

ing or fastening of a vessel, worth perhaps half a million of money, could be fined only fifty pounds. The provision of Clause 71 should be here inserted.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** There was no objection; but these two clauses were taken *verbatim* from the New Zealand Act of 1878, and presumably a difference was made because it was more unlikely that damage would accrue to a vessel from her moorings being cut than that malicious injury should be done to harbour buildings, careful watch being kept on vessels and little or none on buildings.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** The clause assumed that the moorings would be cut; and if the crime were committed, did anyone think fifty pounds a sufficient penalty? There should be at least the option of imprisonment for wilfully sending a ship adrift. He moved that the words "or to imprisonment not exceeding twelve calendar months with or without hard labour" be added to the clause.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 71, 72, 73—agreed to.

Clause 74—Penalty for offering bribes to officers:

**MR. THOMAS:** A penalty of £20 was inadequate; for if big works were in hand, large bribes might be offered. He moved that the word "twenty," in line 6, be struck out, and "one hundred pounds or to imprisonment not exceeding twelve calendar months with or without hard labour" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 75 to 78, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedule—Section 22:

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:** There being at least one grant of land in fee simple within the area defined by the schedule, he moved that the following words be added: "but excluding therefrom any land already granted by the Crown in fee simple."

Amendment passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 12 minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 30th September, 1902.

	Page
Questions: Public Service, effect of new legislation	1289
Coolgardie Water Scheme, Reticulation	1289
Motions: Rabbits Board, to appoint (withdrawn)	1290
Houses of Parliament (new), Joint Committee, change of Member	1296
Metropolitan Waterworks, to inquire	1297
Bills: Rabbit Pest, first reading	1294
King's Park Tramways (to introduce), Point of Order (adjourned)	1294
Widow of late C. Y. O'Connor Annuity, first reading	1296
Railways Acts Amendment, first reading	1296
Indecent Publications, first reading	1296
Droving, first reading	1296
City of Perth Building Fees Validation, second reading, in Committee, reported	1296
Administration (probate), third reading	1297
Railway and Theatre Refreshment Rooms Licensing Amendment, third reading	1297
Justices, in Committee, Recommittal, progress	1298
Marine Stores, second reading, in Committee, Recommittal	1298
Public Works, second reading	1300
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, second reading, in Committee, reported	1304
Point of Order: King's Park Tramways Bill	1294

**THE PRESIDENT** took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **MINISTER FOR LANDS:** 1, Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending 30th June, 1902. 2, Western Australian Government Railways—Alteration to Classification and Rate Book. 3, Return showing Wharfage and Port Dues paid in respect of Inward and Outward Cargoes at the Port of Fremantle.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE, EFFECT OF NEW LEGISLATION.

**HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE** asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How will the amended Public Service Act affect officers who have received long service leave of absence under the Public Service Act of 1900. 2, How will it affect officers who have applied for the long service leave under the Public Service Act of 1900, but who have not been granted such leave up to the introduction of the above amended Act now before the House. 3, How will it affect officers who have been six years in the service up to the introduction of the above amended Act now before the House, and who are entitled to the long service leave provided for in the Public

Service Act of 1900, but who have not up to date of the introduction of the amended Act applied for the long service leave.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 2, and 3, These questions are dealt with in a new Clause, which has been added to the Bill in the Assembly, and which will come before the Council in due course.

#### QUESTION—COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, RETICULATION.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY asked the Minister for Lands: What arrangements have been made for the reticulation of the towns of Southern Cross and Coolgardie from the Coolgardie Water Scheme.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The whole question of reticulation is receiving the earnest consideration of the Government, and is the subject of negotiation between the Government, the municipalities, and the representatives of the mining interest.

#### MOTION—RABBITS BOARD, TO APPOINT.

HON. R. G. BURGES (East) moved:

That in the interests of the country a Rabbit Board be appointed, to assist the Government in hurrying on the erection of the rabbit-proof fence.

It was to be regretted he had to bring this matter before the House frequently, for those in authority did not see the serious consequence which would follow if they continued in a dilatory manner with the erection of the rabbit-proof fence. He wished the Government to have the assistance of settlers who had had experience, and bitter experience, with rabbits in the Eastern States, where the Governments had worked in the same apathetic way as the present Government were doing in regard to rabbit-proof fencing. If some immediate steps were not taken to have the rabbit-proof fence erected through the South-Western part of the country, not only would the agricultural interests suffer, but the pastoral interests would be affected. He did not wish to censure the Government, but to advise them to try and get the assistance of such men as Mr. Walsh, who was a well-known settler living in the Murchison district. This gentleman had often written to the newspapers, and had had a personal

interview with the Minister for Lands in regard to the rabbit pest. He (Mr. Burges) advised the Government to place such a man as Mr. Walsh on the board which it was proposed should be established. Mr. Walsh and his brother, and perhaps other members of the family, some years ago had a station in the Western division of New South Wales. The settlers in the Western portion of New South Wales went to the Government and offered to erect a rabbit-proof fence, if the Government would pay half the cost and give the settlers an extension of their leases. But the Government laughed at the proposal. The settlers saw that the rabbits were coming, and they made another offer to the New South Wales Government. They offered to fence the whole of the Western division, provided the Government would give them an extension of five years of their leases. But the New South Wales Government would not do that. The rabbits came and spread all over the Western division, doing an immense amount of damage. The rabbits drove many of the settlers out of the country, and amongst them Mr. Walsh of whom he (Mr. Burges) was speaking. In the Western division of New South Wales there was a large extent of country rather poor, but covered with low wattle, which was a protection to the grass. The rabbits got into this country and barked the wattles, the sand drifted over the country, and now the land was nothing but a useless sand-drift. There were many settlers in this State who had personal experience of the rabbit pest. Parliament 12 months ago voted the money for the erection of a rabbit-proof fence, and the other day he asked questions in the House to know what was being done and if the Rabbit Department were moving in this matter. He saw a notice in the newspapers calling for tenders for the erection of 20 miles of fencing north-west of Starvation Harbour. It was time some of those who took an interest in the country should find out from the Government what was being done, especially as it appeared that the Government were so indifferent to the interests of the settlers. It did not matter what money the settlers spent, the Government were willing to see this money wasted. When Parliament voted a sum of money, it behoved those

who took an interest in the country to know what was being done with it. Something should be done to see that active steps were taken to prevent the spread of the rabbit pest. He knew one settler who had not a great deal of money, but who had spent a large sum of money to keep his place going, and that settler had told him (Mr. Burges) that he had nearly completed 40 miles of fencing to enable him to turn his stock on to a certain piece of country. The Government ought to do something more than was being done at the present time. The Government, having before them the evidence given before the Royal Commission, and being aware that the rabbits were coming in, should either have pushed on the erection of the fence with all possible speed, or should have left the whole business alone. The carelessness and dilatoriness displayed in the erection of the fence so far meant a scandalous waste of public money. In reply to his second question, he had been informed that contracts had been let for the erection of 110 miles of fencing, and that the letting of a farther 70 miles was contemplated. The answer to his third question stated that the completion of the 400 miles decided on might be expected by the end of next year. Here was a farther delay of 15 or 16 months. His fourth question dealt with country to the north of the 400 miles of fencing already decided on. The protection of our northern division was of the utmost importance to the State. Unless great expeditions were used in protecting that province by means of fencing, the settlers would not be able to resist the rabbit invasion. At the present rate of progress, the erection of the rabbit fence seemed likely to rival the completion of the Coolgardie Water Scheme in point of dilatoriness. In connection with this work, we wanted a man like Mr. Teesdale Smith, who in another State had constructed earthworks as quickly as our Government had erected rabbit-proof fencing. Mr. Charles Harper was another man whom it would be advisable to have on the board. The statements of Inspector White with reference to the prevalence of rabbits had been ridiculed, but the report of the Royal Commission showed that this officer had reported correctly and had done good work. Certain evidence given

before the Royal Commission had been ridiculed by some settlers simply because they wanted to sell their lands, but those very settlers were now asking for Government assistance in the erection of fencing. Certainly those settlers did not merit much consideration, because had they made representations to the Government at the proper time the rabbits would have been blocked by the erection of 20 or 30 miles of fencing in the neighbourhood of Eucla. Mr. Gill, an Esperance settler whom he had known for many years, had told him that rabbits were exceedingly numerous in the district. He (Mr. Burges) had thereupon asked Mr. Gill to write a letter to the newspapers, calling attention to the fact. Mr. Gill, however, did not appear to have done so, or else the letter had not been published. Constable Begley's evidence before the Royal Commission was as follows:—

849. By Mr. Richardson: Your personal observation quite agrees with the report made here?—Answer: Yes. Mr. Ryan gave me the information that the day before I arrived three natives were sent out to see how many rabbits they could catch, and they brought in 43 in a few hours, caught on the sandhill just by.

