

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.7]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.8 p.m.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1923-29.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 27th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Lutey in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £1,700:

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.37]: First there is occasion to be gratified because the waterside trouble is over at Fremantle and we shall return to normal conditions there. Everybody throughout the State will rejoice that the trouble is over. It has held up trade and work for the past month. Another matter to which I wish to refer is the unfortunate retirement of Colonel Pope, Commissioner of Railways, who has filled that position for some nine years with great satisfaction to the people of the country and particularly to the workers on the railways. Colonel Pope has shown himself a strong, firm, fair man, and very capable. He has had the whole of the railway staff working with him, very much to the advantage of the State. We must all regret that ill-health is the cause of his retirement, and I am sure Ministers regret the retirement just as sincerely as anyone else. My Government had some years' experience of Colonel Pope. All who have had to do with him must realise that in Colonel Pope the State had a loyal official and a very capable administrator. He was appointed, hon. members will recollect, from the service, occupying then not a particularly high position. I hope that when it comes to the appointment of a Commissioner, we shall not go outside Western Australia. There is always some risk in bringing in a stranger, particularly in such a service as the Railway Department. In making all appointments we must remember that our duty is to do the best we can for the State, regardless of individuals. It is the duty of Ministers to do that, and I am sure they will. However, I hope that within the service someone will be found capable of filling the vacancy. That, of course, remains to be seen upon inquiry. Now I come to this dry-as-dust document, the Annual Estimates. The Premier, in delivering the Budget Speech, made the best of a bad case; and now I shall try to state the facts.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th October, 1928.

	PAGE
Mt. Leonora electorate, seat declared vacant ...	1116
Annual Estimates, general debate ...	1118
Bills: Wheat Bags, 2R., Com. ...	1127
Town Planning, 2R. ...	1134
Profitsteering Prevention, 2R. ...	1136
Land Agents, 2R., referred to Select Committee ...	1139
Group Settlement Act Amendment, Com. Report ...	1189
Adjournment; Royal Show ...	1145

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

MT. LEONORA ELECTORATE.

Seat Declared Vacant.

THE SPEAKER [4.33]: I have received the certificate of the death of a member—

We the undersigned, being two members of the Legislative Assembly, do hereby certify that Thomas John Heron, a member of the said House serving for the Mount Leonora district, died upon the 3rd day of October, 1928, and we give you this notice to the intent that you issue a writ for the election of a member to supply the vacancy caused by the death of the said Thomas John Heron. Given under our hands this 9th day of October, 1928. (Signed) A. H. Panton, C. P. Wansborough.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.34]: I move—

That the House resolves that owing to the death of Thomas John Heron, late member for Mount Leonora, the Mount Leonora seat be declared vacant.

Question put and passed.

The Premier: And make the worst of a good case?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I dare say I could manage that. One thing we ought to remember is that a fourth of the total debt of the State is due to the expenditure of the last four years. Before I sit down, I hope to show that our investments of borrowed money are sound. I say that advisedly, because apparently in the minds of some people who visited us during the last few months there is some doubt on the subject. I do not think any other Australian State, or indeed any other part of His Majesty's Dominions, can show for borrowed money as sound investments as Western Australia has to show. This being a growing State, that is all the better. However, we must bear in mind that the State has borrowed large sums during the past few years. During the same period, Western Australia has had the highest revenue on record, averaging about £2,000,000 a year more than during my term of office. We have also had the Federal road grant of £382,000, though I understand that grant was not all spent last year.

The Premier: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Budget figures are impossible to follow owing to the confusion caused by the method of treating the advantages that have come to us under the Financial Agreement, from the London sinking fund, and from the migration agreement. I suppose that when the Financial Agreement is finally passed, we shall be able to revert to the old system. It has been most difficult to check the debits in the Budget. The Premier shows a deficit of £94,000. I consider that he might well have made it £400,000 if the figures that I shall use are correct, as I believe them to be. Money has been taken into revenue, I think, that we ought not to have taken into revenue. When we have the Auditor General's report, we shall know more about that. His report for 1926-27 was discussed during the early part of the session, but as to that we have not had any reply. Now I want to read a table which I have prepared, and which I am afraid will prove rather wearying to hon. members; but I think it necessary to read it—

FINANCE.

AVERAGE REVENUE COLLECTED AND LOAN EXPENDITURE.

	Mitchell Government.	Collier Government.
Average Revenue	£6,926,000, over 5 years	£8,394,000, over 5 years
Average Loan Expenditure	£3,006,000, over 5 years	£4,242,000, over 4 years
Total revenue, plus Loan Expenditure each year (average)	£9,932,000	£13,636,000—Over Collier Government's period.

In my last year Revenue increased by £559,000—deficit reduced by £176,000.

In Collier estimate for this year Revenue increase of £414,000—deficit increased by £67,000.

I have also a table referring to loan expenditure—

Return 9.

LOAN EXPENDITURE.

1919-20	...	64%	£2,663,320	
1920-21	£2,586,404	
1921-22	£2,454,925	
1922-23	...	£2,519,040 £1,417,793	£3,389,299	
1923-24	£3,936,833	5 years—
			£15,030,781	£3,006,156

1923-24	
£2,509,552	Settlement Advances 64%
£1,427,281	Works, 36%

Average over 5 years—64% settlement advances to farmers
36% for Public Works.

1924-25	...	£4,099,021	
1925-26	...	£4,078,686	
1926-27	...	£4,113,054	
1927-28	...	£4,680,260	4 years—
		£16,971,021	£4,242,755
		more p.a.	£1,236,599

1927-28,	
£1,641,000	Settlement advances, 36%
£3,039,000	Works, 64%

Percentages reversed.

Average over 4 years—43% settlement advances to farmers. 57% for Public Works.

During the period of five years covered by this table, 64 per cent. of our borrowings went in advances to farmers, and 36 per cent. was spent on public works. The next

table compares the loan expenditure of the Mitchell Government with that of the Collier Government—

LOAN EXPENDITURE.

	Mitchell Government.					Collier Government.			
	1919-20.	1920-21.	1921-22.	1922-23.	1923-24.	1924-25.	1925-26.	1926-27.	1927-28.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Assistance to settlers ...	5,458	31,698	74,674	400,000	441,546	192,710	10,784	84,960	110,980
Land settlement for soldiers	1,947,772	1,527,664	983,914	958,132	778,603	598,849	320,247	176,921	170,484
Agricultural Bank—Working Capital	118,285	151,825	13,516	266,410	264,027	257,072	229,511	105,678	221,170
Total	2,071,515	1,711,187	1,072,104	1,624,542	1,484,226	1,048,431	566,542	367,559	502,618
Agricultural Group Settlement		Total up	to 30-6-24		1,058,000	983,951	1,197,714	1,428,486	1,122,629
Number of settlers	1,278 not full year	2,296 Not full year	2,220	2,244	2,048	1,766
Average per settler			£441	£538	£698	£835
Apart from Group Settlement and from total loans raised over 5 years, viz., £15,030,000, £7,983,574, or 53% loaned to ordinary farmers and to group settlers, £1,058,000 or 7%.						Apart from Group Settlement and from total loans raised, viz., £10,071,000 over 4 years, £2,485,145 or 15% loaned to farmers, and to group settlers, £4,732,931 or 28%.			

I must explain that group settlement was not established until 1921, and then it moved slowly through 1922, when there were 1,278 settlers. So it is impossible to say the average that each of them drew in those two years, because the full number of settlers were not there during the whole of the year. Our Budget statements should be in very much better form. The form could be improved, particularly now that salaries are fixed by the Public Service Commissioner or by boards. We could get a very much better form, and I hope this improvement will be effected. Under the existing form there is confusion, because of interest and sinking fund being mixed up with miscellaneous services and other things. I do not know why we should mix up our interest and sinking fund debit with that of miscellaneous services. It is not much of a service, except to the Treasury. And we have ignored the special Acts dealing with interest and sinking fund, which state distinctly which should be done. It would be much wiser to debit the total amount paid in interest and sinking fund to the one item, instead of mixing it up as we have done. The provisions of the Financial Agreement are being applied now, although the agreement is not an agreement yet. That it will be passed I have no doubt, but applying it as we do leads to further confusion. Then there is

the London sinking fund, which also has fallen into confusion; because again we are anticipating the passing of the Financial Agreement, and applying it to some of our own Acts, which are subject to the ratification of the Financial Agreement. I do not know how we are going to extricate ourselves from the tangle if, by any stroke of good fortune, the Financial Agreement should be rejected. Then there is sinking fund due under the Financial Agreement. This has been charged, but no payment has been made. Here we have an amount of £142,144 15s. 4d. I do not know quite whether that has gone into trust account, but I cannot see any item for it. Then there is the £350,000 the Premier told us of, representing interest and sinking fund due to the London trustees, but charged to miscellaneous services. Again it does not appear in the trust account as held on account of London. There is an item there of £350,000 for Agricultural Bank appropriations. Probably that represents where this amount is to be found. But it is not the proper place in which to put it, for nobody would think of looking there for it. If it has been put there—that line is not referred to—then it is not in the trust account at all. Again that is not the way in which we should keep our accounts. The increase in the sinking fund account in London is going on still, but it

is small this time. The increase is £413,663 less than it was last year or the previous year, when it was £610,000. That requires some explanation. I do not know whether the amount that, I take it, was paid to the trustees in London and which, according to the returns we have, was added to the sinking fund was not paid there. If so, it must be held in trust, if it was paid from the interest for the year. Having regard to the enormous amount of gross revenue received for the past year the financial result is highly unsatisfactory, and this year it will be still more unsatisfactory. The loan expenditure last year reached £4,680,000, which is easily the highest on record. And it will be remembered that in the past we have spent a tremendous amount on railways and public conveniences such as harbours. So it will be realised that we ought to advance a great deal more money than we have done lately to help increase the production of wealth. We are told that 36 per cent. of this £4,680,000 went to agriculture, including group settlement, as against 64 per cent. in my last year as loans to individuals. So we are not likely to make for satisfactory financing. Only 18 per cent. of the money borrowed last year was spent on railways, including, presumably, rolling stock, the total being £806,895. We have many advantages through revenue. One of the greatest is the advantage that comes to us under the migration agreement. The reason the British Government and the Federal Government agreed to help us with this work of land settlement in the South-West was that we ourselves could not afford to face the loss, and it was necessary we should have some help from those Governments. The British Government are anxious that their people should migrate to Australia, and so they are helping us substantially. Already we have borrowed, under the migration agreement, £3,555,000 at 1 per cent. Just as the British Government wish to place some of their people, so we want people to help develop the country and build up a population that will be able, in some measure, to protect the country. Britain is overcrowded, and many of her people find great difficulty in getting work. So the British Government said, "We will help you to develop and make farms, if you will take our people." And we have taken them, hundreds of them, but not nearly as many as we should have taken, having regard to the amount we borrowed.

