

ness lines, although there is a good deal to be said in favour of the contention put forward by Mr. Kirwan and other hon. members that if an industry is to be assisted through railway policy, it would be useful information to the country to know what such assistance costs.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: Why not follow that course?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would have its advantages, but I can see even now that there would be arguments on the other side. I do not think it necessary that I should refer to the question of Collie coal. But it did strike me as somewhat curious that one of the members who threw out a good many references to Collie coal should also dwell on the necessity for doing away as far as possible with political interference in the management and control of the railways. I join with Mr. Nicholson in deprecating the remarks made by Mr. Ewing in regard to Mr. Hume. I have here a file dealing with the question of spark arresters, and if it were earlier in the evening, and if I did not feel that I should be quite unjustified in risking the loss of a supporter on this Bill, a supporter whom I can ill spare, I might be tempted to quote at some length from the file and satisfy hon. members that Mr. Hume has not adopted the attitude which has been charged against him. If I thought that by talking for an hour or two I could secure the passage of the second reading of this Bill, I should not grudge the time; but I believe in always looking at things as in very truth they are, and I realise that the majority of members are opposed to the second reading. Consequently I do not propose to detain the House any longer.

Question (Second reading) put and negatived on the voices.

BILLS (2)—DISCHARGED.

- 1, Government Tramways Act Amendment.
- 2, Government Electric Works Act Amendment.

On motions by the Colonial Secretary.

BILL—VERMIN.

Request for Conference.

Message received from the Assembly requesting a conference on the alternative proposed by the Council to No. 7 of the amendments originally made by it to the Vermin Bill to which the Assembly had disagreed and notifying that Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister), Hon. T. Walker, and Mr. Piesse had been appointed managers for the Assembly at the conference should it be agreed to.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (Honorary Minister) [12.50]: I move—

That in reply to Message No. 23 from the Legislative Assembly, a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, agreeing to the conference, and that the Honourables V. Hamersley, J. J. Holmes, and the mover be appointed managers on behalf of the Legislative Council, and that the conference meet in the President's room at 7.30 p.m. on Thursday, 19th December.

Question put and passed, and a Message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 18th December, 1918.

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

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—FREEZING WORKS, WYNDHAM.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [4.33]: With the permission of the House I should like to make a statement regarding the figures I gave last night, when dealing with the Loan Estimates, in respect of the works equipment and water supply of the freezing works at Wyndham. Last night I was relying on memory, but I now have the exact figures. The actual expenditure to 30th June in connection with the works equipment and water supply was £417,896, and the expenditure from that date up to yesterday inclusive has been £63,614, or a total of £481,510. The estimated expenditure from the 1st July, 1918, to the 30th June, 1919, is £125,818, of which as I have said, £63,614 has been spent, leaving £62,204, which brings the total up to £543,714, to which has to be added departmental charges amounting to £38,000, giving a total of £581,714. The total estimated expenditure on the jetty is £45,000, which brings the figures up to £626,714. I am not very sanguine that the expenditure will be kept within these bounds.

RAILWAY PORTER OAKES, SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. SMITH (North Perth) [4.27] brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the case of Railway Porter Oakes.

Report received and read.

MOTION—LAND ACTS, COMPILATION.

The PREMIER AND MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [4.49]: I move—

That it be resolved and directed that the Land Act, 1898, with its amendments be compiled under the provisions of the Statutes Compilation Act, 1905.

In addition to the Land Act of 1898, there are 13 amendment measures dealing with land legislation. The Statutes Compilation Act of 1905 was passed with a view of meeting the desire to compile the number of Acts of Parliament dealing with one subject, so that those Acts might be in more convenient form, not only for hon. members, but also for the use of the public and of the legal profession. So far there have been only two compilations—the Criminal Code of 1902, with six amendment measures, and the

of this motion is merely to obtain power to have the compilation made. The compilation will be made by the Attorney General through the Crown Law Department, and will then be laid before both Houses of Parliament, whereupon a Statute will be introduced embodying the various Acts in the compiled form. That Statute, subject to the approval of Parliament replaces the various Acts compiled. That, shortly is the position. No expense is involved, because the compilation is made by the Attorney General through the Crown Law Department. When approved by both Houses, the compilation is printed. No power of amending the Acts to be consolidated is involved in the passing of this motion.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

1. Income Tax.
2. Dividend Duties Act Amendment. Without amendment.
3. Discharged Soldiers' Settlement. With amendments.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to Council.