850. By Mr. Wittenoom: By dogs?—Answer: Yes. When I arrived at a place 60 miles from Eucla three or four natives had been sent out, and had brought in 80 rabbits.

That was two or three years ago. The rabbits were now to be found around Lake Lefroy and on the Hampton Plains. The statement that the rabbits existed in millions was, perhaps, an exaggeration; but still the fact remained that one would find rabbits wherever he went. Traces had been found in the neighbourhood of Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, and Kanowna, and farther on as well, in districts where large pastoral leaseholds had been taken up. The question we had to ask ourselves was whether we were going to allow the rabbits to take possession of our country? The small holdings could be easily protected by the settlers with Government assistance, but what about the large area of pastoral country unoccupied? He did not agree with the statement of the secretary of the Rabbit Department that a great deal of country which had been invaded by the rabbits was useless and might well be abandoned to them. That country

would be valuable when irrigated. Moreover, there was an enormous extent of good pastoral country in the northern division of the State, northward of the Irwin, and, indeed, right away from Menzies. Settlement was now proceeding in that country, of which more and more would be taken up as the markets of the State enlarged. Since individual settlers in the north-west portion of the State had erected as much as 300 or 400 miles of fencing, why could not the Government erect 1,000 or 1,200 miles? He hoped that as the result of this discussion some wise suggestions might be made. The motion would show Ministers that the people looked to them immediately to put energy into this work, so that the money should not be wasted or the whole country occupied by rabbits. Of these rodents he (Mr. Burges) had not yet personal experience, as had some other members; but the incursion must be kept back, not only for the sake of settled country, but on behalf of future settlers on the unoccupied lands of the State. Men such as Mr. Walsh and Mr. Bush should be appointed; and, like roads-board members, probably these gentlemen would act gratuitously, if their expenses were refunded. It was for prominent settlers who had had experience of rabbits to undertake the direction and supervision of the fencing.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East) seconded the motion. The last speaker had shown there had been much carelessness in the past, and that some fresh mode of procedure must be adopted to deal with the trouble. The appointment of a board would be a proper step. Many settlers along the Great Southern Railway had had a long and bitter experience of the rabbit pest in the Eastern States, and their advice would be of value. It was useless to blame the present or past Governments for the non-erection of the fence; but none could deny the necessity for its immediate completion; in fact, it should be completed within six months from date, as construction could be commenced at no less than three different places near the Great Southern Railway, and from the coast to where contractors were now working. Even private people had this season erected some 40 miles of fencing each; therefore the Government could by a succession of

small contracts complete the fence within the time specified. Now that the rabbits were close at hand, immediate action was imperative.

HON. C. SOMMERS (North-East): The blame for the delay did not lie on the Government. It was true private people could erect fencing; but they must have the material. When he was the Minister for Lands he was ready to call for tenders when the Leake Government left office, and the change of Ministry threw back the matter for three or four months before papers could be prepared and consents obtained to the letting of tenders. There was a mishap also to the vessel bringing the first cargo of wire netting, resulting in a delay of three or four months. Ministers were to be congratulated on their candour. Some Governments, to conceal the fact that there had been any mistake in the search for rabbits, or that their numbers had increased, would perhaps have continued erecting the original line of fencing after it had been ascertained that rabbits were on both sides of the structure; but Ministers, with the approval of the advisory board, composed of highly respected men such as Mr. Charles Harper, had within the last fortnight determined on the proposed alteration of the fencing line, the new route being one which would admit of material being readily brought by rail, thus obviating unnecessary delays. It must be recollected that a survey had been necessary through a desert country, and that water and stock had had to be provided before men would tender for fencing. Reference had been made to the non-appointment of Mr. White as chief of the department. Mr. White had been offered the position, but not being used to office work he preferred the chief inspectorship, taking charge of the whole out-door work and advising the Government as to local conditions. Mr. White had not been passed over, but had declined the position. He (Mr. Sommers) did not object to the appointment of the board, but objected to blame being cast on the Government. The first mistake had been made years ago in not erecting a short fence across the desert sand-plain, which the rabbits had not then penetrated. The proposed board was unnecessary, as there was already an

advisory board, whose recommendations were gladly accepted by Ministers.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): Good must arise from the discussion; but he had little faith in the practical efficacy of the so-called rabbit-proof fencing. Putting a fence between here and the goldfields and leaving the ends open was like casting a net in the middle of a stream in the hope of catching all the fish. Had the fence been commenced from the sea, it might have been efficient; but to commence construction in the centre of the proposed line seemed ridiculous. There were now forty or fifty miles erected with both ends unprotected, and it was alleged that rabbits were to be found on either side; so that unless the work could be quickly completed, it would represent a waste of money. Doubtless, owing to scarcity of water, fencing was difficult and much time was lost. He feared it would be almost impossible to complete the line in time to be of material benefit; and the only alternative would be to wait till rabbits appeared, and then to fence in the holdings by structures constantly watched and kept in repair. The proposed State fence would be of immense length; there would be no supervision; and it would be like that erected between South Australia and New South Wales. When on the journey from Adelaide to Broken Hill he had seen as many rabbits on one side of the fence as on the other, showing that the rodents could penetrate it as they liked. To keep the fence in repair would require a larger staff. Even if it were now erected, the rabbits had already access to much valuable land. The extent of country between here and the goldfields must be remembered, much of it utterly useless in its present condition; and the rabbits might have it, he should say, for all the good it was to most people. The rabbits would let us know when they were coming, for they would form little colonies, and it would be for us to protect threatened areas. He fully believed in the importance of forming a board to carefully consider this matter and deal with it in a way which would do good; but to carry on the fence in the way suggested would, in his opinion, be only to waste money.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson): While most thoroughly in

sympathy with the mover in desiring to hurry on the erection of the rabbit-proof fence, yet the action suggested in the motion would not assist very much. Boards of this kind were purely advisory. We were aware of the great necessity for this fence, and the board could not advise us farther than that it should be proceeded with immediately. The fence would not be erected by the board, but there must be concentrated effort of a department and inspectors to see that the fence was properly erected. The present Government were in no way to blame in the matter. The fence should have been erected as far back as ten years ago, and then the difficulty would have been infinitesimal; but the matter was not taken up in earnest until Mr. Sommers became Minister for Lands. Mr. Sommers took up the position that it was absolutely necessary that this fence should be erected, and he appointed a secretary and put the machinery in order. A survey had to be made, this being a very costly and difficult matter, and that had been done. The first week he (Hon. A. Jameson) entered into office this matter was taken up with regard to providing material for the erection of the fence. Up to that time, owing to the break in the continuity of Government, very little had been done; the material had not been ordered. It was then at once ordered, the quantity being enormous. Four hundred and thirty miles of wire fencing had been ordered, and this could not be obtained like one roll or a few rolls. The Government to-day received notice that from the present time they would receive 40 miles a month, and it was decided that tenders should be called for the whole amount of the fencing between Burracoppin and the southern coast. The advisory board with regard to matters agricultural advised, after thorough investigation, that the line of fencing should be somewhat altered, bringing it nearer the west; but the Surveyor General assured him that it would be absolutely impossible to have the survey made in less than three or four months. The Government were, therefore, going to follow the old survey line, and they decided that the fence should be gone on with at the rate of 40 miles per month. They had done every-

thing in their power to get this matter pushed on, and were now in a position to have it carried through to a final issue. They would endeavour to get that portion of the fence between Burracoppin and the coast completed within six months. Besides the fencing required for this portion, they had telegraphed for 200 miles for fencing in a northern direction, and they hoped to be able to push on in that direction also. Mr. Moss pointed out to him that he (Hon. A. Jameson) was to-day asking for leave to introduce a Bill to deal with the rabbit pest so that the whole matter might be placed in statutory order. There would be thorough inspection of this fence at the time it was erected, and the Government would have the whole of the machinery in order, so that they would be able to cope with the rabbit pest. They had arranged to, in the meantime, whilst this fence was being erected, use all labour necessary to prevent the rabbits from passing beyond the line where it was proposed to place the fence. Then we should have a large area of quite unknown country between the line of the fence and the great southern line, and with care it would be long before the rabbits could traverse that country. He hoped that long before it was traversed the settlers who were between 20 and 30 miles of the southern line would look after their own interests and see that their settlements were fenced before there was any chance of rabbits getting there. If it became necessary to have rabbit boards to deal with the fencing of small areas, that would be the time to bring forward the suggestion which had now been made. There were boards in New South Wales, and they had been found to answer well. Of course it meant additional taxation, and his own opinion with regard to this fencing was that so important was it to the whole State that the cost in a large measure of fencing operations of this kind should come out of the general revenue. He hoped the time was far distant when boards would be necessary in this State. This matter was on the point of being satisfactorily carried out, and the appointment of a board would retard rather than further the measures the Government had in hand; therefore he could not support the appointment of a board.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (in reply): The Minister had told us this fence could be erected in six months; but the Minister also stated that the Surveyor General said he could not get the survey done under three or four months. [HON. M. L. MOSS: A fresh survey.] The Minister had said an advisory board would be an expense; but he (Mr. Burgess) did not think so. If a board were appointed, it would do no harm. He was sure men would be willing to give their assistance, and the board would be a satisfaction to the people who believed these rabbits were going to be a pest.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in explanation): A new survey would take so long that the Government were going to rely on the old survey. The whole of the efforts of the Government were to prevent rabbits from coming. If, when this fence was erected, the rabbits beat us, we should want advice in regard to them. In the meantime all we had to do was to erect a fence as rapidly as possible.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

#### RABBIT PEST BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and read a first time.

#### KING'S PARK TRAMWAYS BILL.

##### POINT OF ORDER.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved for leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to authorise the construction of tramways in the King's Park."

