Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 21st December, 1932.

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

QUESTION—MINING, SUSTENANCE TO PROSPECTORS.

Mr. NULSEN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it a fact that sustenance has been indiscriminately stopped to the prospectors at Larkinville? 2, If so, will he state the reason?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

1, Reduction of Rents Act Continuance.

2, Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance.

3, Financial Emergency Act Continuance.

BILL—SECESSION REFERENDUM.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 9, Subclause (3), lines 30 and 31.—Strike out the words "if so required by the presiding officer, prove to his satisfaction by means of," and insert the words "make a."

The PREMIER: The object of the amendment is to require statutory declarations to be made by electors before receiving their ballot papers. As with the Federal legislation, the Bill provides that an elector may vote at any polling place throughout the State. Naturally, all the rolls will not be available at every polling place, so that the Council propose that a declaration shall be made by the elector who claims the right to vote at a polling booth outside his own electorate. That is advisable. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 9, Subclause (3), line 31.—Strike out the words "such elector," and insert the word "he."

The PREMIER: It is desired by some members of the Council that votes recorded by people shall be allocated to the districts in which they are entitled to vote. If goldfields people are in the city and record their votes here, under this scheme their votes will be allocated to the district where they are enrolled. I can see no real objection to that. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 9, Subclause (3).—Add a proviso, as follows:—

Provided that voting of electors under this subsection shall be under and subject to regulations, and such regulations may prescribe all matters (not inconsistent with this Act) necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying this section into effect, and in particular may provide for—

(a) the forms of absent voters' ballot papers;
(b) the manner in which votes are to be marked on absent voters' ballot papers;
(c) the method of dealing with absent voters' ballot papers, including the scrutiny thereof, and the counting of votes thereon; and
(d) the grounds upon which absent voters' ballot papers are to be rejected as informal.

The PREMIER: This provision has been taken from the Federal Electoral Act, and

will enable regulations to be framed to facilitate the carrying out of the referendum. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 15, Subclause (2).—Add a proviso, as follows:—

Provided that a separate ballot box shall be kept for the reception of the postal ballot papers for each district and each such envelope shall be deposited in its appropriate box.

The PREMIER: The Council suggest that separate ballot boxes shall be kept for the reception of postal and absentee ballot papers for each district, and each envelope is to be deposited in its appropriate box. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I am not quite sure what this amendment means. I understand that an elector will be able to record his vote at any polling booth in the State, irrespective of where he is enrolled.

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Separate ballot boxes are to be provided for the postal and absentee votes for each district, and there are four districts specified in the Bill. How many ballot boxes will this mean? Surely it means that there will have to be four extra ballot boxes at every polling booth throughout the State.

The Premier: No, it means that the Chief Electoral Officer will get the votes and they will be kept in their separate appropriate boxes. This will really mean avoiding the provision of unnecessary ballot boxes.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Are the absentee votes to be sent to the Chief Electoral Officer?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: Despite what the Premier says, I am afraid he will find this means that four separate ballot boxes will have to be provided at each polling booth throughout the State.

The PREMIER: The amendment has been made to avoid what the hon. member suggests will be necessary. The papers will be kept in a separate box so that the votes cast for each district may be recorded.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 5. Clause 16, Subclause (1), line 28. —After the word "votes" insert the words "and votes recorded by electors under subsection three of section nine of this Act."

No. 6. Clause 16, Subclause (1), line 29. —After the word "Officer" insert the words "who shall keep a separate record of the count in respect of each district."

On motions by the Premier, the foregoing consequential amendments were agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 15th December. Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Constitution and powers of trust:

[Hon. A. McCallum had moved to strike out the word "exclusive" in line 1 of paragraph (b).]

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I ask members not to accept the amendment. Quite a lot of evidence was given to the select committee on the point. Mr. H. D. McCallum, manager of Dalgety & Co's Wheat Department, was questioned, and he agreed that if bulk handling were to be established, an exclusive right to receive wheat should be given. Questions 832 and 833, and the respective answers given by him, were:—

Under such a scheme as that we are investigating, do you recognise that a monopoly must be granted irrespective of who carries out the scheme?—I admit that.

And the monopoly should be limited by such conditions as will prevent any abuse?—Yes, certainly.

The view of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, expressed by the secretary on page 106 of the evidence, contained the following:—

In conclusion my chamber desires to stress the following points as being essential in any Bill brought forward:—1. That a public trust should be set up for the sole purpose of receiving wheat in bulk at country sidings and delivery of wheat in bulk at the port or mill.

I direct attention to the witness's use of the word "sole." Mr. J. A. Stevenson, who was sent here to report to the Federal Government on bulk handling and on the pool proposals, may be regarded as a competent observer, and his conclusion was that to be successful any bulk handling scheme introduced must be supported by the farmers delivering all wheat to the silos. There we have an independent authority advocating the exclusive right to receive wheat. The select committee recommended an amendment which I propose, if possible, to move later on, as follows:—

> Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, the Minister may from time to time in his absolute discretion grant to any person a permit to cause wheat grown by and belonging to him to be transferred by rail to any place or person without the consent of the board and otherwise than through the agency of the board: Provided that the Minister shall not by means of any such permit or permits authorise any person to cause more than ten per centum of the marketable crop grown by him during any season to be so transported as aforesaid.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Minister quoted the evidence of Dalgety & Co.'s representative. I remind members of the old question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Dalgety's representative was the only witness outside the advocates of the pool scheme who favoured a monopoly. So far as I know, nowhere else in the world is a monopoly given. Canada and America have a number of authorities operating. Some Canadian railroad companies have their own silos; the wheat pool have their own silos; some merchants have their own silos; in some provinces the wheat merchants combine to erect a silo, and in others the railway companies operate with the merchants, but in no part of Canada is there a monopoly, and I cannot see any reason why a monopoly should be granted here. I understand that the pool trustees have written to the Government stating that they propose to proceed with the installation of their scheme unless they are prevented. If they wish to instal the scheme, why not let them? If they are satisfied that they can do the job cheaper than can the Minister, why not let them instal the scheme and let the merchants make their own arrangements?

Mr. Doney: You would agree that the duplicate scheme would be a charge upon the farmers?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The argument usually advanced by members opposite is that competition is the life of trade. The country that is the home of monopolies and combines has not granted a monopoly in this respect. If there is any substance in the contention that competition is the life of trade, why should it not apply in this instance?

Mr. Doney: For the simple reason that obviously it would raise costs.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That is contrary to all the fundamentals on which the plea for competition has previously rested. It has been contended that once a monopoly was granted, rates could be increased and any conditions could be imposed.

Mr. Doney: Do not you agree that all the charges of the duplicate scheme would have to be borne by the wheat?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I do not subscribe to that argument. If the hon. member holds that view, it is contrary to the whole case submitted by the pool and by Westralian Farmers Ltd. They suggested that their scheme would save more money than would the Minister's, but the Minister believes his scheme would effect the greater saving. Let them both have power to instal schemes, and decide the point. There is not much expenditure attached to the pool scheme.

Mr. Doney: Two schemes would cost more than one, and three schemes would cost more than one.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That is not the point at all. I would remind the hon. member that in the countries I have referred to there is no monopoly of bulk handling of wheat.

Mr. Sampson: Are the various concerns operating side by side?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes, I have already explained that.

Point of Order.

Mr. Sleeman: On a point of order; are we in order in discussing that an exclusive right shall be given to a trust, when there is no trust mentioned in the Bill? It will be remembered that paragraph (a) of Clause 3 was deleted from the Bill.

The Chairman: I rule that the member for South Fremantle is in order in discussing whether the word "exclusive" shall remain in the Bill or be struck out. I would point out that the Minister has given notice of a

further amendment which will create a trust. I am not responsible for anything that has been struck out of the Bill.

Mr. Sleeman: I contend you are responsible for giving a ruling upon the point of order I have raised.

The Chairman: The Committee can reinstate in the Bill some other form of trust, and that is what I understand the Minister proposes to do.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

Mr. Sleeman: I move—

That the Committee dissents from the Chairman's ruling.

[*Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

The Chairman stated the dissent.

Mr. Sleeman: I moved to disagree with the Chairman's ruling. My point is: Can the member for South Fremantle discuss whether an exclusive right can be given to a trust, when, as a matter of fact, the Committee has struck out from the Bill paragraph (a) of Clause 3, under which it was proposed to constitute a trust. I contend the Committee are not in order in discussing whether an exclusive right shall be given to a trust which is non-existent.

Mr. Sampson: I dispute the view taken by the member for Fremantle. We were not discussing anything except the question of the retention or the striking out of the word "exclusive." The responsibility of the Chairman in this instance is to decide whether we were in order in discussing the retention or the striking out of the word "exclusive." In my opinion, the position of the Chairman of Committees would be utterly impossible if the point raised by the member for Fremantle were sustained.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Committee having deleted paragraph (a) of Clause 3, the obligation of the Government is then to remodel the Bill. It is ridiculous to proceed to discuss the giving of an exclusive right to some trust that does not exist.

The Premier: Surely it is competent for the Committee to strike out any word of the clause or the whole clause.

Hon. A. McCallum: The trust is gone.

The Minister for Works: It may come back.

Hon. A. McCallum: It may. It may be a boomerang, but no one knows whether it can come back this session or not. I think the correct stand for the Committee to take is to decide that the whole clause is out of order.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You moved to strike out one word.

Hon. A. McCallum: If this clause is going to be discussed I do not intend to agree to giving exclusive powers to anyone. It is, however, futile to continue discussing the question of giving power to something which does not exist. The clause as it is now is out of order.

The Minister for Works: We cannot go back. The amendment of the member for South Fremantle was accepted by the Chairman. But for that I would have moved to amend the subclause in another direction. It is always possible to recommit the Bill. I suggest that the Chairman's ruling was the correct one.

Mr. Sleeman: It is the Minister's duty to restore sense to the clause before we proceed with it. We cannot give power to a body that is not in existence.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the Committee deleted the words "trust consisting of the trustees of the Wheat Pool." Since then progress has been made with the Bill. The member for South Fremantle has moved to strike out the word "exclusive" from paragraph (b) in Clause 3.

Hon. A. McCallum: That is not exactly correct. Not only did we strike out the reference to the Wheat Pool being created a trust, but we defeated an amendment moved by the Minister to create an independent trust. We also defeated the amendment moved by the member for Nelson for another form of trust. In fact, three different kinds of trusts have been defeated.

Mr. Speaker: Could not the Minister move for the creation of a fourth kind of trust?

Hon. A. McCallum: There is no trust in existence now.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I have had an uneasy feeling that we have been discussing something that does not exist. On three occasions the Committee turned down proposals for as many different kinds of trusts. It is absurd that we should be discussing the powers of a body that does not exist. To do so is illogical. The whole discussion has really been out of order, but nothing has been inserted in the Bill in substitution for that which was taken out.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: We should endeavour to conduct our business on common-

sense lines when the Standing Orders do not specifically denote the direction in which we should conduct it. Three attempts have been made to establish a trust and each has failed. Logically, we should refuse to discuss the clause any further until some other trust has been established. Further discussion on the clause should be postponed until that error is rectified. The indications are that no form of trust would be satisfactory to a majority of the members.

