said the papers moved for last session, showing the Free Railway Passes issued to civil servants, would be laid on the table as soon as the return was completed.

QUESTION—RAILWAY FIREWOOD FREIGHTS.

Mr. STONE asked the Minister for Railways: Will he consider the advisability of a reduction on the haulage of firewood over the Government railways on long distances in a similar manner to that adopted by the Midland Company, thus creating back loading and enabling selectors to sell their wood, which now goes to waste owing to the high haulage charges?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The present rate for the carriage of firewood is not considered excessive.

QUESTION — MUNICIPAL ACCOUNTS, GOVERNMENT AUDIT.

Mr. STONE asked the Premier: Will he consider the desirability of having the accounts of the various municipalities audited by a Government auditor in a similar manner to roads boards accounts?

The PREMIER replied: The matter will receive consideration should any amendment to the Municipal Corporations Act be contemplated.

QUESTIONS (2)—STATE BATTERIES.

Plant for Bellchambers.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Mines: Is it his intention to carry out

the recommendation of the State Mining Engineer for the erection of a battery at Bellehambers. Black Range?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: As ten head of the present Black Range plant will shortly be available, consideration will be given to the requirements of this and other districts within the East Murchison field.

Reduction of Charges.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Mines: When does the Minister intend to give effect to the policy recently enunciated at Menzies in regard to a reduction of treatment charges at State batteries?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: Within a month I hope to announce the details of the new policy.

QUESTION—POLICE FORCE REWARDS.

Mr. TROY asked the Premier: 1, What amounts have been paid to members of the Police force in the way of rewards during the past two years? 2, To which officers were the rewards paid? 3, What acts of merit did they perform in order to be so rewarded? 4, What Act provides the payment of rewards for acts of merit?

The PREMIER replied: 1, 1905—£200; 1906—£163. 2 and 3, Lists herewith (lengthy). 4, Rewards are paid annually to the police in respect of favourable records approved by the Commissioner for specially meritorious conduct, under Police Regulation 273. A sum of £200 (Item 22, Police) is provided on the Annual Estimates for such purpose, and the payment of the amount allotted each member of the Force is approved by the Governor-in-Council before distribution.

MUNICIPAL SUBSIDIES, HOW OVERPAID.

Select Committee to inquire.

On formal motions by Mr. H. Brown (Perth), a select committee was appointed to inquire into and report upon the overpayment of subsidies to various

Municipalities in the State during the past six years; the members to comprise (as in the previous session) Mr. Brebber, Mr. Heitmann, Mr. Layman, Mr. Stuart, and the mover; to report on the 21st November.

BILL—NEDLANDS PARK TRAM- WAYS (Crawley Extension).

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving the second reading, said: This is a Bill to confirm a provisional order for the extension of the Perth tramways from Rokeby Road, Subiaco, to Crawley and the estate of Colonel Bruce. The arrangements with the Perth Tramway Company have been fixed up by Colonel Bruce, and the two local authorities interested in the matter are fully conversant with the terms of the agreement and have endorsed it. The tramway will run through the University Endowment Trustees' estate, containing some hundreds of acres, and will do much to improve the value of that property. After leaving Rokeby Road the tramway crosses the Perth-Fremantle Road about two and a quarter miles on the Perth side of Claremont and terminates a little lower down the river than Crawley, opposite Melville Water. The promoters have agreed with the Subiaco Council to erect a jetty and baths in Melville Water, opposite Applecross. I do not think there is anything in this Bill to which members can take exception.

Mr. Johnson: There should be a lot in the Bill that is not in it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill has been before the Crown Law authorities, and complies with the terms of the Tramways Act. It is especially desirable, if the work is to be proceeded with at an early date, that the Bill should pass this House as soon as possible. I do not think I can give members any further information. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. D. JOINSON: I move that the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	22

Majority against .. 10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Brebber
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Cowcher
Mr. Holman	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Horan	Mr. Davies
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Stuart	Mr. Gull
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Walker	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Troy (Teller).	Mr. Male
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. N. J. Moore
	Mr. S. F. Moore
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Price
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Varyard
	Mr. F. Wilson
	Mr. Jayman (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford); I regret the Minister for Works could not see his way clear to agree to the adjournment of the debate. I should have been perfectly satisfied if he had given me an hour to go through the Bill and for it to come on again to-morrow. We are asked to agree to the second reading on the incomplete facts laid before us by the Minister. We have had no plan laid before us of the route of this tramway. We are told that it crosses the Fremantle road at a given place. The Minister states that all he knows about the Bill is that it has been agreed to by the local bodies interested. I am beginning to think it is a most undesirable thing to leave anything concerning the public to be decided by local bodies. I have a certain amount of confidence in the Subiaco municipal council, but there are certain considerations I would not dream of placing in the hands of this body. And as far as the Claremont roads board is concerned I know nothing about it. I object to the House delegating its rights, its privileges, and powers to local bodies. Because the Minister comes down and says the local bodies agree to certain things, we are asked as representatives of the people to take them as being correct simply because the local bodies agree. Apart from that

we should have a map before us showing where this tramway is going, what land it is going through, what it is going to open up, and several other considerations that should be placed before members on a Bill of this description. I shall have my opportunity in Committee to insert amendments, but on the second reading we should thoroughly understand what the Bill is about. We should not pass the second reading and have it stated that members have their chance in Committee for inserting amendments. Perhaps members if they understood the whole circumstances in connection with this Bill, would not allow it to go before Committee. We are granting a concession to someone; someone is getting an advantage and the Minister states we are to rush the Bill through, we have got to do it in haste—why? Because we are here giving the right to someone to obtain an advantage. The very time we should be cautious and give a matter mature consideration is when we are granting concessions. We granted a concession for a tramway on the goldfields, and the tramway absolutely closed up the Government railway line; so in this Bill the Minister asks the House to place in his hands the right to say whether the tramway competes with the railway system or not. If it competes, in his opinion, he has the right to stop it. But it is for the House to decide these points, not the Minister for Works. We have no right to place in the hands of one individual the power to say whether a private company shall come into competition with the railways, that belong to the people, or not. That is the portion of the Bill which I strongly oppose, and I hope the House will not deal with it all. We should not place it in the hands of one individual to say whether the tramway company shall come into competition with the present railway system. The member for Claremont says it is not so. And no doubt the member for Subiaco will say "Hear, hear." They are interested parties, for will not the tramway go through their electorates?

Mr. Daglish: I desire to ask that the member shall withdraw the statement that I am an interested party in this tramway.

I am interested so far as the tramway will serve the public; and I object to the statement that I am an interested party in the proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON: I withdraw the statement, and say that if the member is not interested, then he ought to be, for the tramway affects his electorate, and if he is not interested I maintain he is not doing his duty to his electors. If the member for Claremont objects to the statement, I withdraw it also. He should be interested. By the conversation which took place when the division was on, I thought both members were interested. I want to remind members what took place in Kalgoorlie when a proposal was submitted to the House to give a concession to build a tramway to come in competition with the Government railway. The people of Kalgoorlie opposed the Bill and by a majority petition applied to Parliament not to grant the concession. A select committee was appointed by the House, and I came down from Kalgoorlie with Mr. J. M. Hopkins to represent the Kalgoorlie people, and prayed the committee to report that the concession should not be granted. Notwithstanding that the people were against it, and that the select committee were against it, the Government granted the concession, and the Government railway system was closed down by the competition of this private tramway company. When we have experiences of that description, it is necessary to exercise the greatest caution, and I think these Bills should be submitted to select committees to investigate. However, I oppose the second reading as the Minister for Works cannot see his way clear to grant an adjournment of the debate; and if the majority that is used on every occasion decides in favour of the Bill I shall have something to say when the Committee stage is reached. But it is wrong for the Minister to come down with a Bill of this description, granting a concession to a private company, and ask the House to rush it through without that mature consideration that a Bill of this description deserves.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In regard to this proposal, I was quite ex-

pecting this afternoon to hear a motion moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee. I do not know under what authority the Minister makes it a public measure and dispenses with the necessity which arises in connection with other private Bills for its reference to such a committee. We all know as far as other measures are concerned it is one of the safeguards in proposals of this kind, giving a concession to a private company, that a select committee should be formed to investigate the proposal, to take evidence and see that everything is correct in connection with it. On this occasion the Minister for Works, as I asked him just now, informs me it is unnecessary to refer this Bill to a select committee; but that under some Tramways Act he has a right to introduce this Bill as a public measure and pass it through. Admitting that to be a fact, it is to the advantage of the House, and it would be better although unnecessary, that such a measure of a private nature, granting concessions, should run the gauntlet of a select committee.

Mr. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I desire to ask members to agree to the second reading of this Bill, for the reason that it is a measure of considerable public advantage to the people whom I represent, and I believe of considerable public advantage to the people of Perth generally, affording as it will a ready means of access from any part of Perth or any part of Subiaco to the river, giving an opportunity of enjoying a cheap dip in the clean water of the river. At the present time there is no facility to get to the river at any place outside Perth without travelling a longer distance than many people can readily afford; and there is no opportunity whatever outside the facilities provided by the Perth baths for giving children an opportunity of getting the advantage of an occasional bathing in deep water, and an opportunity for them to learn to swim. This Bill will get over that difficulty, and will provide the means for giving the people an opportunity of having a cheap dip in clean water; because a condition has been made in connection with this Bill

that the promoter shall establish baths at the tram terminus, and provide a public jetty at the terminus; he has also to allow school children twice a week a cheap trip on the tramway and a free bath in the bathing establishment at the end of the journey. The promoter has farther agreed, if required, within three years to hand over to the municipality free of charge the bathing establishment to be erected, and to hand over to the municipality, on very favourable conditions, the jetty.

Mr. Johnson : Where is that stated in the Bill ?

Mr. DAGLISH : It is not stated in the Bill; but if the hon. member will refer to the provisional order appearing in the schedule, he will notice that it ratifies two agreements entered into by the Subiaco Municipal Council and the Claremont Roads Board respectively with the promoter, and in these agreements are laid down the conditions I have referred to. There is the farther condition made with the Municipality of Subiaco that the promoter shall hand over, free of charge, a certain area of land—I forget the precise area—for a public reserve, to be used as a camping-ground and a place of public recreation. The fee simple of this land is to be vested in the municipal council, in order that it may remain for all time a public reserve. If there be one disadvantage more than another under which the people of Perth and vicinity labour, it is the disadvantage that families cannot readily be taken to the waterside at a spot where some degree of pleasure is to be gained, without dragging perhaps a large family through a considerable stretch of sand or along a dusty road. [*Member* : What about Cottesloe Beach ?] There is a considerable distance to traverse between Cottesloe Beach station and the water, which distance is a disadvantage especially to those people who have to carry children-in-arms from the railway-station to the waterside. But apart from that consideration, there are many people who cannot afford to pay an unnecessarily large fare or travel an unduly long distance to reach the waterside. If any member chooses to walk along the Perth Park drive on any

holiday, any Saturday or Sunday afternoon, he will find a fair number of people tramping with their families towards the river, week-end after week-end and holiday after holiday.

Mr. Holman : Will the trams carry them free ?

Mr. DAGLISH : No; but will carry them at a minimum fare.

Mr. Johnson : There you come into competition with the railway.

Mr. DAGLISH : The tramway will carry people at a considerably lower rate than they can be carried on the railway at the present time.

Mr. Scaddan : The railway fare is pretty low now to Cottesloe Beach.

Mr. DAGLISH : The hon. member is now quoting the special fares ruling on Saturday afternoons.

Mr. Scaddan : No; ordinary fare, second class.

Mr. DAGLISH : But this question cannot be settled entirely by the rate of fares, for members must know there is and can be no shade on the beach at Cottesloe, also on the river side at Cottesloe there is no public area where people can go to spend a pleasant holiday; particularly there is not the convenience for children that there will be at this place, and there is no bathing establishment at Cottesloe. [*Member* : There is.] Then if there be a bathinghouse with enclosure there, it has been erected since last I had the pleasure of visiting Cottesloe Beach. I desire to say there cannot be too many of such places of resort, especially for women and children; there cannot be too many facilities afforded for teaching our youths to swim, and there cannot be too many facilities afforded here to enable people, especially those with large families, to enjoy their holidays in the open air and at the waterside. [*Interjections*.] I do not care whether there are already a dozen such places. That surely is no argument against the establishment, free of cost so far as the public are concerned, of a new place of recreation. The public will get a distinct advantage by the granting of this concession. The ratepayers of Subiaco municipality and the Claremont roads district have, through their representative bodies, agreed to this, and the proposition

has been hailed with considerable pleasure by all ratepayers under whose notice it has come. The agreement embodied in this Bill is more favourable to the public than any agreement under a tramway proposition submitted since I have been in Parliament. [Mr. Hudson: Where is the agreement?] A large proportion of the provisions of the agreement are embodied in the provisional order. The agreement itself is not an integral part of the Bill, and the member for Dundas will know that an agreement between two or three contracting parties would not be embodied in an Act of Parliament. The agreement is a contract between those parties alone; therefore any references to the bathing establishment, to the provision of a public jetty, and to the handing over of the fee simple of the recreation ground will be outside the covers of this Bill, but are contained in an agreement which is fully binding on the three contracting parties who have signed it. [Mr. Stone: May not we see the agreement?] There will be no difficulty in the way of hon. members seeing the agreement; but it is not appended to the Bill, and I have not a copy of it with me to show hon. members. I will, however, be happy to afford any member an opportunity of perusing it. But I may say that, apart from these advantages, and they are distinct advantages—the provision for a jetty, for a bathing-house with proper enclosure, and for a free area of land—there is also a provision in the agreement that the municipality shall, on certain conditions and at certain periods, have the option of taking over this tramway at half the cost of construction—another very substantial advantage, from the public point of view. The question may and probably will be asked, why the municipality or the roads board do not construct this tramway themselves. I have no hesitation in answering members on that point. There are two difficulties, either of which is in itself great enough to prevent that being accomplished. One difficulty is that the road runs through both districts, and therefore neither the roads board nor the municipality would have power to spend its funds, either or-

inary revenue or borrowed money, on the construction of work outside its own boundary. [Mr. Johnson: We could give that power in the Bill.] The second and perhaps the greater difficulty, and one that no Bill could obviate, is the fact that this will not be a paying proposition immediately.

Mr. Collier: Who is the charitable gentleman who proposes to build it, then?

Mr. DAGLISH: I will give the hon. member that information later. This cannot by any stretch of imagination be construed as a proposition likely to pay for some years to come. Undoubtedly, later on it will pay; but so far as I am able to judge, there will be a number of very lean years, in which the cost of working the tramway will far and away exceed the amount of revenue there is any possibility of its producing. In the meantime, the promoter has this advantage and this only, that owning an area of land on the foreshore, communication by tramway will undoubtedly raise the value of that land; and I presume the promoter anticipates that from the enhanced value of the land he will obtain a return that will justify the expenditure actually involved in working the tramway. When a term of years has expired, I have no doubt the tramway will be a paying proposition; and I hope that when this has been accomplished, the municipality of Subiaco will step in and obtain this tramway under the terms of its agreement, at one-half the cost of construction. If the municipality can do that, it will have the advantage of taking over a business proposition, after the barren years have passed away, and will have the additional advantage of getting that proposition at half the cost it would have had to incur if it provided the full cost of construction.

Mr. Collier: Is any period stated before the municipality has the right of taking over the tramway?

Mr. DAGLISH: The condition is subject to an option held by the Perth Tramways Company, made before the agreement with the municipality, under which the Tramways Company has the right to take over the tramway at any time up to seven years. If the Tramways Com-

pany fails to take it over, the municipal council has at once the option of doing so at half the cost of construction; and in the interim the council has the option of taking over the bathing-house and the jetty free of cost, and of having vested in it for public recreation purposes an area of land, which the council has demanded, and I believe obtained. I am not sure whether the council has actually received the title, but if it has not already obtained the title, the council has obtained an assurance of the receipt of the title in fee simple. Members will therefore see that tangible public advantages have been gained; and even though the concessionaire may himself reap some advantage—and undoubtedly we recognise as ordinary thinking beings that no concessionaire would seek a power like this unless he secured by it some advantage—the public will gain what is to my mind an even more substantial advantage by the passing of this Bill. Personally I would gladly welcome the reference of this Bill to a select committee, because the Bill ought not to pass unless justified after the strictest scrutiny—[*Mr. Johnson* : Hear, hear!—but I have a desire to see this Bill passed quickly, in order that if possible the trams may be running before the present summer is ended. [*Member* : What is the time allowed for construction ?] The time within which the promoters must commence the construction of the line is far more liberal than is likely to be taken advantage of. They are prepared to start forthwith, and have already made arrangements, in the event of this Bill passing, to have the rails sent out immediately. Every day's delay in making the order means a day's additional delay in starting construction. I would gladly support a reference to a select committee except for that one reason of delay. In any case, I do not care very strongly to object to a select committee, as I, a representative of the district affected, would welcome the closest scrutiny by members, but I would urge them not to insist on anything that will unduly delay the passage of the Bill, and thereby unduly delay the construction and com-

pletion of a work that will be hailed with delight by the people of the district I represent.