HON. A. G. JENKINS: I rise to a point of order. A Bill was introduced early in the session entitled an "Act to amend the Parks and Reserves Act, 1895;" and by Clause 7 of that Bill power was given as follows:—

A board may, on such terms and conditions as the Board may think fit and the Governor approve: (1), Construct and use tramways on any portion of a park or reserve under their control; (2), Authorise the construction of such tramways by any other person; (3), Grant running powers over any such tramways; and may, with the like approval, (4) Charge, or permit to be charged, fares and tolls; and (5) Make, repeal, and alter by-laws for the use and regulation of such tramways.

That Bill was ordered to be read a second time "this day six months," on the

motion of Mr. Maley. Standing Order 244 says:—

If the Council order a Bill to be read a second time "this day three months," "six months," or at any other time after the probable duration of the session, the same Bill cannot be reintroduced in the same session.

Standing Order 1 sets out the general rule:—

In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by sessional or other orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, which shall be followed so far as they can be applied to the proceedings of the Council.

Referring to *May*, the 10th edition, at page 286, it is stated:—

It is a rule, in both Houses, which is essential to the due performance of their duties, that no question or Bill shall be offered that is substantially the same as one on which their judgment has already been expressed in the current session. . . . A mere alteration in the words of a question without any substantial change in its object, will not be sufficient to evade this rule. On the 7th July, 1840, Mr. Speaker called attention to a motion for a Bill to relieve dissenters from the payment of church rates, before he proposed the question from the chair. Its form and words were different from those of a previous motion, but the object was substantially the same; and the House agreed that it was irregular, and ought not to be proposed from the chair. Again, on the 15th May, 1860, the order for the second reading of the Charity Trustees Bill was withdrawn, as it was discovered to be substantially the same as the Endowed Schools Bill, which the House had already put off for six months. So, also, on the 17th May, 1870, a motion for an address in favour of emigration was not allowed to be made, being substantially the same as a resolution which had been negatived in the same session. On the 9th May, 1882, it was ruled by Mr. Speaker that a motion affirming the necessity of legislation to enable members duly elected to take their seats was inadmissible, as an amendment to the same effect, but in different words, had been negatived on the 7th March.

On page 289 more decisions are given. I wish now to refer to a decision of Mr. Speaker in the Legislative Assembly, given last session on a motion by Mr. Fergie Reid:—

That in view of the shortage of firewood on the Eastern Goldfields, this House is of opinion that, in order to avoid a disaster to the mining industry, and to make provision for a plentiful and cheap supply, facilities be afforded for increasing the marketable quantity of firewood by constructing 40 miles of railway line (starting from Coolgardie) to tap the timber resources south of Coolgardie.

The motion was negatived. About a fortnight later Mr. Reid moved:—

That in view of the shortage of firewood on the Eastern Goldfields, this House is of opinion that, in order to avoid a disaster to the mining industry, and to make provision for a plentiful and cheap supply, facilities be afforded for increasing the marketable quantity of firewood by constructing 25 miles of railway line (starting from Coolgardie) to tap the timber resources south of Coolgardie.

Mr. Speaker then said:—

I notified last night that I should have to rule this motion out of order, it being substantially the same as one which has been before the House. I have since thought over the matter carefully, and am still of the same opinion. The facts are these. The hon. member brought forward a motion similar to the one now on the Notice Paper on 4th February. It was discussed for the two hours during which motions can be dealt with, unless the House agrees that motions shall be continued afterwards. On the House resuming after the refreshment hour, a motion was made that the discussion on the motion should be continued, and that was negatived. I consider this was tantamount to an expression of opinion on the part of the House against the motion. The motion disappeared from the Notice Paper; now it is the same question put again, and I have to rule that the motion being essentially the same as one which the House has disposed of, it is out of order.

We have already discussed in this House and decided that a board should not have power to construct and use tramways in any part of the King's Park, or to authorise the construction of tramways by any other person. Now leave is sought to introduce a Bill to authorise the construction of tramways in the King's Park. I maintain this is substantially the same Bill, only in different words, as the one already negatived by the House; and as this question is one of great importance and affects the practice of this House, I ask your ruling whether the Minister for Lands is in order in asking leave to introduce this Bill.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like the motion to be postponed until to-morrow, so that I may look into the question. The Bill which was thrown out dealt with other matters besides the construction of a tramway through the park. It dealt with the appointment of a board, making accessible the entrances to Caves (South-West), granting licenses to hotels, and many other subjects. Certainly the hon. member is correct in saying there was a clause in reference to tramways,

and that clause is virtually the same as in the Bill now sought to be introduced. I would like the matter to stand over; but looking at the question on a first glance, I am inclined to agree with the view which Mr. Jenkins has placed before me. However, I would like to go more carefully into the question.

On motion by the **MINISTER FOR LANDS**, consideration of the motion postponed until the next day.

#### HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT (NEW), JOINT COMMITTEE.

##### CHANGE OF MEMBER.

**THE PRESIDENT:** Mr. Matheson, lately a member of the House, was a member of the committee in reference to the erection of the new Houses of Parliament. Last session this matter was overlooked; therefore it was now necessary for the House to elect another member on the committee in place of Mr. Matheson.

Notice of motion given for the next day.

#### WIDOW OF THE LATE C. Y. O'CONNOR ANNUITY BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the **MINISTER FOR LANDS**, read a first time.

#### RAILWAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the **MINISTER FOR LANDS**, read a first time.

#### INDECENT PUBLICATIONS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by **HON. M. L. MOSS** (Minister), read a first time.

#### DROVING BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by **HON. R. G. BURGESS**, read a first time.

#### CITY OF PERTH BUILDING FEES VALIDATION BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

**HON. G. RANDELL** (Metropolitan), in moving the second reading, said: This is a short Bill, the object of which is sufficiently explained by its first and only clause. It appears that in June, 1896,

by-laws were passed by the City Council, with a schedule attached, and that these by-laws with the schedule were gazetted in due course. In June, 1897, it was thought desirable to pass new by-laws, and also a new schedule, which accordingly was done. By some inadvertence or perhaps some little negligence, the schedule to these by-laws, although drawn up, was not gazetted. In September, 1898, the omission was corrected. During the interval the City Council had, in the ordinary course of business, collected the fees authorised by the schedule which had been drawn up but not gazetted. The matter was purely one of oversight, and hon. members will recognise that there has been nothing wrong in the transaction. The City Council, under the Building Act, have been entitled all along to frame a scale of fees to be paid by persons who wish to erect houses. These fees would be paid by the builders or contractors. All of us, when building houses, understand that these fees are included in the price which the contractor charges the owner or proprietor of a building for the construction of that building. I am informed, and so far as I see I believe, that no wrong has been done, but that through a mere inadvertence the City Council are placed in a rather awkward position, from which they desire to be released. A Bill for the purpose has been introduced in and passed by another place, and has now come to us. I hope hon. members will recognise the desirability of assisting the City Council, who, if not protected, will be involved in the payment of a considerable sum of money. As I have said, the scale of fees was in existence previously to June, 1897, and was again brought into operation in September, 1898. By some means or other, it became known that the schedule had not been gazetted. I understand that certain persons have shown an intention of taking advantage of this omission to get a refund from the City Council. The fees, if refunded by the City Council, would not, of course, go into the pockets of the persons who own the houses which were built and in respect of which the fees were paid, but into the pockets of the contractors. This is rather an important consideration. On the face of it, however, the Bill is so purely an act of

justice towards the City Council that I feel sure hon. members will cordially agree to pass it into law. I do not know that I need say more concerning the measure. It is true that a certain point, which however does not touch this question, has cropped up, a point relating to floor area. Mr. Wright, I think, will understand the point. Objection has been taken to the City Council charging fees on more than one floor area. It appears, however, that there is power so to charge, and that under the new schedule which has been gazetted the City Council are charging fees on more than one floor area. This validating Bill, however, does not touch that point, but merely makes legal an act of the City Council which became illegal through an inadvertence on the part of an officer of the council.