Thus it will be seen that the migration agreement is a co-operative thing, of advantage both to the British people and to the Australian people. Under it we shall borrow £1,620,000 more this year. The saving of interest in one year will be £219,900. That is a very substantial sum indeed. Never before in the history of the State has anything like it happened to Western Australia; never before have we had any assistance in respect of land settlement, save soldier settlement. Ordinary settlement has always had to be faced as a State risk. For the next 10 years we shall have received in interest rebate on the £5,175,000 a sum of £2,005,000—again I say a very substantial sum. That will help us to cover the loss on group settlement. I have already shown that the expenditure on group settlement during my term of office was £1,053,000, while the present Government's expenditure has been £4,731,980. At any rate, I think the losses will be pretty well covered by the advantage we shall get. If money is lost it may be some comfort to our own taxpayers to know that we are receiving this help. There is another discrepancy in the figures in the Governor's Speech and the statement made by the Premier regarding the amounts spent by the State on road construction. The Governor's Speech gave the amount as £479,077, whereas the Premier told us the other night that the expenditure from State funds on road construction had been £287,584. I think the smaller amount is the correct one. If we spent the £479,000 mentioned in the Governor's Speech, then the Federal Government can have given us very little. I do not know just what they did give us, but we all know that for every 15s. we spend through the Main Roads Board, the Federal Government find £1. I should like to know how much the Federal Government did pay us last year, and whether they have refused to meet any of the demands made upon them, and if so the amount of those demands.

The Minister for Justice: A lot of that money came entirely out of State funds.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A lot of which amount, the £479,000, or the £287,000?

The Minister for Justice: A lot of the £479,000 came out of State funds.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But two amounts have been given us—£479,000 has been mentioned in the Governor's Speech

and £287,000 was mentioned by the Premier as coming from State funds. Anyhow, that can easily be verified. We have been told that altogether about £600,000 has been spent on roads, and, if so, the Federal Government did not contribute their proportion or anything like their proportion of the amount. The cost of the Canning-Fremantle-road will be about £120,000. We are not going to build other roads at that same cost, but if we did the interest on each mile of road for the next 40 years would be £900, and £900 for each mile of road is more than the people of this State can bear. While the cost of £120,000 for the Canning-Fremantle-road is charged to loan, the £900 interest on each mile of the road will be charged to revenue. It is that sort of dead work that eats up the money and produces the result we find in these returns. If members turn to public utilities and loan expenditure, they will see that over the last four years we have spent £9,693,000. The interest on this sum is £508,000 and I should like members to realise that the additional amount collected in interest from this expenditure is only £98,700 more than for the year ended the 30th June, 1928, so there is a sum of £409,300 to be made good from revenue. It is quite obvious we cannot continue at that rate. We divide our revenue really under two heads, taxation and clear revenue, which is limited, and the earnings on invested money, which forms the greater part of our revenue. If the loan moneys invested in public utilities do not carry their own load of interest and sinking fund, then we must face a deficit, because our taxation, high and all as it is, does no more than cover the cost of free services. There are other moneys we collect apart from taxation, but the proceeds of taxation are used, every penny of it, I think the Premier will agree, to meet the cost of free services.

The Premier: I do not think it covers the cost of free services.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It just about covers the cost. Still, our taxation is fairly high, and it is absolutely necessary that we should make our invested money carry its own load of interest and sinking fund. Unless it does, there must come a time when we shall have to stop borrowing. Every penny of money borrowed should be invested in some wealth-producing enterprise. In Western Australia that is impera-

tive. To a large extent we are hemmed in and all that we can collect by way of taxes must be by way of direct taxation—the most difficult taxation to collect, of course.

The Minister for Justice: And the most unpopular, too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is all unpopular. I know of only one man in the whole State that likes paying taxation, even indirect taxation, and that is the Minister himself.

The Minister for Justice: I also object.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I object to indirect taxation: also I think it is far more costly to the taxpayer than is direct taxation. Anyhow we cannot get any more. We are limited. Before we get a look in, people have already paid not only indirect taxation but direct taxation under the very same headings to the Federal Government. Consequently our opportunity there is limited. Because the work of development is ours and the whole expenditure for opening up the country is ours, it is possible we are justified in demanding from the Federal Government a share of the indirect taxation. When I mention that only 10 per cent. of the whole population are paying direct taxation, whereas 100 per cent. are responsible for the payment of indirect taxation, it will be realised how restricted is our opportunity. Consequently, we have to be mighty careful. I think we agree that our job is to increase the production of wealth in order that the towns, not only of Western Australia but of Australia, may exist at all. Indirect taxation—the tariff—does build cities. We in Western Australia are engaged in building farms. We are able to collect only direct taxation, while the Federal Government collect the indirect taxation. Every person that lands on the wharf at Fremantle pays something to the Federal Treasurer as soon as he lands and so long as he remains in the State. The point I wish to stress is that we must be careful that borrowed money is expended wisely. Unless it is expended wisely, we shall soon be in financial trouble. I do think we ought to get help from the Federal Government in direct taxation to cover losses on our invested money, but it does seem it is almost impossible to expect a new and undeveloped country to supply the funds for develop-

ment from direct taxation. That constitutes one of the great objections to federation. When the States federated, Western Australia was quite undeveloped; it had an enormous territory and it linked up with fairly well developed States. I suppose every member realises that a very low rate of income tax in Victoria produces the revenue needed there, whereas a tax nearly three times as great is raised in this State.

The Premier: But even if the Victorian Government's present taxation did not give them all they want, they have a field to exploit.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Their shilling income tax is equal to 3s. here.

Hon. G. Taylor: They have the taxable wealth.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is so, and they, as a manufacturing State, are in a position to draw their income from the whole of Australia.

The Premier: And they can still raise their tax because at present it is comparatively low.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If they get into trouble they can do so, whereas we have exhausted all our reserve.

The Premier: They have a lot of reserve in the way of taxation.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and can take little risks that we cannot take. Still, I suppose they have no risks to take; their harbours are built and their railways are laid and their big public works have been carried out, whereas ours are only beginning. It is imperative that we should spend our loan money wisely. Since the present Premier came into office the Federal Government have been a little better to us than they were in the past. They have not carried out all the recommendations of the Disabilities Commission—

The Premier: Not by a long way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But they have been very much better to us. The contribution they have granted us to revenue increased by £225,723. If I had had that in my last year of office, it would have cleaned up the deficit entirely. Taxation has increased by £145,000, due in the main to the increase of land tax. The rebate of interest under the migration agreement last year was £148,000. The three items I have just mentioned give a total of £518,723 of clear revenue, representing an advantage

which the present Treasurer has had and which, unfortunately, was not available to me. By this time we ought most certainly to have wiped out the deficit, and we would have done it had we not had to make up such an enormous sum because of loan expenditure. The Premier referred to the wheat yield last season of 35,000,000 bushels and the sheep increase of a million head, both highly satisfactory, which meant an increase to the State's revenue. He referred with satisfaction to the increase in the last 13 years in the production of butter, which is ten times as great as it was in 1914. On looking up the figures I find that we imported 6,780,000 lbs. of butter last year, and that every man, woman and child in the State consumed about 28 lbs. of butter. As we produce only about 11 lbs. of butter per head, we need still make up 17 lbs. I hope we shall make up that quantity before long. It is this wretched habit of ours of importing foodstuffs, including sugar, that is keeping the nose of Western Australia to the grindstone. There is no earthly reason why we should import one penny-worth of food. We shall, I hope, develop the South-West and get this £2,000,000 worth of food that at present we import from the other States. What a difference it would make to the country if we had the butter and the money too! To-day we are getting the butter, but the other States get the cash. It is being produced there while we are striving to do something that will enable us to pay this money to them. We sell 15,000,000 bushels of wheat to London, and with the money buy foodstuffs from eastern Australia. This represents one advantage to them, but it is a decided disadvantage to us. We are importing far too much bacon and cheese, and of everything that we eat. I remarked at the outset I wished to say a word or two in defence of the loan expenditure of the past. Before doing so, I should like to explain that my desire to do this is largely brought about by some remarks made by members of the Economic Trade Mission the other day, sometimes referred to as the "Big Four." I think in England people must have some idea that we have not spent borrowed money wisely. I shall show in a few minutes that we have done so. It is a great advantage to us to have these visits from British Parliamentarians, and other distinguished people, and men of

influence in London, and it is very important that they should go away with a right impression of the country. They know, because we have told them, of what the country is capable. We have told them of what it is capable for them and for us. We do want to make them feel that we have acted wisely towards them in the past. I am not certain whether everyone in this country realises that we are very much better a part of the British Empire than we should be as a separate nation. No matter how splendid Australia may become, she can never be as great as she is were she other than a part of the British Empire, never in the next hundred years. I think we should recognise in the visits that these gentlemen are paying to us that there is a desire to help Australia to become a better part of the Empire and of greater value to it. I hope the result will be that Britain will buy far more foodstuffs and raw materials from us, and that we shall take a great deal of our imports of manufactured goods from the Old Country. Everything we now import from foreign countries should come from Great Britain. If the Empire were treated as one unit, it would be better for us. The Loan expenditure of the past has resulted in railways, harbours, public buildings, and the many conveniences now given to the public, and the many trade facilities that we possess. Every penny that we owe is substantially covered by a splendid asset. Most of the assets are growing in value. A railway laid down to serve 400,000 people must become more valuable when we have a population of 500,000. Even allowing for disadvantages, the loan expenditure is particularly sound. Let me instance the loans paid off by this State from sinking fund. The sinking fund accumulation to-day is worth over 12 millions. Our sinking fund has been used very largely in the payment of our debts. I wonder what part of the British Dominions has repaid so big a proportion of its debts as we have. I doubt whether any Australian State has ever paid off any considerable loan from sinking fund. We have provided a sinking fund for the payment of one-sixth of our debts, and this works out at 16 per cent. of all that we have borrowed. I do not think that is always realised, even by the people here. It is a very big percentage of the total amount borrowed, particularly when we remember that so much

money has been borrowed within the last nine years. Of our loans of £32,000,000, nearly one-half has been borrowed in the last nine years, and 16 per cent. of all that we have borrowed has been repaid, not by a renewal of loans, but from our sinking fund. That is an extraordinary but highly satisfactory position to be in. London need have no fear about its loans to Western Australia. I do not think it has any, but it is concerned that we should spend wisely now. I am merely mentioning these figures in the hope that they may come before the members of the Economic Trade Mission. It is up to us to do all we can to make known the truth about Western Australia. In a speech made by the son of the proprietor of an estate in England to his father, he said, "We are making progress with our backs to the wall." That has been our impossible position for years. We have had to fight all the way to get even a scant recognition of the value of our country whilst we have been making progress. We have come away from the wall now. It is because we have come away from the wall that we shall probably need more help in the struggle of our country than we have received in the past. We must make loan expenditure breed work and more work. It must be so used as to do that. If we build a road, that does not mean development, or a public building. When the job is done and the road is made, or the building is erected, it produces no more work. We are not in a position to afford that. We have to make the best of the position we are in. We have to put our money where it will breed work all the time and over all the years. This has been done in the past, and it will have to be done from now on. We require many things, but we will have to deny ourselves many things. We shall have to see to it that every penny of loan money is spent in the work of wealth production. A member of the Economic Trade Mission asked me what I thought about the loan expenditure. I said if 60 per cent. of the money we borrow is loaned to individuals for farm-making, and is wisely loaned, 40 per cent. can go in the way we have spent it in the past on public works, and the 60 per cent. on new developments will carry the 100 per cent. loan. That is perfectly true. It is the only sound way. It ought to be the State's way, and it ought to be the policy of the country to do that. It is no

use demanding anything from the Government that will not make for an increase in the production of wealth. It is very difficult to deny people who have waited a long time for conveniences, but in their own interests it has to be the case with us, as I shall show when I come on to the question of wealth production. We shall have to take a firm stand. Our job is to give opportunities for the many, to keep everyone at work and to give everyone a chance. This can only be done by natural means. It is no use expecting the Government to employ everyone. That would not be good for them. Apart from that, it would not be continuous work if the Government tried it. The individual has, therefore, to be encouraged to be enterprising. People have to be encouraged in our case if long-term loans be needed by reason of the Government assisting them. Our job is to see that everyone is kept at work. They will never be kept at work unless money is spent in the right direction. I have shown that we are £400,000 short of meeting the interest on the money we borrowed over the last four years. That £400,000 would keep a lot of people employed, 2,000 of them at £200 a year for the full year. If the money had been put into wealth production, the work would have been greater, and it would have been work for to-day, to-morrow and all down the time for years. I therefore urge that all we need do is to remember that our job is to keep everyone at work, and that it is by the expenditure of public money wisely we can do this. We should remember always that it is not done merely by putting on men to do road work. That is not essential to the development of the country at this stage in our history.