Mr. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont) : The hon. member for Guildford was quite justified in calling the attention of members to the fact that this House should not give privileges to persons to construct tramways which would be likely to interfere with the profits of the Railway Department. In the past the House has been far too ready to give privileges of this kind. I anticipate in the future, and I hope it will be the case, that we shall have many applications from people prepared to construct railways and tramways, and I trust that at all times members will be reluctant to give privileges likely to interfere with the revenue of the railways. The member for Guildford complains that there was no explanation given by the Minister in connection with this Bill, but I would remind him of the fact that the promoter has already advertised in the *Government Gazette*, giving full particulars as to the area of the country over which it was proposed to construct the tramway and other details. The second paragraph of the schedule of the Bill recites that the promoter has published notice of his intention to make an application in the form prescribed. That was advertised in the *Government Gazette*, and in the very well-known paper called the *Guardian*, which circulates in the suburbs of Perth and Fremantle. [*Mr. Angwin* : In Fremantle ? I have never seen it.] It is necessary to inquire closely into questions of this kind, but I would remind the member for Guildford that the application has been already advertised. The Bill has been on the Notice Paper for the last three weeks, and if the member cares to ask for any information it will be supplied to him. The reason I opposed the adjournment of the debate was to find out from the hon. member, or from other members, what information they require. So far we have had no definite questions put, and I do not know what knowledge is required.

Mr. Holman : He asks as to the fares.

Mr. Scaddan : And as to the route.

The Minister for Works : Why not read the schedule ?

Mr. FOULKES : If the hon. members refer to the *Government Gazette*, they will be given the full particulars, including the names of the streets through which the line will run.

Mr. Johnson : We do not know the streets by their names.

Mr. FOULKES : Well the hon. member can look at the map.

Mr. Johnson : We should have a map hanging on the wall, the same as in connection with proposed agricultural railways.

Mr. FOULKES : Maps have already been lodged with the various institutions, and with the Public Works Department.

Mr. Johnson : This is the supreme authority.

Mr. FOULKES : The Bill has been here for quite three weeks, and if the member had read it a week ago, he would have obtained the information he desires.

Mr. Johnson : I want the information for all members, not only for myself.

Mr. Scaddan : Can you tell us where the terminus will be ?

Mr. FOULKES : I can show it to you on the map. I do not remember the exact position.

The Attorney General : On Swan location 123.

The Minister for Works : A little lower down than Crawley.

Mr. Scaddan : Well it is between Crawley and the Old Men's Depot ?

Mr. FOULKES : Yes. I would remind the House that the member for Subiaco has taken an active part in connection with the agreement. As mayor of Subiaco, he has met the promoter and, as can be readily understood, the municipality have obtained through the care and tactics of the hon. member, exceptionally good terms. I have every confidence that the member for Subiaco will never neglect an opportunity of promoting the welfare of his particular district. But he does not appear to know very much about Cottesloe, judging from the remarks he made just now. I do not want to set one district against another, for I believe the more places of resort

we have, the better it is for the community generally. Personally, I have no objection to the second reading being adjourned, although I know the promoter is most anxious to have this Bill carried through as soon as possible, because he wants to order the material necessary for the work. The people of Claremont are most anxious in the matter. Notice in connection with this scheme has been given to all the ratepayers there.

Mr. Johnson : Will they run the tramway on the eight hours principle, or on the twelve hours principle as at present exists in Perth ?

Mr. FOULKES : I have not gone into those details. I will supplement the information which has been given by the member for Subiaco, and give reasons why the municipalities do not construct the tramway themselves. One reason is this, that it would not be a paying proposition on account of the shortness of the route. There are hardly any tramways in the world, except through very thickly populated districts, where paying results can be obtained if the distance between the terminal points is short. It would be impossible for the local authorities to construct the work, as it would not be a paying proposition.

Mr. J. BREBBER (North Perth) : I support the second reading of this Bill, but from a different point of view from that put forward by other members. Only those who know the river well understand the desirability of such a place as will be opened up by this land being placed at the disposal of the people. If we look at the foreshore of Perth, we will see that there is no place whatever which children can make proper use of. The water is either too deep or too muddy, and the foreshore, therefore, cannot be used. The portion of the foreshore which will be opened up by the tramway is recognised as one of the best picnic places along the river, and it is very desirable that private enterprise should be allowed to come in and help to provide the people of this State with a good picnic ground. It has been suggested that the public bodies should build the line, but there would be no

traffic to justify such a course being adopted. Public funds should not be expended for such a purpose, but it is different in the case of a private person, who has land at the terminus of the line which he wishes to develop. In his case, the construction of the line will do a very great deal to improve the value of the land. He will afford facilities at the terminus for residents, and all those other adjuncts to enjoyment so necessary at a watering place, and we would be making a great mistake if we were to stop enterprise of that kind. There is no place at present along the river which is touched by railways or tramways directly. [Mr. Foulkes : Cottesloe Beach is.] The foreshore at Cottesloe Beach is quite a distance from the nearest communication, and the journey from the train to the beach is a very disagreeable one. This new spot along the Swan River will be the first place where the people of Perth will be able to get direct communication to a good beach. If the tramway is built, children will be able to use the locality as a splendid bathing ground, while it will be an ideal spot for picnics generally.

Mr. Angwin : What about the foreshore at Point Walter, and at Applecross ?

Mr. BREBBER : Those places are four or five miles from Perth, and it costs 1s. return to visit them. I say that in place of our trying to prevent the utilisation of the river banks and sea coast, we should give more encouragement to private enterprise to open up our numerous beauty spots. I for one shall give the Minister for Works my hearty support in respect of this measure, which I trust will pass.

Mr. W. C. ANGWIN (East Fremantle) : I do not intend to offer any opposition to the Bill, but I rise to protest against the statements by some members that there is no other place on the river near Perth where the public can enjoy themselves. I do not think we can find a better beauty spot on the river than Applecross, and a little farther down is Point Walter, both easily reached by steamer, and the fare is very low.

The remarks of the member for Guildford (Mr. Johnson), with regard to local public bodies, I consider uncalled for. No class of people are better aware of the requirements of a district than those engaged in its local government.

Mr. Johnson : They represent only a section of the people.

Mr. ANGWIN : I agree they represent only a section. At the same time, all the people of the district are the first to cry out if the local body are doing anything contrary to the people's interests ; and I realise that when any local body have agreed to grant a concession such as this in their district, they must have carefully considered the matter and ascertained the financial position ; consequently, they know that the construction of such a work as this tramway, or any other undertaking, will be a distinct advantage to the town or the district in question. The member for Ivanhoe (Mr. Scaddan) says he thought I was opposed to monopolies. I am opposed to monopolies. At the same time, when the agreement provides that the local body can take over and control the undertaking, I say that the power of the monopoly ceases to exist.

Mr. Scaddan : Is that in the agreement ?

Mr. ANGWIN : The local authorities can take over the work when they think fit.

Mr. Scaddan : How do you know ?

Mr. ANGWIN : I am satisfied to take the word of the member for the district. I realise that everything possible should be done to try to retain in the State the large number of people who now leave our shores in order to enjoy a holiday. If we can open up local pleasure resorts, I maintain it is our duty to encourage the local authorities interested, and the people of the State will gain as a whole. If anything, we have too few of such places of amusement, and we find holiday-makers leaving our shores by almost every steamer to spend elsewhere money that could with advantage be spent in the State.

Mr. T. WALKER (Kalgoorlie) : The arguments I have heard in favour of this

measure are just such arguments as would make me hesitate to vote for its second reading. They tend to show that if this work should be undertaken it should be undertaken by the Government. Granted that the municipality of Subiaco has not full control of the route, and could only spend money within the municipal boundaries of Subiaco, and that the same can be said of the municipality of Claremont; notwithstanding all that, if this work be necessarily of a national character, such as will induce people not to leave the State for holidays, such as will open up a pleasure resort on the foreshore of the river, it is manifestly the duty of the Government to carry out the work, which should not be left to the enterprise of a single person. We have too many works of a public or semi-public character given over to private persons. And whilst we hear members of this House declare themselves opposed to monopolies, they say in the same breath that the monopoly disappears immediately clauses are inserted in the original agreement permitting the Government or the local authority to step in at some time or other and to take over the work. But we find by actual experience that the Government or other authority, instead of stepping in, are always granting farther and fresh concessions. The opposite step of resuming is never taken, but the works and undertakings are farther alienated. Considering the character of this Bill, I question whether the House has a right to deal with it in its present form. The Bill provides for a purely private undertaking, and should be introduced as a private Bill. It seeks to farther the interests of one person, a Colonel Bruce. [Mr. Taylor : Bruce is a good name.] I know; but there is about this Bill a considerable suspicion of a spider. I say the Bill should be submitted to the ordeal which has to be undergone by every other private Bill. Why is it fathered by the Minister for Works, if it is a purely private measure?

The Minister for Works : The authority for introducing such Bills is granted by the Tramways Act.

Mr. WALKER : I know the Minister thinks he has power under that Act to deal with this matter; but I question whether there is not a differentiation between this proposed tramway and those already constructed; I question whether authority is granted under the Tramways Act to treat as a Government Bill a measure so purely private as this. The member for Subiaco, in defence of the Bill, and to show the private motives of the one person who is undertaking this great work, told us that the promoter had landed interests on the foreshore of the river, and wished to increase their value. Now I put it to members, if that be his object, and if that object be gratified, what becomes of your public resort, your miles of open beach? The promoter will sell the land. His object is not to provide a fine, open space where the public may go camping, and where the member for North Perth may go in his bathing costume and sport upon the sands. The member for Subiaco, in defence of the Bill, and as an explanation why Subiaco and Claremont could not undertake the work, said that the promoter had these lands, the value of which he wished to increase. And how can he increase the value but by settlement? And if he secures that settlement, and sells his allotments, and a little township arises there, what becomes of your public resort? Why, it becomes like South Perth. What more beautiful place could we have than South Perth for the use of picnickers? But there are roads and residences right along the foreshore all the way round. The public cannot find a spot to hold a quiet picnic.

Mr. Ingwin : There is to be a reserve here.

Mr. WALKER : What is the use of a little reserve, when all the land around it is private? Have we not seen this time after time in other parts of the world? Everyone has heard of the beautiful harbour of Sydney, where just such dodges as these were at one time employed. The member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes), who has visited Sydney, will remember Lady Robinson's Beach, and the tramway there owned by a private company. What has been the re-

sult? Lands have been sold, but what has become of the public resort? Time and time again has population spread out in that direction, and what at one time was a public resort has become a little township. It is no longer a public resort. And in this instance, we are asked to enable the promoter of this tramway to convert the spot and its immediate neighbourhood into a settled district; not a pleasure resort at all, but another little township. That is the object of the Bill; and I do not deny that there may be some purpose thereby served; it may be valuable to have settlement even there. But the settlement will destroy the object of those who support the Bill. Members who have spoken say the tramway will be a valuable proposition by and by, and that the only reason why the municipal councils dare not plunge at present is that the working expenses must for some few years to come be larger than the receipts. But if we can construct tramways elsewhere, why cannot we open up this one, and wait for the good time to come, if the work is to be for the benefit of the public, who will bathe and picnic and enjoy themselves generally? If that be the object, the undertaking comes within the province of the Minister for Works. It is a public duty. We have too many of these ulcers already in the community. The illustration has been cited of the tramline from Boulder to Kalgoorlie, which seriously depleted the property, the asset, of the general taxpayer, by rendering comparatively useless our own railway that we had gone to the expense of constructing from Kalgoorlie to Boulder. Yet the tramway company were allowed between those centres to charge exorbitant fares, and practically do as they liked. Was there any attempt by the Government to step in? Was any supervision at all exercised over the company, or anything done to check them; anything to try to maintain the value of the railway property? Absolutely nothing. Is not that a sufficient illustration of the danger of giving over to private people such immense public interests? And the only argument advanced is the short speech to-night by

the Minister for Works. We are acting blindly. We are told we can see the maps at the Public Works office. For the original agreement we must interview the mayor of Subiaco. That is not how legislation should be framed in this House. Members are entitled to the fullest and completest information; but it has not been given. We are asked to adopt an agreement that we have never read, of which we are told by a member who by his utterance shows that he scarcely knows the districts of which he spoke. This is admittedly a tramway for the sole purpose of increasing the value of the promoter's lands. That is its object. Why should this House give so valuable a concession to a private speculator? This is a pure speculation. Why should we grant a concession that may stand in the way of a really useful tramway service to that very spot by-and-by? These concessions once granted are incumbrances which have to be cleared away before a step in the right direction can be taken. We are planting difficulties in the road of our making progress. If progress in this direction should be necessary in time to come, we are making it so that we cannot do it. The concessions we made to the tramway companies in Perth and Fremantle alone should open our eyes. We know we have parted with our assets; these concessions stand in the way of the public utilising them. If we wished to alter the systems to-morrow we could not. We have given our rights and privileges away. Surely we should learn something by our experience in the past. This Bill should be submitted to precisely the same course as any other private Bill. It should not be fathered by the Government; and in the light of the information we have at present, we should not vote for it. It is a decided step in the dark, and one that is absolutely wrong in principle, inasmuch as it is giving the rights and privileges of the public into the hands of the private monopolist.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan): Dealing with that part of the matter introduced into the debate

raising the question of procedure, I would like to draw attention to the fact that Bills to confirm provisional orders are in the Imperial House treated as public Bills. According to *May*, Bills to confirm provisional orders and certificates are introduced as public Bills in either House. I think that should be sufficient to deal with the point raised by the member for Kanowna, and I feel sure that had he had time and opportunity to investigate the matter he would not have raised a point which clearly cannot in any sense be relied on.

Mr. Holman: That is what we want—time for consideration.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The matter of investigating whether this is a private or a public Bill could have been done three or four weeks back. As regards the merits of the Bill, in common with other members I depend on those who have knowledge concerning the proposal, and the position appears to me to be that there is a gentleman owning a large quantity of land who is prepared, so that the land may become of value to him, to construct a tramway to his estate and hand over to the public the tramway and the road over which it runs. The advantage to the constructor, Colonel Bruce, is apparent. By the tramway company taking over this tramway and running trams to his land he will recoup the expenditure to which he is put by the increase in the value of the land. If that is a business transaction from his point of view, on the other hand it would not be a business proposition from a public point of view for the Government to purchase that land and build the tramway. If such proposition were brought before the House every hon. member would scout it. That being the case, if this tramway is to be constructed—and according to the member for Claremont and the member for Subiaco it would appear to be desirable in the public interest to have it constructed—it can only be constructed under an agreement of this character. No doubt the agreement will require careful consideration, but that can be done in Committee. After the second reading is passed, I am sure the Minister for Works will meet the wishes

of hon. members and will allow sufficient adjournment to enable members to put on the Notice Paper any amendments they think necessary, or to frame any amendments when the Bill is being discussed clause by clause in Committee. At the present stage the local bodies who have a full knowledge of the facts having become parties to the agreement, thus showing that the Bill is for the public good, the only point to consider is whether with this assurance we should allow the Bill to pass. For my part I am prepared to do so. Those who are responsible to the ratepayers in Subiaco and in the Claremont roads district would not venture to suggest to this House, as they do by their approval, that we should confirm the provisional order unless they were satisfied it was one that would be of advantage to the ratepayers in each district.

Mr. G. Taylor: They did so at Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Though at the time I had nothing to do with public life in Kalgoorlie and Boulder, I believe that if the proposition had been placed before the ratepayers of those municipalities to construct their own tramways, a large majority would have voted against it for the simple reason that the townspeople could not possibly have found the expenditure necessary. Had a sufficient sum been raised by way of a loan to construct the tramways at Kalgoorlie it would have placed such an incubus on the town that the municipality could not have borne it. No man living in Kalgoorlie at that time would have taken his share in a concern of that character. [*Mr. W. D. Johnson:* That was not the point.] As far as I can remember, unless the concession had been given for tramways to be constructed there would have been no tramways at all.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: But the people did not want to give away the concession.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As far as the municipality was concerned, there was a large majority of the people who said that, as they could not get tramways by any scheme which would allow them to construct themselves, they were quite prepared to allow a company to do so.