Question put and passed.

• Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

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

#### ADMINISTRATION (PROBATE) BILL.

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

#### RAILWAY AND THEATRE REFRESHMENT ROOMS LICENSING AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

#### MOTION—METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, TO INQUIRE.

Debate resumed from the 23rd September, on the motion by Hon. T. F. O. Brimage, "That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the working and general management of the Metropolitan Waterworks."

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): The Government would cheerfully consent to the appointment of the committee, if members thought some inquiry desirable.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): To appointing a committee he had no objection, but he felt fairly certain its result would be *nil*. From his experience of two prominent members of the board, he felt assured they would be delighted to give any desired information. In their

business ability, integrity, and working capacity he had perfect confidence, and knew that in very difficult circumstances the Act was administered in the interests of the Government, as well as of the city and suburbs. If any facts not known to the public could be elicited by inquiry, well and good; but it did not appear any good could result, nor could much advantage accrue to consumers in Perth, in whose interests the mover was presumably acting. It was well known the Metropolitan Waterworks were over-capitalised.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: For that the House was partly responsible.

HON. G. RANDELL: True; but all would agree that the purchase price of the waterworks had been very high; and he at the time had protested that the figure was at least £100,000 more than was reasonable. On the purchase money, some of which had, he believed, been borrowed from the Savings Bank, interest had to be paid; and both the present and the previous boards had been strictly charged with the duty of raising the interest, having been informed that Ministers would not approach Parliament for a vote to liquidate the debt due to the Government. The administration of the board had been seriously assailed in several quarters, in many cases from interested motives. He as much as anyone regretted that consumers had to pay 2s. per 1,000 gals. for water; but that was due not to the present or the past board, but to over-capitalisation. The board were making every possible effort satisfactorily to carry out their duties; and much of the opposition was due to the high price. Moreover, the board were handicapped by the expenses incurred by their predecessors, which were ascertainable from papers presented to the House. On such a committee he would be sorry to serve, though if he thought there were any irregularities or any possible improvements, he would rejoice to act.

HON. C. SOMMERS (North-East): Against the board he had no complaint. But, to begin with, good might result from an investigation of the charges. The rate of 2s. per 1,000 gals. was high; for consumption in the city and suburbs had increased, and therefore a reduction might reasonably be expected. More-

over, the laying of mains through sand was inexpensive. Owing to the shortage of supply during summer, bores had been sunk; and he understood that often as much as 50 per cent. of bore water was mixed with rain water. This seemed strange in view of the splendid rainfall of the catchment area. The bore water might have been at one time pure, but he was informed it had at times a very bad smell; and that especially called for investigation. Briefly, the rate was high, the quality bad, and the quantity insufficient.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken, and a committee appointed comprising Hon. B. C. Wood, Hon. J. W. Wright, also Hon. T. F. O. Brimage as mover; with power to call for persons, papers, and records, and to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned; to report this day month.

#### JUSTICES BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration resumed from the 23rd September; Hon. M. L. Moss in charge of the Bill.

Clause 225 (postponed)—No action against Justices after order *nisi* to quash conviction has been granted:

HON. M. L. MOSS said he had been requested by Hon. S. J. Haynes to move the following amendment standing on the Notice Paper in that member's name. The Government were prepared to accept the amendment. Clause 225, as it stood, appeared to be a contradiction of Clause 224. He moved as an amendment, that all the words after "when" be struck out, and the following words inserted in lieu: "upon an application to show cause why a conviction or order should not be quashed a *rule nisi* has been granted, no action shall be maintainable against the justices by whom the conviction or order in question was made, in respect of any proceeding taken under or matter arising out of such conviction or order, until after such *rule nisi* has been made absolute."

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

#### RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by Hon. M. L. Moss, Bill recommitted.

Clause 2—Repeal of existing acts:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that after the word "repealed," in line 2, "and amended" be inserted.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 68—Justices may prohibit the publication of evidence:

HON. A. G. JENKINS said he desired to move that this clause be struck out; but in order to adjourn the discussion he moved that the clause be postponed.

Clause postponed.

Schedule 1:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added to the schedule:—

60 Vict., No. 30, an Act to facilitate the Administration of Justice and the taking of Statutory Declarations.

Under 60 Vict., No. 30, power was given to a clerk of court to do what this Bill enabled him to do; therefore there would be two statutes on the statute-book containing the same provision. We did not want that. It was necessary to get that statute repealed.

Amendment passed.

HON. M. L. MOSS farther moved that the following be inserted:—

62 Vict., No. 30, the Interpretation Act, 1898. In section 19, the words "Petty Sessional Court" are struck out, and the words "Court of Petty Sessions" inserted in lieu thereof.

Members would see that throughout the Bill there was reference to a court of petty sessions in a number of clauses. In 1898 we passed an interpretation Act which defined a petty sessional court. This amendment was striking at the definition of petty sessional court by referring to all such courts as courts of petty sessions. The object of the amendment was to prevent a technical objection being raised.

Amendment passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

At 6:30, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.  
At 7:35, Chair resumed.

#### MARINE STORES BILL.

#### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS  
(Hon. A. Jameson): In moving the

second reading, I should like to point out that the measure is introduced in consequence of a demand by the Police Department. For the last four or five years there has been a constant request to have this Bill brought forward. The object of the Bill is to place under the control and supervision of the police all collectors and dealers in marine stores, it being stated that these collectors and dealers in marine stores use their calling for other purposes than that which it purports. That is to say the collectors particularly move about the yards of houses with the object of finding out the habits of the inhabitants and the weak spots of the house by which thieves may break through and steal. In other words these collectors are gaining information to give to burglars or robbers, who may take advantage of the knowledge gained in that way. Therefore it has been thought necessary to have this Bill in force here as in other countries, for this law exists in great Britain, and in Australia—it exists in South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, and New South Wales; also in New Zealand, throughout the States of America, and in Canada it is enforced. We are late here in bringing forward the Bill, but we have good precedent for proposing it, because the law has been adopted by all the other countries of the Commonwealth. The object of the Bill is to license the collectors and dealers in marine stores, which are defined in Clause 2 of the Bill, namely partly manufactured metal goods, second-hand anchors, cables, sails, and so on. The fee for the license for collectors is simply 2s. 6d.; the object being to have registration, so that collectors may be registered and be called on to give their address if they move from one place to another. In that way they will be under constant supervision, and, knowing they are under supervision, they will be more cautious in carrying on their trade, and in seeing that they carry it on for the purpose for which they are licensed. Thus, it will be admitted, this is a very reasonable Bill indeed, and a very desirable one. Members will find in Clause 11, that the license fee for dealers is £1, which is not a large sum for persons of this class. The fees mentioned in the Bill are distinctly reasonable, and I think no dealer or collector will object to pay these small amounts. I hope mem-

bers will see their way to support the second reading. I do not think I need go into farther details. There are provisions for carrying out the objects of the Bill which may be discussed in Committee. The principle of the Bill is that collectors and dealers in marine stores shall be licensed and registered so as to be under the supervision of the police. That is the reason it is brought forward; at the desire and request of the police force in this State, also on the recommendation of many householders. It is found, particularly where women and children are left alone, these collectors become very troublesome. Therefore I ask the support for the second reading, and I hope members will allow the Bill to pass through Committee.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY (South): I feel with the Minister for Lands that this is a very desirable measure, but there is one amendment I should like to see made when in Committee. There appears to be no restriction placed on collectors on holidays, which should be done. We should have to confine ourselves to Government holidays, and I think it would be very wise if a provision were inserted making it illegal for collectors to go round on public holidays.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No one can carry on his usual occupation on Sunday.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Clause 2 contains a provision in regard to Sundays.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: I speak more particularly of public holidays. I hope in Committee the Bill will be amended in the direction I have indicated.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: The definition of "marine stores" ought to include second-hand bags. Collectors were in the habit of paying visits of inspection to one's stables, and ascertaining what chaff-bags and so forth were obtainable. He moved that after "bottles," line 3, the words "second-hand bags" be inserted.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member's view would be met by the insertion of the words "jute goods."

Amendment altered as suggested by the Minister for Lands, passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Licenses to be issued by Commissioner of Police:

HON. G. RANDELL: Presumably the amount of the license fee had been carefully considered; but it seemed very low.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The persons affected by this Bill were mostly poor men.

HON. G. RANDELL: They had been characterised otherwise than as poor men.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: It would be well if the license fee were fixed at 10s., instead of 2s. 6d. The fewer we had of these collector gentry the better.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment suggested was not advisable, since the object of the Bill was not revenue, but registration. By registration of collectors the police would be better enabled to detect crime.

HON. G. RANDELL: To whom were the fees under this clause to be paid?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: To the Commissioner of Police.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Collector to leave address with police officer and report himself:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Were the badges, for the wearing of which Sub-clause (6) provided, to be worn always, and what form were these badges to take?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: These points would be dealt with by regulation under Clause 2.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—Licenses not to be let out:

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved that the following be added to Sub-clause (3.): "On Sunday or on any public holiday or."