The Premier: Some road work is essential.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I know. The great bulk of it is essential. I am only using certain road work to illustrate the position. Some road work does not increase production. Of course, if we do build roads into the country, or improve existing roads in the country, we do increase production. But this work is done only when it is absolutely necessary. If by opening up a new district by means of a road we make for development, that also makes for wealth production. I do not wish it to be understood that I refer to all classes of

roads. What I was trying to do was to impress upon the House the necessity for spending money only in those directions that will mean the production of wealth, and mean giving increased opportunity to all people, particularly the workers. The increased production of wealth has to do with the arguments that I have been using, and the position I have been trying to make clear in regard to loan money. Let me turn to our loan figures. The increased production of wealth between 1919 and 1924 was £6,800,000. The increase in the State's gross revenue over that period was £2,900,000. That seems a tremendous disproportion, but there it is. The figures dealing with the production of wealth are always belated. We have not the figures for 1926-27, and certainly not the figures for last year. Between 1924 and 1926 the increased production of wealth was about £600,000 per annum, but the increase in the State's gross revenue was £940,000. That looks like putting an undue burden upon the wealth producers of the State. Of course that is what has happened. That position cannot continue, but it has continued over the last two years. Had we the figures dealing with the last two years, we could make a comparison, but we have not got them. On the other hand, we know that exports increased by nearly £3,000,000 last year compared with the preceding year. If we take from the people more than they produce, there is not much fun in endeavouring to increase production. Then on top of this there is the Federal taxation collections. These figures disclose an amazing position, and disclose a partial explanation of the continuous unemployment about which we have heard so much. If we go into this question, we must realise what our national income really is, and what it means to us. We know that our national income is represented by some £30,000,000. That is the real wealth that has been created. If we desire to buy overseas, we send away part of our national income, our produce. It may be wheat, timber, wool or some other produce. It is of interest to know that last year our exports and imports practically balanced. Our exports that we sent away were worth about £18,000,000 and we paid for £18,000,000 worth of goods to be brought into the State. If we speak of our national wealth, that is one thing; if we

refer to the turnover of money, that is quite a separate thing. The money that pays for everything is our national income. It is not the money we exchange between ourselves. A sum of £100,000 may do a great deal in the State during 12 months in the direction of building houses and so forth, but that does not help us at all if it comes to a question of importing goods. So we always come back naturally to the production of our national income, which is the phase that really matters. When business and other transactions are fairly active within the State, we may turn over a sovereign many times. It may pass through many hands and each time it does something. We have only to stop the active circulation of money and it leads us into trouble. If there are a few millions used in circulation in the State and that circulation is fairly rapid—that means to say, if men get through their jobs quickly and are paid promptly, and then proceed to other jobs and so be paid again promptly—that circulation is to the advantage of the State, and every time that money turns over it does something in the interests of the people. We must not confuse that phrase, however, by thinking that we create things, that we can send away to pay our debts elsewhere. It is the job of the Government to devote some time at least to increasing the production of our national income. That is a great need throughout the world to-day, and it is a great need with us. So I come back to the point that we must spend wisely, and we must see to it that the people are provided with work. Everyone has a right to work. In our expenditure of loan moneys, it is not wise to bring trouble to men who are the least able to shoulder that trouble. I refer to the manual labourers. That, of course, must always happen to some extent. I am certain we can get all the money we need for the development of this State, and I am equally certain that we should not borrow money except for developmental purposes. We have had before us the Financial Agreement, and I think it will be endorsed by the people of Australia. If the people endorse that agreement, then for the future we shall borrow through the Commonwealth Government. We shall have to spend not what we deem necessary but what we do get by that means, and we must devote ourselves to our task of spending

it wisely. We shall have to refuse to do many things that would be popular, things that the people would like to be done, but our first duty is to the State and to those who require employment. Pending the finalisation of the Financial Agreement, the Premier has set aside £150,000 in a suspense account and has followed that by a further contribution of £350,000 for last year and has provided for £350,000 for this year, making a total of £850,000 placed in suspense pending the time when the Financial Agreement is dealt with. I do not know what will be done with that money. I think we should all realise that the £350,000, which the Premier says he will save annually, should go back to the taxpayers who will have to pay for the loans. We have paid that money into our sinking fund to redeem our loans, and we shall have to redeem them still, but the Financial Agreement simply means putting off the day when the final adjustment is effected. Instead of making provision for the very substantial sinking fund to which we have been accustomed, we shall have only a small sinking fund in the future and the relief gained in this way should go back to the taxpayers who have contributed towards that fund in the past. That is what I claim should be done with the £350,000 that will be saved annually. In future, 5s. per cent. will have to be paid towards the loan sinking fund. I think the advantage of this should come off taxation. If we fixed the tax to keep the larger sinking fund going, the people should receive the benefit of the decreased portion of the payments we are not going to make in the future. I hope the Premier will use the money saved by this means in the reduction of taxation. Here again there is a mixture of figures. When we were discussing the Financial Agreement, we were told by the Premier that we would not be required to pay to the London trustees a sum of £293,850 interest on the bonds they held, and which the State proposed to cancel. We were also told that we were not to contribute £133,700 towards sinking fund, making a total of £427,550. There is a difference between that total and the £350,000 to which the Premier has referred of £77,550. It may be that some of that money has been used in connection with portion of the sinking fund paid to the Commonwealth Public Debts Commission, but certainly the figures require some explanation. I have already

referred to our revenue. This year it is estimated that the revenue of the State will amount to £10,222,000, the highest recorded so far in Western Australia. If we remember our gross production of £30,000,000, and then consider the estimated revenue of £10,000,000—I refer to gross revenue, of course—hon. members will realise that we are really taking one-third of the value of the total production of wealth.

The Premier: A big proportion of that £10,000,000 represents money paid for services rendered to enable that total to be produced.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I was coming to that point. The Premier will realise that I have been referring to gross revenue all the time. I have never had in mind that it was otherwise. While the railways make a charge for services rendered, the money so received is added to the cost of production. If railway freight amounts to £3,000,000, that £3,000,000 is taken as part of the gross revenue. I do not include all fares and all freights, but a good deal of what goes through the railways is added to the cost of production. At any rate, it is a tremendous proportion to take—one-third of our gross revenue. So again we come to the point that we must realise the importance of increasing our national income if we are to continue to live at our present rate. It seems to me that it is impossible to continue maintaining our present living standard unless we do substantially increase our national income. I confess that it almost seems impossible to do that, but I have to remember that in the past the seemingly impossible has been done. If anyone had told me a few years ago that we could buy £10,000,000 worth of motor cars, I should have exclaimed that it was impossible and everyone would have agreed with me. On the other hand, we have done it. Not only have we spent £10,000,000 in that direction, but at the same time we have increased our deposits at the bank more than ever before, so that the utterly impossible has apparently been done. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) says that a motor car represents the best investment because the purchaser receives more than value for his money. At any rate, it is interesting to note that the cost of motor cars has come down in price during the last few years, whereas the price of nearly every other article manufactured has gone up during that period.

The Premier: If half of that £10,000,000 had gone into the clearing of land and the production of wheat, we would be far better off.

Mr. Sampson: It shows that if other commodities were turned out in the same way and the manufacturers concentrated more upon mass production—

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the Premier will agree with me that this is no time to defend motor cars!

The Premier: No, it is not.

Mr. Sampson: I was thinking more about tractors.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: While it has been suggested that we should be proud of the fact that our imports and exports nearly balanced last year, we should not lose sight of the fact that our imports did not decrease. In the previous year our imports represented £18,000,000 worth, and our exports £15,000,000, whereas last year both exports and imports represented about £18,000,000 worth.

The Premier: We would have been better off if our imports had been reduced.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Particularly if there had been no increase in our exports. It is satisfactory to know what the position really is, however, and to realise that the only debt against us last year was our interest bill in England. Previously we were £3,000,000 down on our balance of trade, which, taking the interest bill into consideration too, meant that we were £6,000,000 down. This year, however, we have had to borrow only £3,000,000 to meet our interest bill.

The Premier: Still, if there is no reduction of imports and we have a bad season, the position will be worse.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, we shall have a bad balance of trade against us. All this emphasises that we must spend our money wisely, because we depend upon primary production. We despatch our wheat and wool to meet the cost of our imports and if prices go down, as it seems possible they will do, a serious position will be created. I do not propose to discuss departments at this stage, because they can be dealt with at a later stage of the consideration of the Estimates. We have Bills before us dealing with group settlement and other matters whilst other measures will enable us to debate other subjects. There is, however, a good deal in the Esti-

mates that ought to concern members generally. We cannot go on increasing our expenditure at the rate we have been doing unless, of course, we can do better with our money. We realise that we have a wonderful country and the value of it is recognised now by people with capital who are coming here. Our agricultural lands are producing more than they ever produced and if the price of wheat is maintained—I believe it will be—we need have no fear for the future. The outlook is really much better than people imagine. The world needs far more wheat than it ever did. Turning up the figures of world production over the last 20 years, we are astounded to find the comparatively small increase that has taken place. Russia is putting in a little more than she did, but the difference in their production is not very material. Of course that country is not altogether out of it, but when we are told that we have to fear Russia's production, it is an unnecessary warning. We must not forget that there is an ever-increasing population to consume the world's production and that fact in itself will make it almost difficult to produce sufficient foodstuffs. In saying this I am merely voicing the opinions of people who have given the matter serious thought. Naturally we must be cautious all the time, but I think we have been too cautious in the opening up of our country. If wheat maintains its price at 5s., we can produce 100,000,000 bushels in this State, because the best of our land can be utilised while the price remains at 5s. Men can go out into tree-less country to produce wheat if the price is reasonable. If it should go beyond 5s., say to 6s., we can produce 200,000,000 bushels. Unlike many countries, our light lands are served by a good climate and all can be worked. In Western Australia we have sold about 20,000,000 acres of first-class land, and there is mighty little of the remainder that will not be used in time. While science has come to the assistance of the agriculturist, the opportunities of the scientists are limited. The soil is responsible for 10 per cent. of the weight of the wheat whilst 90 per cent. comes from the atmosphere. What science has done, however, strengthens our belief in the possibilities of the future of this State as a wheat-growing country.