BILL—LOAN, £780,000. All Stages.

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner—Irwin) [4.59]: In moving the second reading of this Loan Bill for an amount of £780,000, I may say that all the items for which we require authorisation were passed on the Loan Estimates last night. The items are not for the full amounts shown in the Loan Bill, because it has been customary, almost since the inception of responsible Government, to ask for greater authorisations than the amounts actually proposed to be expended in the current year. In the First Schedule, "Departmental" is set down for £42,000. The previous authorisation was £1,529,360, and the credit balance at the 30th June was £18,684. As this balance is not sufficient to meet the estimated expenditure for the year ending on the 30th June, 1919, a further authorisation of £42,000 is now required, which will also be used to meet any requirements for the year 1919-20. Railways—additions and improvements to opened railways, £20,000. The previous authorisation under this item was £2,694,863, and the credit balance at the end of June, 1918, £140,494. As this amount is about sufficient to cover the estimated expenditure to the 31st March, 1920, it is deemed advisable to obtain the further authorisation of £20,000. Bolgart extension, £11,000: this is required to complete the second section of the railway. The previous authorisation was for £52,500. Rolling stock, £50,000: the amount previously authorised was £3,452,797 and the credit balance at 30th June, 1918, £41,966. The estimated expenditure for 1918-19 is £54,200. The sum of £50,000 is, therefore, required to cover this

amount and the estimated expenditure to 31st March, 1920. Tramways, Perth electric, £10,000: the previous authorisation was £644,000 and the credit balance at the 30th June, 1918, £44,467. This amount, together with the £10,000 asked for, is required to cover the expenditure for the year 1918-19, and for the nine months ended 31st March, 1920. Fremantle harbour works, £30,000: the previous authorisations totalled £1,537,512, and the credit balance at the 30th June, 1918, was £42,087. As this latter sum is just about sufficient to cover the estimated expenditure to the 30th June, 1918, £30,000 was deemed necessary to cover the expenditure for the nine months ending 31st March, 1920. Development of mining, goldfields and mineral resources, £60,000: the previous authorisations totalled £242,200, and the credit balance at the 30th June, 1918, £17,722. As this amount is not sufficient to cover the estimated expenditure of £50,000 for the current financial year, and the estimated expenditure for the nine months ended 31st March, 1920, £60,000 is now required. Abattoirs, cold storage, etc., £30,000: the previous authorisations totalled £689,605, and the credit balance at the 30th June, 1918, was £127,806. As this latter sum is not sufficient to cover the estimated expenditure of £155,000 required to complete the work, a further £30,000 is necessary. Land settlement for soldiers, etc., £400,000: this is a new item and is required to cover the following items of expenditure:—Advances to soldiers (to be repaid by the Commonwealth Government), £150,000; purchase of estates by issue of war bonds, £100,000; purchase of estates (cash payments), £60,000; cash advances to soldiers, in excess of amount provided by Commonwealth, £60,000. Wyndham Freezing Works, working capital, £100,000: this is a new item and is required to cover part of the working capital for this trading concern. The balance of the capital, £55,000, is being provided in the third schedule by reappropriations of the credit balances shown against the items in the second schedule. The departments tell the Treasurer which items are not considered necessary for some time and they make the reappropriation. That is shown in the second schedule. The Third Schedule shows which works the items are being reappropriated for. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.5]: Hon. members will note that the Bill is small in comparison with others that have preceded it. I would like to point out that the Treasurer in moving the second reading stated what was required for 1919 only. I do not know whether it is always advisable, in getting a loan authorisation to confine that authorisation to the amount actually required in the immediate future. On occasions in the past money has been available at a fair price when the Government have not been able to seize the opportunity of borrowing it because they had no authorisation. I have seen a Bill for three or four million sterling go through in 24 hours when money was available at a low rate of interest. Perhaps money will not be cheap for another 12 months, but