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 7—Collectors to be licensed:

HON. G. RANDELL: This clause might be amended so as to provide what was to become of fees after they had been collected.

HON. M. L. MOSS: This clause did not admit of such amendment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 28, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedules (6)—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

# RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by HON. C. SOMMERS, Bill recommitted for amendments at the next sitting.

## PUBLIC WORKS BILL.

### SECOND READING.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): I move the second reading of this measure, which consolidates nine Railways Acts and three Land Resumption Acts. Though it may seem strange, there is no Public Works Act in force in this State; and with the exception of the various Railway Acts and Land Resumption Acts to which I have referred—and they are only very fragmentary measures as regards the carrying out of public works—there is no Act in force dealing comprehensively with this very important subject. When the Bill is in Committee it will require the closest attention of hon. members, because many of its clauses are of very great importance to the public at large. Now that the railways have been placed under a Commissioner, the position of the Commissioner of Railways in this State is very different from what it was prior to the present Commissioner's appointment. Up till within the last few months the Commissioner of Railways was a Minister of the Crown, and the railway officers under his supervision were charged, not only with the management of existing railways, but with the construction of new railways. The Commissioner of Railways, being now practically a general manager of railways, is charged with their management; and this Bill becomes an absolute necessity, because some authority must be responsible for the construction of railways and other works which may from time to time be authorised by Parliament. Clause 8 is new, inasmuch as it makes it incumbent on the Minister in charge of the Works Department to lay before Parliament during each ordinary session a full detailed estimate of the expenditure proposed to be made on all Government works throughout the financial year, prohibits the undertaking of any works for which Parliament has not specially appropriated money, and demands also that separate estimates shall be laid before Parliament for all works constructed out of loan moneys, or partially

out of loan moneys. I am fully aware that it has been the custom in the past to lay on the tables of both Houses of Parliament these estimates of expenditure; but there has been no provision making it incumbent on the Government so to do; so this clause has been inserted with the object of giving effect to the proposal, and I am sure the House will agree it is highly desirable that Parliament should at every session be taken into the confidence of the Government, and should clearly and exactly see what works are proposed to be undertaken. The Bill largely deals with land resumption; because, as I have already said, we propose to repeal the various Land Resumption Acts and the provisions of the present Railway Acts dealing with the taking of land compulsorily for public works. The clauses in this Bill dealing with land resumption are taken from the Property for Public Purposes Acquisition Act passed during the present session of the Commonwealth Parliament, and from the New South Wales Act of 1900; so that in adopting the provisions laid down by the Commonwealth Parliament and in New South Wales, we have the up-to-date legislation of Australia. If members will now turn to Clause 10, they will observe a departure from the existing state of affairs. At present there is power given to municipalities to take land for municipal purposes. That power has existed in this State since 1900 only; and there is power also to take land for railway purposes, and for such purposes as are contemplated in the Land Resumption Acts. But in Clause 10, not the Crown only but any local authority—and "local authority" is defined by the interpretation clause to mean "municipal council, roads board, or any persons or body however designated having authority under any statute to undertake the construction of public works"—have the power to take land compulsorily, for the purpose of carrying out works they are authorised by statute to undertake. Clauses 17 and 18 contain provisions which greatly modify the existing law. Members may be aware that at present, when land is compulsorily taken for public works, a certain procedure is gone through for assessing the amount of compensation; and that after the compensation has been assessed and paid

it becomes the duty of the person whose land has been taken to give to the Crown a transfer or surrender of the land. Clauses 17 and 18 contain an altogether different procedure. The proclamation of the Governor, published in the *Government Gazette*, immediately vests the land in the Crown or in the local authority for whom the land is resumed; and the estate and interest of the person to whom that land belongs is then at once converted into a claim for compensation; so that, without any transfer or conveyance of the land, the property becomes vested in the Crown or the local authority as the case may be; and that estate or interest which was previously possessed by the owner is converted into a claim for compensation. That greatly simplifies the present procedure.

HON. G. RANDELL: There ought to be a publication in some newspaper.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That detail we can consider in Committee. Next I desire to draw attention to Clause 36. Under the Crown Suits Act of 1898, no claim can be made against the Crown in respect of any matter after one year from the time that the claim arose. It is proposed however in Clause 36 to increase this period, where land is taken compulsorily, from 12 months to two years; and I think that is only fair, for the reason that where claims arise under the Crown Suits Act in respect of breaches of contract, or where a wrong or tort is committed, where injury is done to the public, 12 months is a very fair restriction; but where land is taken compulsorily and the owner is in some other part of the world, it is only fair that the period should be extended; and hence, though the Government can now bar such claims after 12 months has elapsed, the period is proposed to be extended to two years.

HON. G. RANDELL: Clause 13 mentions a period of one year.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member will perhaps draw my attention to that when in Committee. Part III. deals with the method of assessing compensation; and there the present-day rules are largely to be observed. Under Clause 50 the compensation court is to consist of a president and two assessors; and this president is to be either a resident magistrate or a police magistrate where the

claim does not exceed £500, and a judge of the Supreme Court where the claim is above £500, excepting that, by the consent of the parties, under Clause 51 the resident magistrate or the judge may decide the question without the intervention of assessors. That may be found to work well; because we know that in the majority of instances the arbitrators are generally partisans rather than arbitrators; and it is generally left to the magistrate or the Judge either to split the difference between the parties or to give his own award as to what he thinks right in the circumstances. Very likely this provision will be largely availed of in the future. Under Clause 63 there is an important alteration proposed. Some members may recollect that when the Municipal Institutions Act of 1900 was before this Chamber an attempt was made to insert a clause providing for the adoption in a small respect of the betterment principle; and Sub-clause (c) of Clause 63 contains the same words that appeared in the draft of that Act, the provision having been rejected by this House. But the Government have thought fit to include it here; and it appears that this provision has the force of law in other parts of Australia. The sub-clause provides thus:—

By way of deduction from the amount of compensation to be awarded, the court shall take into account any increase in the value of the estate, right, or interest of the claimant in any land adjoining the land taken likely to be caused by the execution of such proposed public work.

It has been argued that this is somewhat unfair; that while the person whose land is taken is obliged to suffer a certain reduction of the value which the balance of his land derives from the carrying out of the public work, adjoining owners, who may be benefited to the same extent, do not contribute anything. To carry out the betterment principle to its logical conclusion, there is no doubt that everybody in the locality whose property is improved by the construction of a public work should either specially contribute something towards it, or there should be contribution in the manner provided by Sub-clause (c). However, it is certainly a step in the right direction, that when a person's land is largely improved in value by the construction of

a public work, this improvement shall be taken into consideration as an element in assessing compensation.

HON. G. RANDELL: Is it according to the Railways Act?

HON. M. L. MOSS: No. All those clauses in the Railways Act providing for the taking of land and the question of the compensation will be repealed by the Bill now before the House. Whether it is for the construction of railways, roads, bridges, or any other public work, the whole procedure necessary for the taking of land, and the amount of compensation, will be laid down in this Public Works Bill. During this session of Parliament numbers of measures will come before members, largely consolidating measures. This is one, and the Justices Bill is another, which gets rid of thirteen old statutes; and it is intended to from time to time get as many of these comprehensive measures consolidated as we can, so as to have our statutes in as small a compass as possible. Whatever may be the public works, whether railways, wharves, bridges, or any other, the whole procedure of taking land and assessing compensation will be under this measure in future. Clause 72 contains a new provision, and one the want of which is somewhat seriously felt at the present time. Where land is taken at the present time, if there is a dual title you have either to dispute the title and have the whole thing fought out by action in the Supreme Court, or accept the title and proceed with arbitration, and pay the compensation. This Bill provides that after the publication of the proclamation of the Governor taking the land for public purposes, the claim for compensation will be considered and the amount arrived at; and if a question arises as to the title, the money has to be paid into the Supreme Court, and the owner of the land has thrown upon him the onus of satisfying the Supreme Court as to his right to get the money. I think members will see the procedure laid down there is simple, and in my opinion it will be carried out cheaply, and will provide us a means of getting over a difficulty which is being experienced at the present time.

HON. G. RANDELL: Will you explain the latter part of Clause 71, sub-clause 3, "the award so made and filed shall be final for all purposes and have the effect

of a judgment of the Supreme Court, and shall be as interest, and may be enforced accordingly"?

HON. M. L. MOSS: If you look at Clause 71, you will see it is there provided that the Court shall make its award in writing. That award is transmitted to the Master of the Supreme Court, and on its reaching him it is filed in the Supreme Court as a record, and has the same force and effect as a judgment, and carries interest at the same rate as that at which every judgment carries interest, eight per cent.; so that if the local authority or Government take land for any of these public purposes, and an award is made, we shall be saved almost the scandal that took place, at any rate before 1894, of an award remaining unpaid a month, two months, even three months, and no interest being recovered.

