live in the country and who get accustomed to what is termed the isolation of farming life, and in time these people tell us that they prefer to live in that way. I know, however, that the average man who goes on the land does like to be somewhere near a neighbour. In an estate like that of Yandanooka we could have a scheme of closer settlement which would give the people who take up blocks an opportunity of living in groups, and having all the advantages which that group life confers. I was impressed by the success of the operations at the estate, due, in a large measure, to the unity of the workers. For instance, instead of having 20 or 30 men on separate plants, there was one manager with one plant. A similar thing would be possible under co-operative effort.

Vote put and passed.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Progress reported.

RESOLUTION—VENEREAL DISEASES, UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

Message received from the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of the Assembly in the following resolution:—"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Government should approach the Governments of the other States of the Commonwealth with the object of endeavouring to arrive at an agreement between all the States as to the methods to be adopted to stamp out venereal diseases, so that laws may be enacted in each State to deal with the evil."

House adjourned at 11·10 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 27th October, 1915.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. CORNELL (South) leave of absence for the remainder of the session granted to the Hon. J. E. Dodd on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment.

Passed.

2, Vermin Boards Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committte adopted.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is introduced in fulfilment of a definite policy announced some time ago by the Government of reclassifying, or repricing land in the less favoured areas selected since the general advancement in price of all Crown lands open for selection in 1910. I need not stress to this Chamber the im-

portance and urgency of the Bill, nor do hon. members require much persuasion as to the fairness of the proposition that those selectors who took up land during the boom period in districts of precarious rainfall, at what are now admitted to be excessive rates, should be given whatever respite is possible to enable them to be in a reasonable position to make a success of their agricultural ventures. That is the proposition embodied in this Bill and the Government present it to Parliament, believing the Bill to be a fair, even a generous attempt to deal equitably by our struggling settlers. I may be permitted here to say a few words in explanation of the belated introduction of the measure. The announcement of the Government's intention to introduce a land reclassification Bill was made some time ago and many anxious inquiries have since followed. Viewed on the surface, the question appears to present only trifling difficulty. It would seem simple in the extreme to frame a Bill for the purpose. That doubtless is the view held by those who have waited with impatience and in some cases with distrust, for the fulfilment of the Government's promise, but I think the introduction of the measure, even at this stage, is a full justification of the fact that the Government intended to fulfil their pledge. The task of preparing the preliminaries in connection with a measure of this description is the opposite of easy. The Minister for Lands has told the country that he found this apparently simple proposition bristling with difficulties. On the assumption that it was a simple matter, a Bill was framed and actually introduced in another place last year, but it was so obviously insufficient to secure the desired object that the Bill was not proceeded with and was ultimately withdrawn. The history of the investigations of which the Bill now before Parliament is the outcome goes back a couple of years. Mr. Bath, when Minister for Lands, appointed a board consisting of experienced and capable departmental officers to investigate the question of prices. That board reported—and it is now generally admitted—that the prices put some years ago on conditional purchase lands, particularly in certain districts, were excessive. I have in mind one district, with a rainfall of about 11 inches only, wherein the price of land was fixed as high as 27s. 6d. per acre. That, I find after investigation, is typical of what obtained in several areas of the State. When it is remembered that prior to 1910 the maximum price asked for land selected from the Crown was 10s. per acre, and bearing in mind the further fact that all, or nearly all, the best and most favourably situated land was alienated before 1910, it is apparent that the selector who took up his holding during the last five years has done so at a distinct handicap as regards price, locality, and suitability for agricultural production. Naturally, criticism followed on the action of the Government in securing the discharge of last year's Bill from the Notice Paper. Much of that criticism, no doubt, represented the genuine belief of disappointed agriculturists that the Government had deserted them; but not all. A section of the Press stated that not only had the Bill been withdrawn, but that the Minister for Lands had declined to give any assurance that it would be reintroduced during the present session. What the Minister did say, and what must have been clearly understood, was that he could give no assurance that the Bill would be reintroduced "at the beginning of the session." Those are the words which were used by the Minister. With his knowledge of the difficulties in the way, and which had forced him to the reluctant decision to withdraw the then Bill, the Minister could not honestly give an assurance that this Bill would be ready for introduction at the beginning of this session. However, the appearance of this measure on the Notice Paper is proof sufficient that the Government have been all along in earnest in the endeavour to deal fairly by the struggling selector. I mention the matter now merely to disabuse the minds of those of the community who may have been misled by this class

of criticism. After the Bill of last year had been withdrawn, Messrs. Canning, Fox, and Lefroy, of the Survey Branch, were appointed, on the suggestion principally of the Under Secretary for Lands and the late Surveyor General, a board to go into the question of repricing as many acres as possible. As a result of several conferences between the board and the Minister, it was decided to adopt the zone system. The original intention was to start at a maximum price of 15s. per acre, but the adoption of the zone system necessitated the inclusion of certain areas—around Gnowangerup principally, and portions of Bolgart—in which it was never intended to reprice land at 15s. Consequently, it has been found necessary to include two zones, A and B, in which the price is higher than the figure quoted by the Government last year. In other respects, the proposals in this Bill give that measure of relief to settlers in less favoured districts which the circumstances and the promise of the Government alike entitle them to expect. Briefly, the price of their land is proposed to be reduced, and, secondly, the purchase term is extended from 20 years to 30. In determining prices for the different classes of land, the factors taken into consideration were, first, climatic conditions, *i.e.*, rainfall; second, distance from railway facilities; and, third, the quality of the soil. Hon. members may see on the wall a schedule showing the six zones into which the agricultural lands are divided for the purposes of this Bill, and the allocation of prices in respect of these is as follows:—

Zone A: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 25s., 10 miles 20s., 15 miles 16s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 9s., 10 miles 7s. 3d., 15 miles 6s. 9d.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 6s., 10 miles 4s. 9d., 15 miles 3s. 9d. Zone B: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 20s., 10 miles 17s. 6d., 15 miles 15s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 8s. 3d., 10 miles 6s. 9d., 15 miles 6s.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 5s. 3d., 10 miles 4s. 6d., 15 miles 3s. 9d. Zone C: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 15s., 10 miles 13s., 15 miles 11s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 8s., 10 miles 6s. 6d., 15 miles 6s.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 5s., 10 miles 4s. 3d., 15 miles 3s. 9d. Zone D: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 13s. 6d., 10 miles 12s., 15 miles 10s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 7s. 9d., 10 miles 6s. 3d., 15 miles 5s.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 4s. 9d., 10 miles 4s., 15 miles 3s. 9d. Zone E: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 12s., 10 miles 10s., 15 miles 9s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 7s., 10 miles 6s., 15 miles 5s.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 4s. 6d., 10 miles 4s., 15 miles 3s. 9d. Zone F: first class land, 5 miles from a railway 11s., 10 miles 9s., 15 miles 7s.; second class land, 5 miles from a railway 6s. 6d., 10 miles 5s. 9d., 15 miles 5s.; third class land, 5 miles from a railway 4s. 3d., 10 miles 4s., 15 miles 3s. 9d.

It will be found in each case that the minimum price is 3s. 9d. per acre. That is in accordance with the Land Act of to-day. The zones contain an area of approximately 4,400,000 acres made up approximately as follows: Zone A, 1,220,336 acres; zone B, 446,020 acres; zone C, 1,097,968 acres; zone D, 1,124,746 acres; zone E, 440,868 acres; zone F, 66,444 acres. The repricing, of course, carries with it an extension of time for the payment of the land rents. For instance, land at 15s. or over will be paid for in 30 years, or in 30 annual instalments. That is to say, for land at 15s. and over, the maximum term of payment is to be 30 years. Land at 12s. will be paid for in 24 years, land at 11s. in 22 years, and land at 10s. or under in 20 years. The object is to place everybody as nearly as possible on the same footing in regard to annual payments of land rents. In this way we are putting everybody on 6d. per acre per annum. Those, however, who are over the 15s. will pay more than 6d. per acre per annum, but the 30 years term will apply to them. As in all other matters, finance has played an important part in the preparation of