Mr. C. A. HUDSON (Dundas): The member for Kanowna has raised some doubt as to the procedure in regard to this Bill, and it seems to me that the House is entitled to better information than has been afforded to the present stage; and though I would be prepared to vote for the second reading, I think the mover and those responsible for the measure should insist upon its being sent to a select committee for report. A committee might go fully into the whole question and see the agreement we are asked to confirm and the route and the effect of the tramway on our public railway system. The Attorney General told us and quoted from the authority of *May* that the confirmation of a provisional order was treated as a public Bill. No one doubts the hon. member, but if he had taken the trouble to tell us, a Bill to confirm a provisional order is treated in *May* as a hybrid Bill. On page 471, Volume 10, *May* says:—

"The appointment by the committee of selection, of committees to consider public Bills for confirming provisional orders or certificates of boards or commissions, and also the class of Bills termed 'hybrid Bills,' is mentioned elsewhere."

On page 443 the procedure on a "hybrid Bill" is stated:—

"If it appears, after the first reading, that a public Bill affects private rights, notice of this circumstance is sent from the Public Bill Office to the member in charge of the Bill; and the examiners of petitions for private Bills are ordered to examine the Bill with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to private Bills."

Special procedure is adopted, and I want to know why a different mode of procedure is adopted with regard to this provisional order from that adopted by Parliament in the past. The Attorney General said that the practice of this Parliament was to treat these Bills as public Bills, but he did not say that a Bill for the confirmation of a provisional order for a tramway for a private person was introduced as a private Bill, that fees were paid, and that when the second reading was carried it

was referred to a select committee. I can quote the instance of a Bill introduced in 1904 mentioned in *Hansard*, vol. 24, page 2155. I am referring to the Boulder Tramways Bill.

The Premier: That was a private Bill and was introduced by a private member. Look in the same year at the Victoria Park Tramways Bill.

Mr. C. A. HUDSON: The practice in the past has been that where the Bill was for a private person it was sent to a select committee. This is a Bill to confirm a provisional order for a concession granted to a private person, and undoubtedly it should be dealt with as a private measure; but in any case it should go to a select committee, and I intend to support any motion for sending it to a select committee.

Mr. J. B. HOLMAN (Murchison): I am sorry the Minister for Works was not able to give us a little more information. We certainly had some information from the member for Subiaco when he told us that this concession is going to greatly increase the value of the land owned by Colonel Bruce, and that Colonel Bruce is going to give us a great deal because he is going to get a great deal back. The member for Subiaco said that the public could not get any convenience at Cottesloe or Cottesloe Beach or in any other part of the country, and he tried to make us believe that the only place we had in Western Australia as a pleasure resort would be the terminus of this tramway. When I hear anybody speak so strongly on a point like that I think it is necessary to seek farther information. The information given by the hon. member was hardly in accordance with facts; because anyone who travels from Perth to the terminus of this tramway will have to pay 6d. to get there and 6d. to return, whereas one can travel on the railway to Cottesloe Beach for 9d. return, children 5d. return. I have been to Cottesloe Beach with my family on several occasions, and I know it is a good place.

Mr. W. C. Angwin: It is one of the worst beaches I have been on.

Mr. J. B. HOLMAN: I have been on worse. We have other fine places. There is Applecross, that is a nice place, and the member for North Fremantle could speak of the glories of the beach at North Fremantle. I see no advantage that we are going to get from passing this Bill. We cannot get any information from the Minister for Works. It reminds me of some of the measures the Minister introduced last year, such as the Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Railway Bill which was introduced in a few minutes without information being given. I believe there is going to be a great waste of money in connection with it. The Minister introduced this Bill this afternoon in less than two minutes. So far as I am concerned I cannot tell by reading the schedule of the Bill what route the tramway is going to take. In my opinion, when a measure like this is brought before the House we should have the fullest information; we should have maps and plans showing the route and the exact country the tramway will affect; also the land owned by the private individual whose property is going to be enhanced in value by the construction of this railway. I oppose the passing of the Bill, because as pointed out by the member for Kanowna and the member for Dundas, we should have a select committee appointed to inquire into this question, for the information given to the House is unsatisfactory. Unless we get some farther information I shall oppose the second reading. It has been said that this tramway will be to the advantage of the people of the State to enable them to go down to the riverside and bathe, and that a pleasure resort will be made for them there. The intention is not to build this tramway for the convenience of the people of this State. I have never known a concession granted to the people; it is only to private people. It has been said that the local authorities favour this Bill. We should not give a concession to any individual or benefit any local authority or municipal council, because if it benefits them it may be detrimental to the people of the State and the people of the State are more important than any municipal council or

local body. Until I am thoroughly satisfied that this work is absolutely necessary and should be constructed, I shall oppose the measure. I am surprised to find on the second reading of what may be an important measure, the giving away of a concession, so little information has been supplied to the House.

The Minister for Works: We are not giving away a single concession.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Bill gives away the right to construct a tramway with certain privileges as to charges. In my opinion too much has been given away to tramway companies. Take the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Tramway. The Government spent £90,000 in building the railway line between Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and as soon as the work was completed a concession was given to a tramway company to construct a tramway line, and during the past few years the revenue from the railway between Kalgoorlie and Boulder has been almost worthless. I do not believe that the revenue derived from that railway would pay for the axle grease. We would be committing a great error if we gave a concession, or right, to anyone that would interfere with the railway revenue between Perth and Fremantle. In my opinion this concession may assume a serious aspect. At the present time a great deal of revenue is derived from the holiday traffic between Perth and Fremantle. If we grant a right to the promoter a great number of people may utilise the tramway in preference to the railway. We should guard against that. We should endeavour to make our beauty spots along the river popular, and try and turn the traffic on to the railways and not give people the right to run tramways in opposition to our railways at the same time enhancing the value of their own property. We have in Perth given away a right to the tramway company and we know how they treat their men. The same thing obtains on the Kalgoorlie and Boulder tramway: we know how the company treat their men there. Passengers on the tramways have to pay through the nose for their accommodation; they have to pay considerably higher than is paid in the Eastern States. The Sydney

tramway system would be more preferable than the system in vogue here, for in Sydney the Government own the tramways. In my opinion as soon as the Government of the State undertake the control of the tramway system the better for us all. I hope before the measure is passed it will be referred to a select committee so that we may have an independent report on the matter, and the information will be placed before members who will then be in a position to know whether it is advisable to pass the measure or not. We do not know what the agreement which has been entered into between the promoter and the Government is. We are told there are certain clauses in the agreement, but we would like to see the whole of the agreement, and I would like to see a plan of the route of this proposed tramway. All we know is that some Edward Bruce is a colonel.

Mr. Stuart: Is he a Yankee?

Mr. HOLMAN: From what he is getting I should think he is a Scotchman, and in dealing with a Scotchman you have to be canny, because that is what Scotchmen are. This is too serious a matter to joke over, for we may be doing something, if this Bill passes, which we may be sorry for. I do not feel disposed to grant this concession to any one individual because the tramway may compete with our railways and take away revenue that we justly obtain. I should like to see money expended along our river shores so as to give people every possible convenience; open up places where swimming baths can be constructed. The member for Subiaco said it was necessary to encourage our children to swim, and he described how it would be possible to go from Perth two or three times a week on this tramway to the river side. He led us to believe that people would be able to go almost for nothing, but on looking through the schedule I find that people will have to pay a great deal of money to have this swim, and I question whether people will take their children to the terminus of this tramway for a swim. In my opinion we should have more than the desire of the member for Subiaco to pass the Bill. We should know what we are doing in the interests of the State.

For a passenger to go from North Perth to the terminus of this proposed tramline it will cost 7d. and another 7d. to get back, without taking into consideration the cost of the swimming outfit. I shall oppose the second reading until the Minister for Works gives us more information, and until he agrees that this Bill shall be sent to a select committee as every Bill of this description should be. If that is done we shall be in a better position to know what we are doing.

Mr. J. A. S. STUART (Mount Leonora): I cannot support this proposition although the Minister for Works gives us all the information at his command. I oppose the Bill on principle. I look on these concessions as parasites, as leeches to bleed us of our railway revenue. It is time the Government took a stand against these matters. We have these concessions granted all over the State. The Kurrawang tramway was granted to a person, and it is carrying millions of tons of cargo, freight which should be going into the Railway Department. It is taking the life-blood out of the Railway Department. We have a tramway system in Perth which last year showed a profit of £35,000, and that £35,000 would have been a lot better under the control of the Railway Department and would come in very handy. This method of transit should be in the hands of the Railway Department as is the case in Sydney. There the tramways are run in conjunction with the railways and during last year they carried forty million passengers, and earned for the department £235,000. There things are as they should be. In this country—take the Kalgoorlie-Boulder line for example—we have the tramway method of transit handed to private individuals, and we have a railway system run in such a way that it would lead one to believe that those who have control of our railways have interests in the running of the trams. The return fare from Kalgoorlie to Boulder by rail is 1s., and the trams run every twenty minutes and the fare is 5d. The trains are run in such a way that it would lead one to believe that the people in control had more interest in the trams than in the

trains. I do not want any farther information about this line. It is like holding out a red flag to a bull to ask anyone on the Opposition side to vote for the Bill. All the means of transit should be in the hands of the Government, and the revenue derived therefrom should be paid into the Treasury.

The Treasurer: What about the Leonora tramway?

Mr. STUART: That is slightly better than this, handing a tramway over to a municipal corporation.

The Treasurer: You would oppose that?

Mr. STUART: I am not opposing the municipal ownership of tramways, it is the next best thing to the Government owning them. There was a concession granted to carry firewood to the Gwalia mine. The revenue from that traffic would look nice in the Railway Department. One would imagine from the remarks of the member for Subiaco that this gentleman, whoever he may be—the colonel—was giving away certain advantages more than he would gain. The only difference I can see between the concessionaire and Carnegie is that Carnegie has got his millions and is giving away a little, but this gentleman is giving away a little to obtain his millions. I shall oppose the Bill.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): I admire consistency, but it is hardly exemplified in some of the members opposite who have spoken this afternoon. These members have complained of the action of the Government in trying to take a Bill into Committee this afternoon. I would direct attention to Volume 26 of *Hansard* wherein it will be noticed that the Labour Government not only put one tramway Bill through, but three the same afternoon; the second reading stage, and the Committee stage as well.

Mr. T. Walker: The same tramway man?

The PREMIER: The member for Guildford, who now offers such opposition, was then the Minister for Works and put the three tramway Bills through; no mention was made at all of a select committee. The member for Leonora has told us that to ask members of the Op-

position to vote for the Bill at the present time was like holding up a red rag to a bull. The Labour Government must have used a great many yards of red Turkey twill in passing their three Bills on that occasion. The Bills I refer to are the Victoria Park Tramway Bill, the City of Perth Tramway Bill, and the North Perth Tramway Bill. The whole debate is contained in four pages of *Hansard*. It will be just as well for the member for Mount Margaret to look into that matter so as to be able to offer some excuse when he speaks after tea.

At 6.15, the Speaker left the Chair.

At 7.30, Chair resumed.

Mr. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): Unfortunately I was not in the Chamber when the Minister for Works delivered his second-reading speech on this Bill. I was absent for only a few minutes; but judging by the utterances of members who have spoken, it must have been the shortest second-reading speech on record for a Bill of this character, beating even the speech introducing the Bill for the Collie Railway, delivered by a former Minister for Works, Mr. Rason, who afterwards excused himself for not giving the House the necessary information by saying that he on that occasion had a headache. I do not suppose the present Minister will excuse himself by that plea. I missed also the speech of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), mayor of that town, of which the municipal council have been treating with the gentleman for whom this provisional order is sought. But the criticisms of those two speeches by other members have satisfied me that some farther information is necessary on this measure before it goes into Committee. Since the tea adjournment I have found on investigation that there is no specific rule by which such measures on their second reading must of course go to a select committee; but there are numbers of cases in which that procedure was adopted. It was not adopted in 1897 by Sir John Forrest's Government, when the City of Perth Tramway Bill was introduced by the then Commissioner of

Railways, the present member for Kataning (Hon. F. H. Piesse). It was not adopted in 1904, when the Daglish Government, of which I had the honour to be a member, introduced other Tramway Bills. But I fail to find in any of the records that when a member of the House asked for a select committee on a measure of this nature, the request was refused. That being so, while there is no fixed procedure for Bills of this sort, I think there is not that urgency about this measure which should induce the Minister for Works to refuse a select committee before the Bill goes into Committee of the Whole. On the passing of the second reading a committee will probably be asked for, on the ground that the provisional order is being granted to a person to whom the Government of this State have never previously given power to construct a tramway. Before the tea hour the Premier referred to the North Perth Tramway Bill; but when the City of Perth Tramways Bill was passed, North Perth was a portion of the Perth Municipality, and afterwards acquired a separate municipal existence, necessitating negotiations between the North Perth Council and the Tramway Company; consequently a Bill for the extension of the tramway was brought before the House in the ordinary manner, and as the Premier pointed out, was passed through its stages with but little discussion, the only speakers in addition to the Minister in charge being the present Leader of the Opposition, and one or two others. That was only an extension of an already existing tramway. And the same remarks apply, though not in the same degree, to the Victoria Park tramway, which was also an extension of the Perth system, not going through the property of a private person, nor giving a private person power to construct a line to enhance the value of his own property.

Mr. Scaddan: The promoter of the Victoria Park scheme was not a land-boomer.

Mr. TAYLOR: The promoter was the local governing body, who desired a tram to facilitate transit between their municipality and Perth. We remember the

old horse buses, and remember also the new motor buses run by Mr. Copley in that district. They failed to provide the necessary service, I do not know whether owing to deficient traffic or to bad roads. But the terminal point of the Victoria Park tramway was not a pleasure resort.

The Minister for Works: And the terminal point of the Nedlands line is not a pleasure resort.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is a place that the members for North Perth (Mr. Brebber), Claremont (Mr. Foulkes), and Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) expect to be a place of recreation. They have already, I believe, ordered their bathing suits.

Mr. Gordon: We are denying the people a chance of making it a pleasure resort.

Mr. TAYLOR: I should not attempt to put any of those gentlemen into a garb that would not suit him. If I suggested a bathing costume for the member for North Perth, it would be kilts; for the member for Subiaco I would suggest the mayoral robe; and the member for Claremont would look very well in the costume of a K.C. But how they will dress or whether there will be mixed bathing is not troubling me. The tramline will terminate at a place of public recreation; and in passing through private land and in reaching that terminal point there will be a tendency to restrict the area available for recreation purposes. I have no desire to oppose the measure except on the grounds mentioned by other Opposition members—because privately-owned works of this sort are monopolies; and I find that permission has been granted to private people to construct tramways in this State, not only against the best interests of the community to be served, but directly opposed to our railway system, competing unfairly with our State railways. I have no desire to review the tram systems of the whole Commonwealth, from the old horse trams of South Australia and Queensland, and to point out how Governments and municipalities have had to buy out the private tramway companies at exorbitant prices, so that the Government might control such modes of transit in a manner convenient to the citizens. But members should

have all the facts placed before them by the Minister in charge, before passing a Bill of this nature. [*The Treasurer: The Brisbane trams are run by a private company.*] Members know the disadvantage the people of Kalgoorlie and Boulder labour under in the way of high tolls. More than that, there is an expensive railway system to cope with the passenger traffic between Kalgoorlie and Boulder which is now being run at a great loss owing to the competition of the trams. We recognise there was a great difference of opinion as to whether the State should control that tram service or a private company; but I am sorry permission was given to a private company. I am confident that the people of Perth and suburbs, after the experience of dealing with a company for the last nine years, would not vote in favour of that wealth-producing machine, a tramway system, being handed over to a company, but would rather see the State reaping the benefit of the system. Last year I read to the House the report of the speech delivered in London by the chairman of directors of the Perth Tramways Company. It was one of the most glowing reports I have had the pleasure of reading for some time; for it pointed out the expansion of the system and the profit derived, and there were some legitimate and eulogistic remarks on this State. While the Nedlands Park tram is to be a branch of the Perth tramway system the provisional order is in favour of Colonel Bruce. The agreement is not before the House; I do not expect it will be before us; because naturally it is between Colonel Bruce and the municipality of Subiaco and the Claremont roads board, and it is a private agreement. But we are called upon to pass a Bill and the schedule annexed thereto, giving power to Colonel Bruce to do what he chooses with this concession when it is granted. I think in view of these facts it would be wise for the Minister for Works to allow the Bill to go to a select committee. I think that is emphasised by the point raised by various speakers this afternoon. The members for Kalamona and Leonora, I think, put their fingers on the essence of the whole con-

cern when they pointed out that this concession, if granted, would be granted to an individual who is not in this State—I have no record of his having been here; I believe he is in India or somewhere—to construct a tramway line, which I suppose he can sell to-morrow if necessary. I do not know the agreement, I have not seen it, but I find in Section 18 of the schedule annexed to the Bill the following:—

“The promoter, his transferees or successors, may from time to time make and enter into and carry into effect contracts, agreements, and arrangements for or with reference to the use by such transferees or successors of the said tramways or portion thereof, and for prescribing and regulating the tolls and charges to be paid for such use, and the terms and conditions of such user, and all matters incidental thereto.”