Mr. Speaker: It has been stated that on three occasions the power to form a trust has been defeated by the Committee. I am asked to rule that the Committee has no power to insert another trust, though it may be altogether different from those which have been rejected. Under the first paragraph of Clause 3 the Minister is empowered to declare certain things by notice in the "Government Gazette." I understand that part of the clause has been passed.

Mr. Sleeman: The Committee refused to give him that power.

Mr. Speaker: At all events, the Committee proceeded after that point. Some member moved to form a second trust, and another member moved to form a third one. Is there anything in the Standing Orders to prevent any member from moving to form a fourth trust, provided it is not the same as those which have been rejected? I rule that the Chairman of Committees was right in accepting the amendment.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: I submit that Standing Orders 176 deals with the matter. It says—

> No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any other question which during the same session has been resolved in the affirmative or the negative.

We have turned down three different sorts of trust. It seems absurd to try now to establish a fourth trust. We might go on indefinitely putting forward different forms of trust, each being defeated in turn. We should only be stultifying ourselves if we did so.

Mr. Speaker: I was asked to decide a point of order, and have decided in favour of the Chairman of Committees.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: I thought we were asked to point to a Standing Order that was in conflict with what you were about to rule. I maintain that the Standing Order I have quoted is in conflict with the ruling which has just been given by you. Already three attempts have been made to constitute a trust. Is it to be the fifth or sixth attempt before it is agreed that we have reached the farcical?

The Minister for Lands: I do not know whether you, Sir, intend to permit any further discussion.

Mr. Speaker: I have given my ruling and I am waiting to see whether anyone desires to disagree with that ruling.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I will do so with great regret. The business of the House should be conducted in a logical and commonsense manner. Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is not correct, because you are permitting the House to discuss the powers of a body which on three occasions the Committee has said shall not be constituted. What could be more absurd than to discuss the powers to be conferred upon a body which is not to be created? Evidently your ruling is based on the theory that ultimately a trust may be created. But there must be an end to the persistency of the Minister, for we cannot continue to ignore the proper procedure in the House. For the reason that the ruling permits the discussion of powers to be conferred upon a body that the Committee has emphatically said shall not be created, I move—

> That the House dissents from the Speaker's ruling.

The Minister for Lands: The question of the trust was not before the Committee at all: the question was an amendment moved to strike out the word "exclusive" in the paragraph dealing with the powers of the trust. Surely the Committee was just as much in order in discussing that as it would have been in agreeing to the postponement of a clause with a view to recommittal. Ultimately the Minister may move to strike out "trust" and insert "board."

Hon. A. McCallum: That would not affect the powers to be given to the trust or board.

The Minister for Lands: There would be no difficulty in getting exclusive rights for a bulk handling scheme controlled by the Government. The only thing that can be before the House now is that which was before the Committee, namely, the amendment to strike out the word "exclusive."

Hon. P. Collier: The question is pretty clear. As has been said, the Committee on three occasions has declared its opposition to the creation of a trust. Yet we are to be permitted to discuss the question that the trust shall have certain powers. There is no trust, so how can we discuss the powers of the trust? The proper procedure for the Minister would be to postpone this clause, go through the remainder of the clauses, and then recommit this clause, and make another attempt, the fourth, to constitute the trust. Since three attempts have been made to create the trust, there can be nothing against making a fourth, or a fifth, or even a sixth attempt. But that is not the question before the House. Suppose the Committee were to proceed to consider the powers to be given to a trust, not knowing that there is going to be a trust, and not knowing the composition of the trust. Later on, if the Minister succeeds in his fourth attempt to constitute a trust, members might well say that if they had known the composition of the trust they would never have agreed to giving these powers to the trust. For the powers of the trust must largely be governed by the composition of the trust. If we are entitled to take as a guide the decision of the Committee on three occasions, we are justified in assuming there is not going to be any trust. Yet we are asked to consider the powers to be conferred upon that body. With all due respect, I submit that such a discussion is entirely out of order.

The Minister for Works: I have consulted the leading draftsmen in the State and they have advised me that, in view of the acceptance of the amendment by the Chairman of Committees, we could not go back. If we could have gone back, I would have moved for the appointment of a board.

Hon. P. Collier: You can recommit the Bill.

The Minister for Works: Exactly, and that is why it can be said the trust is still in the Bill. It is a stretch of the imagination to say the Committee on three occasions refused to create a trust. On the first occasion, the proposal was for the trustees of the Wheat Pool. The Committee rejected that. Progress was then reported, and I brought down certain amendments. Before that happened the member for Nelson had an amendment on the Notice Paper, and I asked him to withdraw it. He wanted to do so, but the Committee would not permit the withdrawal. There was only one vote for it. When I moved my amendment before that, the member for Williams-Narrogin had previously moved one, and unfortunately the Committee did not know what it was voting for. The only decision of the Committee was really on the clause in the original Bill. If it had been possible, and I had been advised that I could have gone back to the beginning, I could have put the amendment on the Notice Paper. But when the member for South Fremantle submitted his amendment, the Leader of the Opposition said that it could not be accepted because the trust had gone out of the Bill. The Chairman of Committees accepted the hon. member's amendment, and put it on the Notice Paper.

Hon. P. Collier: That did not prove that it was right.

The Minister for Works: All I desire now is a division. I have acted on the advice that was given to me, and I consider that I was doing the right thing. The Speaker has ruled that I was right, and I think his ruling is the correct one. My desire is to get back to the Bill and decide whether members want it or not.

Hon. P. Collier: Let us get to the Bill in conformity with the Standing Orders, not by any road.

The Minister for Works: My advice was that we were acting in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Hon. P. Collier: Who advised you?

The Minister for Works: The Parliamentary Draftsman.

Hon. P. Collier: He has nothing to do with the Standing Orders.

The Minister for Works: I hope the House will come to a decision as quickly as possible.

Mr. Kenneally: There are two points that require to be settled. One is, does the trust exist? If we decide that it does, we can clothe it with the powers we desire. But it is admitted that the trust does not exist, that the Committee said "No" when attempts were made to form a trust. We are in the position that we are to be asked to determine what powers we shall confer on that body, the existence of which is still in doubt. What will influence the members of the Committee will be the knowledge of the

form of trust to be constituted, because then they can proceed to say what powers will be given to the trust that is constituted. I shall be influenced by the knowledge of the constitution of the trust. Until we are in a position to say that there will be a body to wield powers, it is asking too much of the committee to say, "We are going to agree to the powers to be conferred on a mythical body."

Mr. Panton: Standing Order 277 reads—

> Any amendment may be made to a clause, provided the same be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, or pursuant to any instructions, and be otherwise in conformity with the rules and orders of the House.

We must ask ourselves what is the subject matter of the Bill. The Bill has been dealt with in such a way that the question of a trust does not for the moment come in. The title of the Bill is "An Act to provide for the handling of wheat in bulk, and for the establishment and financing of a bulk handling system." The system is to be by a trust, but the Committee deleted the clause dealing with the trust, and I contend that the subject matter of the Bill is not a trust. Consequently Standing Order 277 must hold, and irrespective of whether the Minister may be able to provide for the insertion of another trust does not enter the question.

Hon. A. McCallum: We frequently have Bills before the House to establish trusts and boards, and if we admit the practice of proceeding to discuss boards or trusts before we create them, we shall be setting up a dangerous precedent. We have just disposed of a Bill dealing with the milk industry, and that gave very drastic powers. The Minister proposes to bring down this session a Bill to establish a board of works. I do not know whether he is still contemplating it, but if that Bill were to come down, would we deal with the powers of that board before we dealt with its constitution? It is the same with the constitution of this Parliament, and the same with everyone who exercises authority. If we are to accept the practice that we can decide the authority and the powers such a body can wield before we set up its constitution, we shall be establishing a precedent that may be very far-flung in its effects. Every decision arrived at on the clause would be affected by the constitution of the board. It is neither sound nor logical nor even yet commonsense to ask Parliament to clothe a mythical body with specified powers. We should know how the body is to be constituted before we are asked to agree to those powers. The point on which you, Mr. Speaker, based your ruling was not the one on which our objection was founded. We appreciate the fact that the proposals for the constitution of the board have been defeated three times and the Minister is quite within his rights in proposing ten or a dozen variations.

The Minister for Works: I will do so once more only.

Hon. A. McCallum: We do not complain of the action of the Minister in that regard at all. What we object to is being asked to discuss powers to be granted to a body that does not actually exist; in fact, so far as we have been asked to up to the present stage, we have refused to agree to the constitution of that body. If the powers sought had been suggested in respect of the board as constituted in the Bill originally, very few members would have agreed to the proposals.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course not.

Hon. A. McCallum: It is because the proposed constitution of the board has been so altered that members have been encouraged to show greater confidence in the body to be set up. Until we decide on the constitution of the board, we should not be asked to agree to the powers to be wielded by that body. That is the point on which we differ from your ruling.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Minister suggested that because we have been asked to deal with the word "exclusive" in line 1 of paragraph (b), we had agreed to the words preceding "exclusive", but that is not so.

The Minister for Works: You cannot go back.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a new ruling. This must be a new Standing Order.

Hon. M. F. Troy: If that were the position, it would be utterly absurd. The whole clause is not agreed to until it is finally passed by the Committee. It cannot be assumed that we agree to the whole of the words preceding that which it is sought to delete. The Minister also said that when discussing the clause dealing with the constitution of the trust, had the member for Nelson been allowed to withdraw his amendment the position would have been different. The Committee did not permit the member for Nelson to withdraw his amendment, and we cannot assume what might have happened. We can be concerned only

with what actually did happen. The Minister suggested, too, that the Committee did not actually know what was being done. That has nothing to do with the position. All we can be concerned with is what the Committee actually did. Then the Minister made reference to the Parliamentary draftsman and the advice tendered by him. Doubtless the Parliamentary draftsman advised as to what amendment it would be competent to move.

The Minister for Works: And where it could be included in the Bill.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Whatever the Parliamentary draftsman may have done has nothing to do with the point that has been raised. The fact remains that we have been asked to discuss matters affecting something that does not exist. That is the point of difference.

Mr. Speaker: Before I put the question, I want to make the point quite clear with regard to my ruling. The ruling of the Chairman of Committees was that it was in order to discuss the excision of the word "exclusion" because, although the provision for a trust had been struck out of the clause, it was within the power of the Committee, when dealing with Clause 3, to create another form of trust, provided, of course, that the new trust to be created was in a different form from those proposals already negatived by the Committee. Whether it was the same question as provided for in Standing Order 176, had to be determined later by the Committee. With that ruling I have agreed.

Question put and negatived.