this Bill. One of the chief difficulties presented by the problem was that if the selectors were to be treated equitably it was apparent that the revenue of the Lands Department must suffer, particularly by reason of the extension of the purchase period and also of the necessity for adjustment in respect of payments already made on the basis of 20 years' purchase at the higher price. An approximate calculation gives the loss of revenue at £30,000 annually; but not, of course, extending over the whole 30 years. In regard to the land within zone A. there will be practically no loss of revenue ultimately, for the reason that it is not proposed to reduce the price, but there will, of course, be a shrinkage in the amount annually payable on those lands owing to the extension of the purchase period to 30 years. Departmental calculations fix the area selected between January, 1910, and 30th June, 1915, at about seven million acres; that is, land taken up since the advance of prices in 1910. That is the period of selection with which this Bill deals. Of that area, 2½ million acres embrace abandoned holdings; and a similar area, roughly, will come under the provisions in the Bill dealing with poison lands. Against the prospective loss of revenue, however, we are entitled to offset the increased revenue which is certain to follow the greater production consequent on putting our selectors in a financial position to farm their properties successfully. I have thus far dealt with the important, the real, feature of this Bill. There are also one or two other small amendments to the principal Act which have been found to be desirable, and this opportunity has been availed of to bring them before Parliament. One is to permit of the amalgamation in one lease of cultivable and grazing lands selected by one and the same person. At present it is necessary for separate leases to issue in respect of cultivable and non-cultivable land, which is not only costly, but in some cases confusing. The lease will be issued under Part V. or Part VI. accordingly as cultivable or non-cultivable land preponderates in the area covered by the lease. The next amendment is intended to remove an anomaly. Under Section 53 of the Act the total area which may be selected by any one person is limited to 1,000 acres in any one agricultural area, whereas another section fixes the maximum at 2,000 acres. The department have worked on the 2,000 basis, and this Bill proposes an amendment to Section 53 to rectify the anomaly and make clear the intention of the Act. As members know, it is now compulsory under statute to issue half-yearly a rent-list showing the holders of all land in process of alienation, with particulars of area, and similar information. That is a costly production, estimated departmentally at about £2,000 a year. Especially in these times, there does not appear any sufficient reason for continuing such a heavy expenditure, and an amendment proposed in the Bill leaves the matter of deciding as to the frequency of this publication in the discretion of the department. I may point out it is not proposed to discontinue the publication altogether, but merely to depart from the practice of issuing the rent list twice a year. If the discretion asked for in the Bill be given, it may be found practicable, without detracting in any way from the usefulness of the publication, to issue small supplementary lists from time to time instead of the present cumbersome and costly half-yearly lists issued in February and August. Another proposal (Clause 8) authorises the Government to invest the funds standing to the credit of the Lands Improvement Fund. That is a fund created by Mr. Mitchell, when Minister for Lands, providing a recoup from land revenue to cover the cost of surveys made from loan funds. But when the necessary amendment of the Act was passed, permitting the establishment of the fund, by an oversight no provision was made for dealing with the accumulated funds. Successive Governments have used the money—the oversight does not appear to have prevented different Administrations from utilising the cash —but authority has been lacking, and this clause supplies the omission. The last amendment in the Bill deals with the awkward problem of fractions of

acres on survey, and proposes that in fixing the boundaries of a selection by survey fractions of an acre may be disregarded, thereby avoiding the necessity for re-survey, which is a useless expense. Yesterday Mr. Cullen approached me and submitted a number of questions to which he desired replies. The hon. member asked, 1, Why are zones confined to the eastern side of the railway? 2, What about the poison land, and also the land in the Denmark Estate? I saw the Under Secretary for Lands, Mr. Clifton, this morning and obtained this information for the hon. member. Mr. Clifton states—

> With reference to the above queries, Messrs. Canning, Fox and Lefroy have been appointed by the Minister a board to go carefully into the matter and make recommendations with regard to repricing the land under the Bill. In dealing with the matter they have divided the wheat belts into zones and fixed certain prices within the zones as shown on the map. Of course, this map and the zones shown thereon are not portions of the Bill, but have been prepared merely for the guidance of the board and the information of hon. members. The board are dealing first with the wheat lands on the east side of the Great Southern railway. The land on the west side of the railway will be dealt with next, and in connection therewith another plan will, in all probability, be prepared. The board have also been instructed to deal with the land in the Denmark Estate.

The map on the wall affects the Bill in no way, but simply represents the extent of the work done by the board up to a few weeks ago. All non-poison land taken up since 1910 will be dealt with, and in the case of poison land the board will go back as far as 1907. It is admitted that the price of Denmark land is too high, but the schedules for these particular lands have not yet been determined upon. However, definite instructions have been issued by the Minister that Denmark land should be repriced.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Hear, hear.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill has been well received by all parties in another place. It is agreed that it is an important and urgent measure; and the fact that it emerged from the Legislative Assembly practically unaltered may be accepted as evidence that the proposals contained in the measure represent substantially the requirements for meeting the necessities of those whom it is intended to assist. I do not wish to suggest that this House should pass the Bill as it stands, but I hope no serious amendments will be made, and that if any amendments are made that they will conduce to the utility of the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.7]: I understand that owing to the lateness of the session the Colonial Secretary is anxious that we should proceed with the Bill straightway and therefore, although with reluctance, I will speak to it this afternoon. It is annoying that a Bill of such importance should have been brought down so late; yet it seems to be the usual thing every session that Bills of the utmost importance should be brought down at the eleventh hour and that the Government should attempt to rush them through. This Bill was read a second time in the Assembly on 28th September; it was not continued with until 20th October. A Bill of such importance should be put through right away in the Assembly and immediately sent on to this Chamber to allow of mature consideration. Again, it was put through in two sittings in the Assembly. I trust that more consideration will be given to it in this Chamber. Threats have been made that if any vital amendments are inserted in the Bill it will be dropped; as a matter of fact, the threats went further, and we were told, "If any vital amendments are made in the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill look out for your Land Act Amendment Bill."

Hon. J. Cornell: Do not count me in that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The threats do not trouble me. I am here to do my best,

irrespective of threats. Some amendments to the Bill are quite necessary, and I will endeavour to have them inserted. This question of the reclassification of land was one of the main issues at the election of 1911. We were then promised a measure of relief. But this is no measure of relief in any sense of the word. Ultimately the selectors will gain some relief, but none whatever at the present time, when it is most needed. I was amused to hear the Colonial Secretary declare that this would involve a loss of £30,000. That is not a direct loss, because it is due to the extended period, and will come back at a later date.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But there will be a reduction.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But not to that amount. By a curious coincidence I find that the £30,000 mentioned by the Colonial Secretary is exactly the amount of loss made by the State Implement Works during the past twelve months. In respect to the relief required by the settlers, while I do not intend to go as far as the recommendations of the reclassification board and request that there shall be no rent for five years, I certainly intend to move in the direction that those settlers situated 12 miles from a railway shall have immediate relief in the shape of exemption from rent for the first five years. We are continually hearing it declared that the selectors in Western Australia are well treated. As a matter of fact, the selector in Western Australia is treated the worst of all the selectors in the Commonwealth and New Zealand.

Hon. J. Cornell: I question that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In Queensland, in respect to fruit and dairy land in a rainfall of 21 inches and situated at from five to 20 miles from a railway, the selector takes possession on the payment of half cost of the survey, and no further payment is expected of him for 10 years. In South Australia the term over which payments are extended is 64 years, with a special exemption for the first 10 years. In New South Wales, in a 17-inch rainfall at from one to eight miles from a railway, possession is taken on one small payment, and nothing further is expected for five years. In Victoria, the Land Commission which sat in 1914 found, 1, rents for the first four years should be very low, provided the lessee resides and improves; 2, it is useless to defer rents and afterwards demand payment in full out of one harvest, as it leaves the settler in a worse position than ever. In New Zealand, on an estate that was cut up, no deposit at all was demanded, and it was provided that 10 per cent. of the purchase money was to be spent by the selector in improvements in the first, second, and third year. The roads board received part of that money for their rates, so the selector was free also from roads board demands. I do not ask for conditions such as these, but I contend that those situated 12 miles from a railway should receive special consideration to the extent of exemption from rent for the first five years. In the Kondinin-Merredin district, where the railway has been promised for years, —there is no gainsaying the fact that the promise was given in another Chamber that this line would be constructed; I am referring to the time of the dispute with reference to the lines in that district— some of the farmers are still 30 miles from a railway. They are quite content to hold on until such time as the Government can build a railway line. They cannot be blamed for the fact that the Government find themselves in the position they are now in. The Government have no one else but themselves to blame. They have squandered an abundance of money in various directions. When these people are quite content to hang on, the Government should meet them in this matter. It is not a great deal to ask. There is another district, namely, the Newcarnie-Yorkrakine district, where the settlers have to cart often as great a distance as 20 miles to a railway line. There is also the Mt. Marshall-Lake Brown district where settlers have often to cart as far as 30 miles to a railway line. I can remember the time when some of the settlers in this district had to cart superphosphate 60 miles in order to attempt