If this Bill is passed and the agreement with the local authorities is finally completed, Colonel Bruce will be in possession of a valuable asset which he can realise on, which he can sell, perhaps, to some enterprising syndicate at a great profit, this notwithstanding the ultimate object of this provisional order to allow the construction of a tramline to his own private property which will naturally enhance the value of that property. [*The Minister for Works: At his own expense.*] If it be good enough for Colonel Bruce it should be quite good enough for the Government to enter upon a project of this nature. We find in every particular that when there is supposed need for a railway or tramway concession which would be a good project, there is always private enterprise looking for it; but when it is a doubtful project and it is asked for by the people, the Government have come to the rescue. The Government have to construct all the doubtful concerns; but when there is anything which, on the face of it, has a tendency towards success, private enterprise is always on the spot.

The Minister for Works: Did private enterprise offer to construct the line to Coolgardie?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not sure; but I notice that those who constructed the railway by contract and ran it for a short time before the Government took the line over made fortunes, so much so that they have been wealthy men ever since. I have no hesitation in saying that the line was constructed very cheaply owing to the volume of trade that was following on, and that owing to the extension of the contract time the contractors made fortunes by carrying goods to the goldfields. In view of that, I am sure there would have been no difficulty in constructing that line by private enterprise. I am pleased it was not done. In regard to this Bill, I believe it is the general desire that we should have a select committee. I have not heard any argument advanced by those supporting the measure as to the urgency for the passage of the Bill. If the second reading is passed I hope the Minister will not wish to go straight into Committee; but if it be necessary that the passage of the Bill should be facilitated in every way, I have no desire to oppose it. If the company are anxious to start a work which will absorb some of the unemployed, I would not like to see any delay; but if I thought there was a possible chance of successfully opposing the measure from the point of view that I have already indicated, namely the private monopoly point of view, and that it would be in the best interests of the State to build the line, I would take up that course of action. However, I know it is hopeless for this side of the House to defeat the measure or carry out that object, but I am sure that if it was for the establishment of a tramway system similar to that contained in the Perth Tramways Bill, passed in 1897, this side of the House would take up a stand that would be a credit to us in forcing the Government to construct the line for the municipality. When the member for Leonora was speaking, the Treasurer interjected as to whether the hon. member would object to the municipality of Leonora constructing the tramway to Gwalia. I was representative of that district when that provisional order was granted, and I had no end of trouble in getting the

necessary land from the Leonora municipal boundary to Gwalia brought within the municipal area, to enable the municipal council to spend the ratepayers' money on the construction of that line; because it was against the Municipalities Act to spend money beyond the boundary of the municipality. I have always advocated in matters of this sort, the State first, and then the local governing bodies a long way ahead of private enterprise in constructing any of these works. I do not know that the Treasurer made a great point when he interjected. Then the argument was an extension of the system to cart fuel to the mines. I had assisted in getting permission for these tramlines to be constructed to cart fuel from the bush to the mines, where it was almost impossible for them to carry on mining operations by bringing in the fuel in the ordinary way by teams, because the distance was too great, and the nature of the country through which they had to travel was such that horses, bullocks, or camels were not able to pull sufficiently heavy loads to make the proposition payable. They are only ordinary tramlines, especially those running out from Gwalia, and from the various mines at Lawlers, to bring in fuel. There would be no possible chance of any Government undertaking to build such tramlines; and as representative of the district at the time, I recommended to the Government of the day that it was right and proper that every facility should be given to carry on the mining industry in that part of the country. These tramlines do nothing but cart fuel and take provisions and water out to the men cutting the timber. They in no way enter into competition with the railway system, because they are not running parallel to the railway. They are quite different to the Kurrawang line, which runs parallel to the railway system and takes away much of the traffic the railway system should have. I would not by any stretch of imagination support a measure to grant a concession of that nature, one totally different from the systems I have already spoken of. I have indicated the grounds on which I oppose this measure, that is that I would rather the State took up

the venture than give a concession to any private individual. The member for Karonna put the matter clearly to the House, and it is not necessary to labour the point. If the Bill passes the second reading I shall reserve to myself the endeavour to make some alterations when the measure is going through Committee. I shall endeavour to make alterations in the schedule in a way which I hope will make the conditions better for those employed on the tramways, the motormen and conductors and those looking after maintenance work. We have had repeated difficulties with the company in Perth, and I believe that very company will take over the running here after the line is constructed. I will endeavour to have inserted in the schedule a provision fixing fair hours of labour and a fair minimum rate of wages. I regret that we have not had an opportunity of dealing with the agreement, but that is a matter between private persons. If we could have seen it and dealt with it we might have been able to make the conditions better for the persons employed during the construction of the work and the running of the system.

Mr. P. COLLIER (Boulder): I should vote against this Bill in any circumstance for I am always opposed to anything in the nature of a monopoly. Whatever merit private enterprise has, it has none when it creates a monopoly. If there is competition there may be some merit, but once hand over a railway or a road to a company or individual and you create a monopoly. I am of opinion that this State is overburdened with monopolists and combines. I do not know what power the concessionaire has which has induced the Ministry to introduce the Bill into this House in a couple of minutes. It has been admitted by the Minister and by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) who is supporting the Bill that the main object this gentleman has is to enhance the value of his own land. Probably he may have been stirred in this direction by the possibility of the bringing into existence of a land tax. I should be the very last in the world to take any steps which would enhance the

value of anyone's land, for land is already too dear. There is a prospect of the owner being taxed and evidently his desire is to get the Bill pushed through so that he can construct the tramway and increase the value of his land. We have no knowledge of what area will be set aside for the use of the public, but we are merely asked to swallow the Bill as it stands. The least the Minister should have done was to have laid a plan on the table of the House showing what area is held by the individual and what area will be opened for public purposes. It may be, and it is very likely that it will be, that the whole of the foreshore will be sold at increased prices if the concession is granted.

The Minister for Works: You avoid all mention of the improvements to the University endowment lands.

Mr. COLLIER: I know nothing about them. No plan has been produced and all we are told is that a tramway will go to a certain place. I have no knowledge of the locality of the endowment blocks.

The Minister for Works: I told you about it.

Mr. COLLIER: We have been told that the interests of the people are safeguarded. We are always told the same old tale with regard to these concessions. I have knowledge of wood-line concessions on the goldfields, and I know that while they were supposed to be hedged around by conditions and regulations which would safeguard the interests of the people, after the concession was obtained the regulations were not worth the paper they were written on. The Mount Monger line is a striking illustration. When those people were seeking the concession they said they would be only too willing to let people travel on the line and to provide woodcutters with opportunities to carry their wood over the line. After the concession was obtained, however, the private men were driven off altogether. It is in keeping with the member for Claremont that when asked as to the wages to be paid and the hours to be worked by the men, he said that was a mere matter of detail which could be attended to afterwards. I want that attended to at the beginning. Through-

out the whole of Australia the tramway workers are the worst paid of any men in the Commonwealth. We have had an instance of that in Melbourne, where the tramway company have a monopoly and work their employees ten hours a day at a wage of 7s. a day. On the goldfields the employees on the Kalgoorlie and Boulder tramway are the least paid of any able-bodied men on the fields. They only receive 10s. for a day of eight hours. We have no guarantee that the employees of the concessionaire will not be treated in a similar manner. The member for Subiaco urged that we should endeavour to improve the holiday resorts and retain the people here instead of allowing them to go for their holidays to the Eastern States. If the State can afford to spend £1,000 or £2,000 a year in beautifying the caves and so encourage the people to stay in the State, they can spend that sum in constructing the tramways themselves.

The Treasurer: Will you take the job on for £2,000 a year?

Mr. COLLIER: Whatever the cost will be, anything that will pay a private individual to construct will pay the State. I am very dubious about the promoter's philanthropy, and his offer to hand over the line after the trams have been worked for a few years for half the cost of construction. There must be a great gain to be made in order that any individual or company would construct a tramway and hand it over after a few years for half the original cost. If it will pay the private person it will pay the municipality. I have no confidence in municipal councils and I regret I have not the confidence possessed by the member for East Fremantle. My experience, not only in this State but also in the other States, is that at all times they are willing to barter away the rights of the people. Farther, it must be borne in mind that municipal councils only represent a section of the people—the property owners—and even if the Subiaco Council is favourable to the scheme that is no guarantee that the residents of the town are. We have heard of no demand from the people there, and there has been no agitation for the line. This is the first

time I have heard of the matter. There has been no referendum taken, and the councillors apparently took good care that none should be obtained. I doubt if five per cent. of the ratepayers have any knowledge of the scheme whatever. As to facilities for the people to go to the river to bathe, it may be very well for the people of Subiaco, but I am sure the residents of other portions of Perth would prefer to go to Cottesloe or to Cottesloe Beach. It would be a greater expense for the residents say of North Perth or East Perth to go to the terminus of the proposed tramline than take the railway to Cottesloe Beach. For that reason I am quite certain that the larger portion of the people of the city will continue to use the railway. In any case a concession of this kind should not be granted. In connection with the Kalgoorlie and Boulder trams they charge sixpence for a single fare from Kalgoorlie to Boulder, and on race days they double that amount. They carry passengers from Kalgoorlie to the Post Office in Boulder for sixpence, and they make them get out from the car and enter another one and pay another sixpence to the racecourse. That means a cost of 2s. for the return fare. These are some of the methods of private promoters of these concerns whom we are told are concerned only in the welfare of the people. Concessions of this kind should not be given to individuals, and the House should not waste its time in discussing a matter which will ultimately enhance the value of the land belonging to the concessionaire, who is an absentee. I will oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. P. STONE (Greenough): I also shall oppose the second reading, but not on the same ground as the previous speaker, who objected to it on account of its being a case of private enterprise. I oppose it because I think it will be a monopoly given to a certain party for his own particular advantage. I also object to it because I think it will help to starve out the State railways to a certain extent. The owner of the property, who wishes to run a tram in order to accommodate the public, has held the land for 50 years,

but now that he has a land tax he is anxious to invent means to enhance the value of his property and enable him to pay the tax. We have heard of the concession to a private company at Kalgoorlie, and we know it has to a great extent injured the State railway which runs side by side with the tramway. It was a most ill-advised action on the part of the Legislature to grant that concession, especially seeing that no conditions were inserted that the tramline should be run at a distance from the railway, so as not to clash with the traffic of the latter. The House has not been supplied with sufficient information on this matter. The question has been sprung on the country and on members of the House without sufficient warning or information. I feel a little strongly on this question for many reasons. Another reason is that I know the persistency of the members for Claremont and Subiaco and their close connection with the Government. I am sure that as soon as this concession is granted and the tramway is built these members will, day after day, be waiting on Ministers for concessions for roads, etc. Ministers who live in Perth and have interests in the country will be favourably disposed towards concessions to these gentlemen who are anxious to get the tramway through, while the poor unfortunate people living in the country are unable to get a £5 note for works which are sadly needed. They live at too great a distance from the Ministry, who have very little consideration for people living outside of Perth or Fremantle.

The TREASURER (Hon. Frank Wilson): It is passing strange to me that hon. members opposite, who in the past have encouraged the construction of tramlines wherever these assisted the interests of their electorates, should immediately oppose, in the strongest terms, what is practically an extension of the Perth tramway system.

Mr. Scaddan: Where they have been constructed in our electorates?

The TREASURER: There have been trams on the goldfields here, there, and everywhere. At Kalgoorlie, at Boulder,

through the hon. member's electorate, from Leonora to the Sons of Gwalia; trams at Cue, and all over the goldfields. What is the use of members making these senseless interjections? I have been listening for three or four hours to members trying to point out that there is something that is not worthy of consideration in connection with this Bill. I have heard them lecture my colleague one after another. The member for Guildford (Mr. Johnson) lectured the Minister for Works for not giving information to the House, and for not proceeding in the proper way in introducing this measure. The Premier before tea turned up *Hansard*, and quoted to members that three tramway Bills were passed in one day by the member for Guildford, when he was Minister for Works. [Mr. Walker: There is no analogy.] Absolutely the same. Three tramway measures were introduced by the member for Guildford when he occupied the position of Minister for Works, all of them being extensions of the existing Perth tramway system to the suburbs—a Bill to extend the tramway system to Victoria Park, a Bill to extend the tramway system to Subiaco, and a Bill to extend the tramway system to North Perth, and from North Perth to Leederville. This tramway Bill that has been introduced by my colleague is to extend the tramway system from Rokeby Road, the present terminus of the Perth tramway system that goes to Subiaco, beyond Crawley to the river frontage. Where does the analogy come in? These Bills were introduced with shorter speeches than my colleague introduced this Bill this afternoon; they passed the second-reading stage, and were carried through Committee at the same sitting; and then because my colleague, presuming that this was a small Bill and did not need a great deal of introduction, is lectured. There is opposition to it here, there, and everywhere. It is said we are dragging down principles and giving away the rights of citizens.

Mr. Walker: Are you not misrepresenting the facts?

The TREASURER: I am speaking the absolute truth. I understand the member for Kanowna, with his intellectual capa-

city, cannot quite grasp the facts as I put them before the House.

Mr. Walker: I can quite understand that you are misrepresenting the facts.

The TREASURER: That is just where the hon. member fails. The member for Boulder says that we must not trust the municipal bodies, for municipal bodies are at all times ready to throw away the rights of the people. I hope the municipal council of Boulder will bear that in mind. I hope they will take care to let the hon. member's electors know the opinion he has of the people's representatives. I unfortunately, perhaps according to members but fortunately for reasonable people, have a different opinion of these public bodies. I believe men who are elected to the municipal councils, and who give up their time serving on roads boards, are doing equally as good work proportionately as members of Parliament are doing in this Chamber. They are doing the work of the country, and they as public bodies have the interests of the electors at heart; they are elected by the same people who elect us to this Chamber. If they come to the decision that a work of this description is in the interests of the district, I am quite prepared for one to back them up in their efforts to open up their district. It is nonsense to say we should sit back until the Government construct these little tramlines, when people are willing to come forward and do it for us.

Mr. T. L. Brown: For their own profit.

The TREASURER: The hon. member shears sheep for his own profit when at his trade.

Mr. T. L. Brown: I am injuring no one else when doing that.

The TREASURER: This Bill is not injuring anyone else. When the municipality of Subiaco have considered this Bill carefully and come to the decision that it is in the interests of the rate-payers that they enter into an agreement for the construction of the tramline, and when the members of the roads board through whose district the tramline will run have considered the matter and come to the decision that it is in the interests

of their district to have the line constructed, if they are satisfied that the terms are fair and equitable, as I presume they are, and if the Minister for Works after going into the question has granted a provisional order and thinks the terms equitable, I think we are justified in following the usual custom laid down by Parliament ever since I have been a member of it, and passing the Bill. This system has been carried out by members opposite religiously in the same way as we are doing. Those members complain of the Minister for Works throwing the Bill on the table and asking members to pass it after a two-minutes speech. If members will consult *Hansard*, they will find that the member for Guildford, then Minister for Works, did not even take two minutes, I warrant, in introducing the measures which I have mentioned.

Mr. Collier: I am not taking all his sins on my shoulders.

The TREASURER: I think you ought to.

Mr. T. L. Brown: Are you taking all the sins of your colleagues on your shoulders?

The TREASURER: I stand for the Government at the present moment. There was a great complaint made that no information was given. What information is required? Information was given that this was a concession for a tramline; that the line was a continuation from Rokeby Road to the river frontage; that it passed through University endowment land, and then went through the land belonging to the gentleman to whom the concession is to be given, and then on to the river frontage. No one supposes that the gentleman who proposes to build this tramway intends to build it solely for public purposes, and will reap nothing from the enterprise. Of course he will reap something from the enterprise; the land through which the line will be built will be cut up and sold, and thereby he will get something for his enterprise.

Mr. Scaddan: Robbing the public who want land.

The TREASURER: I do not like these interjections from the member for Ivanhoe about robbing the people. I do not

know anyone who wants to rob the public. There is no Minister who wishes to rob the public, or who wishes to have an opportunity to rob the public; at least I hope and can rest certain that there is no member on the Government side who wishes to rob the public—they want to conserve the rights of the public every time. How absurd for members to rise in righteous indignation and raise obstacles to the passage of this measure, making excuses when they have done the same thing, and to a far greater degree than we have done it. Members want a map. Was there ever a map placed on the table of the House for a line of this description? Never has there been a map; but for the want of a map or a plan members say they are justified in voting against the second reading of this Bill. I venture to think that the Minister for Works will be pleased to provide a map before the Bill goes into Committee. Members can have a map, and see for themselves where the line is proposed to be put. I think above all the main question we have to consider is whether the tramline is of public utility; whether it will serve the interests of the public, whether it will be of direct benefit to them; and I venture to think that every member in the Assembly believes in his inmost heart that it will be of advantage to the public generally. Certainly it will open up a new pleasure resort, a new health resort within easy access of the town; and it is more preferable to get into a tram, even if you have to pay the same fare, and get down to the riverside, than to get into a tram, go to the railway station, take the railway ride and then have to walk a mile to the Cottesloe beach. I am not decrying Cottesloe Beach for a moment; all these places are good, and I hope there will be many more of them opened up so that the people will benefit thereby. The next argument was principally I think, and the member for Greenough also endorsed this argument, that we are starving the railways. I believe the Boulder tramway did starve the railway system to a great extent, and the tramway from Leonora to the Sons of Gwalia is running parallel with the railway

Mr. Scaddan: One train in the morning and one at night.