The Premier: The standard is rising.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes and it is good that it should rise. Unless a man gets good food to eat, he cannot be much of a Christian to begin with, and he cannot be of much use to the world either. Besides, it is wrong to think that anyone should have to go short of food. The outlook for the agriculturist in this State is brighter than ever it was. A few years ago we did not think that we could open up our light lands as we are doing. Wheat was then a 3s. 6d. proposition. To-day we know that we can open up the light lands. Wheat growing and production from the soil is like shopkeeping. If we buy an article for a shilling we cannot sell it for 11d., but if we buy it for a shilling and sell it for 1s. 3d. it is not so bad. We cannot produce wheat at 4s. and sell it at 4s. My task now is almost ended. I have referred to the enormous expenditure that we have incurred. During the last few years the Premier spent about £3,720,000 a year from loan and revenue more than was spent in my time. That is an enormous sum and I venture to think that if I had had a fraction of it I could have done very much better with it. Certainly we shall be compelled, whether we like it or not, to watch with care the expenditure of future loan money. We talk glibly about shifting the railway at a cost of a million; we talk about putting millions into the harbour. These are suggestions. Of course we must look ahead and we have to be ready for increased requirements, but our position is such that we are not justified in doing anything like the amount of work that is suggested, work involving enormous expenditure. Again I come back to the point that we cannot incur liability for the payment of interest on money that is not earned. Our revenue is not very large, and we have no means of expanding it. To a great extent that is due to Federal taxation. I should say that unless we increase our population there is not much chance of increasing our revenue. It might be possible for the Federal Government to reduce taxation or confine it to fewer things. That would be a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, however, we have no control over the Federal authorities. I hope the Premier will explain to us the one or two points that I have raised. Particularly should I like to know definitely just what proportion of the interest on the £9,600,000 spent on works has been charged

to revenue. It is important this should be looked into carefully, and it is important also that we should have a definite policy by which we should put at least 60 per cent. of the money we borrow into wealth-producing works. During my term of office we dealt with soldier settlement. That was land settlement, and, as I have shown, 53 per cent. of what we borrowed was spent in that direction. The result of that expenditure has been increased wealth. I do not know what the Premier's loan proposals for this year will be, but I suggest that it will not be possible to continue to borrow and spend as we have been doing. The Premier cannot possibly go on without creating a tremendous deficit. If we had not had the special advantages from the Federal Government, the advantages under the migration agreement, the money derived from sandalwood, and the saving of interest on soldier land settlement, we should not have been able to get anywhere near balancing the ledger. Whilst we have to be careful in many directions, we must be particularly careful in regard to the expenditure of loan money.

On motion by Mr. Thomson. debate adjourned.

BILL—WHEAT BAGS.

Second Reading.

Resumed from the interrupted debate on the 4th October (page 1091).

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. Millington—Leederville) [6.2] continuing his speech, said: Last Wednesday I was explaining the need for the introduction of this measure, and was enumerating the various public bodies which had requested that it should be introduced. I stated that requests had come from the producers of wheat, from the selling agents, from the conference of affiliated agricultural societies, and from the Royal Agricultural Society. I do not propose to labour the question at all, but shall merely give the reasons put forward by those who have requested the enactment of the Bill. In April of last year the following letter was read from the Merredin and District Agricultural Society:—

A resolution was carried at our last committee meeting to the effect that "We respectfully bring to your notice the suggestion that

an Act of Parliament should be enacted making it compulsory that all wheat delivered at the sidings must be branded with the farmer's registered stock brand." The reason for the above suggestion is on account of the trouble experienced with the samples delivered, and which at times, owing to the rush at the sidings, it is not possible to check every bag thoroughly. If the suggestion were given effect to it would enable the buyers at a later date to ascertain from whom the produce had been purchased, hence enabling them to guard against future purchases from the same sellers. At one siding in the district this year wheat had been received into which sand had been pumped.

On the 1st March this year the secretary of the Co-operative Wheat Pool for this State wrote to the Minister for Lands stating—

A number of cases have been brought to the notice of the trustees recently in which earth, machinery parts, and other foreign matter have been found in bags of wheat, and owing to the bags bearing no distinguishing mark it was impossible to discover by whom the wheat had been delivered.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the agents get paid for sampling the wheat.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is impossible to sample every bag thoroughly. Moreover, the mischief is that when the discovery is made the offender cannot be identified. On behalf of the trustees of the Co-operative Wheat Pool of Western Australia, it was communicated to the Minister for Lands on the 1st March, 1923, that—

In the case of alleged wheat stealing at Matyalling, where it was obvious that a large quantity of wheat was involved, the only charge that could be proved was that of illegal possession, owing to the bags not bearing the brands of their owners, and a fine of £10 to each of the three men concerned was the only penalty imposed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Still, they were fined.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: But all that could be proved was illegal possession. Had the bags been branded, there would have been proof of from whom the wheat had been stolen.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And to get over a tinpot thing like that you are going to make the farmers pay £15,000 a year for branding bags.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not as though these were isolated cases. In August of this year the following resolution was passed by the affiliated agricultural societies in conference, a body to which we should give some consideration

and whose opinion on such a question as this is valuable—

That the Government be asked to pass the necessary legislation to compel all sellers of wheat to brand the bags with a registered brand.

These requests have been pressed during the last 18 months, not only as regards the putting of foreign matter into wheat, but also with a view to identification of wheat when stolen, and there have been many such thefts. The proposal is being made in the interest of wheat producers and wheat handlers. The passing of the Bill will not mean the putting on of special officers in the Agricultural Department. The department will not police the Act. Those who suffer will have to take action. Since the agents desire this Bill, they would see that the wheat was branded. The department do not propose to undertake the supervision of that matter. Nor do I propose to do any special pleading for the Bill, since it does not affect my department. The persistent representations which have been made have convinced us that the measure should be enacted. I presume that when all the people associated with the growing and marketing of wheat, or at all events bodies representative of them, express a desire of that kind, our duty is to meet them.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You give the people all sorts of legislation, freak stuff.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If any section of the community require a measure for their protection, I fail to see that that is an argument against the measure. I have heard of little Bills being introduced here, and I think this is the smallest of them all. In any case, it is no annoyance to the general community, though it is urgently required by wheat growers and acquiring agents.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The wheat grower can put his brand on the bags now if he wants to.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: As in times past, the wheat grower will, if this Bill passes, use his registered brand. Therefore he will be at no extra expense. It may be necessary to prescribe that registered brands shall be used, but from the departmental aspect there will be no cost, and the desires of those particularly concerned will be met. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [6.12]: The Minister tells us that there is a request for the Bill. Apparently the hon. gentleman is obliging and will grant any Bill which does not involve cost or trouble to his department. But the Government should pause before putting up legislation. Ever since the session opened we have been considering these little bits of Bills, and that is not good for the country. There are more important measures to be considered than most of the Bills so far brought forward. I hope Ministers will get on with better legislation.

The Minister for Agriculture: This will take only a few minutes, and is only a formal matter.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It will take more minutes than the Minister thinks. Far better consider the unemployed and what can be done for them. There is nothing to prevent buyers from stipulating that wheat bought by them shall be in branded bags, or the acquiring agents themselves can brand the bags when they come in. The management of the Northam mill could say to me, "We will not take wheat from you unless you brand your bags."

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Fruit is branded.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is a totally different thing. Fruit is a perishable article. We have got into a rotten habit of piling up expense on the people. There are two vermin taxes, for example, and various land taxes. Heaven knows how many taxes are imposed on the people. If the Bill passes, the cost to the farmer this year will be £15,000 or £20,000.

Members: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: For a start, he will have to buy something to brand his bags with.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: He will use his sheep brand. That gives general satisfaction.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He may use his sheep brand, but surely he would not need anything as big as that. The sheep brand was used as a temporary expedient under the compulsory pool. But this Bill is to be for all time. I hope the farmers will brand their bags properly when they send their wheat in, because there are always penalties in connection with these matters.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Before tea I was pointing out how unnecessary the Bill is. It provides for the branding of wheat bags. Presently somebody will come along and say, "What about oat bags?" The point is that a great deal of cost will be occasioned under the Bill. We cannot brand 12,000,000 wheat bags without great cost. And of course the Minister provides the usual penalty for an offence under the Act. If a bag be indistinctly branded, the unfortunate farmer will be liable to a penalty. Apart from that, why should not those who want the bags branded do their own branding? Why cannot they brand them themselves, when the bags are delivered? Why should the farmer have to go to all the cost, and in addition run the risk of prosecution? And then what is it all about? We know that some unscrupulous people have put stones and other foreign matter into wheat bags, but I suppose that every bag taken into a stack is tested in the usual way. Is this branding of bags to be a more complete test? How are we going to discover these frauds by this method? So nothing can be gained in that direction. Moreover, suppose a man accepts a bag of wheat that contains also stones or sand, and has it in his possession for three or four months. Would any court of law then grant him his remedy? If he were to come along and say, "I tested this bag when it first came in, but did not find in it any sand; whereas now, three weeks later, when I open the bag I find that there is sand in it." What would the court say? The court would ask, "Who put the sand there?" There would be nothing more to be said. So, regarding these impurities, no object would be gained by the branding of the bags. If some dishonest person were to steal a bag of wheat from a stack and the wheat was left in the branded bag, it might then be traced, and the branded bag would be some evidence that the wheat had been taken from the stack. But no thief would risk keeping the wheat in the branded bag. Rather would he put it in another bag, one that had not been branded. Naturally that is what he would do. At any rate, under the Bill the farmers will be put to very considerable cost, and will run some risk of committing offences against the measure. Last year there were 12,000,000 bags of wheat produced. To brand all those bags would cost a considerable sum of money; and what protection would it give to anybody? No real pro-

tection whatever. And what would be the use of branded bags to the man who carts his wheat to the mill? Another thing: the people who buy wheat would not buy any more simply because the bags were branded. I do not believe any protection whatever would be gained in this way. And I do not think we should impose all this added cost on the farmer simply because one or two people, it may be, have done some wrong thing in adding impurities to the wheat. I am absolutely opposed to putting any additional cost on the farmers. I will not vote to put them to any increased cost without any advantage to themselves. We might as well add in the Bill that wheat is to be carefully protected against weather. For there is as much wheat lost every year through being unprotected in the stack as by any other means. The loss represented by impurities in the wheat in the stack would be as nothing compared with the loss occasioned by weather. The losses by water damage, unavoidable though they be, are far greater than any other losses. We should hesitate before we order people to do things of this sort. If individual farmers want to do it, let them do it, and if the man who buys the wheat wants it done, let him have it done. But why should we fiddle about with this sort of legislation? I hope the Minister will withdraw the Bill and not insist upon its passing. I repeat that it will put the farmers to considerable expense and trouble, and will not result in the protection imagined, will not protect the wheat in the stacks. I suppose some of the wheat in stacks has been stolen, but I do not know that very much of it has been stolen. It will be contended that wheat in stacks is pooled wheat, and is there at the risk of all the farmers, and therefore the bags should be branded in the interests of all the farmers. That is not a reasonable argument. The people who have undertaken to care for that wheat ought to be expected to care for it and protect it. It is part of the charge made against the trustees for the handling of the wheat that it is an expensive process. I repeat that the Bill will not afford protection commensurate with the additional cost. The Minister ought not to be so ready to put up legislation asked for by people outside. When the Minister brings down legislation he ought to be very well satisfied that that legislation is in the interests of the people most concerned, in this case the growers, before it is brought down.