to grow wheat. Situated as they are, 20 miles or more from a railway, these people cannot put their wheat on the world's market under approximately 4s. per bushel, which, with the present high price of 7s. a bushel, leaves them the small margin of 3s. a bushel. This is not a payable proposition, following on a year such as we have just had, and which resulted in such a huge loss so far as the crops were concerned. In my opinion farmers in the past were unable to crop their lands under a charge of 45s. an acre. This means that people in these districts will have to get a 14-bushel average in order to pay the necessary expenses connected with cropping but which will leave nothing for themselves. The Minister for Lands, who is really fathering this measure, admits that there is a number of selectors who have gone out with capital a long way from a railway and have expended all their money upon the land which they took up, and as a result of which expenditure they are on the rocks to-day. He also says that land cannot be a good sound proposition for these people on account of their being so far from a railway, and that the Government are assisting them by advancing money to pay their rents. What kind of a proposition is this, when the Government are borrowing money to advance to settlers to pay their rents, and, at the same time, are charging them 6 per cent., in view of the fact that the Minister in charge of the Department says that these settlers have spent their all on their land? These unfortunate people will be tied up in a worse manner than before, and it will place them in a position out of which they cannot hope to get. The Minister also said that it was not a serious matter that they were not able to get revenue from the farmer, because, although the land revenue represented a huge amount of the revenue being returned to the State, this will mean the development of the land, and the land will ultimately return more to the State than could possibly be expected from any land rents. I agree wholeheartedly with the Minister in this. But the Minister should follow up these words of wisdom in the direction of meeting these people and assisting in this development. We were led to believe that this assistance was going to be rendered to the settlers under this Bill, but I find that no mention is made of it here. As a representative of some of the wheat farming areas of the State, I am going to insist that some mention shall be made of it, and that an amendment is inserted in the Bill with this object. The Minister further states that every one admits that the price of land here is excessive. I think we all admit that. Even the Colonial Secretary admits that in his second reading speech this afternoon. He further states that the land selected prior to 1910 was selected at 10s. an acre. The Minister for Lands also makes that statement, an says that the eyes of the country have been picked out by settlers at the rate of 10s. an acre, that the people who followed on had to take up land in the drier areas, and a poorer class of land too, at a higher price. Such being the case, why do the Government insist that this Bill should not go back any further than 1910? A long way prior to 1910 the price of land was raised. In 1906 and 1907 land was sold at from 20s. to 24s. 6d. per acre. I would ask the Government why, if selectors coming out prior to 1910 were charged these huge prices, they should be made to suffer because the land was selected prior to 1910. Why bring in a half measure? Why should not the Bill be made to cover the whole of these excessive prices fixed upon the land? Because those people in the early stages pioneered the land, they are going to be penalised, and the Government will say to them "You went out prior to 1910, and you have to pay a high price for your land." It seems to me that the pioneers of this country are deserving of every consideration. They are the men who have done more than any Governments have done in the direction of inducing land settlement. They have done more to develop this country than any Government, because prior to 1910, they could not receive that

financial assistance which farmers have been in receipt of since that date. I can well remember the battle I had to fight upon my property from 1903 onwards. I am not voicing anything from my own standpoint, however, because an excessive price was not fixed upon my land. There are others who have been charged an excessive price, and who have pioneered the country, and are just as deserving of consideration as those who selected land subsequent to 1910. If we go back to the year 1907 we will meet most cases of excessive valuations. It is not going to involve a tremendous amount of money, because the selections which were made prior to 1910, where excessive prices have been charged, are few in number. Notwithstanding this, there are cases of this sort which do exist; and these cases are entitled to every consideration. The Minister agrees that where anomalies exist in the case of those who selected land prior to 1910 those persons will receive every consideration under this Bill, but, if that is so, why not embody it in this Bill? The hon. gentleman may not be Minister for Lands for another twelve months, and it does not matter if he is. We, as legislators, want that relief embodied in the Bill—the proper place for it. There is another matter to which I desire to refer, but which does not affect my province to any great extent; that is the question of poison lands. I have had a wide experience of poison lands, and my experience like that of other people, is that it is disastrous to touch it. The man who takes up a poison area deserves a large bonus to assist him in keeping it on, and in addition should not be charged anything for the land. The fee for this class of country has already been reduced to 2s. 6d. per acre, but in my opinion a nominal fee of 1s. per acre would meet the case. The main object of the Government in regard to poison land should be that people should be induced to take it up in order that it may produce some revenue to the country. Let us offer every encouragement to people to take up these poison areas. If the Government gave me a good bonus tomorrow to work a poison lease, unless it was something very good and did not contain very much poison I would not think of taking it on. Let us consider those who are plucky enough to take on these poison lands. What is the use of allowing all this land to lie idle? The man who takes a poison area has not only to consider the cost of eradicating the poison, but the more serious trouble of the loss of stock after the poison has been cleared out. A man may be as careful as he likes in poison country, but when he puts stock on to it there must inevitably be a loss.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Is it wise to encourage men to take up poison areas in that case?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We want to develop the country. Why should we allow the country to remain in its wild state? People should receive every encouragement in the development of the agricultural areas of Western Australia. A charge of 1s. 6d. per acre on this sort of land would not be a very big amount, and it will pay the Government, if they cannot find any other way out of it, to give the land for nothing. I would favour a nominal charge of 1s. an acre. Let us try and do something with the land, for we have a lot of this land on our hands at the present time. At a price the land can be turned to good account, but I am afraid the price will be a big one. I should have liked to have had more time to deal with this Bill. Before sitting down I wish to refer to the Schedule.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Where is the Schedule?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I wish to refer to what we are led to believe is the Schedule. It is, of course, not a Schedule, but I want it to be made one. This Bill, without the inclusion of a Schedule, would be an empty shell and not worth a snap of the fingers. To make this Bill useful at all a Schedule must be incorporated in it. The Colonial Secretary referred to the map which is hanging in this Chamber. He states that the map does not in any way represent the Bill,

and is simply hung in the Chamber as a guide for us, to a certain extent. Where do we stand? We do not know to what extent the Bill will go, or what the result of it will be. A glance at one portion of the map will reveal the fact that four zones of land, "A," "B," "C," and "D," meet at a railway. It is a curious coincidence. I am not going to dispute the values attached to the land, because I think that the three gentlemen who are handling this matter are competent to do so. There is, however, an anomaly here. Under Class "A." a selector who is 4½ miles from a siding would have to pay 25s. per acre for his land, but the selector under Class "D," whose land adjoins the siding, and is equally as good as the Class "A" land, would only pay 13s. 6d. per acre. That is a curious position. I want something definite as regards this map. Take the position of the selector situated where "A" and "D" meet, who says "I want my land reclassified. It is in 'D' zone." He applies to the Minister, and the Minister replies "You are in "A" zone." What protection does that man get? He receives none, and has simply to abide by the decision of the Minister. We want in the Bill both a Schedule and the map; we want something useful to work on, and something under which the selector will know he is working. We have not got this at present.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: We want something definite.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: On the other hand we have an indefinite map like this, and the fact that there is no intention on the part of the Government to include a Schedule in the measure. What is there in the Bill?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: An attempt to keep a promise.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There is not even a semblance of an attempt to keep a promise here. A promise was made that some relief would be given, and that 15s. per acre was to be the maximum price for land. That promise has not been kept. The main promise was to give relief, but no immediate relief has been given, and will not be felt except after a number of years. As the Bill stands now, I will support the second reading, but intend to bring forward certain amendments in order to endeavour to knock the Bill into shape.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [5.30]: I shall not take up any of the little time which I intend to devote to this Bill in recrimination, and anything that I may say which appears to reflect upon past administrations will not be said from a party point of view. The difficulty that Parliament is now asked to deal with dates back to the optimistic wave when the land administration of this country conceived the idea that population was flocking in, and that the settlers would accept any price that the administration might like to put upon the land. I first wish to thank the Minister for answering two or three questions, answers which I thought would shorten the debate. In another place the Bill was launched with very little useful information. The Bill itself is only a skeleton, and the maps are not attached as part of the measure. Numbers of members of Parliament and settlers were at a loss to know what actually was proposed. I am glad to know that all parts of the State will come under the Bill, and that especially Denmark will get relief. I have had Denmark on my conscience for many years past, from the time when I was outside the political life of this country. It is perhaps the most glaring case of over-pricing, and hon. members will be all the better for knowing a little more about it. First of all the Government gave double the value for it, an area of 16,000 acres, and then instead of surveying it and throwing it open to the kind of settler accustomed to that class of land, at a proper price, they put unemployed on it to clear it, or partly clear it, at standard wages. They were paid 8s. or 9s. a day, and I dare say their work was worth 8d. or 9d. a day. But it was all written up against the land, and so, when the settlers came after years of boosting in the Press to look at the land, they were asked to pay from 12s. 6d. up

to £14 an acre for it. No settler would take it, and the Government palmed it off on goldfields men and new chums from the Old Country. These poor fellows, while Government work was going on there, eked out a living, and while their own little capital lasted, and with what they could get from the Agricultural Bank, they were just able to exist. I believe that some reductions have already been made, but still there are not 10 per cent. of those holders with a tolerable proposition before them.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The land cannot be much good.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The bulk of the land is good, but it is very heavily timbered.