HON. G. RANDELL: I refer to the words more than anything else, "and shall be as interest."

HON. M. L. MOSS: That is a clerical error. That "be as" ought to be "bear." The clause carries out a very desirable object, because it will compel the local authority or the Government to pay the award quickly, or otherwise it will bear 8 per cent. interest. The next clause, 86, is somewhat important. It enables the Minister to repair roads that become Government roads, and enables the Government to declare certain roads Government roads. The explanation of the clause is this. Take the road from Perth to Fremantle, for instance. At times portions of that road have been under the direction of roads boards, and I think it is very doubtful whether the action of the Government in interfering with that road has not been an illegality. There are other roads in the same position. Once a roads board is created I think that board is entitled to have the care, control, and management of all the roads throughout the area. We know the Government, however, notwithstanding that there have been roads boards, have taken the care, control, and management of roads, and have repaired them and spent money on them, and generally acted in a way that seems to me to be somewhat in opposition to the provisions of the Roads Act. In order to remedy that apparent defect this Clause 86 has been inserted in the Bill,

so that when the Minister in charge of the administration of this measure takes any of these roads, and makes them Government roads by the expenditure of money, he is to have certain powers and authorities over them, and he will be acting legally instead of illegally, as I think he has been doing.

HON. G. RANDELL: Will Clause 85 give power to the Government over roads in a municipality?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Throughout this Act the word "road" means a public highway. There is no doubt the effect of Clause 85 is this, that the fee simple of these lands is vested in the Crown, and that these local authorities have merely the care, control, and management of them.

HON. G. RANDELL: Sort of trustees.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Yes. I do not think it is advisable for a local authority to get the fee simple of these roads.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: They do not.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No; they do not.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: This Bill will override the Roads Act, then?

HON. M. L. MOSS: This portion will, but there is nothing in conflict there. There is a new Roads Bill before Parliament now, and it is of the same purport as the present one. There the fees simple of these roads are not vested in the boards, but the soil remains in the Crown.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How about Clause 86?

HON. M. L. MOSS: I have endeavoured to explain that where by Order in Council, duly gazetted, the Government take roads and charge the Minister with the care, control, and management, then these roads are to be called Government roads, and the Minister shall have power to control them. When we get to Clause 86 I will endeavour to farther explain it to the best of my ability. Clause 99 seems to me to be a very unfair clause indeed, and one which I at once say the Government are not going to press. They are quite prepared to agree to this clause being struck out. It is, however, only right that I should make this explanation, that when the clause was inserted in the Bill it was placed there with the object of protecting the title, so to speak, of such portions of river beds as those where the Government had constructed bridges, or the local authority had

constructed bridges; but there is no doubt—after looking at that clause—that the result of it would be to inflict the very gravest amount of wrong and hardship upon persons who possess land fronting and abutting on a river bed. [MEMBER: Tidal river.] The Swan River is a tidal river, and there are very considerable interests in connection with the ownership of land abutting on the banks of the Swan River. It was not intended that the Government should interfere with private rights. Clause 99 undoubtedly does that, and we are going to agree to that clause being struck out when we go into Committee. Clause 130 is an important clause. The insertion of that has been necessitated in consequence, mainly I think, of the construction of the Coolgardie Waterworks. Members know that these works are at present giving a supply to the town of Northam, and they will, no doubt, when they get to the goldfields, give supplies to various towns and other localities there. Under the Fremantle Water Supply Act power is given in the case of the Fremantle Water Supply, which is a Government property, to let Fremantle, East Fremantle, and North Fremantle strike a rate for the purpose of providing some return on the money that the Government have expended in connection with that supply; and it may be expedient to have such a power in connection with other municipalities served by the Coolgardie Water Scheme. It may be necessary, if the Government go in for supplying these towns, generally to charge a rate in lieu of charging so much per thousand gallons, and that clause is inserted to give the Government power to take advantage of the Fremantle Water Supply Act in any such municipality, town, or district, as the Government may from time to time supply water to in connection with any scheme of water supply that belongs to the Government. I have endeavoured to point out the salient features of the measure. I strongly recommend the House to pass the second reading of it, and when we get into Committee the Bill will, in many respects, want very close watching, if only for the purpose of giving explanation to any member who may have doubts on the bearing or effect of any of the various clauses contained in the Bill. It certainly is a

measure urgently required. Now that the railways are placed under the control of a commissioner as far as management is concerned, it is necessary to have statutory power, so far as regards construction of these railways, to enable the Minister for Works and Railways to carry out those functions. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. RANDELL: Will the hon. gentleman agree to the Committee stage being postponed until Tuesday?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Yes.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank Act of 1894, and it has been demanded very considerably for the last two or three years by the agricultural community. It has been found that under the present Agricultural Bank Act the facilities for, at all events, stocking farms, and for generally improving them in an agricultural direction, have not been sufficient. Under the present Act we have only been able to advance money upon improvements. [HON. R. G. BURGESS: New improvements.] New improvements, improvements going on. That is to say, we have advanced three-quarters of the value of the improvements about to take place, and the payments have simply been progress payments as made in accordance with those improvements. As improvements went on, so the payments were made, and this has been found to act detrimentally in a certain respect. The improvements are laid down; advances have been made only in connection with improvements in fencing and other matters in connection with the holding, and there have been no facilities whatever for increasing the stock, or for carrying on horticultural and viticultural pursuits. The result has been that a good deal of progress in the agricultural communities has been retarded very materially, and it is now proposed to amend the present Act in so far as moneys may be advanced to farmers

upon actual security of improved holdings. Members will see under Clause 2 the objects for which advances may be made. These objects have been taken from the report of the select committee, which was printed at the beginning of this year. The committee went very fully into the question of the working of the Agricultural Bank, and found that it was necessary to extend the facilities of the bank in the particular direction to be found stated in Clause 2 of the Bill: "To pay off liabilities already existing on their holdings; to carry on farming, agricultural, horticultural, or viticultural pursuits on their holdings; to add to the improvements already made on their holdings." The money is to be advanced on approved securities, and may be utilised for purposes other than that of progressive improvements. By Clause 3 members will see it must be stated by the person applying for the advance the purpose to which the advance is to be applied. It would not do to advance moneys to be expended in other ways than in the general improvements of a farm. It would not do to advance moneys to be expended on a grand tour, as has been suggested. I was asked if the money could be expended by farmers going to the Eastern States to see what was being done there. But that would not fit in with the objects of the Bill. Therefore, we provide in Clause 3 that any persons applying for an advance must set forth in his application the purpose to which the money is to be applied. It will then rest with the manager of the bank whether he recommends such advance being made or not. Under Clause 4, no advance shall exceed one-half of the value of the improvements, or the sum of £1,200. This point has been considered very carefully, and it is thought it would not be wise to make a greater advance than one-half of the value of the improvements at one time. In some of the States the amount is three-fifths of the value; but we think we shall be on the safe side in advancing only one-half of the actual value in so far as this amending Bill does not interfere with the principal Act. Under the principal Act advances can still be made of three-fourths of the value of the progressive improvements; but that would be under a different form of mortgage.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Not in addition.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; quite distinct. The two forms of advances are quite distinct from each other. Advances will be made as hitherto under the principal Act; but not to the same person under both. When advances are made under the amending Bill, that annuls the advance that has been made under the principal Act; and if the amount advanced under the principal Act is so great that it is quite impossible to advance under this Bill, no advance will be made. I hope I have made that perfectly clear to members.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Do I understand that persons who have already borrowed cannot take advantage of this Bill?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: If a person has borrowed already, that person can take advantage of the Bill if it is to his advantage to do so, and if the one-half value of the improvements be greater than the amount already advanced. A person can only come under one of the two laws, the principal Act or this Bill.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: A man can take advantage of this Bill to do away with his present mortgage.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The benefits of this Bill can be taken advantage of to cover any advance made under the principal Act under Sub-clause (2) of Clause 4:—"In the case of land not held in fee simple, such one-half value shall be reduced by the amount of all rent payable and to become payable to the Crown in respect of such land before the issue of a Crown grant." That is to say, under a conditional purchase, suppose payment has been made for 10 years, that is one-half of the value, the other 5s. will be deducted from the half value advance made under this Bill. Supposing a man took up 100 acres of first-class land, the price for which is 10s. an acre, payable in 20 years at 6d. per acre per year; supposing the person had paid the instalments for 10 years, he would have paid off £25. There would still be £25 owing to the Crown on the property, and that £25 would be deducted from the half value which could be advanced under this Bill. This is the object of Sub-clause (2).