It is not good enough for the Minister to say, "Please consider this legislation, because somebody has asked for it." Probably it is somebody not specially concerned. I think the House will be well advised to reject the Bill. In my view it is quite unnecessary.

MR. C. P. WANSBROUGH (Beverley) [7.40]: I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition sees quite a lot of mischief in this small measure. It is a measure desired by the farming community and requested by organised bodies of farmers throughout the State. Not for one moment would I stand for imposing additional cost on the farmers. Neither do I think there is any necessity for laying any extra expense on the farmer, because under the existing laws every farmer is required to have a registered brand. We have had previous experience of the branding of wheat bags, under the old compulsory pool. When every farmer in the pool had to brand his bags, he made it part and parcel of his operations on the farm. While that measure was in operation we had none of the frauds and stealing that have been going on recently. There has been expressed a general desire for this measure, not only from the pool participants, but also from agricultural societies and associations of farmers throughout the State. The measure is very necessary for the protection of the farmers themselves. Because, while it is not a very creditable thing to have to admit, we know that some farmers are prepared to take a mean advantage of their fellow-farmers by packing bags with all sorts of rubbish, including metal, stones and rocks up to 30lbs. and 40lbs. weight, which get into the overseas market and spoil our credit.

Mr. Latham: They are only isolated cases, surely!

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I wish it could be said that they were only isolated cases.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the bags are all tested.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: The test does not always disclose the presence of foreign matter in a bag. It is quite possible to miss with the testing implement rocks and numerous other pieces of rubbish that may be in the bag. We do want this Bill, and it is not going to impose any increased cost on the farmer, except from the point of view of the registration of his brand; and

this will mean nothing new if every farmer be allowed to use his present registered stock brand. I hope the Minister will agree that that will be sufficient. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [7.45]: I intend to support the Bill, but I will speak only to the question of costs. Under the compulsory wheat pool we all had to brand our bags. The usual practice was to buy about a shilling's worth of ink powder and go ahead with it. It was sufficient for about 100 bags. That is what was always done. I hope the Minister will agree to make it clear in the Bill that the registered stock brands will be sufficient for the purpose. It is not quite clear at present. I do not want any farmer to be placed in the position of being compelled to register a fresh brand, because the brand of the farmer is quite sufficient for all purposes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But a fee will be charged, I expect.

Mr. LINDSAY: There is a fee for registering stock brands, 8s. a year, I think. Once a stock brand is registered, there should be no other charge. It is necessary that wheat bags should be branded. I do not see why any farmer should be ashamed to brand his own commodity. Under the present system of selling wheat by weight, there is a tendency for some people to get as much weight as they can. There is also a tendency to reduce the quality of the wheat, as most of us are doing to-day, by taking the second sill out of the harvester. When wheat is sold on an f.a.q. basis, as long as it comes up to the standard, the grower is paid the average price. I hope we shall yet adopt the system when a man shall be paid for any better quality of wheat delivered. As regards stacks, when wheat arrives at the sidings, the buyers for their own protection brand every bag with a stencil. In connection with the selling of wheat in my own district, I know of a man who took wheat out of a stack at night and delivered it back in the morning, although it was not possible to prove the fact at the time. If those bags had been branded with an ink brand, it would not have been possible for him to do that. The producers have asked for this legislation, and the Minister has introduced it only because the producers asked him to do so. It is a good thing that a producer should put his brand

on the commodity he is going to sell. No one should be ashamed to do that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Wheat bags to be branded:

Mr. LINDSAY: I should like the Minister to make clear that a stock brand already registered will suffice for branding wheat bags. Of course some producers may not have a stock brand and would require to register a wheat brand, but there should be no necessity for two registrations.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If a grower has a registered stock brand, it is intended that that should be the brand for wheat bags. That will be prescribed under the regulations. I do not know that it would be advisable to provide definitely for the use of the registered stock brand.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: He would not have to re-register.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He would have to register his stock brand as a wheat brand.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, the regulations will provide that where a grower has registered a stock brand, it will suffice for branding wheat bags.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: Producers without a stock brand will have to register.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, and when such producers start to keep stock, they will have a brand. I have no objection to stock brand being specified, because that is the intention.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: About 50 per cent. of the wheat growers in this State are not stock owners.

The Minister for Justice: They all have a horse or two, at any rate.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I doubt whether they have registered brands. Many owners of stock are located away from their wheat farms. How would that difficulty be overcome?

Mr. Panton: They would get a duplicate of their stock brand.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: An apple grower has to stencil his name, address, and the variety

of fruit on the standard case. If the same thing has to be done with wheat bags, it will be a fairly costly item. To give protection against fraud, branding is necessary, but we should simplify the system. Why should one wheat grower have to paint practically the whole side of one bag with a stencil brand, while another man running a few head of stock is privileged to use a small stock brand?

Mr. Marshall: The first man could register a small brand.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The requirements should be simplified, otherwise there will be confusion.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: It would simplify matters if we struck out of the provision for stamping the words "with the name and address of such grower" and provided for a brand registered with the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would be a convenience for every wheat grower to have a registered stock brand, and as it would not cost him any more to register the brand for wheat, it would serve both purposes. The member for Beverley should include in his proposal "a brand registered as a stock brand in the Department of Agriculture." Then one registration would cover both stock and wheat.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Beverley wish to move an amendment?

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: Yes; I move an amendment—

That the words "with the name and address of such grower or" be struck out.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member's amendment will not overcome the difficulty. He said he did not wish to put farmers to more expense than was necessary and those who had registered stock brands should be able to use them for branding wheat bags. Now it seems that those who have no registered stock brand will be compelled to buy a brand to mark their wheat bags, and in good time when they carry stock they will have to buy a second brand. The hon. member complains about the words "name and address." The grower may register some peculiar brand of his own, or register an old brand. I suggest the hon. member should leave everything as it is, and in line 6 after the word "a," he should insert the words "stock or other."

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: That will do.

Mr. MARSHALL: The stock owner could then buy a stock brand and use it for his wheat. Perhaps the hon. member will withdraw his amendment in favour of my suggestion.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to this proposed amendment. It is my desire to avoid all possible expense. It may suit some people to put their name and address on a bag. If they have a registered brand, we are satisfied they should use it.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I move an amendment

That in line 6, after the word "a," the words "stock or other" be inserted.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The farmer will not require two brands. All that is necessary is to insert the word "stock." We do not want another registrar of brands appointed, nor do the farmers want to pay two fees.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: If we leave in the words "name and address to be stamped on," I fail to see the advantage of the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. The name and address would still have to be registered.

The Minister for Justice. No.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I think my amendment will fill the bill.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There would be possible duplication if we said some other brand beside a stock brand could be used. Great care has to be taken in this matter. Anyone who applied to register a brand would have it registered as a stock brand. We do not want to have a register of wheat brands. The registered stock brand would be the brand that would be applied to the wheat bag. I do not object to the insertion of the word "stock."

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I am willing that the words "or other" should be struck out, and would like to amend my amendment accordingly.

Amendment (that the word "stock" be inserted) put and passed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That the words "as prescribed" be struck out.

The Bill adopts the Brands Act, and we do not want any more waste of paper.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LATHAM: I am surprised the Minister should say it is not the intention of the department to police the Act. It should be responsible for seeing that the Act is enforced.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Act will work automatically. Agents will not buy wheat unless the bags are branded, and it will be an offence against the law to send them along unbranded. It is not the duty of the department to provide inspectors to see that this law is carried out. If the bags are not branded the owners will be committing an offence against the law.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister seeks to create a new law, but says the department will not be responsible for enforcing it. I thought he intended to convey that it will be left to the citizens of the State to take action if they felt inclined.

The Minister for Justice: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—Provided that this Act shall not apply to wheat sold to a flour miller by a farmer."

In cases where farmers cart their wheat direct to millers, it would be ridiculous that they should brand their bags.

The Minister for Agriculture: The only virtue about this is its uniformity.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is so. It has no virtue. The farmer puts his wheat into bags, carts it to the mill and that is the end of it. We should not make the farmer responsible for wheat that has been stored in a mill for months. What is the good of putting people to such an expense? The miller does not require any such protection. There is one point about it: If this legislation is agreed to, it will mean that a bag cannot be used more than once, otherwise confusion will arise owing to the different brands on the bag.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot understand how the proviso could possibly work. Millers buy some of their wheat from agents, and not from farmers only.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the proviso applies only to farmers who sell direct to a mill!

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:

But some of that wheat may be put on trucks and sent to mills. I think the amendment would lead to confusion. One of the virtues I claim for the Bill is that it will achieve uniformity. We must compel everyone to brand, otherwise a loophole will present itself for those who desire to evade the legislation.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: You would void one of the main objects of the Bill if you accepted the amendment. I refer to the prevention of thieving.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. I cannot accept the amendment. One of the objects is to prevent the thieving that has gone on in the past.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister told us that he had not introduced the Bill because he believed in it, but because people wanted it. If wheat is delivered to the pool, the bags will be branded so that they cannot be stolen. If a farmer desires to protect himself against thieving, he will brand his bags himself and will not require an Act to compel him to do it.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think the proviso is dangerous.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the Bill itself is wholly unnecessary. I loathe the idea of passing legislation to compel people to do things that are perfectly useless.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Leader of the Opposition has drawn attention to a point that should receive further consideration. When bags are branded more than once it will lead to confusion.

Mr. Lindsay: No, it will not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must speak to the amendment.

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

Ayes 9

Noes 22

Majority against .. 13

•—

AYES.

Mr. Collier
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Davy
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Sampson

Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Brown	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corbey	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Latham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Pantou

(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Troy

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—Regulations:

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Committee will delete this clause. The Minister has a comprehensive measure, and there is no need to make regulations. We have set out definitely how bags are to be branded, and therefore there is no necessity for regulations.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot agree to the hon. member's proposal. It may be necessary to prescribe—

Mr. Latham: We have cut out "prescribe."

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: All the more reason why we should have regulations. I fail to see why this should be the one Act without power to make regulations.

Mr. DAVY: Do I understand that the Minister is of opinion that in every Act of Parliament there should be power given to the Government to make regulations? It is not always so; it is only a comparatively modern development. Quite at random I have turned up a 1900 volume of statutes and I find that in some the evil habit was then beginning to creep in. It was by no means as universal as it is now. I agree with the member for York that the time has arrived when we should put a check to this. Our draftsman should work out his legislation and provide in it everything he requires. Let us make a start now and carry one Bill without a clause to provide for the making of regulations.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon.