Committee resumed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I object to the exclusive rights proposed to be granted in connection with bulk handling. No case has been made out in favour of that proposal. Only one witness, apart from those advocating the Wheat Pool's proposition, advocated the granting of a monopoly, and all the weight of the evidence was against such a proposal. The Government have received a letter from the Wheat Pool intimating that it is proposed to go on with the scheme, and we see from the "Daily News" this evening that the determination is reiterated. That is intended irrespective of what Parliament may do regarding the Bill. If anyone possessed a claim for a monopoly it must be the Commissioner for Railways who controls all the channels of transport. I hope the Committee will not agree to exclusive rights being granted to anyone. There are rival schemes, and let it be demonstrated which is the better. No country has granted a monopoly over bulk handling and it should not be allowed here.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I differ entirely from the views of the member for South Fremantle. Whoever handles the wheat in bulk must have the exclusive right to do the work. If that were not so, it would mean duplicating the cost to the farmer. That is what Western Australia is suffering from to-day. We have duplicated services in all directions.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I was supporting the retention of the word "exclusive." The economic condition of the State and the struggle to maintain the financial stability of existing services is due to the fact that we have always shied at giving exclusive rights to those authorised to conduct various activities. Railways have been built and then roads have been constructed to permit of competition so that it was impossible to make the railways pay. One activity has been created to murder another. For the same number of people to attempt to maintain duplicated services is an economic fallacy. That sort of thing should not be imposed upon the wheatgrowers. They have a right to handle their own commodity, and the authority handling it should be given the exclusive right. My principles would not allow me to object to the granting the exclusive right, so long as I had a voice in the election of the authority.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	22
Majority against ..	6

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Hon. J. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Noes.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Church	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
	(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted at the end of paragraph (b):—"that for the purposes of this Act there shall be a bulk handling board consisting of five persons being the members for the time being of the bulk handling board hereinafter constituted; provided that three of such persons shall be from time to time elected by the wheat growers of the State, as defined in Part V.; and that such board shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal with power to sue and be sued and to own, hold, and dispose of all kinds of property and to enter into contracts and to do and suffer such acts and things as it may be necessary or convenient to do or suffer for the purposes aforesaid."

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I submit that the amendment is not in order. For all practical purposes it is the same as the amendment moved previously by the Minister and rejected by the Committee. The Standing Orders provide that no question substantially the same may be submitted twice in the one session. The previous proposal was to constitute a similar board with similar powers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The previous amendment rejected by the Committee began—

(a) That for the purposes of this Act there shall be a bulk handling trust consisting of the members for the time being of the board constituted by this Act.

The amendment I am now submitting provides that for the purposes of the Act there shall be a bulk handling board consisting of five persons being members for the time being of the bulk handling board hereinafter constituted, provided that three of such persons shall, from time time, be elected by the wheatgrowers of the State as defined in Part V. I consider the amendment is quite different from the previous one.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The amendments, in substance, are the same. I do not think that can be disputed.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the Minister is in order in moving the amendment. In my opinion, there is a great deal of difference between the two amendments.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: To my mind, there is no doubt that the amendment is substantially the same as that moved by the member for Nelson. The principle is the same, but one or two words have been changed.

Mr. KENNEALLY: An amendment, practically word for word the same as that moved by the Minister, has already been defeated. I submit that not only are the amendments substantially the same, but they are almost exactly the same.

The CHAIRMAN: My attention has now been drawn to the amendment which was moved previously by the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith). That is fatal to the Minister's amendment. I rule the Minister's amendment is out of order.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move—

That progress be reported.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the Committee dissents from the Chairman's ruling.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: My motion takes precedence.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister is on his feet.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have already stated that there is no trust mentioned in the Bill. We have been told that frequently to-night. The Bill makes provision for the constitution of a board. Consequential amendments have been made in the Bill because of the deletion of the word "trust."

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman: I desire to report that my attention has been drawn to an amendment by the Minister for Works which was defeated, and also to an amendment by the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) which was also defeated. As those two amendments were substantially the same as that which the Minister for Works has now moved, I have ruled the latter out of order. The Minister has moved to disagree with my ruling, on the ground that his amendment is substantially different from the other amend-

ments to which I have referred. I relied upon Standing Order 176.

The Minister for Works: I consider my amendment is in substance different from the other amendments that were defeated. The amendment of the member for Nelson was that the trust should consist of five persons, including three bona fide wheat growers, who were not associated with any wheat-buying partnership or organisation connected with the purchase of wheat, and also including one member to be nominated by the Commissioner of Railways, with a chairman to be appointed by the Government. The only similarity between my amendment and that one lies in the use of the words "three shall be appointed by the wheat growers." There is nothing to say how the other two members shall be appointed. I consider that my amendment is substantially different from the other amendment.

Hon. A. McCallum: Although the words may be different, in substance the Minister's amendment is identical with the two propositions that have already been defeated. The amendment for a trust of five was defeated, and that for a board of five was defeated. The proposal for three wheat growers and two others was also defeated. Our Standing Orders say that so long as these amendments are the same in substance as those which have previously been voted upon, they cannot be moved. We have heard of the rose that is called by another name smelling as sweet. The Minister has called his rose a dandelion, but it is still the same old rose, although its petals have fallen. It is indeed the last rose of summer.

Mr. Speaker: I am asked to decide a point raised by the Minister for Works, who has moved to disagree with the Chairman's ruling. I am asked to decide whether his amendment is different from that which was moved by the member for Nelson and defeated. I have perused the two amendments, and come to the conclusion that there is a distinction without a difference, and that in substance the Minister's amendment is the same as the other. I uphold the Chairman's ruling.

Committee resumed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and passed; progress reported.

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is—

That leave be given to sit again.

Question put and negatived.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [8.7]: in moving the second reading said: This is a short measure which has come to us from another place. It is designed to amend Sections 45 to 47 of the Electoral Act. It is not intended to amend the Act as it refers to elections for this House, but only as it refers to elections for another place. The area of the provinces, which have to be covered for another place, is very much larger than that of any of the electorates for this House. It is submitted in the Bill that the limitation of 14 days, which appears in the sections to which I have referred, although quite proper in the smaller areas of electorates which this House has to deal with, is not at all sufficient or appropriate for the very much larger provinces which another place has to deal with. Under Section 45 of the principal Act it is provided that additional rolls may be made, and this Bill seeks to insert, instead of the 14 days in the second line, the words "thirty days" in the case of a claim for the Council enrolment. Instead of a claim for enrolment becoming effective at the expiration of 14 days, not for this House but for another place, it will require 30 days. Under Section 46 a corresponding change is made in the case of objections to claims, which again alters the period that in the case of this House is 14 days to a period of 30 days in the case of another place. Under Section 47, which deals with claims for enrolment, the period provided for in the Act, as applied to both Houses, of 14 days is altered to 30 days in the case of another place. It all depends on the view that is taken of the convenience and possibility of election of candidates for Parliamentary honours. It is a fact that a province is a larger area than an Assembly constituency. It is not desirable, therefore, to have exactly the same period for a province as for an Assembly electorate. To have the same period in both cases prima facie is absurd. It is submitted by those

who have brought forward this measure that this should be recognised, that provision should be made whereby in the case of the very much larger area that is comprised in a province the limit of 14 days for the various operations which the Act provides, namely, for the claim first of all, for the enrolment secondly, and for the objection thirdly, should be increased in the case of another place to 30 days. That sums up the whole argument. That which is a very proper adjustment in the case of the smaller areas which this House has to deal with is wholly inadequate for the larger areas, namely, the provinces, which another place has to look to for its representatives. This amendment is a just and reasonable one. It does not interfere in any way with the arrangements for this House. The Bill has been agreed to in another place as something which is desirable in all the circumstances, and is regarded as a just and proper adjustment of the position as it relates to another place. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As to procedure.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: A considerable amount of private members' business is on our Notice Paper. This is a private Bill from another place, and is being given precedence over all the private members' business which we still have to deal with. I think it should stand over until our own members have had their business attended to. Accordingly I move—

That the debate be adjourned until after the House has discussed private members' business.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I presume the hon. member only wants this debate adjourned until our private members' business has either been discussed or discharged from the Notice Paper. I take it he does not want to postpone the debate indefinitely. Does he really think it is proper to adjourn this debate? The motion will merely mean adjourning it until such time as our proceedings may become more hilarious than judicial, and when everything will be dealt with in a hurry.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to discuss a motion for adjournment.

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

Ayes	.. ..	18
Noes	.. ..	21
	Majority against ..	3

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Cunningham (*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Church	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Keenan	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. J. I. Mann	(*Teller.*)

Motion thus negatived.

MR. KENNEALLY (East Perth) [8.18]: I move—

That consideration of this measure be deferred until later in the sitting.

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

Ayes	.. ..	31
Noes	.. ..	8
	Majority for	23

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Church	Mr. North
Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Doney	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Cunningham
Sir James Mitchell	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Brown	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. McLarty (*Teller.*)

Motion thus passed.

BILL—RESERVES.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Council's amendment: Clause 7—Delete this clause:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

This deals with a small reserve excluded from King's Park as the result of an exchange made in 1917. It was of no further use to the King's Park Board and, being close to the University, it was intended to be set aside for a college for one of the churches. However, there is no real objection to its being excluded from the Bill.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [8.28]: I move—

That the report of the Standing Orders Committee be agreed to.

Most of the amendments proposed by the committee are of a minor nature and have been suggested in order that the Standing Orders might be brought up to date by the removal of those that are obsolete or have never been given effect to. The first amendment is for the deletion of Standing Order No. 35, which provides for the setting up of a Committee of Supply after the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. This has never been given effect to. The next amendment is to delete from Standing Order 99 the words "in the case of a petition against the return by a returning officer that it be referred at once to the Court for the Trial of Election Expenses; or." Since this matter has been removed from the two Houses to the Supreme Court, there is no further necessity for that Standing Order. Then it is proposed to amend Standing Order 107 by inserting after "given" the words "to the Clerk at the Table." That is to provide that questions, which are now read aloud by the member asking them, be in future handed to the Clerk at the Table. With the consent of the House, I propose to add to those words to be inserted the further words, "before 5 p.m." At the present time members may hand in their questions up to 4.30 p.m. The proposal is that the time shall be extended to 5 p.m. It is proposed to strike out Standing Order 149. If hon. members look at Standing Order 73 they will find that it is to all intents and purposes similar and it is that Standing Order it is proposed to stand by. Standing Order 73 provides that when ordered to withdraw a member shall do so immediately. No. 149 provides that a member shall have the right to be heard in explanation. During the whole course of my experience in this Chamber, extending over 12 years, No. 73 has always applied in cases of that sort. The other amendments to Standing Orders are of a minor nature.

Question put and passed.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Add—a new clause to stand as Clause 42 as follows:—"This Act shall continue until the 31st day of December, 1935, and no longer."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

I can see no great objection to the new clause. By the end of 1935 we shall know whether this legislation has been beneficial or not, and Parliament will then have an opportunity of deciding whether it should be repealed or re-enacted.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I commend the Minister for accepting this amendment. The period of three years will give the Act a fair trial: any shorter time would not have been of much use, seeing that it would not have been possible to thoroughly organise the industry.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message returned to the Council accordingly.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE (CHAPTER XXXVII.) AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 12th October on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—FIRE BRIGADES ACT REGULATION.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Minister for Lands so much of the Standing Orders were suspended as to enable the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) to discuss the regulation laid on the Table of the House on the preceding day under the Fire Brigades Act, 1916.