The TREASURER: If there is only one train, the tramway takes the traffic between the two centres, because it is more convenient and the tramway passes in front of the men's residences. They can go to their work by it, the tramway taking them to the scene of their labours. The same thing applies to Boulder. How far are we justified in refusing the people who live in the suburbs and the cities, whether on the goldfields or the coast, some tramway facilities. We must be careful indeed before we take a stand and say that we refuse to give any support to tramway facilities. It is true the railways may suffer to an extent, and I for one object to have a tramway built which will run right alongside our railway system, and have the effect of perhaps unduly competing with the railway system, but I fail to see how a tramline joining the service at Rokeby Road, and going due south almost to the river frontage, can possibly be thought to be in direct competition with the railway system. It may take a few passengers who might otherwise go to Cottesloe Beach, but I doubt it. I believe we shall have as much passenger traffic to the beach, because some people prefer the ocean to the river.

Mr. Taylor: The member for North Perth wants the river.

The TREASURER: The member for North Perth wants access to the river in addition to access to the ocean, and he is perfectly right. I hope that sometime we shall have a tramway carried to the North Beach, so that the residents of Perth may be able to go by tram on to the North Beach. I want briefly to say, in conclusion, that all the stories one hears about private enterprise schemes are not quite correct—the profits that are made, the enormous profits and the robbery of the public thereby. If one inquires into the facts, one will find they are not always as correctly stated as members imagine. Take the Perth tramway system; it built up the city of Perth. Members will agree that for many years the tramways were run at a loss. Lately I admit, and I am glad to see it, there

has been a profit and dividends have been declared; because the best advertisement we can have for the city is that those who have had the pluck to invest money in the industries of the State, whether tramways, or lighting schemes, or mining schemes—the best advertisement we can have is the fact that they are getting some return for the capital invested in the State.

Mr. Foulkes : The city of Perth receives a dividend from the tramways.

The TREASURER : Of course it does. It receives three per cent. of the gross takings. I had a part in framing the conditions many years ago, before the company tendered ; and one or two other companies who at that time thought of constructing tramways in Perth promptly dropped the idea because they considered the terms were too stringent and the enterprise would not pay them. The present company then came along and built the tramways ; and I am glad that after the many years in which they lost money, they are now getting some return, and will perhaps be able to meet the day when they must hand over the system *gratis* to the city of Perth. I believe it was the member for Mount Margaret (*Mr. Taylor*) who argued that if a referendum of the citizens were taken to-day they would vote for municipal tramways. I dare say they would, and I should be inclined to vote with them. After the tramway company have made the system a success, and we know it to be a payable proposition, then of course we should be glad to see the tramways in the hands of the City Council. But we must remember that all the progress, all the development and all the wealth of a country are due to the individual efforts of the citizens of that country ; and it is not a bit of use decrying private enterprise, as members are so apt to do here, for each one of them in his own sphere is exhibiting that very private enterprise which he condemns others for showing to a far greater extent. So long as the thing is done honestly, so long as it is done above-board and carried out on fair and proper lines after due inquiry, then I think we ought to encourage that private enterprise which members are so fond of con-

demning. If this agreement is wrong, they should point out where it is wrong.

Mr. Taylor : We have not seen it.

The TREASURER : It is in the schedule of the Bill. Members have had the Bill before them since the 16th October, and yet they complain that they have had no information.

Mr. Taylor : The agreement is not there.

The TREASURER : No ; the agreement is entered into with the municipal bodies who are supposed to protect the interests of the ratepayers, just as members here are supposed to look after the interests of the people of the State generally. There is enough information in the schedule to show Opposition members that all due safeguards have been provided, exactly the same as in the Bills which they when in power introduced to this House two or three years ago, and passed much more rapidly than we are passing this Bill.

Mr. Stone : Is there any guarantee that the agreement will be carried out ?

The TREASURER : Yes ; a deposit is lodged, as usual, for the carrying out of the contract. I have not anything farther to say, except that members will have every opportunity in Committee of making such amendments as they desire. But I hope they will pass the second reading. We have spent four or five hours in discussing the measure, with very little effect.

Mr. J. SCADDAN (*Ivanhoe*) : I well recollect the passage of the three Tramway Bills of which we hear so much from the Ministerial bench to-night ; the Bills for the extension of the Perth tramways to Victoria Park, North Perth, and Leederville, which Bills the Treasurer is trying to make us believe were parallel cases to the Bill now under review. But I can assure the Treasurer there is no parallel whatever. Take the case of Victoria Park. The people of that suburb made a general demand for tramway communication with the city. They did not care so much whether it was a Government tram or an extension of the Perth Tramways Company's system. There was a public demand to the Gov-

ernment to authorise a tramway, and the demand was granted by the Government then in power. The North Perth case was similar. But in this case there has been no demand by the public of Subiaco.

The Treasurer : Oh, yes.

Mr. SCADDAN : I lived in Subiaco for the last two or three years, until recently ; and I ought to know that there was not any demand by the public of Subiaco for a tramline to Colonel Bruce's property.

The Treasurer : Oh, yes.

Mr. SCADDAN : I absolutely deny that.

The Treasurer : You are only one man.

Mr. SCADDAN : But I do not go about with my ears shut ; and if there was a demand for it, I should know. I will admit there was a suggestion on one or two occasions that the Subiaco Council should endeavour to provide tramway or other communication with Crawley, in order that people might have an opportunity of picnicking on the river. But let me inform the Treasurer and others that if they had a map before them they would find that the terminal point decided on by the public of Subiaco, and the other point on the river where this proposed line will terminate, are separated by about two miles ; and in my opinion the public of Subiaco have at present no conception of where this terminus is to be. In the first place, the point on the river with which the public wished for tramway communication is an undoubtedly fine picnic spot on the east or Perth side of Sir George Shenton's residence ; but the spot where this tramway will terminate is considerably on the west or Fremantle side of that residence, farther down the river, and is not a convenient picnic ground, as the other undoubtedly is. I am satisfied that even if this line is constructed, its terminal point will not be utilised by the people of Subiaco as freely as they utilise Crawley Point, where they now spend so many holidays. This is undoubtedly a demand made by Colonel Bruce himself to obtain tramway communication to some property he has on the river ; property that he cannot get off his hands

under present conditions ; property that he knows will be taxed as proposed by the Government, the proposal having been in the air for a number of years. How will he get that property off his hands ? By securing a provisional order which will permit him to run a tramway to the property, thus enhancing its value and enabling him to dispose of the land for residential purposes. As I said, this Bill is licensing the robbery of the public. I admit that according to our present code of morals he is within his rights in enhancing the value of his property to any possible extent. At the same time, members will know full well the value of that property to-day is nothing to what it will be if the tramway is constructed. And it is admitted by the Treasurer that if it will cost Colonel Bruce £10,000 to run the tram, he hopes by that expenditure to recoup himself, and to receive about £20,000.

The Treasurer : I admitted nothing of the sort.

Mr. SCADDAN : I am only assuming the figures ; and their incorrectness does not affect the validity of my argument. How does Colonel Bruce hope to obtain that enhanced value ? By absolutely fleecing the public. Where will he get the £20,000 ? Not from the Government, but from the people who will buy his land. Although that is allowable by our present code of morals, I contend it will be an absolute robbery of the public. [*Mr. Foulkes interjected.*] The hon. member is going off on a side tack. I think he has recently been yachting. I am trying to point out that there is at present no demand for tramway communication to that particular spot on the river. As a matter of fact, I doubt if there are five residents anywhere within two miles of the proposed terminus of the tramline. Yet we are asked to pass a provisional order to construct a tramline to a desert, in the hope that people will go there to reside. It cannot be necessary to run nine trams a day to a spot where no one resides, as if the spot were to be used for picnic purposes every day in the year. Yet that is what is stipulated in the provisional order—that nine trams a day shall be run.

Mr. Gordon : The Government are not paying for the trams.

Mr. SCADDAN : True. The Government, however, by passing this measure, are enhancing the value of Colonel Bruce's lands, and assisting him to fleece those who will require land in the near future.

The Minister for Works : If you sell a piece of land for more than you gave for it, do you call that "fleecing the public" ?

Mr. SCADDAN : If I had a piece of land in a desert, five or ten miles from the nearest settlement, and I asked the Government to provide tramway communication or to make roads, as they will have to make them when this provisional order is passed—

Mr. Gordon : If there is a tramway, roads will not be needed.

Mr. SCADDAN : Would the hon. member lay the rails in the air ? Does he know the provisional order requires that macadamised roads of a certain width shall be constructed ?

Mr. Foulkes : At the cost of the promoter.

Mr. SPEAKER : Order ! There are too many interjections.

Mr. SCADDAN : I rather like them.

Mr. SPEAKER : You yourself have been interjecting very frequently this afternoon.

Mr. SCADDAN : Well, you should have drawn the attention of the House to it when I was interjecting. I consider it is absolutely unfair to complain of it now.

Mr. SPEAKER : I tell the hon. member that I gave him considerable latitude. I had intended to speak to him just before he rose.

Mr. SCADDAN : I should have had no objection ; but I contend your speaking to me now is unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member must not make such a remark as that.

Mr. SCADDAN : I contend that you put me in an unfair position.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member must be respectful to the Chair.

Mr. SCADDAN : I contend that some respect should be shown to hon. members, too.

Mr. SCADDAN : To resume my argument, if I am permitted to do so, I take up the position that this Bill is an absolute attempt—I do not say on the part of the Government, because the Government are only concerned to the extent that they require parliamentary sanction before they can permit the construction of this tramway—to barter away public interests ; but in connection with other concessions we have granted, I wish to tell the Treasurer it will not be news to the public of Boulder to hear that the municipal council bartered away the public interests by granting a concession to construct tramways in the municipality. The member for Kalgoorlie (Hon. N. Keenan) knows that the people of Kalgoorlie will not be surprised to hear a similar remark about their tramways. The tramway concessions in Kalgoorlie and Boulder were granted absolutely in the face of strong public protests both from Kalgoorlie and Boulder ; yet we are told that we are parties to the construction of private tramlines in our own electorates. As to the tramways in my electorate, referred to by the Treasurer, I did not know they were being constructed ; but they are principally for the purpose of carrying cyanide sands to vacant grounds for the purpose of relieving the plants treating other ore. If the Treasurer objects to those tramways, I do not.

The Treasurer : I do not object to them.

Mr. SCADDAN : I contend they are absolutely essential for mining purposes. If those are the tramways to which the Treasurer refers, I admit I was a party to them. We need them, otherwise the mines would have to get rid of the sands in some other fashion. I contend that the demand by members for a map or plan of this proposed tramway is absolutely just. It is said we did not ask for maps in respect of the other provisional orders granted ; but I say there is no parallel. In the case of Victoria Park, everyone knew that the tram was

to be constructed from the existing terminus into the heart of Victoria Park, for public purposes. As to this line, it is to be constructed from Subiaco to some point on the river; very few know where. The provisional order undoubtedly states that the line shall proceed "along Broadway in Swan locations 86, 268, and 123, to a point near the foreshore of Melville Water in Swan location 123." If anybody knows, without looking very carefully at the map, where is the exact terminal point of that tramway, I contend he has a very fine bump of locality. I asked the member for Claremont whether he knew. He said he could tell me if he had a map, but as he had none he could not tell me. He knew that it was somewhere in his electorate, but that was all. I am going to oppose the second reading. If the Bill passes the second reading, I shall endeavour to assist members on this side of the House to have certain amendments made, because the provisional order makes no provision except that the promoter may lay this tramline. We do not surround the concession with any conditions whereby we can satisfy ourselves that those employed on the tramway will receive fair treatment. In the past, tramway servants have been probably the most sweated workers in this State and in other States; and having full knowledge of that, we would be within our rights in protecting them in the future. I know we are not able to do it with those concessions we have already granted, but we should make proper provision in this Bill that the men employed on the tramway should receive fair treatment. If it were a tramline urged by the populace of Subiaco to a point on the Perth side of Crawley there would not be so much objection to the Bill.

The Attorney General : Would you vote for it then ?

Mr. SCADDAN : Under present circumstances, no. Because if there had been any way by which the Subiaco council could have got through to Crawley I am sure—and the member for Subiaco will bear me out—the Subiaco Council would have constructed a tram many years ago. There has been a genuine demand by the people of Subiaco to have

proper transit to that point on the river; but the present Bill is not an endeavour to carry the people to a picnic point, it is an endeavour to carry a tram to a certain point to enhance the property of Colonel Bruce. This I strongly object to.

The Minister for Works rose to reply.

Mr. T. L. Brown : Will the Minister's speech close the debate ?

Mr. Speaker : Yes, unless the Minister gives way.

The Minister for Works : The hon. member was not on his feet when I rose. However I do not wish to prevent the hon. member speaking.

Mr. Speaker : The member for Geraldton may proceed.

Mr. Taylor : The Minister should give the hon. member—

Mr. Speaker : No hon. member has any cause to plead for another hon. member. Each member is able to speak for himself. The member for Geraldton may proceed, as I have already told him.

Mr. T. L. BROWN (Geraldton) : The Minister rose rather hastily, but I thank him for having given way and allowed me to address the House on this question. I oppose the concession asked for by this gentleman who is not residing in our State, but who is an absentee. It is this gentleman's desire to enhance the value of his property and to enlarge his banking account at the expense of the people who are living in the State. Without fear of contradiction I say the object of this Bill is purely for the benefit of the gentleman himself and, as has been done previously in this State, to rob the railways of legitimate traffic.

The Premier : Is there any railway near Nedlands ?

Mr. T. L. BROWN : There may be no railway near there, but if it will pay this gentleman to run a tramway there, will it not pay the Government to consider the interests of those living in the State ? We are told by one or two members—particularly by the member for Canning—that this gentleman is going to build the line and that we are not to pay for it. I would like to ask the hon. member : Who subsidises the roads boards, who will

have to simultaneously make the roads along which this tramline runs? Have not the Government to subsidise these roads boards? I think it will be found in the schedule that the local governing bodies have to construct their portion of the road simultaneously with the laying down of this line. Farther than that, the roads already constructed have been built to a great extent by money belonging to the State. It naturally follows that if these roads have been constructed by the local governing bodies they have been subsidised to a certain extent. Now we find in this schedule that each yard of gravel or metal taken from a road at present constructed will belong to the promoter of this tramway.

The Treasurer : Because he has to put it down again.

Mr. T. L. BROWN : But why should it belong to the promoter? If it has to be removed, why should not the material be used to the advantage of the roads board?

The Treasurer : So it is, on the road that the tramline follows.

Mr. T. L. BROWN : No; it is to be devoted to the use of the promoter. It is absolutely taken from the roads board, it is not the property of the roads board at all, it belongs to the promoter. Though he cannot take it from the route, he can take it from one portion of the route to another; and I defy the Treasurer to interpret the clause differently.

The Treasurer : Read the fourth line, read it out to the House.

Mr. T. L. BROWN : There is no need for me to do that. I take it to mean that the promoter can take the material from one portion of the route to another. The tramway will run in the centre of the road, and the probability is that the road constructed by the roads board is a ribbon road. Consequently, instead of the roads board being able to take the material from the centre of the road and use it for constructing their portion at the side, the promoter will be able to take it from the centre to construct his portion. The Government are continually petitioned by members, especially those opposite, though I myself do so, to subsidise roads boards and councils to make

roads; but we do not do it with the intention of assisting men who are living outside the State to increase their dividends or enhance the value of their property. We do it to assist people struggling on the land, people not living in such favoured circumstances as Colonel Bruce who lives in London; we do it to assist people who are endeavouring to put Western Australia in the van so far as the Commonwealth is concerned. But here the Government ask members to assist a gentleman who is living outside the State and whose only interest in the State is that his dividends may be increased or that the unearned increment may be increased by that assistance. It is a move in the wrong direction altogether, and I regret that the Minister for Works should allow himself to be led in the direction of assisting a gentleman whose only endeavour is to advance his own interests. It is provided that fares and tolls may be fixed by this honourable gentleman, the promoter. He can fix the fares at a certain rate. Once he has the concession going, what control have the Government over this honourable gentleman?