I maintain that though we cannot afford to launch out in a large number of undertakings at the present rate of interest we have to pay, it will be necessary to have the authorisation to raise money whenever we want to do so to carry on the development of the State. I am afraid we shall experience some difficulty in the future and it will be necessary for the State to take the responsibility in providing work for a large number of men owing to the action of the Federal Government in closing down works in this State and keeping them going in other parts of Australia, in addition to the soldiers returning. The Bill, as I stated, is a small one, and when we are in Committee I shall ask a question about the proposed expenditure on grain sheds, which heading appears in the schedule.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Colonial Treasurer in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

First Schedule:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the heading, "Development of Agriculture, £30,000," there appears "grain sheds." Will the Treasurer explain what the meaning of that is?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: This is merely a heading which has been there apparently for many years past and it has been lifted from a previous Bill without being noticed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It does not apply to the erection of silos?

The Colonial Treasurer: Oh no.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not want any authorisation for expenditure on bulk handling to get in by a side issue. I want Parliament to have an opportunity of discussing the question of bulk handling before any expenditure is authorised. I will accept the Treasurer's assurance.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I understand that a conference was held yesterday on the subject of the freezing works. Is the Treasurer in a position to give us any information about it?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The conference which was held yesterday was adjourned until to-morrow. The question, however, has not yet been discussed by Cabinet. The position is that the Government are determined that if the scheme we have in view is not adopted, it is not intended to let the matter drop altogether. With regard to the appearance of Armour & Co., which was referred to by an hon. member opposite the other evening, we have had every evidence that there is a desire on the part of that firm to get a footing in Western Australia. Mr. Birt is the Australian representative. There was a Commission sitting in New Zealand recently and Mr. Birt gave evidence before it and stated there that he was the representative for Armour & Co. in Australia. He made it clear when giving evidence that it was the desire of Armour & Co. to get into Australia, and, as a matter of fact, they are

here now. The British Government have warned not only Australia but all the British Dominions against letting them in. The position in regard to the freezing works is a difficult one. I hope, however, that we shall reach finality to-morrow with regard to the scheme which has been outlined in the Press. I do not say that that is a perfect scheme. The Minister for Industries and myself, Messrs. Holmes, Giles, and Cotton, have devoted a good deal of time and attention to the matter and we hope to finalise things to-morrow. It is obvious that these freezing works must be put up. We have the expert, Mr. McGhie, to advise us. Armour & Co. wanted to put up the plant and have it ready by September. Mr. McGhie said whatever Armour & Co. could do we could do.

First schedule put and passed.

Second schedule:

Mr. PICKERING: I notice that the amount reappropriated for the Busselton jetty extension is to be £9,104. I would like an explanation. The expenditure on this jetty was approved and I believe a scheme was initiated to the satisfaction of the Minister for Works. Busselton is undoubtedly going ahead, but has been neglected in years past. It is time justice was now done to it. I resent the action of the Treasurer in re-appropriating moneys which were intended to be spent on the jetty. The Busselton jetty has more than justified its existence. A guarantee has been put up by the Kauri Timber Company that there shall be no loss on the jetty and I cannot see why the Government do not go ahead with it. I move—

That the item Busselton jetty extensions, £9,104 17s. 9d., be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The jetty has been repaired and enlarged at different times. During the regime of the Wilson Government it was decided to spend £15,000 upon it but later on it was deemed to be necessary to hang the matter up for a while. Captain Dodd pointed out that instead of taking the jetty out farther it would be better to widen it a little and make some alterations in regard to sidings. Circumstances have prevented this from being done. I hope in a month or two to pay a visit to Busselton when I will undertake to see what can be done.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In order to utilise the jetty for the export of timber it is necessary to carry the jetty out into deeper water so that the vessels may get alongside. If this vote is allowed to remain here the Minister for Works will have no money to spend on the jetty when he goes to Busselton. There is a danger of Busselton losing the trade to which it is rightly entitled, unless the jetty is extended as required.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At present we have all the work we can do to keep the men employed who are engaged by the Public Works Department. If we had the money we could not go on with the works. We shall have to wait until next session, when it is hoped to find the necessary money. In the meantime, the money is required elsewhere.