To disallow regulation.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [8.42]: I move—

That the regulation under Section 38, paragraph (j), of Rules and Regulations under the Fire Brigades Act, 1916, relating to services outside fire districts, laid on the Table of the House on the 20th December, be and are hereby disallowed.

The regulation in question reads as follows—

His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and Administrator in Council has been pleased to approve under Section 38, paragraph (j) of the Fire Brigades Act, 1916, of the amendment of the regulation made under the said Act and published in the "Government Gazette" on 7th May, 1926, by inserting therein after Regulation No. 66, a new regulation to stand as Regulation No. 66 (a) as follows:—"Whenever occasion requires, any portion of a brigade or any of its officers or men or engines, escapes, or other property may be directed or be taken beyond the limits of any district, and from one district to another, for the purpose of attending fires."

I ask the House to disagree to the regulation because it does not represent the correct way by which an alteration should be effected but rather a back stairs method. The whole position is altered because of the modern means of transport that are available to-day. An effort has been made to convince the members of the Fire Brigades Board that the policy indicated in the amended regulation should be adopted, and that they should appreciate the fact that the metropolitan area to-day is, in effect, one district, so that there should not be separate districts with regard to fire fighting equipment and brigades. To-day separate districts do exist with their separate brigades, equipment, appliances and rates. The conditions are not uniform throughout the various districts. The ratepayers and property owners in one district may pay the amount requisite under the provisions of the Fire Brigades Act and make ample provision for protection against fire. At the same time, those appliances are available for use in other districts when required. It is true that the system was inaugurated many years ago, and modern developments of transport have made it possible for the men and appliances of one district to be transferred rapidly to another district in the event of fire. Instead of the Fire Brigades Board recognising that the whole position should be reorganised in the light of latter day developments, they are endeavouring to tinker with it by means of the amended regulation. If we agree to the amendment, we will allow the separate districts to continue, the varying rates to apply, and different styles of equipment installed in different districts. In other words, the efficiency of one district may not be as apparent as in the fire fighting arrangements of another district. The property in one district, under existing conditions, may be seriously endangered because of the absence of the fire fighting appliances in another district. We are asked to allow those conditions to continue, and one district perhaps to batten on another district in respect of fire fighting conveniences. It is wrong to do anything of that sort by way of regulations. There is a good deal of public support behind the contention that the present Fire Brigades Act is obsolete and

should be completely overhauled rather than that matters should be dealt with by way of amended regulations. I regret that the board have attempted to do this in the manner indicated in the amended regulation that has been tabled, and I submit it would be wrong for the House to endorse the regulation, under which an injustice is attempted.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [8.50]: I hope the House will disagree to the amended regulation, and I endorse what the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) has stated. I agree with him that this is a back stairs way of dealing with the matter. A little while ago a dispute arose in the Midland Junction district, and the most peculiar part about it was that neither the Fire Brigades Board nor the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association desired the establishment of a volunteer brigade at that centre. An appeal was made to a previous Minister of the Crown, and unfortunately he granted permission to the Midland Junction Municipal Council to establish a volunteer fire brigade board in that district. The effect of the amended regulation will be that the fire brigade from one district will be despatched to another district in order to save life and property on behalf of a local authority not prepared to pay for those conveniences.

The Premier: What if the fire was just over the street?

Mr. SLEEMAN: There would be no splitting of straws in that event, but if one local governing authority, operating in a thickly-populated district, is prepared to carry on with a volunteer brigade, it is not right that another district where the cost of proper fire protection is undertaken in the interests of residents, should be called upon to supply the other district with the use of the fire brigade in the event of a conflagration. I agree with the member for Guildford-Midland that the Fire Brigades Act requires amendment, and I trust that next session the Act will be overhauled in a proper manner. Amended regulations such as that under discussion should not be introduced at such a late hour of the session.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [8.53]: I cannot endorse the remarks of the members who have spoken to the motion. The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) said there was a right way by which the board's objective could be obtained, and that was by amending the Act. Section 38 of the Fire Brigades Act, 1917, provides that the Governor may make regulations for all or any of the purposes set out, and paragraph (j) reads—

> For permitting, when occasion arises, any portion of a brigade or any of its officers or men or engines, escapes, or other property to proceed or be taken beyond the limits of any district for the purpose of attending fires.

Sufficient power is provided there to give effect to the regulations to which exception has been taken. I do not think that the member for Guildford-Midland would suggest greater powers than those embodied in the existing legislation and, unless we have those powers to deal with matters by way of regulations, it would not be right for the local fire brigade board to refuse to render assistance in the event of a fire in an adjoining district. It would be a serious matter if a big fire broke out in the city and the Fremantle Fire Brigade refused to render assistance. As a matter of fact, that assistance is rendered frequently, but I understand that legal advice has been obtained by the Western Australian Fire Brigades Board that they need not do so.

Mr. Sleeman: This has been done to get over an industrial trouble.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not admit that it has.

Mr. Sleeman: You do not know much about it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not follow industrial matters so closely as does the hon. member, but I do not bring such matters to this Chamber.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is what you are doing now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Not wilfully.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have pointed out that the Act provides the necessary power to enable this sort of thing to be done.

Mr. Sleeman: But not for such a purpose.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We have done exactly what the law says we may do.

Mr. Sleeman: This is government by regulation.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But we have done no more than the Act states we can do. The Fire Brigades Board gave very serious consideration to this matter before deciding to table the amended regulations.

Mr. Sleeman: Previously the Minister ruled against his experts on the Fire Brigades Board.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: As far as I know, no volunteer fire brigade enters into this question at all.

Mr. Sleeman: Why, that is the nigger in the woodpile.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is easy to find a nigger in the woodpile if one desires to do so, but I do not know that there is any nigger in this.

Mr. Sleeman: You would know if you had been connected with the matter.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have not been connected with anything with a nigger in it.

Mr. Sleeman: You know that a previous Minister ruled against the Fire Brigades Board.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: As W. M. Hughes said, "What is the good of worrying about what happened yesterday." We are concerned with what is happening now.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [9.58]: The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) mentioned that the amended regulations had been tabled as the result of an industrial dispute. As a matter of fact, that dispute is very indirectly connected with the matter. The Fire Brigades Board were of opinion that the powers outlined already existed, and that the chief officer was entitled to call upon a brigade in any one district to attend a fire in another portion of the metropolitan area. It was only when a notification appeared in the Press from the secretary of the Fire Brigades Union that the chief officer did not possess that power and intimating that legal opinion had been obtained to that effect, that the board considered it their duty in the interests of the State to deal with the matter.

Mr. Sleeman: What was the statement made?

Mr. ANGELO: The position arose indirectly because some dispute had unfortunately occurred with regard to the formation of a volunteer brigade. The member for Guildford-Midland raised the point that because one district was being run more cheaply than another owing to its having a volunteer brigade, it would not be fair for the brigade in a more expensive district to help it at a fire. The local authorities pay only three-eighths of the cost of the maintenance of the brigades as a whole, and the insurance companies pay three-eighths.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Well, that comes from the ratepayers.

Mr. ANGELO: Yes, but the taxpayers are paying one-fourth through the Government. Surely the taxpayers, and the insurance companies who are also taxpayers, are entitled to the utmost help of all the fire-fighting appliances. I am sure the hon. member is not serious. Suppose a fire occurred in a street just over a boundary and there was danger of life being lost and certainly of property being destroyed, the hon. member would not like to see a brigade refuse to render help, simply because it was not costing so much as a brigade in another district. I hope the motion will not be carried.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland—in reply) [9.2]: The Minister said that under Section 38 of the Act power was given in 1917 to do what is proposed to be done in the dying hours of the session and of Parliament. The Minister knows that for 16 years there has been no need for the regulation.

The Minister for Lands: Because the board thought they had the power.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is not correct, and the board know it. The member for Gascoyne knows it better than does anyone else. The board have functioned without the regulation for 16 years. There have been exchanges of brigades in cases of emergency, and that is only common-sense. A slight difference of opinion has occurred, however, and the board are trying to use the Government immediately before the election to put up this political stunt and get the regulation through. What they have found to be unnecessary in the last 16 years is considered necessary now.

The Minister for Lands: On a point of order, the hon. member is not in order in introducing new matter to which we will have no opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to introduce new matter when replying.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not introducing new matter. I am putting the right construction on the Minister's statement. He said that this might have been done 16 years ago, and then he said it was being done to-day because the board considered all along that they possessed the power. That is incorrect. The board have not found it necessary until quite recently. Now they have taken action just when the matter might be discussed in a comprehensive way throughout the metropolitan area. They have got the Government to introduce the regulation in the dying hours of Parliament.

The Premier: Anyhow, there will be no change of Government.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Evidently the board are fearful that there will be a change.

The Minister for Lands: But you know that regulations can be altered.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There has been a difference of opinion between Ministers and the board. The board were not desirous of doing what is being done, but they have been over-ruled by a Minister. Something is being done to which the board were not a party, but difficulties have been created that have caused the board to attempt to get the regulation passed. It is wrong and unfair to issue a regulation to deal with a difference of opinion that has arisen. Parliament should insist upon a proper investigation and a full knowledge of the facts. The regulation will interfere with the administration of the board and will work injustice to certain districts. The Minister is quite at fault in endorsing the board's application at this stage, because of an industrial difference that exists.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	21
Majority against	4

AYES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Nulsen	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Parker
Mr. Church	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Davy	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. J. I. Mann	(*Teller.*)

Question thus negatived.