The Colonial Secretary: Is it still timbered?

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The original owners, the concessionaires, cut off all the valuable timber, leaving the stumps, and the unemployed chopped down a certain amount of karri and jarrah, and from every stump there grew from six to a dozen saplings before the land was occupied by the new settlers. I am not going to delay the House over the matter, because the Minister has given an assurance that the board will reclassify this land but let me tell him that they will have to reduce prices there anything from 50 to 75 per cent. to make a tolerable proposition of it. Whatever was spent on the unemployed down there will have to be written up against the State, and not against that land, for the land was an easier proposition before the unemployed saw it than at the time the settlers took it up. I was anxious also, until the Minister's answers were given, about the land to the westward of the Great Southern railway, where the worst of the poison country exists. There was no mention by the Minister in another place about that land nor was there a mark on the map, but now we know that the settlers there are to be considered. I am not going to take exception to the minimum in the Bill of 3s. 9d. for third class land, and 2s. 6d. for poison land. What I am afraid of is that the poison land, which in nearly every case should be down to the minimum of 2s. 6d. will be treated according to its value as land. I would like the Minister to make a special note of the old way of dealing with poison land. The old terms are quite stringent enough for to-day. The old rate was 3s. 6d. for the best of the poison land. The conditions were that the poison had to be cleared within a certain time, and, as evidence of it having been cleared, the land had to be stocked. The land infested with poison should in no case be charged more than the minimum. Coming from the minimum to the maximum, why has the Bill gone so wide of the report of the skilled advisers, the board who inquired into this matter? Our trouble is that the Minister knows nothing of the land, and the department looks at it inevitably from a departmental point of view. When the Minister appointed the board he practically said to them "Study the question from the point of view of settlement, not from the departmental point of view, and give a tolerable proposition to the men we have already here." The board reported to the effect that a great deal of the land had been over-priced. Many settlers would agree to give those loaded prices because of the promises of railways, promises which have not been kept. Other settlers agreed to give the loaded price because they were inexperienced, and were in the hands of the land guides, and took up what was shown to them. They had no proper economic idea of values of land. They went where they were advised to go. Now the board said in effect, "Keep these men, do not let them be driven off in the hope of getting others; reduce the land to what is a fair thing." And they recommended that the maximum should be 15s. and to work down from that to the minimum. This Bill has classified a great many of the areas from 15s. up to 25s. an acre. That is a mistake. Special consideration should be given to the pioneers, because they made it possible for others to settle alongside of them and endure less hardship. By all

means let the pioneers have the advantage of the picked lands, which under certain conditions may be worth more than 15s. Good luck to them if, after having borne the brunt and toil of early settlement, they have the advantage of picking the best land. It is a bad policy to drive a hard bargain with these people and say, "We think your land is better than some of the other lands, and we will load you up with from 15s. to 25s. an acre." That is a mistake. When the Bill is in Committee I shall urge that 15s. be the maximum for rural lands. A great deal that has to be done in connection with this measure will be done in Committee, but I think it was a mistake for the framers of the Bill to go beyond re-pricing. The other amendments which the Minister has referred to are all right but they could have been brought in in a separate Bill. This should have been purely a re-pricing Bill. Ministers do not seem to understand how they make trouble for themselves by the heterogeneousness of their legislative proposals. They should keep to the idea in this case of a re-pricing Bill, and submit the other amendments in another Bill. When amendments are being brought in, I want to see effect given to another proposal of the Advisory Board, that under certain conditions five years exemption from interest and instalments should be given to enable a settler to get on to his feet. I do not want that concession to be limited to any particular area. It should be a rule of settlement to pay a deposit, carry out the statutory improvements year by year, and that the settler then should have five years free from instalments to get on his feet. However, I think all these amendments should be in a Land Act Amendment Bill, and not in this re-pricing Bill. The cause of all the trouble we are dealing with to-day was the over-optimism of certain land administrators. We are not concerned in blaming this or that Administration. There was a time in the development of the State when judicious advertising, liberality towards immigrants, and liberality in regard to the Agricultural Bank began to have their effect, and immigrants came from overseas and settlers from the neighbouring States. And when the Administrators saw this tide they said, "Now let us exploit them, we will raise the price of land and limit the concessions; we will charge for surveys and get, instead of 10s. per acre, anything up to 27s. and 30s." I wrote against it and spoke against it until I was weary. "Oh," said these Administrators, "we have been under-valuing our lands, we do not know the value of our lands." Now we are learning how foolish these administrators were, and let us guard against such folly in the future. The Minister must guard against it by accepting 15s. as the maximum under the Bill. The Minister will say we will lose some money. The worst enemy the State can have is the man with a grievance; I mean with a just cause of grievance against the Administration—the settler who will write back to his friends in the other States or in the Old Country and say, "I came out expecting a square deal but I have been exploited and taken advantage of." I do not go the whole length of those who say it will be a good bargain to give land away if there is a certainty of improvement. No, do not give land away but put a fair price on the land and give settlers a reasonable time to get on their feet before taking instalments from them. A fair price for land will never bar settlement. If we get caught again by that foolish optimism which says, "Let us put the price up and get all we can," then I say the State will deserve another slump. I could, of course, blame the Government for being so long in bringing in the Bill. But I am more inclined to say we are glad to have the Bill and to do our best to perfect it. I do hope the Colonial Secretary will use his influence with the Minister who brought in the Bill to welcome every improvement that either House will put into it.

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [5.49]: As one of the representatives of a province which will be largely affected by this Bill and as a selector situated some 50 miles north of Geraldton, where I am endeavouring to make a farm, I desire to

say a few words on this measure. First of all I may say the policy of high-priced lands in a country like Western Australia is a wrong one. When first speaking in this Chamber after my election I referred to the land policy and the promises of the present Government. The leader of the House took me to task saying that when I sat behind a Liberal Government I made no protest. Let me assure members that I did make a protest and a very strong one too to the late Minister for Lands. I told him his policy was a wrong one, not that I believed the land is not worth the money but because it is a wrong policy. The then Minister contended that it was absolutely essential that the price should be put up to enable the Government to build railways and make roads for the convenience of selectors. I say that the selector is going to pay by railway freights and fares for these railways which are going to be one of the finest assets Western Australia can have; I am not a pessimist about the so-called dry areas of Western Australia, because I believe that at no distant date these areas will be profitably occupied. But I contend that in a new country such as Western Australia it is a mistaken policy to put up the price of land, and it should be the object of any Government to have the land developed so that it will produce wealth, and not to be so much concerned about the price received for the land. Seeing that it is only possible to get men of limited capital, the Government should do all they possibly can to encourage these people to make good. One of the reasons why the present Government are in power to-day is because of their bitter attack on the late Minister for Lands, because of his land policy, and the promises from the present Government to reduce the price of land. The leader of the House this afternoon said that the Government had not forgotten their promise, but seeing that they have been in office for over four years it is high time they gave some measure of relief to the settlers in the dry areas. This is the first attempt, at any rate. Some time back the Government appointed a Commission to report and that Commission reported. The Commission consisted of the late Surveyor General, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Hewby of the Agricultural Bank, and Mr. Packham, one of the oldest farmers in Western Australia. I had the privilege and the honour of introducing settlers from various places north of Geraldton to this Commission, and let me tell members here that one could not convince that Commission that the price of the bulk of the land in Western Australia was too high. That is from the point of view of the value of the land, but the Commission recognised that it was impossible for men with little or no capital to make good with the rent they have to pay, because it is necessary for any selector to have from 1,000 to 2,000 acres of land to profitably occupy their holdings; and it is impossible for a man with limited capital, no matter how energetic he may be, to get his land cleared for a considerable time to return him a profit and pay the high rents. The Commission recognised that, and they reported to the Government, I believe, in favour of a fixed term of years of exemption from the payment of land rents. What notice have the Government taken of that report? There is no evidence of it in the Bill. Then again, if I remember rightly, and I think the speech of the leader of the House bears me out, that the late Minister for Lands, Mr. Bath, advised Cabinet to make the maximum price 15s. The Minister this afternoon said that was the intention but owing to the zone system they could not carry it out. This Bill does not make the maximum anything like 15s. but very much higher. What does the Bill propose in the way of relief? The relief is practically nil; there is nothing in the Bill of a mandatory character. The Minister may do this or he may do that, and I contend that under the present Land Act the Minister has all the power required for fixing the price under the Land Act. Section 55 gives him that power. Why has the Minister not availed himself of it seeing that the Government have been in office for over four years. In this Bill a minimum is fixed and we have a map hanging on the