Mr. PICKERING: The money should be retained for this work. There are many lumpers in my electorate who are dependent on the work they get from the jetty. There are some 40 or 50 altogether.

Mr. Jones: They have all gone to Bunbury.

Mr. PICKERING: I resent the attitude of the Government in cutting out this money.

Amendment put and negatived.

Second Schedule put and passed.

Third Schedule:

Mr. PICKERING: I should like some information upon the item "Shipbuilding advance, £1,000."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The amount was put down in connection with preliminary inquiries with regard to shipbuilding in this State. It was an amount set aside from the £30,000, which it was expected might have to be advanced in order to give the company a chance of success. This particular amount should come out of revenue and not out of loan, and will be transferred.

Mr. MUNSBIE: We were given to understand by the Treasurer in connection with ship building that one of his objects in getting the compulsory loan from the insurance companies was to have money to advance to the shipbuilding company.

Third Schedule put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (COTTESLOE).

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [5.38] in moving the second reading said: This Bill will give power to the Governor to grant to the Municipal Council of Cottesloe an area of two roods of land adjoining that which has already been vested in that local authority, and upon which the municipal buildings stand.

Hon. P. Collier: Which lot is that?

The PREMIER: The municipal buildings stand at the corner of Broome and Jarrad-streets. The municipality was granted half an acre some years ago on which their buildings were erected. They now find it necessary to have an increased area in order to accommodate their plant, such as carts and horses, and so on. It is simply desired to grant them another half an acre adjoining block 164, which has already been granted to them, making in all one acre. I have been to the place and I am well satisfied that this additional area is necessary. The fact that it is a Class A reserve renders the Bill indispensable. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.32]: I have no objection to the passage of the Bill, but I always view with suspicion any attempt to deprive the people of their playgrounds. These Class A reserves have been so fixed that no person can deprive the people of them without

the passage of a Bill through Parliament. Before a Class A reserve is interfered with the people in the locality should know what is intended, and should have an opportunity of protesting if they so desire. Do the people in the locality know that the Bill is before Parliament? Of course, if they do and have no objection, the matter is largely for themselves, although in many cases I have protested against interference with a Class A reserve even when the people concerned were desirous of having it done.

Mr. DUFF (Claremont) [5.34]: This matter has been before the municipal council and the people. It is not interfering with any recreation ground. The council have no room for the housing of their carts and plant. This proposal was put before the Government 12 months ago, and has been held in abeyance until some three months ago, when the council asked me to take it in hand, and thereupon I saw the Premier. The area involved is purely scrub land, and is not used for any purpose. Nor is there any hope in the world of its ever being used for any other purpose than that intended in the Bill. The people of the district are well aware of what is being done.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [5.36]: After what the member representing the district has said, I do not propose to offer any objection. But it seems to me the land in question should never have been a Class A reserve at all. Members are perfectly right in taking a keen interest in Class A reserves, for those reserves should not be interfered with without very good reason. However, it is apparent that this small area is detached, and we can safely let the council have it as desired.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Irwin) [5.41] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is for the closure of certain roads. Clause 2 deals with the closure of portion of Dampier-terrace in Broome. The town council have no objection, nor can there be any objection from anybody else. The land is required for tram yards. It is merely the closing of a road for the purpose of public utility, for the provision of additional facilities. Clause 3 deals with the closure of a right-of-way at Mandurah which runs through certain hotel premises. The local roads board purported to close this right-of-way under the provisions of the Roads Act but, as the right-of-way is delineated on a subdivisional plan deposited at the Titles Office, the legality of the procedure of the roads board is open to question. Cou-

sequently suitable provision is made in the Bill. The right-of-way was closed on condition that the hotel proprietor, Mr. Slee, should surrender to the Crown part of another block in lieu. The closure is not being made for Mr. Slee's convenience, but principally in order to deal with a footbridge across Peel's Inlet, connecting the hotel with the town of Mandurah. The block of land offered by the proprietor will suit the department just as well as that claimed, and the department have insisted upon the retention of a roadway to connect with Formby-terrace. Everything is in order, and there is no objection by the owner of the land. The roads board desire it, and the proposal to close this road is in the public interest. Clause 4 deals with, perhaps, a more important question.