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How about the Land Purchase Act?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the Land Purchase Act it would be a little heavier, but not very much. Clause 5 says that Clause 4 shall not apply to advances under the principal Act. That I have already explained. There will be a priority of advances under Clause 6. Applications for advances under £500 have a priority over applications for larger amounts. The object is to secure advances to those who have small holdings. Where larger holdings exist, a person can always get private bodies or institutions to make advances to him. It is on small holdings, which require so much looking after and inspection, that it is difficult to get advances. Therefore, it is thought that priority should be given to applications for advances under £500.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How will that work out?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It will be worked out under inspection: a property would require to be worth £1,000.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What will you do if sufficient persons apply for amounts under £500 and absorb all the money? How will you give advances to other applicants?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Supposing there are several applications for advances at the one time, and it is decided that only a certain amount is to be advanced on that occasion—every month these applications will be dealt with—those who make application for amounts of £500 will have priority of claim.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Then the Bill will be useless.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; because under Clause 7 we propose to increase the amount of money to be advanced to £300,000. At present, the Act only allows £200,000 to be advanced.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How much has been spent?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is a balance of about £30,000. We have spent about £170,000, and we propose to increase the amount to £300,000, and if it is found the demands are very great indeed, that sum will have to be farther increased. We fear the demands may be

very large in this direction, but we shall only have an amount up to £300,000 to expend. We expect great results from Clause 6. In some of the Eastern States, for instance in Victoria, advances may be made up to £2,000, in South Australia up to £5,000, and in New Zealand up to £2,500. There the Governments have large sums at their disposal: in South Australia the amount is £3,000,000; in Victoria, £2,000,000; in New South Wales, £500,000; in New Zealand, £3,000,000; and in Western Australia at the present time only £300,000.

HON. G. RANDELL: An amount of £300,000 for the principal Act and this Bill?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: At the present time. I believe it will be found advisable to very greatly increase the amount.

HON. G. RANDELL: The rate of interest is governed by the principal Act.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. With this explanation members will have no difficulty in supporting the principle of the Bill. I hope the closest attention, particularly of agricultural members, will be given in Committee, for we look on this Bill as a very important amendment, and one which we hope will greatly help along the agricultural interests. The amount is small, but we hope it will be spent to advantage. To increase that amount we simply have to amend 50 Victoria, No. 21, Section 5—the amending of one clause of the principal Act. I think there will be no difficulty in passing the second reading of the Bill.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (East): I must congratulate the Government in bringing forward this important measure; but I am afraid it is not so important as it ought to be. It is faulty in the extreme as to this country in the present circumstances, for we have an enormous number of people coming to settle in the country. The Government have increased the amount which may be borrowed; but there is a saving clause by which all the good is annulled. With Clause 6 in the Bill, the measure might be done away with altogether, for people are placed on a false basis. People will go into the bank and think they can get money, when they will have to wait a long time for it, which will be a hindrance to them. That is the opinion of a great many, and I

know Mr. Throssell, the late Minister for Lands, was rather opposed to increasing the amount. Mr. Throssell thought loans should be granted only to the small man. Although I know that the amounts advanced encourage small men and new men coming into the country, who can get money at a liberal rate with a long time to pay it in, it is rather unfair to other holders of land who are not able to borrow money at a similar rate. It was generally supposed that this Bill would do something for larger holders; but it seems the Government have no confidence in the country by the small amount which they are prepared to advance. We have a small population, but up to the present time the bank has been worked all right: there has been no loss. Already £170,000 has been absorbed, and this, no doubt, has increased land settlement. With another £130,000, the Government will make no headway at all. I am sorry the measure is not more liberal. I should have preferred to see the amount under Clause 7 increased to £500,000; but I do not suppose this House has the power to increase the amount. If we suggested an increase, the other House would not agree to the amendment; therefore, I suppose we shall have to accept what is mentioned in the Bill. I am sorry our energetic Minister for Lands has not thought fit to bring in a more progressive measure. Still, I am going to support it; but I am pretty sure before another 12 months are past it will be found that the amount will have to be increased. No one knows better than the Minister for Lands the immense increase that has taken place in settlement, and the large increase of population which has come to this practically unknown country. Members who have taken an interest in what is going on know that there has been a large increase of population in this country, our immigration being larger than that of all the other States put together, for the last 12 or 18 months. That fact alone ought to show the Government the necessity for very greatly increasing the capital of the bank. I hope the Bill will be passed, though I am sorry its spirit is not more progressive. The lands of this State are now being largely taken up by settlers from the sister States and from our own goldfields. I

do not see how the Bill as it stands can do much: it will be rather in the nature of a farce. While the measure purports to grant to settlers the loan of a large amount of money for the purpose of raising mortgages and enabling them to buy stock and to acquire facilities for making their holdings more profitable, the fact is that the ordinary banks are offering more liberal terms. I shall not mention names, but I know of one bank at any rate which lends money without all these hampering and non-progressive restrictions. The banks are beginning to find out that the lands of this State are a good investment, and it is certain that if the Government do not show themselves more liberal the Agricultural Bank will go back instead of advancing. Other States will be found introducing more progressive measures than this. In speaking on the Land Bill, I made some remarks very much to the same effect. Our land regulations generally are liberal enough, but in some respects they are behind those of other States. Naturally, those other States wish to keep their population, of which we for our part do not desire to rob them; but we must have liberal legislation, and therefore I am sorry that the Government have not thought fit to bring in a broader measure than this. I do not know whether we can amend the Bill as regards its amount.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No; we cannot.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Recognising that the Bill represents some advance, I intend to support it.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I have much pleasure in supporting this measure, for introducing which the Government deserve credit. The success achieved by the Agricultural Bank in the past justifies our passing the Bill, the aim of which is most desirable, and will, I feel sure, meet with acceptance by the people throughout the State. The advisability of increasing the amount of advances with a view to offering larger facilities for cultivation might well be taken into consideration. Everyone knows that to begin farming in Western Australia means the expenditure of a large amount of capital. There is not only the purchase price of the land—that, indeed, is but a trifle—but there is the cost of clearing, fencing, water supply,

the purchase of machinery, horses, and other necessities, involving in the aggregate heavy capital expenditure. The Government know that they have at all times a sufficient security, and therefore must recognise that they are at all times perfectly safe in making advances to settlers, and so greatly benefiting the State as a whole. I am sure this measure will meet with public approval.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): The Government are to be commended for having introduced the measure; though I agree with Mr. Burges that the increase of capital as proposed is utterly paltry. A sum of £300,000 is far too small for the purposes of the Agricultural Bank. I may inform the Minister for Lands that the success which has attended the operations of the bank so far—I defy contradiction in making this statement—is due not even in the smallest degree to the funds authorised by the State. The success of the bank is due to the fact that the business people of the country districts have shown faith in our lands and in our settlers. The paltry amount lent by the Government in the past is but a drop in the ocean. The security demanded by the bank is in nearly every instance excessive—so excessive as to tie the farmer hand and foot, making him a mere slave to the Agricultural Bank. Inquiry will show what I state to be correct. Were it not for the faith which the business people of the country districts have consistently shown in our lands and our settlers, the Agricultural Bank would have been a failure. I have no hesitation in making that statement. This is a good opportunity for informing the mind of the Minister for Lands on a point which has long been observed by country residents. Bitter complaints have been made by those who have borrowed money from the bank as to the position in which they are placed. True, the rate of interest is reasonable; but the amounts advanced by the bank have, up to the present, been far too small for the requirements of the settlers and for the advancement of farming. I hope that when the Bill gets into Committee the Minister will see his way clear to raise the amount of the bank's capital to at least £400,000. The hon. gentleman has referred to the capital authorised in other States, and I may point out that

we have to compete with those States under federation. The sliding scale will soon have vanished, and we shall not then have the same facilities for production. Under such circumstances our farmers will certainly come to grief unless—

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: But you are close to the market.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Whether that be so or not, our farmers have to produce an article to compete with the best imported. If we do not set our house in order by enabling our farmers to get their farms in a paying condition, Western Australia will not be able to compete with the other States. I can point to farms carrying improvements to the extent of £80,000 or £90,000, and to several improved to the extent of £60,000. In view of these facts, hon. members may recognise what a drop in the ocean this Bill represents. I commend the Government for taking a step in the right direction. If they proceed on the same path and liberalise their methods, we shall find the State advancing in the production of cereals much more rapidly than in the past even. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): While I am pleased to support the Bill, I cannot follow the hon. member (Mr. Piesse) in his argument that we are to lend more on particular blocks of land. I hold that the money of the Agricultural Bank is the public money, and that its expenditure should be safeguarded in every possible way. We have to limit laws to meet extreme cases. I do not go so far as to say that anyone applying to the bank for a loan would act dishonourably, but we have to bear in mind the fact that we must guard against the inexperienced man. Unfortunately, it is a fact that all and sundry are considered fit and proper persons to go on the soil. I think the farming members will agree with me that if there is a calling the pursuit of which demands the possession of money, experience, brains, and muscle, it is farming. One feature of the Bill requiring amendment, to my mind, is that which seeks to limit its operation to the small man. It seems to be assumed that only the small man should go on the land—that the small farmer is to be looked after, and none other. The larger

man, it appears, is to be penalised. I hold, however, that we have to legislate for the good of the whole farming community—large farmers and small farmers alike. So long as the bank does safe business, so long as its funds are advanced where they will be returned, operations are proceeding on proper lines. I congratulate the Government on introducing this useful measure, but I consider that the funds proposed to be made available should be available for the larger as well as the smaller man. It will be necessary, therefore, to increase the amount at the disposal of the Government beyond the balance now contemplated, £130,000. I should be glad to see the amount increased very considerably.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Extension of purposes for which advances may be made :

HON. G. RANDELL: Were the already existing liabilities here referred to liabilities to the Government or liabilities to private persons?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They were private liabilities, mortgages already existing and carrying a higher rate of interest. The mortgages on small holdings carried rates of interest from eight to ten per cent., and as high as fifteen per cent. in some cases. The object of the clause was to render available to farmers so situated the more generous terms offered by the Government.