Mr. Horan : What evidence have you that he is honourable?

Mr. T. L. BROWN : I treat every man as honourable until I find him otherwise. He has a title and I take it that he is honourable. If he is not he should be.

The Attorney General : What is his title?

Mr. T. L. BROWN : It is "Edward Bruce of Folkestone, in the County of Kent, England, C.B., Colonel in His Majesty's Indian Army."

The Minister for Mines : Do not waste time.

Mr. Taylor : You ought to give a man with a title like that a chance.

Mr. T. L. BROWN : I shall endeavour to stop that gentleman's chance and try to urge that the people living in the State should have the chance by referendum or plebiscite to say if he should have the concession asked for or not. In regard to the tolls, as I said when the Attorney General tried to side-track me there is nothing in the Bill or schedule to prevent this gentleman fixing what fares he likes

if the dividends are not big enough after the rates are first fixed.

Mr. Ewing: Why, the people will not use the trams if they are overcharged.

Mr. T. L. BROWN: But there would be no other means of getting there if they did not use the trams. If the land is sold and the people settle there, being two miles from the railway they must use the trams. I much regret the Treasurer allowed himself to reply to me as he did to-night. Because I am opposed to a concession that will benefit a gentleman living in England whose only interest in Western Australia is how much profit he can obtain from it in one year—[*The Treasurer:* Why not?—or how far he can enhance the value of his property, I am accused because I saw fit to take off my coat and shear certain sheep in the interest of a certain machine. [*The Treasurer:* For a profit, yes.] What money I earn in the State will be spent in the State. What I am trying to do is to advance the interests of the State. It is an Australian invention and an Australian industry with which I am concerned, and I do not see where the Treasurer's accusation comes in.

The Treasurer: What did I accuse you of?

Mr. T. L. BROWN: Of shearing sheep and advertising a certain machine. To-day I was shearing sheep, and I am going to spend the money I make from it in the State. The gentleman who desires this concession will shear the people of Western Australia, and will spend the money he makes from it in England. If the Treasurer cannot see that, I cannot help it.

The TREASURER (in explanation): I never charged the member with anything dishonourable. He interjected that the promoter desired to construct the trams so that he might make a profit out of them. I agreed with him in that, and asked what harm there was in it. I said the hon. member was carrying out an avocation for profit, and was selling sheep-shearing machines for profit. I presume he does not do that work for honour and glory, and I cast no reflec-

tion on his honourable profession. In fact, I hope he gets good profit out of it.

Mr. T. L. BROWN: I am glad to have the good wishes of the Treasurer. I did not accuse him of inferring that anything I did was dishonourable. Possibly he is interested in the company whose interests I am trying to advance. If my words conveyed the meaning that I thought the Treasurer accused me of dishonourable conduct, I am sorry, and I hope he will accept my explanation in the spirit in which it is intended. There is no comparison between the two cases. What I said was that any industry or any concession whatever, which will operate in the direction of having money spent in the State so that the people living in the State will derive a benefit from it, should be supported, for it will help to advance Western Australia. If this were the case in connection with the concession now being asked for, I would be prepared to throw in my support; but in the case in question the gentleman is living outside the State; the whole of the profits to be derived from the concession, the whole of the enhanced unearned increment to be obtained, will go from our shores to be spent in England, where the promoter is probably living in luxury. Those who are living in the district through which the line will run and who are paying rates and taxes to the roads boards can ill afford thus to enhance the value of the promoter's property. If the line were to enhance the value of property held by persons who are paying taxes, then we might be able perhaps to grant the concession; but the circumstances are very different from that. It is an absentee who will derive the whole of the benefit. The Treasurer continually refers to what was done while the Labour Party were in power. Surely it must be apparent to him that this string is almost worn out. Why does he keep harping on the one string, "You have done it, your party have done it, so why should not someone else?"

The Treasurer: Because you presume to lecture us for doing what you have done yourselves.

Mr. T. L. BROWN: Surely the Minister must be liberal-minded enough to allow that if people once make a mistake—I do not say they have in this instance—they should not be bound to go on making the mistake. Circumstances alter cases. It is quite possible that in the first instance a concession was asked for and granted in all good faith, but that subsequently those who received the concession had, perhaps owing to the fact that they were prevented by those in power, exceeded greatly the privileges granted to them originally. Then it is not reasonable to suppose, seeing the state of things that had arisen those who originally granted the concession would say, when another application for a similar one was received, “No; we will have no more of these concessions?”

The Treasurer: In what way have they gone beyond their concessions?

Mr. T. L. BROWN: The member for Ivanhoe (Mr. Scaddan) gave an instance in the case of the Kalgoorlie trams, where instead of charging the ordinary rate on race days they charge double rates. If one concession is abused, and if one company or individual sees fit to abuse a concession, is it not right that those who granted the concession and had found out that the concessionaire had broken the agreement and misinterpreted the regulations, should oppose the granting of any farther concessions to anyone until they had the agreement laid before them so that they could see exactly the position of things as they stood? In the present case the measure has been brought down and laid on the table with very little information attached to it. With regard to these agreements, you can construe them as you like, but you will be told subsequently that your construction is incorrect; and it appears that the only person who really knows what the agreement means is the man to whom the concession is granted. If the Treasurer will read the schedule he will find that wherever it refers to the promoter the word “may” applies, but wherever it refers to the roads boards or municipalities “shall” is used. The roads boards

and municipalities are tied down, but the promoter is not, for in his case everything seems optional. That alone is sufficient to condemn the whole scheme. If one party has to comply with the terms of a schedule, the other party should be placed in a similar position. As to the member for Canning, who interjected, if he were to read the schedule I am sure he would be the last man to interject in the manner he did, for he would find that instead of Mr. Bruce paying for the construction of roads it is the people who are living in the roads board district through which the line will pass who will have to meet this expenditure. When this work has to be done, the roads board are sure to come on the Government for assistance, and just as assuredly will be told by the Treasurer that the finances of the State are in such a condition that no money can be granted to them. Subsidies to roads boards are to be cut down; special grants are no longer to be made, and the applicants for assistance will be told that on account of the financial position the land must be taxed. Taxation proposals are placed on the statute-book, and these taxes the people will have to pay. Yet we are prepared to-night to grant a concession whereby our liabilities are going to be increased without any hope whatever of the finances being benefited in any way. I regret that members should see fit to ask the House to grant this concession or assist in any way this gentleman in his desire to benefit himself by enhancing the value of his property. In dealing with this case, the Government should take warning from the similar case of the Midland Railway. With regard to that line passengers, and particularly second-class passengers, have to pay to-day a far higher rate for travelling in inferior carriages over an inferior line and at an inferior pace than passengers over the Government lines. The Government should seriously consider this, and the member introducing this measure should take into consideration not only this particular concession, but the principle generally as it applies to the whole State.

Perhaps what I have said may not be palatable to some, but I do not care. Farther than this I do not wish to offend; but in speaking as I do, it is my duty, on behalf of the people living in this State. This is my adopted home and one that I rather like, and my desire is to see Western Australia advance. If the interests of Western Australia advance, so do my own interests, and I wish to safeguard as far as I possibly can those who to-day are working in the interests of this State and are demonstrating to the outside world that Western Australia is a land which eventually will become one of the leading, if not the leading, State in the Commonwealth. We must safeguard her interests, and I claim the support of members to this end. This they should do rather than consider a gentleman who is residing in London and who wishes to live in luxury at the expense of Western Australia. He wishes to enhance the value of his property so that he might live in greater luxury than ever. Let hon. members consider their own interests, and the interests of their children and the residents of Western Australia. I trust that my few remarks will be of some value, and that before voting members will consider the position as it really exists. Consider the terms which are operating throughout Western Australia, also the system that obtains on the Midland railway line, and if we compare the charges made on the Government lines with those on the Midland railway, I know the proportion which one will bear to the other. If members can conscientiously vote for the concession let them do so, but I feel sure that if members consider the proposal for one moment, they will vote in opposition to the granting of the concession.

Mr. J. EWING (Collie) : I simply rise to show that the member for Geraldton is probably in error when he says the Midland Company are charging more than the Government in the way of freights and fares. I believe the agreement with the Midland Company provides that the fares and freights shall be the same as on the Government lines.

Hon. F. H. Piessé : The agreement states that they shall be no more ; they can be as much less as they like.

Mr. EWING : How can the member for Geraldton be correct ? He cannot, for if the Midland Company charged more they would be violating their agreement. In connection with this Bill, my reasons for supporting it are that I am satisfied that the interests of the State have been conserved by the Minister when signing the provisional order which we are asked to confirm. Several speakers have stated that there is no provision as to fares. I have read one paragraph of the agreement in this Bill, and I find that such is not the case. Provision is made that the promoters shall charge not more than 3d., and there is a provision for workmen's tickets ; and provisions are made safeguarding the State. We have often heard about the lack of employment in Perth and the suburbs. Should we not encourage anyone who is desirous of spending money in Western Australia at the present time ? I do not want to discuss this gentleman who is getting the provisional order, I have not heard his name before ; but we should not attack him when he is desirous of spending money in Western Australia, and has sufficient confidence in it. I have only to call attention to the condition of Perth before we had the tramway system, and the position to-day, which has been brought about by the splendid tramway system. Members have argued that the city of Perth should have constructed these tramways themselves, but the city had not the enterprise and the courage. Therefore, why cavil at those who had the courage and are getting a just reward : If the municipality of Subiaco were able to carry out this work, we should be glad to assist them to do so, and if they were prepared to do so, this Bill would not be before the House. Our duty is to conserve the interests of the State and see that as much money as possible is brought into the State for investment. I rejoice to find that there are some people, although they live in England, who are prepared to spend money in Western Australia.

Mr. P. STONE (in explanation) : The member for Geraldton is correct when he states that the charges on the Midland line are greater than on the Government line. The second class fare to Geraldton is 5s. more than the charge for the same distance would be on the Government line.

Mr. T. L. BROWN (in explanation) : As to the fares to be charged over this proposed tramline, in paragraph 8 I find the rate mentioned by the member for Collie as 3d., excepting on special cars. I would like to know whether the company are to define how many special cars they will run a day, or whether all will be special cars. In another clause I find that for three years certain cars shall run, and as many special cars can run as possible. My argument, therefore, is correct, that the company will run as many special cars as they like and at special rates.

Mr. H. BROWN (Perth) : I would like to know if this is a public or a private Bill. I am only asking for information, for in regard to Government Bills there should be plans and specifications laid on the table.

The SPEAKER : The Minister is in order in introducing the Bill. Under the Tramways Act, there is power to do so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (in reply as mover) : I am not at all surprised, after hearing the hon. member for Geraldton, that some complaint has been made as to the terseness and brevity of my speech in moving the second reading of this Bill. To give the same information to the House one might have put it down for a solid hour, but I thought it better—

Mr. T. L. Brown : I did not, during the whole of my remarks, refer to the brevity of the speech of the hon. member. I was not in the House when he made his speech, and I refrained from referring to it. The Minister is incorrect in saying I referred to it.

The SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : I purposely made my speech as brief and short as I possibly could. There is audacity which, if it occurred outside the House, one would characterise as impudence. When one looks at the speeches delivered by the member for Guildford in 1904, in moving the second reading of three Tramway Bills, one will find the total matter in *Hansard* for the whole of these three speeches does not amount to three and a half columns, and the three speeches were probably delivered inside ten minutes. Now the hon. member stands up and accuses me with what practically amounts to disrespect to the House in adopting the course which he followed three years ago. I venture to think that is audacity pure and simple. He also charges me with not putting plans on the table in connection with this Bill ; yet he knows perfectly well that for none of the Bills introduced in 1904 did he put a plan on the table. Not only that, but he moved the second reading of the Bills and took them through Committee at the same sitting.

Mr. Johnson : Perhaps I have seen the error of my ways, and I want to put you right.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Practically, the hon. member can go into the stable and take the horse, but I must not look over the fence. He can do things when on this bench, but when somebody else comes here he is the loudest to declaim.

Mr. Taylor : When one knows ones faults, he can easily excuse himself.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : This Bill has been on the table for nearly a fortnight ; the provisional order has been advertised in the *Government Gazette* for objections, during something like four weeks. Members had every opportunity of seeing exactly what the Bill is like ; and although no plan is here, the route has being perfectly set out. Members, I presume, are paid by the country to avail themselves of what is in the Bills before them, and if any member desired to know exactly where this tram will run, he could have found

out the whole of the route inside ten minutes.

Mr. Johnson : You must not suppose we are going to run after you for information.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : I do not want the hon. member to do so. The streets are named in the Bill, and if the member got a locality plan he could have seen exactly where the tramway is to go. What does the whole matter come to ? To listen to members, one would imagine the Government were out on some boodling operation, proposing by concession and grant to enable Colonel Bruce to make considerable money out of this property. Other members say, why does not the Government build the line, if it is good enough for Colonel Bruce. The fact of the matter is that without the land the building of the tramway is of precious little good. There is not the slightest doubt Colonel Bruce intends to enhance the value of his property in this locality. He approached the local authorities, and they struck a deal with him. They said, "You are going to build the proposed line at your own expense to improve your property ; we must see that you give us a *quid pro quo*." What have the council secured ? They have secured at the present moment an approach, which does not exist now, to a valuable piece of foreshore ; they have secured certain foreshore rights, and from the promoter an agreement whereby he is to build a jetty and baths in this particular locality. At this moment this locality is absolutely closed against the public. All the foreshore rights are owned by Colonel Bruce. He has now agreed with the local authorities to surrender certain rights so far as the foreshore is concerned. One matter which weighed with me was the following letter from Mr. Randell, the secretary of the University Endowment Board. It reads :—

"I am directed to inform you that the trustees are prepared to give their hearty support to the proposed extension of the tramway, and that no objection will be raised to its passing through the University endowment area, provided that it is constructed in

a direct line from the corner of Aberdeen road, Ferdinand and Thomas streets to Hampton road, on the southern boundary."

They hold a considerable area of land in that locality, which will be greatly enhanced in value and greatly assisted by this tramway. A similar assent has been given by the other two local bodies interested. May I for a moment show the reason that there is no advantage in so far as this House is concerned, by this Bill being made a public Bill. For some considerable time the provisional order has been greatly scrutinised and everything looked after, not only by the land resumption officer, but by the Crown Law Department, and no one can take the slightest objection to the Bill. As an example of the arguments used by the other side, I would draw attention to one statement made by the member for Geraldton. The hon. member says that on going through the Bill, everywhere where the promoter is referred to, it says the promoter "may," but the council "shall." I have looked through the Bill casually now to see if this is correct ; and to show how this is a sample of the absolutely reckless statements made by the other side, Clause 1 says "the promoter shall." Then we come to Clause 2, "the promoter shall."

Mr. Taylor : What follows ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No matter what it is, I wish to draw attention to the words "the promoter shall." Then we come to Clause 6, "the promoter is hereby liable." In Clause 8, "the promoter is hereby liable"; also "the promoter may demand tolls;" it would be senseless to say he "shall demand tolls." It goes on in the next clause to say, "the promoter shall carry school children" at so much. Clause 12 says, "the promoter may erect and maintain."

Mr. T. L. Brown : Will the member read the first paragraph where he said, "the promoter shall"? The clause reads that the promoter shall be empowered to make and let certain lines.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of explanation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If we go to Clause 14, it says again "the

promoter shall"; also "the tramway shall be constructed." We go on to Clause 16, "all work shall be submitted"; again referring to the promoter. We go on to Clause 18 and find that he "may." Is it correct to say that "everywhere" the promoter is referred to in this Bill it is provided that he "may"—never that he "shall"? I say that is absolutely a fair sample of the arguments used on the other side against this Bill—why I do not know; whether it be that the time of this House may on a small Bill like this be inordinately used up; but for some reason or other there has been a debate on this Bill that the importance of the measure in no way warranted.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	13

Majority for .. 10

AYES.

Mr. Barnett
Mr. H. Brown
Mr. Cowcher
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Davies
Mr. Draper
Mr. Eddy
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Male
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Monger
Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Price
Mr. Smith
Mr. A. J. Wilson
Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Layman (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Bolton
Mr. T. L. Brown
Mr. Collier
Mr. Holman
Mr. Horan
Mr. Hudson
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Stone
Mr. Stuart
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ware
Mr. Heitmann (Teller).