BILL—TENANTS, PURCHASERS AND MORTGAGORS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

MR. KENNEALLY (East Perth) [9.12]: in moving the second reading said: This measure has been rendered necessary by the experience gained of the operation of the parent Act. Legislation was passed by Parliament to give relief to people who were unable to pay their rent or who were purchasing on time payment the houses in which they lived and were unable to continue the payment of instalments. When Parliament was considering the question of relief, it provided that when a person, through being out of employment, was unable to pay, the Commissioner should have power to grant certain relief. The orders took the form of protection orders for three months, and could be renewed if the Commissioner deemed renewal advisable. Provision was not made for the case of a person paying instalments on a house which happened to be in the name of a woman. A man out of employment might have been purchasing a home standing in the name of his wife. The principal Act provides that if the non-payment of the instalments is not due to the unemployment of the person making application for relief, no order for relief will be made. In such cases, it has been decided by the Commissioner that the non-payment of instalments of purchase money is not because of the unemployment of the wife, but because of the unemployment of the husband, and therefore the wife is not entitled to an order for relief. The Bill proposes to remedy that anomaly. It was never intended by Parliament when passing the principal Act that relief should be withheld simply because the house happened to be in the name of the wife instead of in the name of the husband. Sections 4 and 6 of the Act deal with that aspect. The Bill proposes to add a subclause to those

sections providing that in case the applicant is a woman the word "unemployment" shall be deemed to mean "the unemployment of herself and/or of any person on whose earnings she is wholly or mainly dependent." Section 8 of the Act provides that no order shall be made under Sections 4 and 6 unless the person making application satisfies the Commissioner that he has endeavoured to obtain employment. If the amendment of Sections 4 and 6 is agreed to, a consequential amendment will be necessary to Section 8 as provision will have to be made, where the applicant is a woman, for her to satisfy the Commissioner that the person who is mainly responsible for providing her with the money to pay the instalments is out of employment and that he has endeavoured to obtain employment, but has failed. The Bill also proposes to amend Section 24 of the principal Act. Under that section, power is given to a person to contract himself outside the provisions of the Act. The position created by that clause at the present time is this: If a person out of work requires a house, many land agents have a typed form prepared which they call upon him to sign before they will permit him to obtain possession of the house. That practice is becoming general, and the result is that an intending tenant cannot enter a house until such time as he signs the form undertaking that he will not avail himself of the provisions of the Act while he is a tenant of the house. Parliament passed the Act with the obvious intention of protecting people who are unable to pay rent, yet Parliament inserted in the Act a clause giving people the right to contract outside it. Landlords and their agents therefore require tenants, before they enter a house, to sign such an undertaking. It is then produced to the Commissioner on any application that may be made for relief, and he has no option under the Act but to say, "You cannot obtain relief under this Act."

The Premier: You cannot compel persons to sign such an undertaking.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The only alternative the person wishing to obtain the house has is to remain without cover for himself and his family. Economic necessity compels him to sign the form. That was never intended when this legislation was introduced. I submit the measure to the House, as I believe members are desirous of helping those who, through force of circumstances, and through no fault of their own, find themselves in need of assistance. It is in that spirit I submit the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [9.22]: I do not think I can take exception to the first two provisions of the Bill. The Bill provides that in the case of the applicant being a woman, the word "unemployment" shall be deemed to mean the unemployment of herself and of her husband. If both are unemployed, they are certainly entitled to consideration. However, I do not agree with the last provision in regard to contracting out of the provisions of the Act, which is made possible by Section 24. I do not think Section 24 should be amended in the way suggested. Why should not a man have freedom to contract as he pleases? The member for East Perth said that the tenant is forced to sign an undertaking whereby he contracts himself out of the provisions of the Act.

Mr. Kenneally: Through economic pressure.

The PREMIER: I object to taking more freedom away from people than is absolutely necessary. Most men are capable of looking after themselves, to an extent, at any rate.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: You took away the freedom of people by the two measures you mentioned last night, the Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act and the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act.

The PREMIER: Yes, but this is a very different matter. The member for East Perth wishes us to provide that no man shall be free to make a contract if he thinks fit to do so. We have made provision to protect people who need protection.

Mr. Kenneally: That is so.

The PREMIER: We protected people who were in possession of houses before the passing of the Act.

Mr. Kenneally: No.

The PREMIER: We ought to give the people as much freedom as possible. It is because we have surrendered our freedom that we are in our present trouble.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Everything a person does now is subject to regulation in the interests of the majority of the people.

The PREMIER: The hon. member suggests we can, by regulation, do what is

best for everybody. I assure members we cannot. Everybody should be as free as possible. A person ought to be free to exercise his own judgment, as long as he does no harm to other people.

Mr. Sleeman: But a person is harming his family if he contracts himself outside the provisions of the Act.

The PREMIER: I hope the House will not agree to the third amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [9.26]: The first provision in the Bill is, I think, a justifiable amendment of the principal Act. I informed the member for East Perth that if he introduced the Bill I would vote for that amendment, and accordingly I will. With regard to the second proposed amendment, that of course has been argued at some length in the House. I think this is the third occasion on which it has been argued. My objection to it is that it would not help people, but would harm them. If a man could take possession of a house and then, in spite of any arrangement he might make with the landlord, turn round and apply for protection under the Act, it appears to me that no one would get possession of a house. I confidently assert that at present we are getting over our housing problem in an unexpectedly good way.

Mr. Kenneally: The Attorney General says that when a person enters into possession he can apply for protection immediately.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If he gets possession.

Mr. Kenneally: But if he applies for protection, he must convince the Commissioner that the circumstances are such as to warrant the protection.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is so. He gets possession of the house and then goes to the Commissioner and proves he is out of work and cannot pay rent. Of course, the Commissioner has a discretion, but he is empowered to make an order. I was saying that we were getting over our housing problem in an unexpectedly happy way. That opinion is not confined to myself. I have heard it expressed by persons whose political views are different from mine. I believe the reason is because there is a better understanding now between landlord and tenant. This matter has been left to the landlord and the tenant and they have been very fair towards each other. I can quote an instance that occurred two or three days ago. A man saw me. He had been in a house for 16 months and owed £25 for rent at 10s. a week. That means that he had had the free use of the house for a year. That is not an isolated case. I am proud of the way people have behaved. If we begin to put further restrictions upon the landlord we shall be running a serious risk of defeating our own ends, and destroying the goodwill and forbearance which in 90 per cent. of instances the landlord has been exhibiting during the last two or three years. I shall vote for the second reading because I am in favour of Clauses 2 and 3, but I hope the Committee will strike out Clause 4.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [9.32]: I hope the Bill will be passed through all stages without amendment. The final clause is the most necessary of all, dealing as it does with contracting outside the Act. The Attorney General thinks it will prevent people from getting houses. There are men who were in fairly constant work, and who were challenged by the landlord to sign the necessary documents before getting into the house. Some of them signed those documents thinking they would be at work for some time. They then lost their jobs and found they could not pay the rent. Because they had contracted themselves outside the Act they could get no protection. When a person has signed one of these forms the landlord knows that though his tenants may be down and out they cannot get any protection. One of these unfortunate people wrote to the Premier saying that he was likely to be put out of the house at any time as he could not get protection from the court, and asking if he could have made available for his family one of the small homes at the disposal of the Government. Seeing that he could get no assistance from the court, the only thing left to do was to write to the Premier. I do not think the member for East Perth is asking too much in requesting that the Bill be passed.

MR. KENNEALLY (East Perth—in reply) [9.35]: In reply to the Premier, I would point out that all our laws are designed to prevent people doing certain things. A burglar is prevented from committing burglary, for instance. Unless these

tenants are prevented from contracting themselves outside the law, they will continually be in trouble, and we should amend the law to stop them doing such a thing. We have had considerable experience since the Act came into existence. We know that owners and agents are having typed forms prepared for their tenants to sign, and it is time we put a stop to that sort of thing. I thank members for the support they have given to the Bill, and hope it will be passed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; Mr. Kenneally in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 24:

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

Ayes	16
Noes	19
Majority against	3

AYES.

Mr. Corboy	Mr Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Panton
Miss Holman	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Parker
Mr. Church	Mr Patrick
Mr. Davy	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	(*Teller.*)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Wansbrough	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Troy	Mr. H. W. Mann

Clause thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—AUCTIONEERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [9.42]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the Auctioneers Act Amendment Bill to be introduced and passed through all stages at this sitting.

Question put and passed.

First Reading.

Bill introduced by the Attorney General and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [9.44] in moving the second reading said: I must express my regret at the Bill being brought down so late. This would not have happened but for a promise that I gave to the auctioneers. I explained the purport of the measure to the Leader of the Opposition, who expressed his willingness that I should bring it down. The Bill is a simple one. It proposes first of all that when an auctioneer, who already holds a license, applies for a renewal, he shall not have to spend money on advertising the application in a newspaper, as he does now. That is a reasonable alteration of the Act, and brings things into line with other licenses. At present these people have to pay a high annual license fee, in some cases as much as £25 a year, which some firms have to pay for several members of their staff. They then have to make formal application for a renewal every year, and this has to be accompanied by an advertisement in the paper costing several pounds. That appears to be entirely unnecessary, and so I propose the amendment contained in Clause 2. Another proposal is to relieve to a certain extent the necessity for the auctioneers—who at present are making a very small revenue out of their licenses—to pay the whole of their license fees in one lump. It is proposed to permit them to pay their license fees in two moieties, one moiety on the issue of such license, and the remaining moiety on or before the 1st day of July. If an auctioneer should fail to pay the second moiety, his license shall be deemed to be cancelled without, however, relieving him from liability to pay the remaining moiety, which shall be recoverable from him as a debt due to the Crown in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Then he cannot get a half year's license, as one can in respect of a motor car?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, they are quite content to be allowed to pay their license fees in two moieties. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. C. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [9.46]: The Attorney General has said there has not been any request for a license to be issued for six months, and that the whole amount of £25 will have to be paid.

Mr. Wells: To pay mine, I have to find £50 next week.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: But suppose the hon. member desired to go out of business at the end of June next year; surely there is no reason why he should have to pay a license fee for the whole 12 months.

The Attorney General: There may be a good argument in that, but they have not asked for it.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: We have different methods of dealing with these various licenses. Under the Traffic Act one can take out a license for only half a year, and need not pay the remainder if he does not wish to. All he has to do is to unscrew his number plates and hand them in. However, the Bill does give some relief in the direction asked for, and it will not result in harm to anybody. I have compared it with the parent Act, and I see no objection to the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Third Reading.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—HERDSMAN LAKE SETTLERS.

Debate resumed from the 12th October on the following motion by Mr. Millington:—

That in the opinion of this House a reappraisement board should be appointed to re-value the holdings of the settlers on Herdsman's Lake.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [9.55]: I do not propose to agree to the motion, for it would be tantamount to an expression of want of confidence in the Surveyor-General and those associated with him. For a number of years the Surveyor-General and his officers have fixed the price of lands in this State, and it has always been more or less subject to the Minister for the time being. I cannot believe the Surveyor-General is likely to have made a mistake in respect of the Herdsman Lake land. On the south and east sides of the lake there are 40 settlers.

Hon. M. F. Troy: How many of them are on sustenance?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There cannot be many, for a number of them are employed in the city and some in the public service.

Hon. M. F. Troy: In the Government motor garage?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; there may have been at one time, but not now. At a place like Herdsman Lake it is very difficult to determine a value for the land which would be satisfactory to the people, more especially in view of the trying times we are experiencing and the difficulties that people have in getting money with which to pay rent. The total cost to the State has been considerably more than £100 per acre and, taking into consideration the improvements effected, the value placed upon the property is £70 per acre. In determining that value, the commercial value of the land was not taken into consideration; it was a price fixed on account of the proximity of the area to the city and its suitability for homes that would provide means of sustenance for the holders. The member for Mt. Hawthorn in moving the motion said the price of the land was entirely due to the excessive cost of drainage and the mistakes that were made in the calculations. All I can say is that the hon. member himself, as Minister, fixed the price of the land on the advice and recommendation of his officers. Therefore he must have had some knowledge of what he was doing at the time the values were assessed. He fixed the price and attempted to dispose of the land. The whole of the lake was divided up in checkboard fashion, that is to say sectional

lines were run across the lake itself from north to south and from east to west. It was proposed that the man who got a block in the middle of the lake should reside on the edge of it. The Government decided to re-design the whole area because it was not possible to sell the edge of the lake, and to give encouragement to people to buy blocks there, homes were erected at a cost of £260. The hon. member said it cost between £30 and £35 an acre to clear the land. That would all depend on the methods adopted. If a man attempted to clear the land with a mattock the cost would be excessive. By chopping down the flax and reeds, and burning off at a suitable time, they could be ploughed out. I will give a short history of the lake up to the time the hon. member signed the Executive Council minute fixing the price at £70 an acre. That was done on the recommendation of his officers. Since that time there has been £19,303, spent upon it. Personally I believe we were justified in making reductions in the price of the land. It would be wrong to fix a price on the present-day values. We have put in drainage.