wall of this Chamber showing the classified areas marked A, B, C, D, E, and F. We have also a schedule of prices denoting the price of the different zones, which may mean nothing at all. I should like to see something mandatory in the Bill that would give tangible relief to the settlers. Why not give effect to the recommendations of the Commission exempting settlers from the payment of rent for a term of years—three or five. I understand the Treasurer says he cannot do that because of the finances. What have we to-day? The Government are collecting rents from Loan Funds not from the settlers, which means a book entry. I am convinced that this House made a lamentable mistake in passing a clause in the Industries Assistance Bill to enable the Government to take money from Loan Funds. If that had not been passed this would have been a more just Bill to the settlers of the State. A clause in this Bill says that no man's case shall be considered unless the rent is paid to the 31st December, 1915. I think that an awful clause to put in a Bill to give relief to men in indigent circumstances who are unable to pay their rents. Yet it is contended that this is a Bill to relieve settlers. Under this Bill every selector has to make out a case for the reduction of his rent, and the man who can make the most noise and worry the department most we shall find will receive the most consideration, whilst the most deserving, because of their inability to place their case properly and not understanding what is required, will not receive a fair deal. I am supporting the second reading of the Bill but I hope the House will amend it so as to afford immediate and tangible relief. There is only one clause in the Bill that gives relief, that extending payment over a number of years, and providing that the selector shall not have to pay more than 6d. per acre. I hope the Minister will accept a proviso to that clause bringing those who have taken up land under the Lands Repurchase Act under it so that they may have this assistance. Before the close of last session, with Mr. Cunningham, the member for Greenough, and Mr. Patrick, I waited on the Minister for Lands in reference to this matter, and the Minister said that he could not bring the Bill in last session so as to deal with the settlers, but he promised that they should have some remedy or that a clause would be inserted in the Bill this session. It looks as if no consideration is to be given to those settlers this session unless a clause is inserted in the Bill dealing with them. I hope some such proviso will be inserted so that those who have taken up land on repurchased estates will have some consideration. The price of the land on these estates is very high and the interest has to be alded to the price. Owing to the bad seasons we have had for the last few yers, it is impossible for the settlers to pay the high rental and the interest on it. I hope the Government will accept some provision on these lines. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. H. P. Colebatch debate adjourned.

BILL—MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly having disagreed to two amendments made by the Council, also having amended one amendment, the reasons for the same were now considered.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 1 to which the Assembly has disagreed reads—

> Clause 6, paragraph (c): Strike out the words "be elected by duly registered unions of mine workers in accordance with the regulations" and insert the words "in accordance with the regulations be elected by the majority of persons bona fide employed in the mines in the several mining districts."

The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to this amendment is that the majority of mine workers are members of duly registered unions.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Under the Arbitration Act, registered unions alone are recognised and this being to all intents and purposes an industrial measure, the same provision should apply. It would be preferable to deal with a responsible body like a registered union. Some members fear that, if they accept this, they will be practically granting preference to unionists, but that has no bearing on the matter. The men not connected with unions would have to form themselves into some sort of an association to conduct the election. The great majority of mine workers belong to registered unions.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: The reason given by another place is amusing. What has the fact that the majority of mine workers belong to duly registered unions to do with the election of an inspector to look after the lives of men working in the mines. The same principle might as well be applied to parliamentary representation.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The Government's original proposal is evidently not in accordance with the desires of the people concerned who do not take the view that the minority should be entirely ignored. A little time ago a committee sat in Kalgoorlie and the secretary of the Eastern A.L.F. District Goldfields Council when questioned in regard to compulsory holidays said, he certainly thought the rights of the minority should be respected. Apparently, the argument advanced by the Colonial Secretary is not one that appeals to those men immediately concerned.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: This Bill is really to protect the health of the miners. The Committee have accepted, after a most violent protest last session, the extraordinary principle of workmen's inspectors being elected by the miners, and why not now give this concession graciously to the miners.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Why not give this concession to the unionists and reduce the non-unionists to the position of helots? The amendment should be insisted on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Dr. Saw's attitude is not consistent with his position as a unionist—a member of the medical association. The law of the land recognises trades unionism and the non-unionist has no say in the matter of fixing wages and working conditions. The non-unionist is really a pariah. I cannot understand why a man earning his daily bread should not be a member of a union. He might desire to gain kudos from those opposed to unionism, but there can be no other reason. The explanation of there being 15 to 20 per cent. of non-unionists on the eastern goldfields is not that unionists desire to make their lives the lives of rats but the toleration and open-mindedness of the big majority of unionists. If unionists had employed coercive methods, they would probably have forced many of these non-unionists into the unions but no force has been employed on the eastern goldfields, where this Bill will operate chiefly, to coerce men into the unions. Reason is the only method employed to get non-unionists to join.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not see why the Committee should insist on this amendment, which proposes to recognise non-unionists as well as unionists. One point which has been missed is that the demand for workmen's inspectors has been put forward by unionists only. The proposal is now to take from unionists, to a certain extent, the right for which they have fought, and to confer it on non-unionists.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: It is the unions who will have to pay for the taking of the ballot; not the non-unionists, who are not an organised body. The Chamber of Mines, I am sure, would rather deal with an organised body than with an unorganised and therefore irresponsible, body.

The clause should remain as it stood originally.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I think the Committee should insist on this amendment. Unionists ought to recognise that Parliament has gone a long way in agreeing to the appointment of workmen's inspectors, and they should not insist that the election shall be by unionists only. Unions do extraordinary things at times, as shown by a paragraph in this morning's *West Australian* relative to a strike of the German prisoners of war at Rottnest, which strike was apparently brought about by the carpenters' union. The carpenters' union, it seems, conspired with the enemy to further deplete the Treasury of the Commonwealth. Indeed, I am not sure that those unionists have not brought themselves within martial law. In Germany, similar action would doubtless bring summary punishment. That action of the Carpenters' Union causes me, for my part, to insist on the amendment.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I do not think there is anything out of the way in what the unionists ask in connection with this clause, namely, the recognition already given to them by the laws of the land and also by the employers. When there has been industrial strife, peace has always been brought about by the unions. In fact, it was in the interests of industrial peace that unions were in the first place legally recognised, and, so far, that legal recognition has worked well, at least on the eastern goldfields. It is now proposed that in a comparatively small matter such as this, recognition shall be withdrawn from the unions. As regards the paragraph quoted by Mr. Sommers, I will not attempt to justify the action of the union any more than the commercial representatives in this Chamber will attempt to justify a commercial man found guilty—and there have been several instances—of trading with the enemy. The fact remains that no instance can be adduced of non-unionists settling an industrial trouble. I know which way the votes are, but I desire to point out the reasonableness of the unions' position.

Hon. A. J. JENKINS: It has been pointed out to me that perhaps there might be some danger in this amendment by reason of its phraseology. Would the present be the proper time to move an amendment on the amendment, or after the amendment has been insisted upon?

The CHAIRMAN: The present would be the proper time, but I think that if it is proposed to vary the amendment the better course would be not to cut our amendment about, but to present separately an amendment as an alternative.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: It has been pointed out to me that the words "by the majority" in the amendment might be taken to have the meaning that an absolute majority must be obtained of the persons bona fide employed before a valid election could take place. It would be advisable to strike out the words "by the majority" and substitute "by the persons bona fide employed."

Hon. J. CORNELL: I propose to move in the direction indicated by Mr. Jenkins, but, in doing so, I desire that it should not go forth that I am giving way on a point I hold dear. The clause, if further amended as I am about to suggest, will not be all that I desire it to be. I move as an alternative amendment—

> *That in Clause 6, paragraph (c), the words "be elected by duly registered unions of mine workers in accordance with the regulations" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "in accordance with the regulations be elected by persons bona fide employees employed in the mines in the several mining districts. Provided that no person shall be eligible to vote in any election for a workmen's inspector who is not a natural born or naturalised British subject."*

That gets over one difficulty pointed out by Mr. Jenkins with regard to the majority.

Amendment (Hon. J. Cornell's) put and passed.