A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [8.36] in moving the second reading said: It will be remembered that last session two Bills were brought down, one dealing with the establishment of a Commission to report upon town planning—the lay-out of the metropolis—and the other governing the principles of town planning throughout the State. The Bill to create a commission was passed and the Commission are now functioning. The other Bill was referred to a select committee, and when Parliament rose the committee ceased to exist. It is desired now that we should proceed again with that Bill. This is exactly the same Bill as I introduced last session, and it is desired to pass it without delay. Unless that is done, the work of the existing Commission will be largely wasted; there will be no local authority to give effect to any report that may be presented. The Commission will be able merely to report to the local governing authorities, who will have no power to act. It is also desired that a commissioner who will act as town planner shall be appointed. The Commission now sitting have put up to me that it would be desirable to appoint this Commissioner as early as possible as he will be able to assist them in their investigations and they would thus have the benefit of his advice. The Commissioner will be an expert whose advice will be required in the carrying out of the plans of development. It is sound policy that we should have such a Commissioner carrying out his duties as early as possible. It is not necessary for me to give a detailed explanation of the Bill. That was done last session and since then the House has not changed. It is constituted as it was then. I hope the House will pass the measure because the longer we delay the passing of it, the more valuable time we shall lose, and the more will it cost ultimately to give effect to town planning ideas. During the trip I had the privilege of taking recently, I found that town planning was being adopted in most countries of the world. Even in very old cities where it has been found expensive and difficult to lay out the town, new cities are being established outside the old ones. Those new cities are being built on the latest town planning ideas. In Delhi a new

city is being laid out by English architects and town planning authorities. This new city is being built outside the old one, and will eventually be a beautiful place. In Cairo, although there have been big improvements to the old city, alterations are now being made to make the place up to date. At the same time, a new Cairo is being built. Heliopolis is being laid out on modern town planning principles and that, too, will be an ornate city when it is completed. The Zionist movement in Palestine has set out to build a New Jerusalem. They did not attempt to lay out a new city within the old city walls but they have gone without the city walls and are establishing a New Jerusalem around the old historic place. The new city is being built for more than one reason. It was thought undesirable to disturb the old historic place, and it did not lend itself to a decent lay-out. The same principles are being followed in other parts of the world where it is considered too expensive and inconvenient to attempt to convert the old cities into new cities. There new cities are being laid down outside the old city boundaries. That should not be necessary in a growing city like Perth. We should take advantage in the early stages of our development to lay out a city on up to date lines and provide for the growth that undoubtedly is ahead of us. Perth has been laid out on obsolete lines. It is a pity we did not have the advantage of the later principles of town planning when Perth was originally designed. In Paris credit is given to Napoleon III. for having laid out that city in such beautiful style. Napoleon, I think, is given credit for originating the early ideas of town planning. That, however, is disputed there. The system was to build streets radiating out from given circles and the idea is generally accepted by town planners now, that although Napoleon got the credit for having laid out those thoroughfares in that manner, he did so not for aesthetic reasons but for the purpose of defence, his idea being to fortify those places and prevent the erection of barricades across the streets. It was said that that was his idea, and that he had no notion of town planning. Undoubtedly, however he made a very beautiful city; and the scheme adopted in Paris is now largely followed by up-to-date town planners. There is hardly an English city in which some measure of town planning has

not been adopted. London itself has spent huge sums to remedy the defects of the past, but a tremendous amount will be needed. On the other side of the world, in the United States and Canada, more work has been done in that direction than on the Continent.

Mr. Griffiths: Of course those countries are much younger.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and they are taking advantage of the new ideas. The prettiest lay-out I have seen for a residential area is O'Shannassy Heights just outside Vancouver. The Canadian-Pacific Railway Company bought the heights, and sold the land on condition that a certain type of home was built; the purchase of a block carried with it certain obligations. Undoubtedly there has grown up on those heights within the past five years a most beautiful suburb. Looking around the city of Perth and seeing the new suburbs created within the past five years, and comparing them with O'Shannassy Heights, one realises what Perth has lost through not having some principle of town planning. Take Nedlands. Wonderful progress has been made in that district during the last five years; but, still, one sees nothing there except a long ribbon road, metalled footpaths, rows of fences, and houses laid out like a chess board—nothing attractive or artistic, no cognisance taken of the contour of the country, but simply lines drawn on a piece of paper without any account whatever being taken of the natural advantages of the locality. In Vancouver, at the spot I have mentioned, wherever one stands, at any street corner, and wherever one looks, in any direction whatsoever, nothing is to be seen but a garden. Everything is beautifully laid out. No long, dry strips of metal, but flowers and shrubs everywhere. The sidewalks, though narrow, all are planted with flowers and shrubs, and the obligation to maintain these is on the owner of the land abutting.

Mr. Teesdale: The water is not cut off there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. Owners are compelled to use the water. If they do not keep their street plots in order, the local Government are empowered to do it, and to add the cost of doing it to the rates on the property. Water, of course, is very plentiful and correspondingly cheap in Vancouver.

Mr. Sampson: I suppose it is not necessary to water gardens in Vancouver.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. It was very hot while we were there.

Mr. Latham: For about two months of the year gardens have to be watered there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no long dry spell in Vancouver; it rains pretty well every month of the year. However, sprinklers were going when we were in Vancouver; and I found the journey across the Rockies very hot and dusty—in fact, as hot and dusty as I have ever known it to be on our Transcontinental line. The advantages at O'Shannassy Heights are gained by slight outlay and without much trouble, and everyone seems to have civic pride cultivated to a high degree. Even the telegraph posts and the posts carrying tramway wires are covered with flowering creepers and climbing roses. Here we have mere ugly posts defacing our streets. I was greatly struck by the comparison between that suburb, only five years old, and the Perth suburbs which have grown up in the same period. The comparison is much to our disadvantage. I wish the House to bear in mind that not only are new suburbs being created in the metropolitan area, but that in our country districts new towns are rapidly being established. Up to the present no attempt has been made to lay out our country towns so as to make them at all attractive. No notice has been taken of the contour of the land, and many of our country towns are built in the wrong spot. For instance, Merredin is built right in a hollow, with hills surrounding it. Merredin would be a fine town if it were built in the right spot. Moreover, most of our country towns are bisected by a railway.

Mr. Lindsay: And they are usually on the wrong side of the railway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Nothing is done to make them attractive or beautiful. A country town is planned by means of a ruler and a pencil and a map in an office, without any regard for the natural advantages of the situation. Therefore I am anxious, not only that we should set about the building up of a beautiful metropolis, but also that we should create in the back country some of the ideals of town planners. I shall not enter into the details of the Bill. Hon. members know the powers that were asked for last year. They are large powers, and I do not expect that

the House will grant many of them readily. After what the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition said here recently about select committees, I hesitate to suggest, but I do suggest, that a Bill of this kind could with advantage go to a committee of members for examination.

Hon. G. Taylor: It would be a good idea.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If that idea is accepted, the committee could report before the session closes, so that the measure may be passed this year. Some of the local authorities may have to be consulted. A Town Planning Commission has been giving much attention and study to the principle. Its members have seen the draft of this Bill. However, the Bill is not that which they put up to me, because I have not embodied in it such wide powers as the Town Planning Association requested. Some of the local authorities may have views to express on the subject, and may make suggestions for the improvement of the Bill. Therefore I think it would be well if a select committee examined the Bill, reporting to the House before prorogation. I think the majority of hon. members will agree that the time is ripe for the passing of a measure adopting the principle of town planning, especially as we have given the initiative by setting up the Commission. The work of that Commission will be largely wasted unless some Bill of this kind is enacted. Melbourne has had a Commission sitting for three years. Although the Commission has been able to report to local authorities there, still no statutory authority exists for giving effect to recommendations, nor have the local authorities any means of carrying out what is desired. Further, there is no power for two sets of local authorities to act together in carrying out a recommendation of the Commission as to through roads, or in meeting the difficulties created by motor transport. I believe, however, that the Victorian Parliament will consider a measure on the lines of this Bill during the current session. Still, three years have gone by in Victoria, and have been wasted so far as town planning is concerned. Every year lost here will mean greater expense in giving effect to the principle of town planning, if it is adopted. The earlier we start, the more economically shall we be able to accomplish the work. I hope, therefore, that the House will agree to place the Bill on the statute book. I

again commend my suggestion as to a select committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—PROFITEERING PREVENTION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th September.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [8.57]: I desire to express my views in opposition to the Bill—I may say, my strong opposition. In fact, I feel opposed to everything in the Bill, including the Title.

The Premier: The short Title.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. The other day I was reading some speeches by Mr. Stanley Baldwin, and one of them was a speech he made in the course of a debate on the merits of oratory. Mr. Baldwin, who from the reports of his speeches appears to me to be an excellent speaker, but certainly no orator, expressed the view that oratory was more of an evil in public life than a good.

Hon. G. Taylor: There are not many sufferers here, though!

Mr. DAVY: Mr. Baldwin instanced as a form of oratory the use of catch phrases, and he urged that catch phrases are extremely harmful in any community, that they result in people being ruled by the mere sound of a word rather than by its meaning. Here the Government have adopted as the short Title of the Bill a typical catch phrase—the word “Profiteering.” They call this measure an anti-profiteering Bill. I submit that such an expression is an undignified one to put at the top of a piece of legislation. It is like bagging the question. The Title is merely likely to inflame the passions of the people, and not to appeal to their reason. The Bill attempts to do two entirely different things. Firstly, it seeks to vest enormous powers in some person who is going to be a very remarkable person, a most comprehensive Commissioner. Of the 29 clauses of the Bill, 26 are devoted to giving this ubiquitous gentleman these very large powers.

The Minister for Justice: He will not be ubiquitous; he will only be appointed occasionally.

Mr. DAVY: So the Minister says, and I am very ready to believe that the Minister's intention at the moment is to appoint this person only very occasionally. But we cannot deal with legislation in accordance with the intentions of the particular Minister who introduces that legislation. We are asked to place on the statute-book, powers that will stay there for all time, until some other Parliament is able to repeal it; and so the Minister's intention at the moment is quite irrelevant to the merits or demerits of the Bill. To continue my argument: of the 29 clauses, 26 seek authority to appoint a commissioner and give him wider powers than any other person or body of persons in Western Australia have to-day, except—if I may make this exception—the Federal Commissioner of Taxation. The other three clauses propose to make offences, certain acts by combines. If the Minister had brought down a Bill seeking powers of that sort, and that sort only, I should have found it difficult not to support it. But with regard to the powers he seeks for this commissioner, I cannot agree for one minute that the desires of the Government are justified. Indeed, the Minister made no attempt whatever to justify them. He is asking us to create authority in the Government to appoint a person who will have power to inquire into the whole of the ramifications of any business in Western Australia, will have power to inquire, not only into the prices charged for any commodity in the ordinary sense of the word, but also into services rendered by a person in regard to commodities both material and immaterial, both corporate and incorporate. And this person is going to have power to call on people to produce all their books, and answer all questions, and then in the end to come to a conclusion as to the prices at which goods should be sold for cash or for returns and so on. There was no suggestion made as to what he is going to base his prices on, whether on prices that will enable the least efficient trader in the industry to make a profit, or the most efficient or the middle efficient man. It seems to me before the Government are to be granted powers of that sort they ought to make out an exceedingly good case that such powers are necessary. The Minister quoted the finding of the Prices Regulation Commission. I do not know by which Government that Commission was appointed.

The Minister for Justice: By this Government.

Mr. DAVY: Very well. The Commission commenced operations in 1925, and in 1926 it returned its report. The Minister, in excuse for this Bill, quoted these words from the Commission's report—

We are generally of opinion that there was not any evidence of excessive profits, except in few cases which, however, were not sufficient to warrant general legislation.

And the Minister went on, "Consequently the Government do not in this measure seek general legislation." If this is not general legislation, I cannot suggest what it would be. If this particular legislation is opposed to general legislation, then I must confess I do not know the difference between particular and general. We cannot imagine anything more general than the powers sought by the Minister in this instance. Yet in spite of that Prices Regulation Commission appointed by the Government reporting that it did not think any general legislation was required, we are told we must give these powers to the Government.

The Minister for Justice: It was not required at that stage.