Hon. M. F. Troy: More drainage.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The land would have been useless without it. Every block of land is drained to provide some form of irrigation in the summer. When I first went out there in the company of the Surveyor-General and Professor Prescott from South Australia it was impossible to get anywhere on the lake. Thus it was valueless without additional drainage.

Hon. M. F. Troy: What has been the total expenditure on the lake?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Close on £150,000: to be exact £149,072. There has been maintenance work done since the land was originally made available. A road has been put round it, and that cost £6,921, and an additional amount of money has been spent there since we redesigned the lake, the total being £19,303. So there is that added value. In 1928 the estate was declared a suburban area, and 38 lots were made available each being allied with another containing a homestead block on the high land. Lots were offered for sale and six were disposed of, the upset price being £70 an acre under certain conditions.

Hon. M. F. Troy: When the Governmen reclassified the land did you reduce th price?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We re designed the area. The hon. member wh moved the motion told the House that th intention of the Government originall was that the blocks were to be the mean of the settlers' livelihood.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That was the origina intention.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, bu we found it would be impossible for pec ple to earn a living from vegetables whic were a drug on the market. Our desire wa to bring the land into gradual cultivation In February, 1931, the lots in the centre o the lake were divided into areas of fron 35 to 39 acres, the idea being that w would be able to lease the centre block for pasture purposes and if we ran stock o them, that would eventually improve th land. If we left the land as it was it would b a long time before it would be of much use We proposed to lease the blocks for a perio of ten years, but we received two applica tions only. The rent was fixed at 15s. a acre per annum. Later on the rental wa reduced to 10s. an acre and I am sorry t say that to-day stock is being depastured o the holdings on a weekly agistment basis The cost of the blocks, prior to the las amount being spent, totalled £149,072. Th valuation placed on the blocks would repre sent no hardship to any occupier who wa in employment. It was never suggested tha the land was capable of producing commodi ties that would provide the settler with living. On the other hand, the object wa to provide a man with a house, enabling hi to live on the property straight away and while attending to his business as usual, t gradually develop the holding in his spar time. So far only 260 acres out of th 1,283 acres purchased have been dispose of. No settler who has bona fide attempte to do the right thing by the Government ha been put off his holding. The member fo Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Millington) quoted th history of the blocks from the scientist' point of view regarding the suitability o the land for production and I shall refer t that phase too. In 1912 Mr. E. A. Mann analysed samples of the soil and reporte that they were decidedly alkaline through shell lime, and that the soil was too salt t

afford any reasonable hope for successful cultivation. In September, 1919, he reported that the control of the salt in the soil represented a matter of drainage, and that the deleterious salts could be drained out if a sufficient fall were provided. He also pointed out that the testing of samples of soil in and around the lake at that time would be misleading, as the salt present then would not represent what would be left after the proper ebb and flow of ground water through a winter and summer season under the control of flood gates connected with the drainage system. He stated that if a sufficient proportion of the soil was a deep peat, he did not think any difficulty need be anticipated under a properly controlled drainage system, by which means the deleterious salts could be reduced below a harmful limit, in those parts of the ground that would be utilised for market gardening or dairying purposes. In December, 1919, after a report had been made by Mr. Arney regarding the depth of soils sampled by him, Mr. Mann reported that the evidence available indicated that the lake, if drained, could be utilised for establishing market gardens, but that only a small proportion would compare with the best quality of market gardening land at Osborne Park. He also expressed the opinion that, with the depth of water table proposed under Mr. Arney's scheme, the soil could be completely drained of any deleterious salts. It may be interesting to note that the purchase price of the 1,073 acres first taken over was £10 an acre, which represented £10,732. Later 202 acres were bought at £15 an acre accounting for a further £3,036 and in March, 1928, the Government purchased an additional eight acres for £700. The investigation of the soils was continued at a later date and in March, 1926, the Government Analyst, Dr. Simpson, was asked to submit a report and he said that the soil was heavily charged with common salt and magnesium salts, while the lake bed would require further leaching and draining before cultivation. Later on he suggested that the salts would be largely removed by additional drainage and that crops with high resistance to salt should be tried on the land before placing settlers on it. This was all prior to the fixing of the price of the holdings at £70 an acre. In September, 1930, just after I had visited the area with Professor Prescott, Dr. Simpson expressed the opinion that the north-western corner of the lake was then ready for cultivation and should be quite suitable for the growth of lucerne, tomatoes, melons, pumpkins, etc., but suggested that his report should be referred to the Director of Agriculture for his opinion. On the suggestion of the director, experiments were carried out with the crops mentioned by Dr. Simpson with fairly satisfactory results. In August, 1931, when reporting on some soil samples that bore a white incrustation and on some surface water that had been taken from the lake, Dr. Simpson reported that the soils were very acid and contained water soluble ferrous iron compounds, while the water contained large quantities of calcium, magnesium and ferrous iron. He was doubtful if a crop of any kind could be grown successfully on the soil in its then condition. Hon. members can see the reports that were made on experimental work carried out on the properties. Those reports will be found on file 2802/31. The officer in charge of the potato branch of the Agricultural Department, in a report to the director, dealt with experimental work that had been carried out on the properties of Messrs. Sayers, Hemley and White at Herdsman's Lake, and in his conclusions pointed out that the growing of seasonal crops was possible in that area where provision was made for an ample, good water supply from the main drain. Swedes, beets, beans, peas, pumpkins, strawberries, marrows, rhubarb, tomatoes, potatoes, etc., were growing well, in some instances luxuriously, until the water supply was not available. He pointed out that the acid, cloddy, peaty soil just under the foreshore required leaching and aeration before crops could be grown, but in other parts the soil seemed excellent but, judging by results he noted, the settlers had started at the wrong end of their blocks as the best soil was nearer the main drain. He suggested that the foreshore land would allow of winter cultivation and the swamp of summer cultivation, while experimental work should be continued earlier in the season than was possible that particular year. Members may see the notes put up by Dr. Teakle and Mr. Morgan, officer in charge of the potato branch of the department. Due consideration was given by the Government to the recommendations of the officers who made the experiments. I am satisfied that every precaution was taken to ensure that the land was suitable for cultivation. I repeat that it was never intended that the

blocks should provide a living for the men who took them up.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Not by your administration?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No. It has been said that the Surveyor General did not fix the value at a reasonable figure. I have already pointed out that on the recommendation of the expert officers of the Lands Department, the member for Mt. Hawthorn himself signed the Executive Council minute fixing the price at £70 per acre, and since then several thousand pounds has been spent to provide drainage in the winter and irrigation in the summer on portion of each block. A good road with a bitumen dressing has been constructed and considerable fencing has been erected since. If the land was worth £70 per acre then, it is worth £70 now, even taking into consideration the fall in the prices of land generally. The homes provided there are very cheap. A man has an opportunity to get a house, a garden, and space in which to run a cow, fowls and a few pigs, and the block should supply the feed for all of them. On the farming side he should be able to earn the rent from the block. Unfortunately the period of unemployment came so quickly that many of the men were thrown out of employment. Their unemployment, however, does not lessen the value of the land. The land is cheap and is worth every penny of the price, and it would be wrong to set up a board that would not be as well qualified as are the departmental officers to express an opinion on the value of the land. As the hon. member himself had a good deal to do with the determination of the value, the House would be wise not to agree to the motion.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [10.34]: This is one of those land settlement muddles associated with the administration of the present Premier, muddles that are costing the country so much in heavy interest charges year by year. If the expenditure on the Peel estate, at Northcliffe, on the group settlements and elsewhere were calculated, it would be found that the interest charges amounted to probably £500,000 a year. There was no need for the purchase and draining of Herdsman's Lake. There was no dearth of land at the time. Even though the population of the city has grown since the purchase of Herdsman Lake, the market is still glutted with all the commodities that could be grown there. The cost of purchasing and draining the estate was £150,000 and that expenditure has not earned one cent of interest. I know a little about the estate because I was brought into contact with it when Minister for Lands. Portion of the estate is valuable and could be utilised, but not for many years could it be made productive, having regard to the cost of its purchase and development. The layout is wrong and is in keeping with other schemes undertaken by the present Premier. When we undertook to sell the areas, we found, that apart from one little spot on the north-west corner, there was no high land around the lake on which the people could erect their farm buildings. The Premier proposed to establish a village settlement at the north end, a mile or so away from the holdings. Some of the areas which have been made available and on which houses have been erected were resumed by the Labour Government. Without them there could have been no settlement. I am always nonplussed when I think of the reputation of this man as an agricultural expert. Any reputation he might have had exists purely in imagination. I have a copy of a pamphlet issued for the Peel estate 10 years ago showing people shovelling sovereigns, and the statements in it bear evidence of a remarkable imagination. In view of the statements recently made by the member for Murray-Wellington, the pamphlet makes interesting reading. The Herdsman Lake estate is in trouble, and necessarily so. How could it be otherwise? The Minister has informed us that a further expenditure of £19,000 has been incurred. The £19,000 also is earning no interest. The interest on the whole outlay has been accumulating over the last 10 years. The Minister stated that because the member for Mt. Hawthorn recommended Executive Council to fix the price of the land, he should not now complain. The hon. member was Acting Minister for Lands at the time, and any Minister would refer the value of the land to his officers. It is not the Minister's duty to fix the value. In fact, he is not entitled to do so.

The Minister for Lands: He is entitled to challenge the value fixed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. The estate, however, was purchased under the Lands Purchase Act, which provides that in fixing a price for such land every penny expended

must be returned to the State. Any Minister doing his duty under that statute must have agreed to a price that would return the whole of the money expended plus interest. Consequently the Minister's hands were tied.

The Minister for Lands: That did not apply to improvements; it applied only to the purchase.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It applied to the purchase and to the drainage. Unless the estate were removed from the Land Purchase Act, the Minister would have no alternative. I understand that the land has been removed from that Act and may be sold at a lower value.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I was given to understand that it was so. However, it may be removed from the Act.