Hon. P. Collier: It is rather important.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We want an explanation of this clause.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for the district will be able to assist the Premier.

The PREMIER: The member for East Perth (Mr. Hardwick) no doubt will be able to explain this clause thoroughly. Its object is the closing of certain roads near the Cricket Association ground. For some time past the West Australian Trotting Association—a name not unknown in this Chamber—have held trotting meetings on the Cricket Association ground. They decided to make a new course, and with that object they purchased a certain area from the Cricket Association, to the north of the present ground, and also purchased a number of other blocks in the neighbourhood, so that they would be enabled to lay out a complete trotting ground of their own.

Hon. P. Collier: How could they purchase from the Cricket Association? The Cricket Association had not the freehold of that land, unless they got it very recently. They had not got it in our time.

Mr. Foley: They had the swamp.

The PREMIER: The land purchased by the Trotting Association from the Cricket Association is the swampy area lying to the north of the ground. I have here a plan showing the roads affected, and I shall lay that plan on the Table.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for the district will be able to explain the plan clearly.

The PREMIER: In order that a grandstand may be erected, and a ground laid down, it is necessary to close the roads mentioned in this clause. The matter was referred to the Perth City Council, and it was generally agreed that if the Trotting Association would give sufficient land for the opening of a road on the north side of the Cricket Association ground, and also give up for the purposes of a road some land fronting on the river, the City Council would offer no objection to the Trotting Association's proposal. Accordingly, it is proposed to close the roads coloured blue on the plan, and to open the roads coloured pink and green on the plan. The ground on the closed roads will be given in exchange for the land to be transferred by the Trotting Association.

The arrangement, I understand, is really all in favour of the City Council, as the area of the roads closed is only 2½ acres, whilst the area to be surrendered by the Trotting Association is about 3½ acres. I requested the mayor and some of the councillors of the city of Perth to wait on me, together with representatives of the Trotting Association, and explain the position exactly. On behalf of the Perth City Council the mayor expressed entire satisfaction with the proposal, as it would involve the converting of what is now an unsightly waste into a beauty spot. The council propose to make a drive between the Trotting Association's ground alongside the river and it will really be a great boon to the metropolis. The council are prepared to undertake the construction of the roads which it is proposed to open in order to enable a round drive to be constructed. That drive will lead along the river, and will join the roads in East Perth. The Trotting Association—I asked that the two bodies should come together in order that I might be fully satisfied, both parties were agreeable to this arrangement—then said they were prepared to go on with the construction work at once. This will mean a considerable outlay, giving employment to a large number of men.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Has the member for the district interviewed the people residing in the district who will be affected?

The PREMIER: I have gone into the matter carefully, and it seems to me that the proposal has everything to recommend it. I have had a lithograph and a tracing prepared, showing on a larger scale the details of the proposal. In this House there has been a good deal of criticism of the Trotting Association. I am an old man now, but still a lover of sport, and with a liking for seeing sport encouraged. Some people object to trotting. I personally take no interest in trotting, but I do look forward to the time when, instead of seeing trotting on the Cricket Association ground, we shall hear the rap of the cricket ball instead. The Cricket Association will be greatly benefited by disposing of the land, and I am in hopes that the entire arrangement will tend to advance cricket again. Our young men are returning to their homes. All games of this kind have been at a standstill for some years. The flower of our youth has been away fighting for Western Australia and the Empire. I am pleased to think that on the return of our young men the Cricket Association ground will be more generally utilised for cricket and kindred sports than for trotting. Although I have no objection to trotting, I have always looked upon the trotting meeting as a sort of sacrilege committed on the old ground which was devoted to cricket, where I myself have played so often. Cricket, in my opinion, is one of the finest of games; and I prefer to see the ground utilised for cricket. At the same time, the Trotting Association will be able to have their ground alongside. I am sure that this proposed arrangement will give a great impetus to cricket.