No. 4.—Clause 10: Add at the end of the clause the following:—"A workmen's inspector shall have power to do all or any of the following things, namely:—(a) To make examination and inquiry to ascertain whether the provisions of this

Act affecting any mine are complied with: (b) To enter, inspect, and examine any mine and every part thereof at all times by day and night, with such assistants as he may deem necessary, but so as not to unnecessarily impede or obstruct the working of the mine: (c) To examine into and make inquiry respecting the state and condition of any mine or any part thereof, and of all matters or things connected with or relating to the safety or well-being of the persons or animals employed therein or in any mine contiguous thereto, and for the purpose of such examination or inquiry the inspector may require the attendance of any mine official or employee, and such official or employee shall attend accordingly: (d) With the authority of a district inspector, but not otherwise, to initiate and conduct prosecutions against persons offending against the provisions of this Act: (e) Where a district inspector is not available, or with the authority of a district inspector, to obtain written statements from witnesses, and to appear at inquiries held respecting mining accidents, and at inquests, and to call and examine witnesses, and to cross-examine witnesses." (Assembly's modification)—Add to the amendment the following words to stand as paragraph (f):—"(f) To exercise generally such other powers as are in his discretion necessary for carrying this Act into effect":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the modification be made.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: When the power to appoint these workmen's inspectors was first asked for it was admitted by all parties that the power to be given to the inspectors should be limited. That limitation was the safety of the men employed in the mine. This modification will go much further. It gives the workmen's inspector power to carry into effect the whole of the existing Act. It is a drag-net clause which not even the warmest supporters of the workmen's inspectors desired in the first instance. We have endeavoured to meet them in every way and they should be satisfied with the powers we have granted to them. If, after trial, it be found that those powers are not sufficient, hon. members will readily add to them.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: When we were discussing this matter at a previous sitting, I said I would be satisfied provided it could be shown that the workmen's inspectors would have the power to take action on discovering dangerous work. I then bowed to the knowledge of Mr. Jenkins, who gave us an assurance that all the necessary powers were provided in the parent Act. It seems now that the workmen's inspectors will not have the power Mr. Jenkins assured us they would have, namely that in the event of a workmen's inspector noticing a breach of the regulations he would have the power to stop it. Give him that power and we will be satisfied. I understand he will have no power beyond what is specifically set out in the clause. If we appoint workmen's inspectors we should give them power to carry out their duties.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: On the previous occasion Mr. Millington asked whether, under Section 36 of the existing Act, workmen's inspectors would have power to do certain things when they found dangerous work was going on. I then gave it as my opinion that they would have that power. I still say the power will apply to workmen's inspectors the same as to Government inspectors.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: This modification made by the Assembly will put the workmen's inspector on an equality with the district inspector. It is not part of the workmen's inspector's responsibility to carry out the Act. He has but to carry out his duties under the Act. It is the Minister who has the discretionary power prescribed in the modification.

Hon. F. CONNOR: Paragraph (b) gives the workmen's inspector power to inspect any mine at any time of the day or night; what more power does he want?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I took the deletion of this paragraph very seriously when the Bill was last before the Com-

mittee. To an extent I agree with Mr. Jenkins that certain powers are conferred on the workmen's inspector under Section 36 of the parent Act. I was under the impression that this subclause, as applied to district inspectors, was not in the parent Act. I find now that it is. Therefore this clause gives the district inspector far wider powers than the workmen's inspector will have. Proposed paragraph (f) is contingent on paragraph (a.) A workmen's inspector inspects a mine working and finds that the conditions are not being complied with, and that the place where the men are actually working is a death trap; but under the Act he is powerless to do anything. If under paragraph (f) a district inspector comes along and sees this danger he can use the power under that paragraph to stop the men working. I claim that a workmen's inspector, to be a success, must also have that power. If he saves two lives in five years he would justify the insertion of that paragraph. If we are to have workmen's inspectors let us have, not a sham, but a reality.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: When the matter was first mentioned the point was sheeted home that the main reason why check inspectors were wanted was that there were not enough inspectors, and that there were certain conditions prevailing in the mining world which did not come under the notice of the existing inspectors. It appears now that this idea has been put on one side, and that the check inspector is to be a law unto himself. He is to judge, not only whether a mine is safe, but he is to be in the position to rectify the trouble. The commonsense view of it is that a check inspector comes along, and the man in charge of the mine says that such and such a stope is dangerous and must be altered. What would be the result? Is he to take action straight away? My idea is that he would report the matter, and if the evil was not remedied action would then be taken. I cannot see why these men should be given power to act independently of the district inspector. The district inspector is the proper man to control the check inspector. I was under the impression that the whole of the need for check inspectors was to watch the work and see that the lives and limbs of the men working in the mines were not in danger.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	16
Majority against ..	10

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. F. Connor	*(Teller).*
Hon. J. M. Drew	

NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	*(Teller.)*
Hon. E. McLarty	

Question thus negatived; the Assembly's modification of the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 6, new clause—Add the following clause:—"(1.) Any regulation or by-law made or purporting to be made under or by virtue of this Act shall—(a) be published in the *Gazette;* (b) take effect from the date of publication or from a later date to be specified therein; and (c) be judicially noticed, and unless and until disallowed as hereinafter provided, or except in so far as in conflict with any express provision of this or any other Act, be conclusively deemed to be valid. (2.) Such regulations and by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after publication if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. (3.) If either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such regulation or by-law has been laid before it disallowing such regulation or by-law, then the same shall thereupon cease to have effect, subject, however, to such and the like savings as apply in the case of the repeal of a statute":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

This new clause was moved by Mr. Cullen. It is an amendment of the existing Act which has been in operation for nine years, and it alters the sytem adopted under that Act in connection with the making of by-laws and regulations. Under the original Act of 1906 it was necessary, before regulations could be annulled, that both Houses of Parliament should object. Under Mr. Cullen's clause either House of Parliament can, by raising objection, annul the regulations. Mr. Cullen will say that one House can reject a measure, and that, therefore, one House should be in a position that it can reject a regulation.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is sound logic.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It takes two Houses of Parliament to make an Act and if this clause is passed it will be possible for one House of Parliament to practically repeal the operation of an Act.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: That is not a logical proposition.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is a logical argument. There may be an alteration in the personnel of this House after the next elections, which will take place next year, and there may be eight or nine new members returned, and the Government, in the meantime, may prepare regulations under this Bill. These regulations will be laid upon the Tables of both Houses next year. Then it will be possible that the new House might object to this class of legislation, and disallow the regulations, and practically defeat the object we have in view.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Colonial Secretary puts it this way, that, since two Houses are necessary to make a law, one House ought to be sufficient to make a regulation. My logic is that, since it takes both Houses to make a law, it should take both Houses to make a regulation. I hope the Committee, for the sake of the rational administration of this measure, will stand by the amendment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Cullen has not brought forward one instance to show that, during the nine years in which the Mines Regulation Act has been in existence, it has worked harshly. This House has never dealt with the question of regulations under this measure in those nine years, and now the hon. member wants to do something which is altogether foreign to the understanding arrived at when this Bill came down.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The Government have already put this into one of their own Bills.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Government are fools, I am not. There would be some reason in Mr. Cullen's attitude if he thought that harsh regulations might be made for the purposes of these inspectors, and if he restricted his amendment to that portion of the measure, but the amendment does not do so. He wants the amendment to apply to the whole of the measure.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The Colonial Secretary seems to be afraid that, if we insist on the amendment, it may result in the desires of the Chamber being flouted. I hope the Committee will insist in order that the desires expressed in the amendment shall be preserved. One of the strongest controversies which raged around this Bill was as to the method of the appointment of these inspectors, and, from the expressions which have fallen from hon. members in this Chamber, and in another place, including Ministers, we know well they could do any act of harshness and injustice to non-unionists. Although we have carefully laid down the duties of workmen's inspectors, we have made no provision whatever as to the method by which the inspectors are to be elected. We have allowed the whole of that to the Minister's discretion, and we should insist, therefore, on the amendment. It is most unusual to provide for the election of the officers, and then not to provide machinery by which the election shall be carried out. If the Minister intends to frame

regulations which will be just and fair, there will be not the slightest danger of this Chamber interfering with them.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The action which it is proposed to take shows that we are willing to put the screw on on every possible occasion. Here we have a measure which we know the Government are anxious to pass, and we are taking the opportunity of demanding that a regulation shall apply to an Act which was passed nine years ago. I wonder what kind of a noise would be made if the Government adopted towards a measure like the Lands Act Amendment Bill —which the majority of hon. members in this House want to see passed—an attitude similar to that which we are adopting now towards this measure. If the Government refused to accept the Land Act Amendment Bill, hon. members in this House would be prepared to swallow their principles so as to get it through. The action which it is proposed to take in regard to the measure before us now is merely showing the Government a point, but, if the Government retaliated, there would be a great howl about it. It is no use protesting, but it is as well to point out that on all possible occasions points like this are being shown.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	5
Noes	.. .. ..	14
Majority against	..	9

Ayes.