The Minister for Lands: The Treasurer is not likely readily to agree to that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Since he caused the muddle, he should agree to anything. His hand is in all this bad business. If experience shows that the land is not productive and that the settlers cannot get results from it, the Minister has the right to ask Parliament to sanction a revaluation. The land is not nearly as valuable as was at first expected. It was assumed when the land was selected that it would be as valuable as the Osborne Park land. We know it is not. The land is rich peaty soil, but is very shallow, and has a substratum of marl. Land of that kind will produce very little. It is light soil The Minister mentioned that some of the land is let for grazing purposes. I am surprised that the Government find it difficult to let some of the land for grazing purposes at a rental of 15s. per acre per annum. I saw the estate during spring and summer, and the north-west portion carried a fair amount of good feed.

The Minister for Lands: Wonderful clover!

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am surprised that people in the metropolitan area who own stock do not utilise the land for the purpose of fattening stock for the market, because the rent is reasonable in all the circumstances. It is suggested that the land might be taken up by men in employment in Perth in receipt of an average wage of £3 per week. It is suggested that if such a man paid a rent of £1 per week he could produce his own vegetables, milk and butter, and so reduce his cost of living. However, I look upon this estate as one of the most deplorable attempts at land settlement in the vicinity of the city. After having been settled on it for ten years, people cannot make a living on it. I support the motion, which, after all, merely asks that a revaluation of the land should be made in the light of what experience has proved.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) —in reply) [10.50]: At long last this motion of mine has come to the surface.

The Minister for Lands: Better late than never.

Mr. MILLINGTON: In view of the replies made by the Minister, and the time during which the motion has been in cold storage, it is evident that he still persists in his opinion that the price originally fixed is justified. He gave some of the history of the purchase and development of the lake and quoted from the same reports and the same file I quoted from, but he drew entirely different inferences. I endeavoured to be fair. I said the houses were cheap and that I had no objection to the price charged for them. I did not suggest the houses should be revalued. My contention was that the land should be revalued in the light of actual experience. The settlers, with scarcely one exception, have not been able to pay interest or sinking fund, unless they have had an income from a private source. The Minister also said it was never intended that a man should derive a living from five acres of swamp land. If that be so, why was this swamp land sold at £70 per acre? In my opinion, five acres is a large holding for one man. A charge of £70 per acre would suggest that the land is very valuable agricultural land. As a matter of fact, it is not, and that is our complaint. The Minister suggested that I was complaining about the price fixed by the Surveyor-General. That is not so. He did what any official would have done, and I did what any Minister would have done, in the circumstances. The land has been tried out, and, if the Surveyor-General were given an opportunity, he would candidly admit that the particular 40 blocks settled are not worth the price he fixed for them. Other portions of the lake may turn out to be more valuable. I did not move the motion on my own initiative. The Minister knows there are 40 settlers, and I have a petition signed by 38 of them asking me to

bring this matter under the notice of Parliament. Those are the men who have worked the land. They know perfectly well it is over-valued. There is not one expert in the Lands Department or in the Agricultural Department who will confirm what the Minister said. I hope the Minister is not setting himself up as an expert on the value of swamp land, because he certainly is not, if he says this land is worth every penny that has been charged for it. An independent expert or a board should be appointed to revalue the land, because the settlers know they have been overcharged and are suffering an injustice. Even if the land were sold to men working outside, it would not be justice to overcharge them for the land. I was under the impression that all the water was fresh water. That is not so. Almost invariably the bore water has been found unsuitable for agricultural purposes. Mr. Hemley installed a pump, but the water was so putrid that it killed his lawn. He had to discard the bore, and sink a channel to the main drain, where he was able procure good water. It is impossible for these settlers after a two years' trial to grow a satisfactory crop on account of the mineral contents of the water. The experts of the Agricultural Department know this. Mr. White's report is borne out by the official report, namely, that the carrots and turnips proved a failure. Every plot was a failure. Mr. Hemley's crops were also put in under the supervision of the Agricultural Department. The unlimed plots were all a failure, and of the limed plots four of beetroot and one of silver beetroot were good, while the balance were of no value. The settlers cannot pay interest and sinking fund on £75 an acre while they wait for the land to sweeten. The experts say it can be sweetened if it is properly drained, but during the winter the water cannot get away and cannot serve any useful purpose in the direction of sweetening the soil. I do not see why the settlers should suffer through the mistake of the Surveyor General, who valued the land in the first place. He realised it was not worth what it had cost, and wrote down the price. His lowest figures was £70. The settlers should not be saddled with all the mistakes and blunders that have occurred in the past. The drainage was supposed to cost £25,000 but actually cost over £100,000. Even the experts of the Agricultural Department could not grow produce profitably upon that land. It will take many years to sweeten up, if it ever does. The Minister contends he is an expert and that the land is worth the price charged.

The Minister for Lands: You said so once, when you signed the document.

Mr. MILLINGTON: When a Minister signs a document presented by an expert officer, he is not certifying that the estimate is correct. I am not an expert valuer. The Minister says it was never suggested the men should earn a living there. If that is so, why were they charged such a high price for the land?

The Minister for Lands: You cannot run a cow, fowls, etc., on much less than five acres.

Mr. MILLINGTON: In the case of good swamp land it takes two men all the year round to cultivate two acres. Lack of quality in this land is the cause of all the trouble. Apparently the Minister knows more than the 38 men concerned. The land was only valued at that figure because that is what it cost to prepare. I defy the Minister to permit the Surveyor-General to revalue it in the light of the most recent evidence. Land should be priced at its economic value. These men must be given an opportunity to pull through; they cannot do so at the present capitalisation. All they are asking is a fair deal. I intend to test the feeling of the House on this question.

[*Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	20
Noes	.. .. ..	22
Majority against	..	2

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Miss Holman
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.	
Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Church	Mr. Parker
Mr. Davy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
	(*Teller.*)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Wansbrough	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Angelo

Question thus negatived.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [11.18]: The member for Nedlands explained the Bill fairly clearly, and I have no objection to its being carried. It is not quite what the Government proposed in the No. 1 Bill of the same title. Had that Bill been passed, the proposals in this Bill would not have been necessary, but this appears to me to be an improvement on the existing law, although of course there may be some difference of opinion on that matter. I hope the Bill will be agreed to.

HON. J. C. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [11.20]: This proposed alteration of the law if carried into effect will disturb the uniformity of the procedure for the two Houses. The Bill is scarcely necessary, and it will lead to hardship, for it will mean that a man will not be able to get on the rolls unless residing in the electorate for at least three months prior to the election. It will mean possibly a period of 90 days between the issue of the writ and polling day, a period during which names cannot be added to the roll, so many people will be denied their franchise. The object of the Bill is to give more time for the lodging of objections, but as a rule there are comparatively few objections to names going on the roll, and in my opinion comparatively few men would sign an application form unless they had reason to believe they were properly entitled to vote. At the last election, out of some 400 names put in at the last minute only 10 or 15 were objected to. It is for that we are asked to alter the law at the almost certain cost of depriving a large number of people of getting on the roll. I should like to see people allowed to get on the roll right up to election day, but of course that is impracticable. In any event, I do not think we should extend the time during which people cannot get on the roll. The Electoral Act provides that if people are improperly placed on the roll, objection can be taken at the polling booth.

The Attorney General: Not once they are on the roll.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Paragraph (i.) of Subsection 2 of Section 118 of the Act provides for the scrutineer asking a voter if his name is properly on the roll, and if thought advisable the elector can be asked to sign a declaration.

Hon. N. Keenan: He cannot be prevented from voting if his name is on the roll.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: No, but he can be subject to a severe penalty for making a false declaration. The object of the Bill seems to be to deter people from getting their rights as citizens in regard to votes for the other Chamber. That is not the policy we should follow. I would prefer the system that was in existence in New South Wales some years ago where electors' rights were issued, and the right was the authority for a person to vote at an election. We are doing something in the nature of restricting people from enrolment and we should be very chary about it. I intend to oppose the second reading, more particularly as there is not a Legislative Council election taking place next year. Therefore the matter could well be deferred until the next meeting of Parliament when it would be possible to devise means of dealing with the electoral law more comprehensively. There is no urgency for the amendment contained in the Bill and therefore I hope the second reading will not be agreed to.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands—in reply) [11.35]: It is not the object of the Bill, as the member for Geraldton has just stated, to deter people from enrolment. The object is to make the rolls as nearly as possible what we desire them to be. It is only reasonable in connection with Legislative Council provinces which cover such huge areas to ask that the period should be extended from the

14 days which we have in our electorates to 30 days for the provinces in another place. The law in regard to the Assembly is not altered; it is proposed to alter the law only for another place. It is a measure that the Assembly might well accept.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	20
Majority for	2

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Church	Mr. Parker
Mr. Davy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Corboy
	(*Teller.*)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Lamond
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Raphael

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; Hon. N. Keenan in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 45:

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like an explanation of this clause. What does it really mean? How far does it alter the existing practice? It is most unfair that in the closing hours of the session an attempt should be made to alter the electoral laws. I am not exaggerating when I say that members are not giving serious consideration to the business that remains to be dealt with. I protest strongly against a Bill of this kind, emanating from a private member of another place being foisted on us. Only Bills of the greatest importance should be submitted to the House at the last sitting and in the closing hours. We should not be asked to deal with the Bill, which is of importance as affecting the electoral laws, at this late hour of the session. Regardless of the merits of the Bill, the Committee should refuse to give it serious consideration, on the ground that it is new business introduced at such a late hour. There is no urgency about it, because there will be no election for the Council for 18 months. Is it believed that once it is passed and is on the statute book, it will be difficult to have it repealed? It is a matter that should properly stand over until next year. I do not make any threat, but if this Bill is to be pushed through at this hour of the night, we shall not adjourn as early as expected. Infinitely more important matters that have been on the Notice Paper for three months have been discharged or are not to be gone on with, yet this Bill, introduced perhaps with the object of assisting a private member or his party, is to be forced through at this stage. What is behind it? It is most unfair. A Bill introduced by a private member in another place and dealing with electoral matters, must be viewed as suspect, particularly as there is no Council election for another 18 months.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I move—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	19
A tie	0

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Millington	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Parker
Mr. Church	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Davy	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wells
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	(*Teller.*)

The CHAIRMAN: Following the usual practice, I shall vote with the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It might be necessary for a man to get his name on the roll 90 days before an election and, in the sparsely populated areas, that would be decidedly unfair. This Bill, introduced by a private member in another place, is squeezing out private members' business here, much of which remains to be dealt with. The motion by the member for Claremont dealing with the Douglas credit system has been deliberately pushed to one side.

Hon. P. Collier: We were promised an opportunity to deal with it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We were told that ample opportunity would be given to discuss private members' business, and yet this Bill from another place is given precedence.

Hon. P. Collier: There was never an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The motion of the member for Murchison regarding migrants should have been dealt with. The Government have broken faith with us. There is not ample time to deal with private members' business.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I regret the hostility to this simple measure.

Hon. P. Collier: Is the Bill urgent, when there is 18 months before the next Council election?

Hon. N. KEENAN: A longer period is required in the case of the Council as compared with the Assembly.

Hon. P. Collier: Is there a Council election next year?

Hon. N. KEENAN: No. This is something in the nature of a reform for another place, and this is the appropriate time to consider it. It will not affect this House.