Mr. DAVY: Will the Minister tell us of anything that has happened since that stage? Will he quote a single case that justifies this general legislation? If anything has happened, it must have happened between the time the Minister introduced the Bill, some days ago, and now. In his speech the Minister said, "We may never have need to use it. I hope there never will be any need."

The Minister for Justice: You have read only a part of my speech.

Mr. DAVY: I read every word of it. The Minister said we may never need to use this Bill, and he hoped there never would be any need for it. The man who then hoped there would never be any need for it, now tells us that there is need at the present time. When the Minister sat down, every member thought he had told us there was no need for the Bill at the time. That being so, I cannot help reminding members of something the Premier said the other night. If there be no need to use the Bill now, I can only take it the Minister is asking us to put it on the statute-book as a threat to people who may offend at some future time. But the Premier the other night declared it to be improper for the Government to threaten

citizens. He said the time for the Government to act was when the law was broken. Now we are asked to put on the statute-book this piece of legislation which, according to the Minister for Justice, is to be nothing but a threat to people who have not yet done any wrong. I submit that the true method of regulating prices is to keep trade free. The best protection the community can have against being exploited is competition. That competition should be enabled to act as a policeman of persons who seek to charge more than is fair to the public.

The Minister for Justice: In trade there are combinations everywhere.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, there are. This very Government two or three sessions ago brought down a Bill which included a clause designed to check just the very competition which, if it existed in all branches of trade, would make unfair profits absolutely impossible. When the Arbitration Act Amendment Bill was brought down, one clause was put into it seeking power which was intended to kill the one-man bakery. Everyone knows there is a fairly tight combination of master bakers who endeavour, as best they can, to fix prices. As a matter of fact I do not think they have ever been very successful; because you do not find master bakers driving Rolls Royce cars around the town. If they were making excessive profits we should find them becoming extremely wealthy. The reason why they have not been able to make excessive profits has been the competition they have never been able to entirely eliminate. One of the most serious bits of competition from which they suffer is the man who gets fed up of working for another, and goes out and sets up for himself and cuts the prices. He is regarded with the greatest possible hostility by the master bakers. And so those people came to the House and solemnly asked us to pass legislation that would have effectually killed the one-man bakeries. I suggest to the Government that if they want to keep prices in proper check they should use every endeavour to encourage and increase free competition.

The Minister for Justice: The hon. member agrees that there is a combination amongst the bakers.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. Wherever we get a restricted number of persons in a trade, the tendency is for them to put their heads together and devise means to avoid fighting

each other in business. If the Minister and I had a monopoly of the sale of nails in Western Australia, and if we were not afraid of someone else coming in, we would put our heads together and say, "We don't want to be silly about this; we will both charge the same price." That is the natural tendency, and the only way to stop it is to encourage others to come in as soon as the particular industry is more profitable than it should be, according to the justification of the market. As soon as we get a business showing excessive profits, inevitably, if allowed to, capital will flow into it until the price is reduced to a normal rate. Holding the belief that the chief check on excessive profits is competition, I would be in favour of a clause designed to check combinations to fix prices and stop anybody coming into competition with them. I know that at present there are certain groups of people in certain industries here who have put their heads together, very naturally—I am not going to use the expression "profiteering" in respect to it—and agreed to charge certain prices, and I know they do their best to discourage anybody that does not agree to those prices. If the Minister were to bring down sensible legislation designed to make the worse efforts of those people illegal, I would vote for it. But on the one hand to have a Commissioner to fix prices, and then at another time to bring in legislation designed to crush the very competition that would make any suggestion of this Bill unnecessary, is to my mind not in the best interests of the community. I submit that the Bill, in its present form, ought to be voted out. It seems to me, if I can use the phrase without being offensive, that this type of measure is nothing more than a flat tax on one.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	14
<hr/>			
Majority for	4
<hr/>			

AYES.	
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munro
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Panton
Mr. Marshall	
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

NOMS.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Latham	Mr. North
Mr. Lindsay	(Teller.)
Sir James Mitchell	

PAIR.

ATK.	No.
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Maley

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LAND AGENTS.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 27th September.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [9.17]: I do not think we need discuss this Bill further because I understand the Minister will agree to the appointment of a select committee at the proper stage, which is after the passing of the second reading. If that is so, we need not discuss it further now because we will have another opportunity when the select committee reports. I think it is proper to refer the Bill to a select committee, and I am glad the Minister has agreed to take that course. That is so, is it not?

The Minister for Justice: I have agreed to a select committee.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then I suggest that the House allow the second reading to pass on the understanding that when the proper stage is reached we refer the Bill to a select committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Referred to Select Committee.

On motion by Mr. Davy (West Perth) resolved:

That the Bill be referred to a select committee.

Ballot taken and a select committee appointed consisting of Messrs. Clydesdale, Lindsay, Mann, Marshall, and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days on which the House stands adjourned, and to report on the 30th October.

**BILL—GROUP SETTLEMENT ACT
AMENDMENT.***In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause 2 "a board of three members" be struck out, and the words "an official" inserted in lieu.

I explained on the second reading my reasons for the amendment. I believe an official could do the work and he should be an officer of the Agricultural Bank.

The **PREMIER:** The Government have given consideration to the amendment, but I regret we are unable to accept it. The work of valuing the blocks is a big and important one. It will involve the expenditure of a large amount of money, and considerable writing down will have to be done. Having regard for that fact, we think it is better the responsibility should be placed upon a board of three, rather than upon one man, more especially if he be an official. There will probably be more than one revaluation, if not a second writing down. It is almost certain that the group settlers will not be satisfied with the valuations placed upon their blocks, be they ever so reasonable or low. They are bound to ask for a reconsideration of the values. If the values were to be assessed by a Government official, there would be a greater incentive on the part of the settlers to cry out against them. They would take the decision of the Government official to be virtually the decision of the Government, and would endeavour to bring pressure to bear upon the Government to secure a further writing down. The impression has been created in the minds of the group settlers that they have not had a fair deal from Government officials. I am certain they would not accept without demur the appointment of a Government official with sole power to assess the capital value to be charged upon their blocks. They would not have the same ground for objection against a board, especially if the majority of that board did not consist of Government officials. I do not suggest that the assertions of group settlers on this matter are well founded, but they would say, "Here is another Government

official who will be influenced by the Government. Their desire will be to have the loss reduced to the smallest possible amount." The view would be held that the more the amount would be written down, the greater would be the loss for the Government, and that it would be to their interests to keep the values fairly high. They would say that the Government official was actuated by a desire, as a civil servant, to keep the values higher than they ought to be.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not justified, is it?

The PREMIER: No. The hon. member knows the attitude of some people outside. They would say this scheme has cost more than it should have done, that it was the fault of mismanagement or mal-administration, and that, therefore, the Government were anxious to limit the losses, for which purpose they had appointed a Government official. That would be the contention. In order to remove any suspicion from the minds of settlers as to anything of that kind taking place, it is well that we should appoint a board to make the valuations. The chairman should be a Government official, but the other two could be independent outside persons who would be qualified for the work. It would be undesirable that this work should be done by the Group Settlement Board. Members of that board know intimately practically all the settlers. If they are to remain, their work will be to move amongst the settlers, to keep in constant touch with them, controlling and advising them. If that board were to assess the values, and they did not satisfy the settlers, it would be impossible for the board to work in harmony with the settlers, who would feel that an injustice had been done to them by the board. That would militate to a great extent against the successful and amicable relationship that should exist between the board and the settlers. For that reason also, we think it would not be wise to entrust the work of revaluation to the present board. The work carried on by the board now has no relation to the fixing of capital values for the holdings. The present board has to do with the administration of the groups, and the other will have the sole responsibility of fixing the capital value. We should, as far as possible, avoid any undue friction between the present board, if they are to continue, and the settlers.

Mr. ANGELO: I cannot see eye to eye with the Leader of the Opposition. It is desired to start the settler off with a true valuation of his block. That work must be done by an independent board. The last persons I should like to see upon that board would be Government officials.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We have an Act which says the work shall be done by an official. We are going back upon the agreement and the Act.

Mr. ANGELO: The Leader of the Opposition has in mind a high official of the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board. That officer has had a lot to do with the scheme. It is not fair to ask him now to cut down the values. He is sure to be biassed, whoever he is. The valuation should be made by independent persons, who will hold the scale evenly between the Government and the settlers. I suggest that the board should consist of one Government official, a retired banker, and some local farmer or settler who knows the conditions of the particular district concerned. I am sorry I cannot agree with the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not think the suggestion is a fair one.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I realise that under the amendment the Agricultural Bank will be the responsible party, and that its valuations are not likely to be too high. I was astonished to hear the Premier say that there were bound to be further reductions.

The Premier: No. I said there were bound to be further requests for reductions. We know the position.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I shall not enter into details of what has been squandered. The amendment places too much responsibility on one man, and thus, possibly, the right thing would not be done by the country. An officer of the Agricultural Bank might feel inclined to value improvements at the lowest amount. I shall support the amendment, but I propose to move a further amendment later. The member for Gascoyne proposed two retired bankers, possessing no knowledge of southwestern difficulties, as members of the board.

Mr. Angelo: I said, one of two.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: They would have no knowledge of clearing difficulties in the South-West. I hope the Government will never fall for such an idea. Practical knowledge of the subject is needed.

Mr. Angelo: A third member with local knowledge was suggested.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The life-blood would be squeezed out of the settlers by the private bankers. I hope the Government will not confine themselves to the appointment of one board to go through the country, especially as the conditions in the various districts differ as much as chalk and cheese.

Mr. BROWN: I favour a board of three rather than a single official. I have no objection to one of the three members of the board being a bank official. The object of the Bill is to secure the writing down of the capitalisation of many blocks, and this cannot be done satisfactorily except by a man with a good knowledge of the district and of intense culture. I have the greatest respect for bankers, but their knowledge is purely theoretical, the result of reading, or of the experience of others. A banker looks only at the financial side of any question. In any case, the official of the Agricultural Bank is a banker too, and so there is no danger of the financial aspect being overlooked. Again, a man who has resided in the South-West all his life may have had an experience altogether different from that which has fallen to the group settlers. The Government should be most careful in making appointments to the board.

Mr. LATHAM: Though I do not altogether favour the amendment, still I recollect that when the Industries Assistance Act was amended in 1924, authority was given for considerable writing down by bank officials, and I think their actions proved satisfactory to all concerned. The first point to be ascertained now is the true valuations of the blocks. When the Premier pointed out the probability of a second writing-down, it struck me that the broadcasting of his remark might involve great danger of further depreciation of the State's assets. I hope there will be no second writing-down. The first writing-down should be such as will give the settler a chance to make good by reasonably hard work. Officials would give quite as good service as could be obtained from outside men appointed to the board. On the other hand, the settlers might not feel entirely satisfied with writing-down done by Government officials. I greatly regret the necessity for the Bill, and I hope that before any writ-

ing-down at all is done, the existing Group Settlement Board will satisfy themselves that the settlers are using their best efforts to fulfil their responsibilities to the State. In a board of three each district should be represented by a member possessing local knowledge. This is necessary on account of the varying conditions.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Every group settler signs an agreement under which Mr. McLarty is to apportion the amount to be charged to each holding.

The Premier: Was that in your time?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes.