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—NORTH FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Price) in moving the second reading said: I do not know whether on this occasion I shall be expected to speak for an hour; but at all events I have not any intention of doing so. It will be well within the recollection of members that when the question of tramway communication for Fremantle

was mooted, the various municipal councils met together with a view to propounding a scheme which should be general throughout the district. However, at that time, for some reason or other, when matters were nearing completion, the North Fremantle council decided to stand out; and since the inception of the scheme at Fremantle they have been outside the radius of tramway communication. About twelve months ago negotiations were entered into by the Tramway Board and the North Fremantle council. The result of these negotiations has been the formulating of certain agreements between the various local authorities, whereby it has been determined to extend the tramway through North Fremantle. [Mr. Taylor: For what distance?] I suppose the whole distance will be about one and a-quarter miles for the present. For the benefit of those members who may know the locality I may state that the branch for North Fremantle will leave the East Fremantle route about the Richmond Hotel, near the old bridge, which is to be cut down. Members will recollect that provision was made for this work on last year's Estimates. The line will traverse the old bridge, go through Victoria Avenue, the main street of North Fremantle, and so on right up to the end of that thoroughfare. The extension will undoubtedly be of considerable benefit to the whole district. The want of tramway communication has been severely felt in North Fremantle. For a considerable time antiquated 'buses served the North Fremantle people, and served them unsatisfactorily; and the district has undoubtedly suffered by not having tramway communication with the rest of the town. I had the whole of this Bill submitted to the Crown Law Department, and I am informed by the Solicitor General that no clauses in the Bill clash with the Fremantle Act—that is, the Tramways Act—except as modified by the Fremantle Council and Fremantle Tramway Board. There is absolutely no new matter, as it were, introduced in this measure. The borrowing powers of the North Fremantle council

have been incorporated in the Bill, and are in excess of the borrowing powers which the council have under the Municipalities Act, the powers granted in the Bill being for a special object. The same was done for the Fremantle and East Fremantle councils in connection with the Fremantle tramways. I may say that arrangements for the running of the line have been entered into between the board and the council, and certain arrangements made as to the respective shares of the profits, if any. The agreement, as a matter of fact, is fixed up for seven years. In this Bill at all events members cannot see the slightest sign of private gain, and I know they are very sensitive on that point. The locality is shouldering the whole of the expenditure. It is not a wealthy neighbourhood; the whole of the residents of North Fremantle are working people; and the tramway extension is an improvement they all desire. Without more ado I leave this Bill in the hands of members, and I trust that they will pass the second reading.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford): I do not desire to object to the Bill with the notion of delaying it, nor had I any such desire this afternoon when speaking on the preceding Tramway Bill. But I should like to point out that the proposed tramway will come distinctly in competition with the Government railway. And again, the Minister for Works has neglected to deal with the most salient feature in the Bill. The measure will place in the hands of the municipality the right to compete against an existing Government concern; for to-day North Fremantle is served by the Government railway.

Mr. Bolton: Nonsense! You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. JOHNSON: The fact remains, if people wish to go to North Fremantle, they go by rail. And now the North Fremantle people, the Minister for Works would like us to believe, are anxious to construct a tramway to come into competition with the Government line. I remember that on previous occasions when

Tramway Bills were discussed, the House distinctly laid down that it would not on any consideration grant provisional orders for the construction of tramways which would compete with Government railways. The proposed tramway will compete with the Government line, and I desire to emphasise the point. Again, there is the other consideration—that the Bill seeks to exempt the North Fremantle municipality from certain provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act. I have not had time to ascertain the exact effect of those exemptions; but the municipality will be given power by the Bill to place a burden upon the ratepayers of North Fremantle; and evidently, by virtue of the exemptions in the Bill, the ratepayers will not have an opportunity to protest. It is apparent that a referendum before raising a loan to construct this tramway will not be necessary under the Bill. I see the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) is taking notes, and of course he will explain whether that is so. We look farther into the Bill, and we notice that the municipality have a right to levy rates in order to pay interest and sinking fund on the loan raised—another burden upon the ratepayers of North Fremantle. And all this is done to provide a tramway system to run in opposition to the existing Government railway. These are the matters we want explained; and it is useless for the Minister for Works to complain of the “audacity” of members who rise to oppose any Bill he brings in. My remarks made on the preceding measure this afternoon were not so much in opposition to the Bill as to the manner in which it was introduced; to the fact that it was granting a private concession, and that the Minister wished to rush it through the House. My protest was rather against the haste shown by the Minister to get the Bill through. One of the last things a Minister should do when introducing a Bill to grant a concession is to try to rush that Bill through the Assembly. He should give as fully as he possibly can the facts of the proposal; and it is worthy of note that this afternoon he neglected to point out that there was a special agreement between the local bodies and the concession-

aire, an agreement the details of which we do not know up to date. He should have placed them all before us, and given us an opportunity of considering them, before the motion for the second reading was passed. I think this is another occasion when he ought to adjourn the second reading in order that members may study the Bill, and ascertain thoroughly the effect it will have on the Government railway system.

The Minister for Works: Read your own speeches in 1904 about adjourning second-reading debates.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am making a speech now, and am concerned about it. If you were to read up some of my speeches, you would make a much better job of your own.

The Minister for Works: Consistency is not your strong point.

Mr. Taylor: Is this all the opposition to the measure?

Mr. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): I do not object to opposition. I invite any opposition that is genuine. It seems to me rather a pity that the member for Guildford (Mr. Johnson) should use the debate on this measure to introduce some objection that he had to a previous measure. I agree there was not much in the hon. member's opposition to this measure except a feeling of compassion for the ratepayers of North Fremantle. The hon. member's first contention was that the tramway would be in competition with the railway system. The hon. member does not often visit the rising suburb of North Fremantle or he would know that the tramway does not compete with the railway any more than the present line to East Fremantle does, because it is only a tramline to junction with the tram that runs to East Fremantle, and the other point extending towards Perth is at least one and three-quarter miles from the North Fremantle railway station and is between the North Fremantle and Cottesloe Beach railway stations, and cannot in any way compete with the railway system. If it ran as another tramway runs in a district which the hon. member at one time nearly represented, there would be something in

the hon. member's arguments. This tramline does not run from one railway station to another alongside the railway line. It will not compete with the railway, and it runs to a point where a railway station has been refused. The hon. member said that the people of North Fremantle were to be taxed and that it was evident a referendum would not be allowed. The hon. gentleman has occupied the position of Minister for Works in this State and knows that before this Bill was brought down it was necessary that the matter should be gazetted and advertised in the local papers calling for objections if necessary from the ratepayers, and that a referendum if necessary could be demanded. That has been done in this case. The thirty days' notice has been given and no referendum has been demanded though it might have been demanded, though it might have been shown that the people of North Fremantle are prepared to support this scheme without a referendum. The hon. member again had a compassionate feeling towards the ratepayers of North Fremantle when he mentioned that they must provide interest and sinking fund. Of course they must provide interest and sinking fund; but have the people of East Fremantle regretted that they had to provide interest and sinking fund on their big Tramway Bill; did they regret it when they were handed a big surplus last year; or will the people of North Fremantle object in those circumstances? This scheme will be good for the people of North Fremantle; and if the people of North Fremantle are satisfied, if there is nothing contravening the Tramways Act, the hon. member should support the measure. I wish to explain why the second reading should be carried and the Bill put through as soon as possible. It is not that I desire to see the Bill rushed through. If any member does not understand the Bill I would not oppose an adjournment of the debate, but there is nothing in the Bill to call for an adjournment. On the other hand, there is a special reason why the Bill should go through as soon as possible. The debentures allowed under this Bill have already been printed. They were done under the

provisional order granted by the Minister for Works, and they are dated 1907. If this Bill does not go through this session all these debentures will be useless. The last prorogation put them all behind, and after the local authorities have had their printing under way and have practically started to cut down the bridge which is part of the scheme, if the Bill does not go through the debentures will have to be reprinted, because they will be illegal according to the Act. So if there is no valid reason for an adjournment I appeal to hon. members to allow the Bill to go through. If any information is required I am sure the Minister will be glad to afford it or to grant an adjournment, but as there is no reason for delay the debate should not be adjourned. I do not see any reason for objection to this Bill because it follows another measure to which the hon. member could not agree. There are certain clauses in the Bill exempting the municipal or tramway scheme from the Municipal Corporations Act of 1906. These were referred to by the member for Guildford; but the hon. member need have no fear; the ratepayers are sufficiently guarded under this Bill, and there are people who will look after the ratepayers' interests in regard to this matter. It is the almost unanimous wish of the ratepayers to have this tramway started. They simply desire to have the provisional order already granted ratified; and as this Bill will do that, I can see no reason for delay. It is also provided that if the special rate that may be struck to provide interest and sinking fund under this Bill exceeds the amount required for the year the surplus must be placed to the credit for the next year and a lesser rate struck. Of course this cuts both ways. If sufficient funds are raised by the special rate the deficiency is met from the general fund of the municipality and must in all cases be made up again the following year from the special rate. I think it will be admitted that the ratepayers are well guarded; and they are satisfied with the provisions that are made. The people of North Fremantle desire this. Not only has the loan been raised but the money is in hand, the debentures are signed and

the work has been gone on with at one end, while orders have been placed in England for the material. Therefore, unless there is any serious objection to the Bill, I hope it passes the second reading to-night. I do not know why it should not go through Committee and be taken through the necessary stages and sent to another place. If there is any objection I am satisfied that full explanation will come from the proper quarters.

Mr. H. BROWN (Perth): Before members vote for this measure, they should study the Estimates. We have heard arguments to-night that we will have the promoter or roads board asking for all kinds of subsidies to maintain roads around the locality; but here we have heard the member for North Fremantle saying how well the tramways are paying at Fremantle, and telling of the big surplus handed over to the council. It is the old contention of sops to the constituents, and unless I have the assurance from the Minister for Works that the sum of £1,500 placed on the Estimates for the regrading of the bridge across the river will be struck out, it is my intention to oppose this Bill. [*The Minister for Works*: That money was granted two years ago.] For a private individual we would not lower the bridge; we would not do that for the Perth Tramways Company or for Colonel Bruce who has had so much abuse to-night; but here hon. members are bragging of the enormous profits the Fremantle corporation make out of their tramway system while they are being spoonfed by the Government to the extent of £1,500.

Mr. Bolton: Who is being spoonfed?

Mr. H. BROWN: The municipalities concerned. Here it is on the Estimates to bolster up this tramway which is making such a big surplus. The hon. member says that the work of cutting down the bridge has already been commenced. It is not the Tramway Board cutting down the bridge, it is the Government who are doing it.

Mr. Bolton: You are wrong.

Mr. H. BROWN: Then how can the Minister explain the £1,500 on the Estimates?

Mr. Bolton: The cost of cutting down the bridge is £3,000.

Mr. H. BROWN: It is the old game of sops to the constituents.

The Minister for Works: Are we discussing an item which was discussed on the Estimates last year?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is referring to the cost of this work.

Mr. H. BROWN: I am referring to the Estimates of 1907-8 and I am using them as an argument. Hon. members have told us of the high profits the concern is making in Fremantle, and now we are asked for some concession; we are asked to assist this splendidly paying scheme by granting £1,500 while country districts are being starved for want of roads. My only object was to draw the attention of the House to this action of this "Fremantle" Government.

Mr. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): It may come as a surprise to the Minister in charge of this Bill that I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading. I do so because this is a Bill to enable the people of North Fremantle to reach their metropolitan area, that is Fremantle proper, by a tram without having to walk a distance of a mile, or a mile and a-half in some cases, to the station. While I recognise there is some force in the argument of the member for Guildford that this tranline will compete with the railway system, at the same time, even if that be so, the system is conducted and controlled by the municipal authorities; and if the dividends of which we have heard so much to-night continue in the future as they have done in the past, the councils may be able, I hope, to reduce the rates and taxes in the municipal area and make up for it by their tram service. I do not know if there is a desire on the part of the Minister to put this Bill through Committee to-night, but from the reasons advanced by the member for North Fremantle there appears a necessity for the measure to become law as soon as possible owing to certain financial arrangements and obligations having been entered into already by the council. However, unless it is absolutely necessary to go into Com-

mittee to-night, it may be as well for the Minister to adjourn the Committee stage until the next sitting of the House. I have much pleasure in supporting the measure.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (in reply): It has been suggested that this tram will compete to a large extent with the railway. The idea is altogether erroneous, because for some years a regular service has been maintained over the route by cabs. This is a most unsatisfactory mode of conveyance, and I think on the whole all who reside in Fremantle and North Fremantle will welcome the alteration. May I refer to the statement of the member for Perth who, as usual, has turned tail and cleared out of the House immediately he has made some extraordinary observation of a kind that only comes from his lips. This bridge, as everyone knows, is one of the means of communication between the north and south sides of the river, and it is the business of the Government to maintain that communication. Take the case of the Causeway between Victoria Park and Perth; the cost of upkeep and asphaltting was borne by the Government, but we have not heard the member for Perth declaiming against that. In view of the fact that the bridge under discussion which was built some years ago was utterly unsuitable and was incapable of carrying the traffic across it, the Government carefully considered the question of cutting down this high level bridge. The North Fremantle Municipality contributed largely towards the cost of the work, and when we find a small community like that providing between £1,500 and £1,800 for a work which was expected to cost £3,300—although I think now that it will not cost over £3,000—so as to maintain decent communication between the north and south side of the river, and a good thoroughfare, it must be admitted that they have done well and are entitled to the help the Government gave them. It is absolutely out of place for the hon. member to draw attention to the question now, for the simple reason that he had his opportunity to object when the Estimates were before the House last year.

As we only commenced to spend the money voted just before the end of last financial year, the vote will again appear on the Estimates in a few days' time as a re-vote. I hope the House will pass this Bill. In view of the fact that the member for East Fremantle is away, and as I promised him not to put the Bill through the Committee stage in his absence, I do not propose to have the Bill taken into Committee to-night.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT.

Machinery measure—Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd October.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In regard to this measure, I have no intention to follow the example set by the Treasurer of dealing now with the financial position of the State. I have already stated on several occasions that at the present time there is undoubtedly a necessity either for a great deal of economy in the control of our finances, and in administration, or else there is a necessity for increased taxation. The Government, and practically all members of Parliament, have recognised this necessity and on several occasions we have had taxation measures introduced by the Treasurer to make up the deficiency. I purpose to deal at some length with the various measures which have been introduced by the Treasurer and to point out this fact, that the people of the State have to a large extent been—if I may use the term—misled, by the repeated introductions of such measures and by the defection of the Government from their financial proposals which they said were badly needed in order to adjust the finances. There is one thing plain, and although the Treasurer assures country audiences whenever he gets an opportunity at shows and other functions that the State is in a sound financial position, we must recognise that with a deficit which already amounts to over £200,000 and which is likely to be increased during the current financial year, we are not in a

position to permit that deficit to, like Tennyson's brook, "go on for ever." In this connection there is a prevailing opinion throughout the length and breadth of the State, after the way in which the Government have withdrawn their financial proposals, that they were never really in earnest in introducing the measure for the taxation of the unimproved value of land. [*The Treasurer: No.*] I am only telling you what is the opinion of people outside. That opinion was formed when at the close of last session of Parliament this Legislature and the people generally were led to believe that the motive underlying that prorogation was to enable the Legislative Council, not the Legislative Assembly, to reconsider their taxation proposals. That view was borne out by the attitude of Ministers themselves. I am not going to repeat or quote at length the statements used by Ministers in opposing the present member for West Perth, but members have only to look up the speech of the member for Kanowna and to traverse the files of the papers for the month of September, to find that those Ministers who took part in the campaign, who supported the Government candidate against the present member for West Perth, repeatedly declared that they were strongly opposed to any suggestion of an income tax and that they were supporting a land tax measure which they thought was an equitable one. The member for West Perth assured the electors in the course of his speeches that that was really the only question at issue between him and the Government, and the position was just as clearly defined by the Government candidate. Now we have the Treasurer amending his proposal, reducing the proposed land tax, and tacking on to it a proposal for an income tax. In introducing the Bill last week the Treasurer said that the equity of the Bill must go without saying; it was undoubted. He certainly did try to preserve some show of consistency in his utterances by saying he thought the proposal for a land tax was equitable, but he introduced this combined measure as the very embodiment of equity. The question I want to ask of him and his colleagues is this: that if they consider

this measure the embodiment of equity, why in two separate years did they introduce a Bill for a land tax alone? If this measure is equitable, then according to them they must have been doing wrong, and taking a wrong course altogether, in introducing their proposal for a land tax by itself. Or is the explanation of this sudden conversion to the equity underlying a tax on incomes, to be found in the dictation of the Legislative Council? I think members will agree that the latter explanation is the one that commends itself not only to members of the House but to people outside. Especially is it one that commends itself to our reason, because no other explanation would account for the absolute change of front, the reversal of form, on the part of a number of Ministers occupying the Treasury bench. In respect to this measure the Treasurer says it is equitable because the incidence of the tax affects the whole of the population. There might be some justification for that argument if he were introducing a measure of taxation for the first time, if there were no other forms of taxation in existence; but I contend there is no possible justification for that opinion if members and the Treasurer will study the incidence of taxation as it at present falls on the people of the State. We must bear in mind that even if the amount the Treasurer anticipates will be received from the taxation is exceeded by a considerable amount it will only bear a small proportion to the total sum at present raised from the people of the State apart from the payment which they make for services rendered, such as our railways, water supplies, public batteries and other public undertakings. We have to bear in mind that we still raise between £700,000 and £800,000 in revenue returned from the Commonwealth, after Federal expenses are deducted. We have to bear in mind that we raise a very considerable sum from the operation of stamp duties, probate duties, the totalisator tax and other taxation measures which are in force at the present time; and before we can argue that the income tax bears equitably, because it will affect a greater number of