Hon. P. Collier: You will not get it through.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I regret to hear that; it is not a contentious measure. Having regard to the enormous size of some of the Council provinces, the Bill might well be passed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I understand we are merely waiting until the Council deal with certain business previous to closing the session, and it would be more in keeping with the dignity of Parliament if we suspended the sitting instead of dealing with business in this haphazard manner. Not one half of the members are showing any interest in the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: The second reading was moved only to-night.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Is this the way to deal with legislation? This sort of thing leads to Parliament being held up to contempt. The arguments advanced by the member for Nedlands in favour of the Bill appeal to me as being against the Bill. In large provinces people require more time to get on the roll than do the people in small districts. The Bill would apply not only to general elections, but to by-elections. No one would be entitled to get on the roll after a vacancy occurred because it is unthinkable that the writ would be withheld for 30 days. Consequently hundreds of people would be disfranchised. Why make it difficult for people to get on the roll? We should make it as easy as possible, within the bounds of safety, for people to get on the roll, so that Parliament may be thoroughly representative of the people. The effect of the Bill will be to allow an additional 16 days in which to get names off the roll.

Mr. Panton drew attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	18
Majority for	1

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Millington	*(Teller.)*

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Church	Mr. Parker
Mr. Davy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Wells
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North
	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that leave be given to sit again.

Question put and negatived.

PAPERS—SANDALWOOD.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Kalgoorlie) [12.25]: I move—

That all papers in connection with the report of Mr. Gepp concerning the sandalwood industry be laid on the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [12.26]: I assure the hon. member that, even if there is not an opportunity of laying all the papers on the Table of the House, the Minister will make available such of them as he has. Some confidential documents are with the Commonwealth Government and therefore are not in the possession of the Minister. All the papers that are available in this matter will, however, be made available to the hon. member, if it is not possible to lay them on the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12.29 a.m. to 1 a.m.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL).

Council's Amendments.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to a schedule of two amendments.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

No. 1, Clause 3: paragraph (j), page 4—Delete:

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I was under the impression that we had struck out this paragraph before the Bill left the Chamber. Apparently an error crept in and it was allowed to remain. I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2: Clause 4: After the word "that" in line 38 insert the words "all things being equal":

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This deals with preference of employment to returned sailors, soldiers, and nurses. I move—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 1.5 a.m. to 2.35 a.m.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—WHEAT POOL.

Council's Amendment.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to an amendment.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Council's Amendment: Schedule—Add a rule, as follows:—"13. Notwithstanding that this Act may not come into force until after the firm and/or the trustees have wholly or partly conducted the election of councillors for the period commencing on the 30th day of November, 1932, such elections shall be deemed to be the first election of councillors for the purposes of these rules and the councillors elected thereat shall be deemed to have been duly elected in accordance with these rules. The provisions of rule 1 shall be deemed to have been complied with in regard to such first election if the 20 districts therein referred to shall have been defined by the trustees prior to their becoming incorporated under this Act."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Bill was introduced into this House in September and during its passage through this House an election was held. All that this amendment does is to validate that election. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 2.10 to 3.40 a.m.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

1, Criminal Code (Chapter XXXVII.) Amendment (No. 2).

2, Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagors' Relief Act Amendment (No. 2).

3, Auctioneers' Act Amendment.

Without amendment.

CLOSE OF SESSION.

Complimentary Remarks.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [3.42]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until the 20th January, 1933.

Before we adjourn, I would like to wish you, Mr. Speaker, and also the Chairman of Committees, the "Hansard" staff, the officers of Parliament and the general staff of Parliament the compliments of the season. We have had a fairly strenuous session, and before we meet again we shall have to face the electors. I hope most of us, in fact all, will come back. That would be quite satisfactory if it could be arranged. One always takes a little risk, however, when one contests an election. I hope the coming year will be easier for you, Sir. I should like to acknowledge the courtesy and kindness of the Opposition during the whole of this Parliament. One might say that from 1919 to the present time we have been carrying on the work of Parliament in a manner which surely must commend itself to the electors of the State. We have devoted ourselves entirely to business, and have got through it with much less friction than is the case in most Parliaments. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept my thanks for his courtesy during the whole of that period. To my immediate followers I wish the compliments of the season. I acknowledge the consideration they have extended to me and the Government during the trying period through which we are passing. It is not an easy matter at the best of times for members of Parliament always to approve of their party leaders. It must be far more difficult in these times, when there is so little that can be done for the individual members' electorates. These times are not like the old days, so one can all the more appreciate their courtesy and consideration. I hope, Sir, that you will convey to the staff the good wishes I have expressed. We are particularly fortunate in every department connected with the Parliament of Western Australia. We have been looked after very well by the whole staff, and we can congratulate ourselves not only regarding the officers of the House, but those members of the staff who look after our creature comforts. I notice that the younger members look very much better after they have been here a few months.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [3.48]: I join with the Premier in his expressions of goodwill to yourself and the officers and staff of Parliament. We have got through the session as we have been able to get through many sessions during past years. There has been a minimum amount of friction and that, I think, is due to the high regard and respect in which you, Sir, are held by every member of the House. We have been well served by the chairman of committees, by the Clerk of the Assembly, the Assistant Clerk, and all the other officers of Parliament. I sometimes wonder what are the thoughts of the officials of the House at the close of a last session of Parliament. After all, we come and go, but they, as it were, go on for ever. Having sat and listened perhaps to many Parliaments and observed the members who have been in the House, I wonder what their feelings are on such an occasion. I think there ought to be a Standing Order compelling the Clerk or the Assistant Clerk to keep a diary in which to write up his reminiscences. Of course, it would have to be done very late in life, so that the references would apply only to members who perhaps are no longer with us, or amongst us.

Mr. Kenneally: I think a censorship would be necessary, too.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Mr. Grant, I understand, has been doing something in that direction. I understand he has kept a diary and is contemplating publishing his reminiscenses. I hope he will do so before too many of us have disappeared from the House.

The Premier: You are running a risk. I have heard a little about it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Although we have these felicitations at the end of each session, we feel them more at the end of a Parliament, because the necessities of the situation compel us to go out during the next few months in order to contest our seats, and

we shall be carrying the political war into each other's camps. Nevertheless, I feel that, when all is over, so far as members personally are concerned, there is a tinge of regret. I have found from long experience in the House that we learn to like each other, apart from our political differences. That phase of Parliament which we dislike most is the end of a Parliament, which inevitably brings changes. Friendships independent of party are formed in the House, and in point of personal contact elections sever some of those friendships. I can only say I wish my friends on the Government side just as much good luck as one political opponent can wish another. Whatever the fortunes of the elections, we all have to face them and, if it should be my lot to disappear from the House, at any rate I will have abiding memories of the long years I have spent in the Chamber and the friendships I have formed with all sections of the House. I wish every member a pleasant and happy Christmas, when we shall be able to forget our troubles for a few weeks. I hope we shall not too early launch into this inevitable thing that faces us, and that the aching may not be prolonged too much; let us have a few weeks or a month or two in which to forget that we have to face a general election. I can say truthfully that we part good friends, all of us. I should like to reciprocate the remarks of the Premier as to the consideration which he is good enough to say has been extended towards his Government by the Opposition. I likewise have had nothing but the utmost courtesy from the Premier and all his Ministers. And if during the session one's temper may have become ragged at times and one may have said something in the heat of the moment. I am sure every member of the House understands. I acknowledge for my own part, and I think I can speak for the whole of the Opposition, that the Premier and all his Ministers have extended to us the utmost courtesy and kindness. So we part good personal friends and we have to trust to the fortune of war as to what happens in the future. Whatever it may be, I am sure the elections will leave no bitter sting, but we shall be able to meet again—those of us who come back—in the same good friendly spirit that we have been able to maintain throughout this session.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [3.55 a.m.]: May I as leader of the smallest party in the House join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing goodwill towards you Sir, the Chairman of Committees, the "Hansard" staff and officers of the House, and the other officers of Parliament. I desire to thank the Premier and my colleagues and the Leader of the Opposition and members on both sides for their kindness to me and to my party. It is with a pang that I realise we have come to the end of a Parliament. Within my time in the House there has been one general election in which only one seat provided a change. While we do not know what is ahead of us, we make new friends and there is a pang of regret at parting. Western Australia can be proud of the associations in its Parliament; we have nothing to regret, nothing to live down and I think it can be said we set an example to most other Parliaments. I hope it will be found that the last three years were the worst we had to live through, and that the New Year will bring with it a more prosperous and easier time for all. I wish members a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [3.57 a.m.]: I desire to express thanks to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for their kind references to me. We are all looking forward to a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, and I join with other speakers in wishing all members of the House and their wives and families the compliments of the season. The future is a blank and we do not know who will return from the elections. During the session I have received the utmost courtesy, not only from the Government side of the House, but also from the Opposition, and I have been treated with the greatest respect. I thank all parties for the generosity they have shown me, particularly the deputy chairmen who have assisted me during the past three years. Whenever I have asked them to do anything for me they have come forward readily. Also to the officers of the House I express my sincere thanks. After the elections I shall be pleased indeed if I am here to see all the old faces back again. The Chairman of Committees very often desires to get the business through in an ex-

petitious manner, but always with a desire to be fair to both sides of the House. I have been treated with the greatest respect by members generally and I appreciate that very much indeed. While on occasions members may have had to disagree from my rulings, I may have been wrong in my decisions. No one can at all times be in the right. Nevertheless I appreciate the courtesy that has been extended to me. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, and every member of the House a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

MR. SPEAKER [4.2]: Time passes quickly and it seems only the other day that members of this House asked me unanimously to take the Chair. Just as long as memory lasts, I shall always remember the happy time I have experienced in presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly. Thanks to the generosity and kindness of every hon. member, I have been able to discharge the high and honourable duties entrusted to me. I hope each and every member will be in the House after the elections take place, but whether or not I hope they will carry with them very happy recollections of their associations with this Parliament. I hold two records of which I am proud. One is that during the last three years the Almighty has blessed me with good health and I have not missed one sitting of the House. The second record of which I am proud is that no other Speaker has ever had so easy a task as I have had. With the exception of one or two ripples on the magnificently smooth waters through which we have proceeded, thanks to the harmonious relations that have existed between the Premier and his colleagues and the Leader of the Opposition and his team, my task has been made doubly easy. I should like to express my appreciation to the Chairman of Committees and his Deputy Chairmen, Messrs. Panton, Angelo and J. H. Smith, for their efforts during the year and I extend my thanks to the Leader of the "Hansard" staff, Mr. Ramaciotti and all connected with that staff who have done excellent work during the year. I also extend my thanks to the two Clerks and those associated with them. I am certain that no other Parliament can show a better record for clean fighting and fair speeches on the floor of the House than our own Parliament. In conclusion, I am deeply grateful for the kindly sentiments expressed by the various speakers and to each and every individual member of the House for their wonderful kindness to me.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.5 a.m. (Thursday).

By Proclamation published in the *Government Gazette* on the 17th January, 1933, Parliament was prorogued to the 7th February.