Hon. F. Connor	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. R. G. Ardagh
Hon. J. M. Drew	(*Teller*).

Noes.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. E. McLarty	(*Teller*).
Hon. W. Patrick	

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

[*The President resumed the Chair.*]

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

BILL — LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT CONTINUANCE.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly had by Message notified that it disagreed to the amendments made by the Council.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [8.36]: I think it only fair that this Message should be considered in the Council and not in Committee because it depended wholly and solely on a point of order which was implicitly, if not explicitly, raised in Committee and upon which I would like to say a word or two. Members will notice that the Message from the Assembly gives the reason why it does not so much refuse to accept the amendments made by the Council as it refuses to consider them, the reason given being as follows—

> Because the point having been raised in Committee that the amendments made by the Legislative Council are not in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and the procedure laid down by *May*, and the point having been referred to Mr. Speaker, who upheld the Chairman's ruling, this House is of opinion that the said amendments are irrelevant to the subject-matter of the original Bill, and violate the procedure on expiring laws continuance Bills.

Each House is master of its own destinies, and if the Assembly and the Council disagree on points of order in this particular way, I do not quite see what is going to happen to the unfortunate legislation which forms the battlefield over which this is to be fought out, but I am certain that, although as hon. members will recollect I did not quite agree with the method of procedure, more from the point of view of draftsmanship and what I termed legislative symmetry, which was being adopted by this House, still I am perfectly sure that under our Stand-

ing Orders—which bear a very strong resemblance to those of the Assembly—the amendments which were moved to this Bill were most decidedly in order. I pointed out and quoted the Standing Orders at the time, namely, Nos. 193 and 198. Standing Order 193 reads—

> Any amendment may be made to any part of the Bill provided the same be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, and be otherwise in conformity with the Rules and Orders of the Council.

The subject matter of this Bill, speaking in a wide sense, is an amendment of the licensing laws of the State. If we take that wider sense, both the amendments proposed—the amendment limiting the trading hours of hotels and also the amendment which was proposed by the hon. Mr. Cullen dealing with the system known as treating—are undoubtedly in order because, in my opinion and I think as a matter of fact, they are relevant to the subject matter of the Bill. If we narrow the definition and say the subject matter of the Bill in question is not so much one of amending the licensing laws of the State as a limitation of the hours during which hotels may remain open in war time, even then our main amendment, namely that hotels shall be open from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., is still undoubtedly within the four corners of that Bill and a relevant amendment to the subject matter of the Bill. With regard to the violation of the procedure on expiring laws continuance Bills, I maintain that parliamentary procedure as laid down in *May* comes into operation only when our own Standing Orders are silent on any question. Our own Standing Orders provide, as I have pointed out, to the fullest possible extent for the case at issue; therefore I maintain that the procedure on expiring laws continuance Bills, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, has nothing whatever to do with the case. But even if it were otherwise, the practice which has been established and established this session by the Government putting into one of their own expiring laws continuance Bills an amendment of the parent Bill, is a sufficient confirmation and a sufficient argument for the course which has been adopted here. That is, allowing that our own Standing Orders are not admitted to deal sufficiently with the case at issue which I maintain they do. I therefore say, in defence of my ruling at the time, that under our Standing Orders the procedure which was adopted was in order. The amendments are quite in order, and I regret very much that the Assembly is creating what appears to be almost a hopeless position by taking up the stand it has done. Taking the narrowest possible view, I do not think that any more than one amendment could be open to this objection and I maintain that even that amendment, if a proper interpretation is placed on our Standing Orders, cannot be objected to on the score of the point of order raised in the Assembly. I am at a loss to know what is to occur under these conditions and what is to become of this unfortunate little Bill. It perhaps would be as well if, after the matter has been discussed, the consideration of the Message were adjourned so that the matter might be thought over, because I am very much concerned about this Bill which has fallen a victim to the punctilious interpretation of the Standing Orders of another place.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Will the hon. member cite the case he referred to just now in which the Government made a similar extension of the title.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: There was no bother about any extension of the Title. The Bill I alluded to was the Roads Act Amendment and Continuation Bill. If the ruling that no other amendment can be introduced into a Bill which continues an expiring Act, what becomes of the Roads Act Amendment and Continuation Bill? The very title itself is an offence against the point raised in the reasons given. The title is, "A Bill for an Act to amend and continue the operation of the Roads Act, 1911." What can be plainer proof that at times this rule, which is laid down, might be disregarded, and if I remember rightly, not only were the amendments which appeared in the

original Bill carried through the House but other amendments were put in at the instance of the Government. If we in this House have erred, we have erred in the best of company.

The Colonial Secretary: What was the wording of the hon. Mr. Cullen's amendment?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It deals with treating during war time on licensed premises. The amendments are so utterly out of court, according to the Message sent, that the Assembly has not even troubled to say what the objections are. The only thing that troubles me is what is going to become now of this Bill. I would suggest that some little time be given us to find out the best means of resuscitating this apparently drowned measure. All I have to say on the Message is that, in my opinion, the House could not have acted otherwise than it did, and was acting *perfectly within its rights*, and moreover acting in a manner of which it has already had an example set to it by the Government during the present session. In the circumstances, I do not understand what is the meaning of this Message.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary debate adjourned.

BILL—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly having amended an amendment made by the Council, the same was now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 3.—New Clause, omit the figure "8" and substitute the figure "7" in lieu thereof:

The CHAIRMAN: In order to shorten discussion, I may mention that this amendment represents a correction of a clerical error on the part of the Clerk.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

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

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly having declined to make certain amendments requested by the Council, the same were now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1.—Clause 2, after the word "and," in line 2, insert "Municipal and Road Board rates and licenses":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This amendment was moved by Mr. Cullen with the object of enabling the Industries Assistance Board to grant to necessitous settlers loans for the purpose of enabling them to pay their municipal and roads board rates, and cart and carriage license, and dog license. Evidently the Assembly objects to the granting of this power to the Government, and moreover the Government do not want the power. In these times of stress the Government feel the municipal and roads board authorities should show some degree of leniency towards unfortunate settlers unable to meet their obligations. I move—

That the requested amendment be not pressed.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I am surprised that the Assembly should object to so small an amendment. The principal Act mentions various purposes for which loans may be granted to distressed settlers, and the result of excluding the preferential debts which my amendment covers may be to imperil the board's security. I moved the amendment at the request of a number of local authorities, who have since expressed their satisfac-

tion at the fact that the Government did not object to the amendment. The Colonial Secretary expressed no objection. If local authorities wait, the settler will not ask the Government for money; but if the local authorities will not wait, the settler must get the money. I hope the Committee will insist on the amendment.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I was rather surprised at the suggestion of the leader of the House that municipalities and roads boards in these times of stress should not press for payment of rates. We know that the Government have practically abolished municipal and roads board subsidies. If these bodies are to have neither subsidy nor rates, will the Government, out of the wealth of their experience in such matters, advise municipalities and roads boards how they are to get on without money? Municipalities and roads boards must continue to do their work, which from the point of view of settlers is just as important as the work of the Government, or in some respects more important. Without roads farmers cannot get their wheat to the sidings. Municipal councils and roads boards cannot press one ratepayer and refrain from pressing another. I do not know that these bodies can build up million-pound deficits like the Government. If they are stuck for money, they will have to put the bailiff in. Say a bailiff were put into a farm over which the Industries Assistance Board have security—will not the security be affected? The amendment does not compel the Government to pay municipal and roads boards rates, but only gives power to the board to advance money for that purpose.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	14
Majority against ..	10

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. Cornell (*Teller*).
Hon. J. M. Drew	
Hon. H. Millington	

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. Sanderson (*Teller*).
Hon. J. J. Holmes	
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	

Question thus negatived: the Council's amendment pressed.

No. 3.—Clause 3: After the word "or" in line 2, insert the words "Municipal and road board rates and licenses":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not pressed.

Question put and negatived: the Council's amendment pressed.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: We sent to the Assembly seven requested amendments. The Message from the Assembly deals with only six. Numbers 2, 5, 6 and 7 were agreed to by the Assembly. Numbers 1 and 3 were disagreed with. What has become of No. 4, and why was there no Message in regard to it?

The CHAIRMAN: No. 4 appears on the Assembly's Notice Paper of Thursday, 21st October. Apparently it has not been dealt with by another place. The best thing to do will be to call their attention to it in the Message to go back from this House.

[*The President resumed the Chair.*]

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

SELECT COMMITTEE, RETIREMENT OF C. F. GALE.

To adopt report.