the population than perhaps a land tax will do, we have to examine carefully the incidence of the taxes we already have in existence. There is not the slightest doubt we have indirect taxation because people in paying taxes over the counter in the purchase of the necessities of life, or the luxuries, do not recognise the amount they contribute to the revenue of the State, a fact which is made plain to them when they are called upon to pay direct taxation. But the fact remains, and it must be apparent to any member if he studies it, that by our haphazard method of raising revenue the incidence bears most unjustly on the great working population of the State; and it is because of that fact that I, as a member of this House when the Land Tax Bill was first introduced, and when the financial necessities of the State made it necessary that new sources of taxation should be found, welcomed it because it gave to those in power an opportunity of readjusting taxation so that it would bear more equitably, and bear more on the population in proportion to their ability to pay. The Treasurer has said that this will affect a very large proportion of the population, and it was astonishing that that gentleman could have given these statistics and furnished members with the facts he did, with the assurance he did. Anyone examining the tables giving the amounts to be raised by the dual taxes on land and incomes must realise the burden will fall on those who at the present time bear more than their fair share of the taxation of the State. It is not necessary to go far to demonstrate that fact. For instance, we have only got to take the incidence of our customs revenue. Certainly that revenue is raised by another Government, by the Federal authority, but the fact remains that we get back a considerable proportion towards the revenue of the State. Therefore to all intents and purposes it is taxation on the people of this State, and its incidence is heavy because every member must recognise that the working population are the people with the big families. It is not against the working population of Australia, or in fact of any part of the world, that the clergymen and

men like President Roosevelt have uttered their diatribes against what they term race suicide. If there is any race suicide in the diminution of the birth-rate it is not amongst the working population, but amongst those who are better able to afford big families, but who do not vie with the working population in assisting to increase the population. And the result is that with these large families which the working classes have they have to pay through the nose for them by the increased share which they have to bear of the taxation through the customs. I want to deal particularly with the goldfields population. They have to bear a much larger share because of the fact that they are more dependent on supplies drawn from outside; they are more dependent for subsistence on articles that are dutiable, with the result that they contribute more to the revenue of the State. Taking the basis of taxation in Western Australia, apart from the payment for services—because I want to distinguish between the two—the taxation amounts to about £5 per head of the population. Take the larger share that a goldfields resident has to pay. A man, his wife and three children will have to contribute at least £25 in taxation to this State. And when we bear in mind that the agriculturist produces for himself a lot of articles and has no need for articles which the goldfields resident has to purchase, it probably means that the goldfields miner or worker with a wife and family of three children contributes some £40 to the taxation of this State. Yet the Treasurer tells us that he wishes to adjust the burden of taxation equitably and therefore imposes an income tax, which places a heavier burden on these people. By imposing a tax on incomes which, with the incidence and the exemption taken into account, will affect every man on the goldfields who receives say £3 10s. a week and over. No wonder they are up in arms against his so-called equitable form of taxation. No wonder they resent the backdown that the Government are guilty of in the matter. No wonder they resent the attempt made by the Treasurer to agree with the Legislative

Council and suit their particular taste and at the same time raise the necessary revenue to adjust the finances of the State. We have heard a great many arguments used by members in the House, and we have seen it repeated in the Press and in utterances throughout the country, that there is no justification whatever for imposing a land tax, because it would fall on the agriculturist. Well, there is this answer to that objection; an answer given on more than one occasion by Ministers: that the tax will bear just as heavily on the owner of lands in the city and towns, who is securing the unearned increment, or that landowner will have to bear an even greater burden than will fall on the agriculturist. But is it not right and just, and has it not been claimed by the Treasurer and his colleagues, before they backed down, that it was just to ask even the agriculturist to contribute to the cost of Government something not the result of his own energy and enterprise, but rather the result of the work of the whole community resident in Australia? Of this unearned increment several instances have come under my notice, and they have resulted from the railway policy of the present Government, a policy which is to an extent responsible for the existing deficit, a policy which has made greater calls on our revenue to pay interest and sinking fund, and which therefore leaves a smaller amount to be expended as it was expended in years past. Let us take the line traversed recently on the occasion of the opening of the Collie-Narrogin railway. At Darkan the construction of the railway has enabled a landowner in the vicinity to cut up a piece of land and sell it at greatly enhanced prices for the purpose of town blocks. And because that landowner, through the construction of the railway, has had this added value given to his land, the Government, who have Crown land on the other side of the railway and have cut it up for the same purpose, are absolutely unable to dispose of it, or so far as I can gather have disposed of but a small portion of it. So with the construction of the Greenhills-Quairading railway. A landowner there, who, as regards his agricul-

rural land, has been greatly benefited by the enhanced value given it by that railway, has also cut up land for town blocks, and has sold those blocks at greatly increased prices, practically preventing the Government, who represent the community, from reaping the advantage of the expenditure of their own money on the construction of that railway, by selling town blocks which the Government themselves surveyed for that purpose. The town will be in an altogether different place—on the land cut up and sold by that landowner. These are two instances of the operation of the policy to which this country is committed, a policy which involves a greatly added burden on the people, in the shape of interest and sinking fund charges. And even the most sanguine of us must anticipate that a number of years will elapse before we can hope to secure from those railways a return which will enable them to be self-supporting trading concerns. The Treasurer has excused himself for his change of front on the amended taxation proposals by stating that they are in operation in all the other Australasian States and in New Zealand. But when we examine the incidence of the taxation of those countries, when we consider the special circumstances of Western Australia, we see that the propositions are altogether different. The Attorney General (Hon. N. Keenan) wished to know what were my views on the income tax question; and I notice that although he recently professed in his speech on the no-confidence debate not to know what my views were, I remember also that in his speech in Kalgoorlie he wished to show that I had been inconsistent on the question; that I had advocated an income tax on one occasion and opposed it on another. He stated that in the session to which he referred—I think it was the session of 1906—I supported an income tax. The only mention I made of an income tax during that session was in the debate on the Budget Speech, when I pointed out that we had then a deficit of over £100,000, and that the Government proposed to meet that deficit by imposing a land tax, which,

by reason of the exemptions and rebates to be granted, would raise only £60,000. And I pointed out that if those exemptions and rebates were eliminated, the Government could raise, according to their own estimate, a sum of £90,000; and I went on to point out that if they persisted in throwing away this £30,000, even if they desired to adjust the finances, their only alternative was a tax on incomes. I was pointing out the only alternative: I was not advocating it on that occasion. Later on my remarks at Leonora, which were published in the Press, were in opposition to any proposal to introduce an income tax in preference to a tax on unimproved land values. I stated that if there was to be any new taxation, then in my opinion it was more equitable to introduce a land tax, and that the proposal for a land tax should therefore come first. Now I desire to say that rather than see a deficit in the State finances—a deficit which must have a bad effect on our credit, a bad effect when we seek to borrow money in the London market—rather than see that, if the money is not to be wholly raised by a tax on the unimproved value of land, I should prefer the balance made up by a tax on incomes, thus avoiding a deficit. But I have always in this House, when speaking on the question, pointed out that a tax on incomes, and especially a tax as now proposed, is essentially a tax on effort and energy, and therefore not to be compared with a tax on the unimproved value of land, a tax which seeks to bring back to the community a portion at least of the value which the community creates. And moreover, throughout the Continent of Europe, and in the United States from no less a person than the President of the Republic, the advocacy of a tax on incomes is heard because of the desire to curb the unjust power of wealth which, in the words of President Roosevelt, has not been earned honestly. And in advocating a tax on incomes we have always to bear in mind that we are not to penalise effort and energy; we are to avoid as far as possible taxing an income which has been earned honestly, fairly and

above-board; and we have also to see that in imposing such a tax we leave to the taxpayer a limit or an exemption representing a fair and comfortable livelihood. In my opinion, a tax on incomes is a very indirect and roundabout method of trying to reach those who are making money by the exercise of unjust power, making it in some such manner as the trusts in America, or for that matter the trusts in Australia, are piling up their dividends at the expense of workers and consumers alike. And in imposing such a tax the margin of exemption has to be fairly wide; because no one in this House will admit that even a worker, an able-bodied man, is not capable of earning a sum representing £200 a year. For that reason, in advocating an income tax I advocate an exemption; and farthermore, I believe in a system of graduation, such as they have in New Zealand. There is absolutely no comparison between the incidence of the income tax in New Zealand and what would be the incidence of the income tax proposed by the Government. In New Zealand they have an exemption of £300; they have a reduction which we have in our Bill for life insurance premiums to £50 per annum, and they adjust their rate making it 6d. in the pound for the first taxable £1,000 of income, and 1s. in the pound on taxable incomes in excess of £1,000, and on companies also. As is proposed here, they make an exemption of the rents or profits derived from the direct use or cultivation of land, and interest from mortgages on land; but they take the opposite policy to that proposed in this Bill by which the Treasurer proposes where the taxpayer occupies a property of his own to assess income on that at 4 per cent. on capital value, and charge income tax on it. In New Zealand allowance is made to the taxpayer who occupies his own freehold or leasehold premises by way of rent as sinking fund at the rate of 5 per cent. on the capital value of the land and improvements. So they exempt the man who by diligence and thrift has secured his own house, and make him free from taxation to that extent.

The Premier: Then according to that principle you would exempt the mansion, whereas under this Bill we tax 4 per cent. of the value.

Mr. BATH: I would not assess the mansion or the cottage in which the taxpayer resides and regard it as part of his income. It is an altogether unjust application of the principle.

The Premier: Then you would discriminate between the man who is fortunate enough to own his own house, and the man who is unfortunate enough to have to pay rent?

Mr. BATH: How can it be claimed to be part of the income of any man if he does not pay rent but lives in his own house? Income tax falls on those who are deriving income from rents, but this Bill also seeks to tax the man who is living in his own house, and using it for residential purposes.

The Treasurer: As it taxes the man who pays rent, we place both on the same footing.

Mr. BATH: The Treasurer has a difficult task to impress on the people the logic of his position. In New Zealand, to show that the income tax will not have the same incidence as this will have, the total number of income taxpayers is only 8,993; but I guarantee that between 5,000 and 6,000 of the men employed on the Kalgoorlie mines will be assessable under this tax, and that we will have in that district alone, without counting the rest of the State, as many taxpayers as there are in New Zealand. In New South Wales the income tax is 6d. in the pound on incomes in excess of £200, and the taxable incomes of over £400 furnish 68.46 per cent. of the total revenue. But under this measure, according to the tables given by the Treasurer, the total sum to be raised from taxpayers receiving less than £300 will be £42,000, as compared with £18,000 from those who receive more than £300, exactly opposite to the experience of New Zealand and New South Wales where the greater proportion of the burden falls on those who receive over that salary. In New South Wales the total number of income taxpayers is 22,814, out of a population of 1,300,000. In South Australia, where they have an

exemption of £150 as is proposed here, the amount raised on the tax on personal exertions on incomes under £500 per annum is only £17,000, while the amount raised on taxable salaries over £500 is £32,895; and the total number of taxpayers in South Australia, including those who pay the tax on property, which is distinct from the tax on personal exertions, and those who contribute it in companies, firms, and trusts is only 11,882. The exemption of £150 in South Australia will free many more people there than it will free in Western Australia. If we compare the cost of living in the two States it will be seen that the tax here falls with fourfold force on the working population of Western Australia as compared with South Australia which approaches more nearly to us in the incidence of the tax. We have only to compare the retail prices they pay for articles of daily consumption in South Australia with the prices we pay in Western Australia for fruit, butter, bacon, bread, and other articles of necessity in connection with the food for our working population, to see that in South Australia they have a much greater advantage than Western Australia; and therefore an exemption of £150 there I should say it would be equal to an exemption of over £200 in Western Australia.

The Premier: It is £100 in Queensland.

Mr. BATH: The tax was imposed in Queensland by a Government which, fortunately for that State, is at present out of existence.

The Premier: But it has not been amended.

Mr. BATH: There has been a strong agitation in Queensland for the repeal of the tax. In New South Wales where the exemption for the income tax is £200, the Government are submitting a proposal in their programme for raising the exemption to £1,000, showing that, so far as New South Wales is concerned, they recognise the injustice of the incidence of the tax and are trying to free those who already bear an undue burden of taxation through the incidence of the income tax. As far as my attitude on this measure is concerned, I say we should

have re-introduced the tax on unimproved land values, we should have ascertained what amount would be raised by it, we should have ascertained how far it would operate with economies in administration, as distinct from the transfer of expenditure from revenue to loan fund, with a view to seeing whether we could adjust our finances in the future by means of the land tax alone. If it were found that with that tax we could not liquidate the current deficit for the financial year, then would be time enough to talk about introducing a tax on incomes. No wonder the members of the Legislative Council are agreeable to support the measure, and rub their hands with delight, when they find the Government amending their proposals by the addition of an income tax, for it means that the very people who have benefited most by the development of this country, who practically sat down in the metropolis and reaped the benefit of increased values by the influx of people to the State, by the self-denial of those who have gone into the back country prospecting, by the agriculturists who have gone on the land to develop it, and by the artisans in the towns and on the gold-fields. They reaped all these advantages, but when they were asked to give back to the community some portion of these advantages, some portion of the millions of the unearned increment gained by the development of Western Australia, they sit like logs and say, "No, we will have no such taxation." The Government, instead of fighting the issue with them on behalf of the mass of the people of this State, backed down and introduced a measure of taxation which helps these people to do as they have done in the past, to shift the burden on to the working communities. No wonder they say the Government have done the right thing at last. It seems to me that a measure such as this which suits these people but which adds to the already overburdened taxpayer in the State, should not commend itself to this House or to the people whom we in this Assembly are supposed to represent. The Attorney General talks of the old men and women in "homes" exercising undue in-

fluence if given a vote, but what is that to the influence which is wielded by the representatives of property in another Chamber? When a question like this, which they think will affect their pockets, is placed before them, they exercise undue influence and bring all their power, not only in that House but also in the Government, in order to defeat the proposal. Not only through the customs revenue of the State, but also in other directions the incidence of our existing forms of taxation is altogether inequitable. We have only to take such items as stamp duties, licenses, revenue from mining, and other channels of revenue to find out that the working community, whether they be on the goldfields or in the metropolis, pay the biggest amount of these forms of taxation. Then we come to the public services of the State. Take the railways as an instance and it will be found that of the revenue contributed, the working population are asked to pay the biggest share. Consider the railway freights to the goldfields on articles of general use and compare them with the rates on other articles, and again you will find that the working consumer has to pay the greatest share of the revenue derived from that source. You have only to compare the rates exacted on machinery between the coast and the goldfields with the railway rates exacted on agricultural produce. On machinery the rate is two or three times as much as it is on wheat. The consumer, the man who will have to pay under this income tax, is called upon, in addition to other burdens, to pay the greater proportion of the revenue of the State. The measure is entirely unjust. While I will support, as I have in the past, a measure for the taxation of unimproved land values, with a view to adjust the finances, I have nothing but the strongest objection to the amended measure of the Government. I will oppose the measure not only on the second reading, but also in Committee in order to eliminate, as far as in my power lies, the objectionable proposals contained in this measure.

Mr. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): I move—

That this debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	16

Majority for 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Barnett
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Cowcher
Mr. H. Brown	Mr. Eddy
Mr. T. L. Brown	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Collier	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Davies	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Draper	Mr. Male
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Monger
Mr. Holman	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Horan	Mr. Price
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Stone
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. J. Wilson
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Smith	Mr. Layman (Teller).
Mr. Stuart	
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Ware	
Mr. Heitmann (Teller).	

Motion thus passed, debate adjourned.

BILL—MARINE INSURANCE.

Received from the Legislative Council, and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.53 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 5th November, 1907.

	PAGE
Questions: Ravensthorpe Railway, Hopetoun Jetty, etc.	491
Motion: Goldfields Water Supply, to be Self-Supporting	491
Standing Orders Amendment, Lapsed Bills, debate resumed	499
Bills: Registration of Births, etc., Recommitment, reported	499
Sale of Government Property, 2s. concluded, in Com. progress	504
Workers' Compensation Amendment, Com. progress	507
Navigation Amendment, Com. reported	509
Public Health, postponement	509

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.