The Premier: But the Act was only passed in 1925.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but there was an agreement before we went out. Mr. McLarty was to be the determining factor in deciding it. The amendment secured by Mr. Angwin when Minister for Lands still retained Mr. McLarty, but it was then merely a division of the money spent. Now that we have spent so much more money than was anticipated in 1925, it is considered that a revaluation is necessary. On top of that there is the agreement between the Government and the settler. In the Bill we propose to set that aside. I do not know whether the Premier intends to agree to the balance of my amendment, or whether he intends to stick to the clause in the Bill.

The Premier: I think we shall stick to the clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then it means apportioning the amount of expenditure to each parcel of land. It is not necessary to have a Bill to do that, because that does not amend the Act on the statute-book now.

The Premier: But that provides for the managing trustee of the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the Committee will agree to pass the clause as it stands, for it is useless in that it does not provide for writing down. We are too prone to appoint boards for every little tinpot thing. The work to be undertaken in this instance is a multiplicity of small things and surely it is not beyond the capacity of one man to do that.

Mr. Griffiths: But a large amount will be involved in the aggregate.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Quite so, but I propose that one individual shall make the valuation and submit it to the

Minister whose approval will be necessary. Why is it necessary to have a board to do that?

The Premier: It will be a pretty big job for one man.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, in the aggregate, but he will have to deal with a large number of small things. Fancy sending a board of three men to a small farm to sit down solemnly and value a £240 building, fencing accounting for £100, stock valued at £200, and clearing worth anything from £100 to £1,000.

Mr. Angelo: Why not have an independent man altogether?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Because none such exists here. The present Group Settlement Board have not been very successful. They have been operating for some time and have spent £635 on every group settler. I doubt whether the group settlers have got £200 out of that amount. The rest of it has gone in salaries and travelling allowances. That is not the board's fault, but we require some policy that will alter the situation immediately, for every day's delay means an expenditure of thousands of pounds. I urge the Government to appoint one officer, but the Minister requires a board. If we are to have a board we do not know who will make up its personnel.

The Premier: The clause says that one member must be an officer of the Agricultural Bank, and the other two are to be appointed from outside the public service.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier must think that the group settlers will have no confidence in an officer from the bank.

The Premier: I do not know that they would have too much confidence in any single Government official.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Committee may determine that we shall have to pay three men to do one's work. I do not know what virtue there is in a board of three! Why not a board of five or seven?

The Premier: I think it is possible to embrace all the knowledge required within three, and that being so, there is no need to appoint five members.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You will not get any more knowledge in three than in one.

The Premier: It is not such an easy thing as you suggest.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think it is. Of all the money that has been spent, I should say that £2,500,000 of it has not gone outside the Treasury. This is not the big job that the Premier imagines. I hope, if we are to have a board of three, that the members will not be paid tremendous salaries. We are already pledged to the appointment of a bank official.

The Premier: To be frank, I do not think there is any official of the bank who would care to take on the job at all.

Mr. Angelo: It is not fair to ask such an official to take it on.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think there is much in it. As a matter of fact, we have officials on the spot and all there will be for the board to do will be to sit down and determine the figure to be assessed.

The Premier: I doubt whether we can induce one of the bank officials to do it. I say that advisedly.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) suggested there should be, in addition to an official of the Agricultural Bank, a banker and a farmer with experience of the district to be covered. The only objection I can see to that is that the third man would have to be changed as the board moved about from one district to another. As for a banker not having much knowledge of farming, I know of one who would be an ideal man on the board. The Leader of the Opposition has said this is only a small matter. However, there will be millions of money spent, and so I am sure it will be too big a responsibility for any official of the Agricultural Bank to take on.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. I have group settlers in my electorate and I know that they and their fellow settlers have a dread of departmental officials coming amongst them. If we had a board appointed, the group settlers would be much better satisfied.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	24
				—
Majority against	16
				—

AMES.

Mr. Davy
Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. H. Smith

Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOSS.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Brown
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corboy
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Latham

Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munste
Mr. Rowe
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Withers
Mr. Pantou

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I want to move an amendment to strike out all words after "by" in line 5.

The Premier: You cannot do that, for the Committee has already decided to leave the words in.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It has not.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot take an amendment to strike out words after "by" in line 5, for the Committee has decided that the words down to "members," in line 5, shall remain.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: But I gave notice of this.

The Premier: The Committee has decided that the words shall stand.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Well, then, I move an amendment—

That all words after "members," in line 5, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"and such a board of three members shall be appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall be an officer of the Agricultural Bank and the others two practical men residing in the areas concerned, namely, Manjimup, Peel Estate, Busselton and Denmark, and the decision of the board shall be final.

The Premier: You require to move that after "Agricultural Bank," not after "members."

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No, I want it after "members."

The Premier: Then you propose to re-insert the same words.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No, I want a separate board for each district.

Hon. G. Taylor: So you would have three boards?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No, four boards instead of one. It is impossible for one board

to operate successfully, and the sooner we place the groups on a proper footing, the better it will be for the State. One board could not be conversant with the conditions applying, say, in the Denmark district and on the Peel Estate. To have two practical men from each district to work in conjunction with an Agricultural Bank official would be much better in every way. The four boards could operate at once; there would be no loss of time, and the debit against the groups would not be mounting up. The Minister told me in answer to a question that 25 per cent. of the money expended on group settlement went in overhead charges and administration costs, and a sum of £1,700,000 has been lost in abandoned holdings and linked-up blocks. If one board has to do the work, another year or two years will pass before finality is reached. I have already pointed out that we have lost enough money on group settlement, and that Parliament and the country will be astonished at the writing down that will be necessary. With the assistance of practical men in each district, the value of clearing and other work could be assessed and the groups placed on a proper basis in three months. There are men on the groups who will stay there for another two years under existing conditions and, when the board gives a decision, they will leave their holdings, which will then be capitalised at such a high figure that nobody will be able to make a living on them. Under the proposed board we shall get nowhere and the country will have to carry the baby. The amendment would be a solution of the whole difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member proposes to strike out certain words and then re-insert them.

Mr. J. J. SMITH: I thought that would be the simplest way to move the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment as moved will not read correctly. The hon. member should have his amendment prepared. Unless he can put it into proper form, I cannot accept it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negated.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member wishes to have a board of three members for each of the four group districts. I suggest he move in that direction.

Mr. J. H. SMITH : I move an amendment—

That after "members," in line 3, the words "for each of the four group districts" be inserted.

Mr. A. Wansbrough : The amendment should read "A board consisting of two local residents and an official of the Agricultural Bank."

Hon. G. TAYLOR : Apparently time is the essence of the contract. The Government are anxious to put the settler on a firmer basis than is his position at present. It would take one board many months to complete this work, whereas four should be able to do it in a quarter of the time.

The PREMIER : The appointment of four boards would not reduce the time involved in the work. The same official would be appointed to each one, so that no time would be saved. If there is an impracticable suggestion in regard to the board it is that the valuations should be fixed by four different bodies, each of which might adopt a separate system. The board doing the whole of the work will have some regard for consistency.

Hon. J. H. Smith : Are you going to standardise the whole thing?

The PREMIER : No. The board will take all the factors into consideration.

Mr. ANGELO : A little while ago members voted for one man; now they want twelve. One member of the board should be an ex-banker, and the other a local resident.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL : The writing-down should be made with the approval of the Minister. I therefore move an amendment—

That the words "the decision of the board shall be final" be struck out.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL : I move an amendment—

That the following provisos be added—Provided that the amount so apportioned may be reduced on the recommendation of such board with the approval of the Minister:

Provided also that the amount to stand as a charge against each parcel of land shall not exceed the value of the improvements made on the block together with the stock, implements, and any other asset created by the expenditure of public moneys.

It seems to me that what the Act states is all that can be charged, and all that the group settler can be called upon to pay. I doubt if really more than half the money has been expended on the blocks. If the system suggested were adopted, it would not matter if the revaluation took 12 months: the group settler would know what was ahead. We should not go on paying out money at the rate we have been doing during the past three years.

The PREMIER : These provisos are not really required. The first of them provides that the amount may be written down, which is contrary to the provision that the board's decision shall be final.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell : But you can recommit.

The PREMIER : That is so. "Appportioned" in the clause implies writing down.

Hon. G. Taylor : No.

The PREMIER : I am not quite able to understand the second proviso. The whole question is the value of the improvements. It is the board's job to value the improvements. It is a question of value, not of money spent. The board may decide that the value of the land and improvements is £1,500, but the proviso says that "the amount to stand as a charge against each parcel of land shall not exceed the value of the improvements" and so forth. The board's job is to value the improvements.

Mr. Davy : No; to apportion the expenditure; to divide the total expenditure up and apportion so much of the expenditure to each individual block.

The PREMIER : No.

Hon. G. Taylor : That is the intention.

The PREMIER : It is not. We would not need a board to do that; a clerk could do it, by mere addition and division. The provisos would not assist in any way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL : The parent Act has almost precisely the same provision, in that it says that expenditure is to be apportioned to the various blocks. What is wanted here is what my amendment says, that the group settler shall pay for what he has got.

Mr. DAVY : It appears to me that the Bill is merely a piece of machinery for the purpose of substituting a board for the managing trustee of the bank. Subsection 1 of Section 3 says—

Every grant, and every conditional purchase lease under this Act, shall be issued subject to the payment by the grantee or lessee of such part of the expenditure on the group

settlement area chargeable to the group settlers, including capitalised interest, as is apportioned to the parcel of land intended to be granted or leased, and the survey and other fees payable in respect thereof.

That means that all that is to be found out is the total expenditure on the group settlement area and then the Bill will provide that the board shall take that total amount on an area and apportion it amongst the various blocks.

Hon. G. Taylor: There is no writing down about it.

The Premier: A board is not required to do that. An office boy could do that.

Mr. DAVY: Perhaps a certain amount of skill may be necessary in apportioning the amount to the various blocks.

Mr. Lindsay: But that is done in the office now.

The Premier: The expenditure on each block is charged up separately.

Mr. DAVY: Well, it may be that an office boy could do it and it would not be the first time a board had been appointed to do the work of an office boy. If the Premier looks at Subsection 1 of Section 3 of the principal Act, he will see that if the Bill is passed as it stands, the only job for the board to do will be to apportion the total amount among the different blocks. The board will not have any power to write down at all.

The Premier: If that is so, the clause has been very badly drafted, because that was the clear intention.

Mr. DAVY: I suggest that the Premier discuss the matter with the draftsman for I feel sure he will agree that that is what it means. If that is the position, no finality could be reached without the addition of the proviso suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Premier: That is so.

Mr. DAVY: That would leave it for the Minister to say that the amount assessed was too much, and it would enable him to write it down as required. Then again it would be reasonable to say that no amount so apportioned should exceed the actual value of the work done, because we know that, owing to mismanagement or some other reason, an expenditure, of £3,000 may not result in work worth £1,000.

The Premier: That is what it was intended the board should do.

Mr. DAVY: With all due respect, the Bill does not say that.

The Premier: I will look into the question with the draftsman and if what you say is correct, we will have to recommit the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why not report progress?

Mr. ANGELO: The first proviso is necessary to make the clause complete but I suggest it should take the form of an addition to the clause and not that of a proviso.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	15
				—
Majority against	3	—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Teedale
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Panton
Mr. Marshall	

(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Mr. Maley	Mr. Wilson

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE PREMIER (Hon P. Collier—Boulder) [10.59]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Thursday.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.0 p.m.