Debate resumed from the 21st October on motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, "That the report of the Committee be adopted," and on an amendment by Hon. J. Cornell "That paragraphs 4, 9, and 10 be struck out."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.7]: In supporting the amendment I do not propose to say much on this question. The case from my point of view has been so ably put by Mr. Cornell that there is little

for me to add, if I am to avoid wearisome repetition. Paragraph 4 of the report is, in my opinion, open to the strongest objection. That paragraph sets out that the Solicitor General appeared to think that "Mr. Gale could not be legally retired under the Public Service Act, he not having committed any offence, being under the statutory age of retirement, and his office not having been abolished." And then the Committee sums up with these words, "Your Committee is therefore of opinion that Mr. Gale has been illegally retired." It is implied by this sentence that the conclusion arrived at in regard to illegality was based on Mr. Sayer's evidence; but I have read that evidence through and through, and I have failed to discover any portion of the Solicitor General's evidence where he said Mr. Gale could not be legally retired under the Public Service Act. On the other hand in reply to question 715, Mr. Sayer is reported as having said, "If I had to find in the Public Service Act a provision which would enable Mr. Gale or Mr. Neville to be retired on the amalgamation of those departments, I should look for it, I think under Subsection 2 of Section 9." The Public Service Commissioner, be it remembered, retired Mr. Gale under Subsection 7 of Section 9 of the Act. It might be concluded that because in the opinion of the Solicitor General Mr. Gale should have been retired under Subsection 2, instead of Subsection 7, of Section 9 of the Act, the retirement was contrary to law. But if we accept Mr. Sayer's advice on one point, there is no reason why we should not accept it on another. If Mr. Sayer is qualified to say under what subsection of Section 9 Mr. Gale should have been retired, surely he is qualified to say what is the effect of what was actually done. We cannot reasonably pick and choose such portions of Mr. Sayer's advice as suits our purpose. We cannot, with effect, argue in one breath that he is a safe legal adviser, and in the next that he is an unreliable legal adviser. The committee were curious to know Mr. Sayer's opinion on the question of Mr. Gale being retired under a subsection which Mr. Sayer did not consider apropos; and the chairman asked him this question—"What is Mr. Gale's legal position if he has been retired on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner under a section of the Act that does not apply?" The Solicitor General's reply was direct to the point—"I do not think it is at all material as to what subsection the Commissioner chose to quote. If he stated Subsection 7 in mistake for Subsection 2, there is nothing in that." Yet this report says that Mr. Sayer appeared to think Mr. Gale could not be legally retired under the Public Service Act, and, basing their conclusion on that assertion, the committee add, "Your committee is therefore of opinion that Mr. Gale has been illegally retired." There is nothing in the Solicitor General's evidence to indicate that he thought Mr. Gale had been illegally retired. And Mr. Sayer resents such a conclusion being drawn from his remarks. He has addressed a minute to the Public Service Commissioner on the question and in that minute, after quoting paragraph 4 of the committee's report, he expressed himself in this way—

> I desire to observe, with reference to the annexed paragraph from the report of the select committee on the retirement of Mr. Gale, that my evidence does not justify the inference that Mr. Gale was illegally retired. I expressed the opinion that it was within the power of the Commissioner to recommend the amalgamation of the offices of Chief Protector and Secretary for Immigration, and for the Governor in Council to give effect to such recommendation. The result of the amalgamation of offices would be that one of the officers would, necessarily, lose his office. I stated that, in my opinion, the recommendation could be made under Subsection (2) of Section 9; but that it was immaterial under which subsection the Commissioner purported to act, if the amalgamation of offices came within the powers conferred by the Act, and, in my opinion, it did.

In this letter Mr. Sayer adheres to his opinion previously expressed before the

select committee, that the retirement should have been effected under Subsection 2 of Section 9; and he repeats what he said before the committee, that it was immaterial under which subsection the Commissioner purported to act, if the amalgamation of offices came within the powers conferred by the Act, which in his opinion it did.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I do not think he said it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He never said it before the Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I copied it from the evidence. Unfortunately I have not taken the number of the question. I shall be able to give it to the House presently. In the face of Mr. Sayer's evidence, which I have quoted, and which is supported by his minute, which I have read, the report of the committee falls to pieces and this House should support Mr. Cornell's amendment. I could deal with other points raised in the discussion. I could emphasise the impossibility of amalgamation of the positions with a view to retirement and economy if the view were accepted—as it appears to be accepted in some quarters—that an officer is secure in his position so long as he is under the statutory age for retirement, and so long as his office is not abolished and his efficiency and good conduct are not impaired. This, I may state, is the present view of a section of the Press, and only a few months have elapsed since the very same Press were slating the Government for not taking action in the direction of economy by retrenchment in the civil service. I could deal with many other aspects of the question, but I desire to confine myself as closely as possible to the amendment moved by Mr. Cornell, and intend to support the striking out of paragraphs 4, 9, and 10 of the report. Those paragraphs, I submit, are not borne out by the evidence. They are not supported by the Solicitor General's testimony, and the Solicitor General has since strongly resented the interpretation placed on his remarks.

Hon. J. Cornell: I should think so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In justice to Mr. Sayer those paragraphs should be removed. Their presence in the report cannot be justified and I shall be much surprised if, in the circumstances, they are adopted by this House.

On motion by Hon. W. Kingsmill debate adjourned.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE, HORSE RACING CONTROL.

To adopt report.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [9.20]: I am at a loss to know what to do with this report. The explanation given by Mr. Colebatch that a minority report could not be brought up under the Standing Orders of another place and that therefore members had either to vote for or against the report, helps somewhat. This makes it necessary for us to deal with the report in some way, and here comes my difficulty. I do not see how this House can possibly adopt this report *en bloc*; nor can it be referred again to the joint committee, for that committee has finished its functions, I assume; nor can this House go into Committee on the report to weed out certain clauses, because it is not our report—it is a report of the select committee. What on earth is to be done? There are several clauses which I should deem it undesirable for any Legislature to agree to. This House could not accept straight away the proposal for a board to control racing. That is a matter for very mature consideration indeed. Subsection 12 of the report brings up the question of monetary or time compensation to people who might be affected by legislation. On the strength of the report I am satisfied that this House cannot accept that proposal. Then it is proposed under Clause 17 of the report that incontinently and straight away the Trotting Association shall be slaughtered, and that there is to be no night racing after the close of this year. This association has expended a lot of money and contracted to spend a lot

more, and it is to be wiped out in one act and at a couple of months' notice. No Legislature could face such a proposition. Again, the most serious of all is the clause which was referred to in such strong terms by Mr. Colebatch, the proposal that this State should add to its State ventures by the running of sweeps. We have got low enough already. We are running nearly everything under the sun. We are running hotels, and if we take up sweeps the imagination would fail to think of any other lucrative business which the State could undertake. The State cannot descend to this. Surely this committee cannot mean this seriously, that after they ask us to help in killing Tattersall's sweeps in Tasmania, we should set up Government sweeps to run them in Western Australia? Do members of the joint committee really mean that the evil of sweeps can be condoned if this State gets the profits, and that they are chiefly bad because now the money is going to another State which needs it even more than Western Australia? To ask this House to endorse a proposal of that sort cannot surely be seriously intended. Besides, the mover and the champion of the report, who announced himself as the principal racing authority on the committee, and who I believe was the chief authority on the committee, said in effect that if the Government took this report seriously and acted upon it, he would hardly know whether to vote for certain clauses of the report or against them. Can this House seriously adopt such report? Of course it cannot. What is to be done? The committee has assembled a lot of very valuable information. Possibly the most kindly way of dealing with the whole subject will be this, that I should move an amendment to the motion to the effect that the committee be thanked for the valuable evidence which has been collected and that Clauses 14, 15, 18, and 21 of the report should be commended to the immediate attention of the Government. Clauses 14, 15, 18, and 21 are really the essential clauses of the report. Clause 14 deals with the totalisator, limiting it to bona fide race clubs and refusing it to unregistered clubs. Clause 15 proposes that street and shop betting shall be suppressed, that betting on racecourses otherwise than through the totalisator shall be prohibited; and that totalisator agents shall also be prohibited. Clause 18 prohibits advertisements relating to betting on horse-races. Clause 21, that betting by and with persons under the age of 18 years through the totalisator, or otherwise, should be prohibited, is also one which should commend itself to the House. Here are four clauses which I think the whole House will endorse. I think the best way of dealing with the report is to commend these four acceptable clauses to the immediate attention of the Government, and to thank the committee for having assembled such valuable information in the evidence on which the report is based. I move an amendment—

That the committee be thanked for the valuable evidence collected and that Clauses 14, 15, 18, and 21 of their report be commended to the immediate attention of the Government.

On motion by Hon. R. J. Lynn debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.33 p.m.