HON. G. RANDELL: The principle of this Bill required to be carefully guarded. Success in this instance was to be achieved by administration alone. The payment of existing liabilities by the Government seemed particularly objectionable unless the utmost precaution were exercised. By this clause we were departing from principles prevailing in other States which had adopted legislation of this nature. The feature was entirely new.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Not new in the Eastern States.

HON. G. RANDELL: Did the hon. member know whether the Eastern States paid off liabilities in this fashion?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Yes.

HON. G. RANDELL: The principle seemed to be dangerous.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Would not any lender take over a reasonable liability?

HON. G. RANDELL: Unless such advances were carefully watched by a thoroughly reliable manager, the Government might sustain serious loss.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Losses on advances of only half the value?

HON. G. RANDELL: In two or three years, half the value might mean one-fourth of the value. Many estimates of half values had not realised more than the amounts advanced; and all knew the Government were more liable to be tricked and to make losses than were private persons and private banks.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: So far, the Agricultural Bank had not been tricked.

HON. G. RANDELL: According to Mr. Piesse, the Act would have been a failure but for new settlers. It was, of course, desirable that men should obtain small advances; and it was well that the clause admitted of £1,200 being granted, and was to some extent improved by the proviso that £500 applications should have priority; but if Sub-clause 1 were carried it should be on the understanding that there was serious possibility of loss to the State, for the Agricultural Bank Act was particularly susceptible of being manipulated prejudicially to the country's interests. Sub-clause 1 was wide in scope, new in principle, and liable to great abuse.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The principle was not new, but had been frequently applied here.

HON. G. RANDELL: The hon. member seemed to know much of such illegal transactions.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It was impossible to avoid hearing of them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would be seen that the sub-clause was guarded on all sides. It was purely permissive; and in view of the fluctuating prices of land, care had been taken to restrict advances to one-half the value. In Victoria two-thirds were advanced, and in South Australia and New Zealand three-fifths; therefore we might fairly be considered safe. Clearly great hardship would be inflicted on small holders if the sub-clause were struck out; for many

were paying high rates of interest for small loans from private sources.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The hon. member (Mr. Randell) knew more of Perth than of the country districts. Was it not better to advance money to a man with good land somewhat improved than to lend to men who were merely commencing to clear land which might afterwards prove worthless? Which was the safer investment? If the sub-clause were struck out, the Bill was not worth considering. Many good estates already improved could be advantageously cut up; and surely these were fit subjects for advances. If a liberal measure was introduced, let members revise it with all the caution they could, but not throw it out. The last man was no doubt a good man in working the Act. If anything, he was a little bit too careful. Perhaps he (Hon. R. G. Burgess) was a bit too risky; but it was no use to be afraid in this country. We had plenty of wealth in it. This money was going into the land, and it would return tenfold. Let us give this a cautious trial, and if it was not workable we could withdraw it. There was a lot of new land south-east of Broome Hill on which the whole of this money could be used.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: It was certainly to be hoped the Committee would pass this particular sub-clause, which was one of the most vital in the Bill, and carefully safeguarded. It simply said that the manager "may." He knew Mr. Paterson, who would judge very much as Mr. Walter Padbury judged. Mr. Padbury judged by the amount of manure that was wasted or conserved. If he saw manure lying about, he would put the man down as thriftless, and would not be inclined to lend him any money. Mr. Paterson went somewhat on the same lines, and considered not only the place but the man. The banks were not in the habit of lending money at much less than eight per cent., and if a man could pay off a mortgage at eight per cent. and get one at five per cent., he would be three per cent. better off.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Sub-clause 2 provided thus: "to carry on farming, agricultural, horticultural, or viticultural pursuits." It would be wiser to put in the word "pastoral." Anyway, in relation

to stock, was it not the intention of the Government to advance money for this purpose?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Would not "farming" cover it?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: If the Minister read it that way, he was willing to let the clause stand in its present form.

HON. C. SOMMERS was in favour of the clause as it stood. He thought Clause 1, which enabled money to be lent in order to pay off existing liabilities, was a good one. The whole success of this Bill would be in the management. With regard to Clause 2, special care would have to be taken. The danger was in relation to advances for horticultural and viticultural pursuits. Everyone could plant a vineyard, but it was not everyone who could make a success of it.

HON. G. RANDELL: Care and caution should be exercised. He did not refer to Clause 2, because he thought it unnecessary to do so, and the other clause seemed to be the most risky. He quite understood it was also to a very large extent risky to lend money on horticultural and viticultural pursuits. He had no objection to the Bill. The only thing he wanted to recommend was very great caution. If we lent this money it would, he believed, be from loan funds. We should have to borrow the money at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or 4 per cent., and lend it at 5 per cent., and this did not show much margin. If there were a few losses, all profits were gone. He was quite prepared to admit the principle that the Government could afford to run some little risk to induce the settlement of the country. He thought that all were most anxious to see the country settled in the best possible way, either by agricultural, horticultural, or pastoral pursuits, or whatever the land was capable of producing.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: We had to thank the present manager, Mr. Paterson, for the great success of the bank. He intended to support the present Bill, but he congratulated Mr. Randell on having thrown out hints of caution. He looked upon him as one of the steadier members of the House, and a gentleman who always gave us hints so that we should be cautious in our legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—Applicant to state purpose to which advance to be applied:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: This clause did not go far enough. The old Act provided that the money should be spent in the way intended.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: An applicant set forth the purpose to which the advance had to be applied, and the money was advanced upon the declaration that such purpose was to be carried out. It would be in the agreement.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—No advance to exceed one-half value of improvements or the sum of £1,200:

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: In speaking on the second reading Mr. Clarke said he considered that the large farmer should be helped as well as the small farmer. That might be all very well, if we could afford it, but he contended that we could not afford to give away large amounts of money like this even for such a good purpose as land settlement. He would be as liberal as possible with the smaller landowner and the small selector who was struggling to eke out a living on the land. The limit should be considerably under £1,200. He moved that in line 4 the word "twelve" be struck out and "eight" inserted in lieu.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the principal Act a sum of £800 could be advanced on improvements. The select committee which inquired into this subject recommended that the limit of the advance should be £3,000. The Government fixed the amount at £1,200, being just half as much again as that already obtainable. The advance would now be on a more tangible security. In Victoria the limit of the advance was £2,000, in South Australia it was £5,000, and in New Zealand £2,500; so that Western Australia was still the State where the lowest amount could be advanced.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: While willing to offer every assistance to settlers, there were other industries in the State beside agriculture. If a man held land valued at £2,400, which would enable him to get an advance of £1,200, that settler should not require assistance. It was the settler who was just beginning and wanted merely a hundred or two hundred or up to five hundred pounds to

enable him to do something. In a year or two it would be found that the total which was available, the £300,000, would not be sufficient. The Bill was good for the small man, because there was a difficulty in getting an advance of £100 or so, but the man who owned an estate valued at £2,400 could obtain an advance from any institution. He would support the amendment.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The hon. members who opposed the clause should have voted against the Bill, for this was the vital principle of the measure. Why should new settlers get an advantage over older settlers? The advantage in obtaining money under the Agricultural Bank Act was that five years might elapse before repayment began, whereas such terms could not be obtained from any institution.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: It was to be hoped the amendment would not be pressed, as the object of the clause was to assist men in obtaining advances up to £1,200. There was not the slightest reason why the clause should be only made to apply to men with small holdings.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The reason that large amounts were advanced in South Australia was chiefly for village settlement purposes, and in Victoria a great deal of the money advanced for promoting agriculture was used for draining lands. Twelve hundred pounds was rather high, but if the agricultural members desired to have this amount fixed in the Bill, he would vote for it.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 5, 6, 7—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.40 o'clock, until the next day.