Mr. O'Loughlen: And football.

The PREMIER: And football. Having dealt with the various clauses of the Bill, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. DURACK (Kimberley) [5.55]: I should like to ask the Premier whether the road proposed to be closed at Broome has been used as a public highway?

The Premier: I think the hon. member had better ask that question during the Committee stage.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.56]: There are some features of this Bill which commend themselves to me. As regards the remote locality of Broome, the member for Kimberley, I take it for granted, will be able to advise the House whether any injustice would result to the residents of that town by the closing of the particular road. To express any opinion of value on the provisions of a Bill of this kind is extremely difficult unless one knows the locality and the circumstances very well, so that one can judge whether the public would be inconvenienced by the closing of any particular road. For my part, I lean to the belief that harm will not result from the closing of a road at Broome, or in the country, but when we come right to the back door of the City, to a place like East Perth, the matter assumes an altogether different aspect. It is all very well that the Trotting Association and City Council and Cricket Association should unanimously agree that this proposed exchange is a highly desirable thing; but, after all, the first consideration in such a matter is the convenience and the wishes of the local residents. I should say the member for the district would be able to give information on that point. That hon. member has had even the great honour of being born in the salubrious suburb of East Perth, and, having represented it for 13 or 14 years in this House, knowing every street, every back lane and right of way in the whole electorate, should be able to tell the House whether it is a good thing that this change should be made. And particularly ought the hon. member to be able to inform us whether he has consulted—as I take it he, the representative of the district, would do—the people living in and around the neighbourhood which will be affected by this exchange. The closing of a road in the heart of the City is a serious matter, and especially so if it is a road leading to the foreshore. It may be that in the not very distant future the public may be shut off from access to the river in that part of the town by the closing of these particular roads coloured blue upon the plan. This map, as regards the roads shown upon it, is not very familiar to me; but I have no doubt that each of the coloured patches on the map would call up familiar scenes to the member for East Perth. If the hon. member would take one of the plans and demonstrate to the House how the neighbourhood will be affected by the proposed exchange, he may be able to make a reasonable case for the Bill. But, for my part, I am not prepared to allow a whole district to be altered in this fashion merely because the members of the Perth City Council agree with the members of the Trotting Asso-

ciation. The member for East Perth should be able to give us more definite and more detailed information than that furnished by the Premier. Unless a better case is made for Clause 4, that clause will have to be very seriously considered in Committee.

Mr. HARDWICK (East Perth) [6.0]: I support the second reading of the Bill. This particular locality was really the haunt of my boyhood. The Cricket Association are returning more land to the people than really is contained in these two roads it is suggested shall be closed. They are two streets which have practically never been used because it was never necessary to use them.

Hon. P. Collier: They run to the river.

Mr. HARDWICK: That does not say that they have ever been used. The foreshore had been owned by private enterprise and the Cricket Association having got control of that portion, they are now granting to the people the right to the use of the foreshore. They are giving us more useful land by the closing of these two thoroughfares. The roads which are being closed approach the river, it is true, but there is such a steep declivity that they are practically useless. I have made inquiries and I find that the members of the city council have been energetically conducting inquiries, but not one person has disagreed with the proposal which is before us now. The Trotting Association are prepared to make that one of the beauty spots of the State. We must remember that to-day trotting is extremely popular, but it may not be as popular in five or ten years time as it is now. The Trotting Association are coming to our rescue and are granting us this beauty spot and the people will have the use of the grounds.

Hon. P. Collier: Are the trotting people going to shift their ground altogether?

Mr. HARDWICK: Yes, and make a new track.

Hon. P. Collier: Will they have enough area?

Mr. HARDWICK: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: This means, then, that we shall have the trotting people there permanently at the back door of East Perth.

Mr. HARDWICK: They intend to spend many thousands of pounds and will, by that expenditure, convert one of the most unhealthy localities near the City into one of the most healthy and most beautiful.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You have not told us whether you consulted the residents of East Perth.

Mr. HARDWICK: They have the greatest confidence in me and will stand by anything I do.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [6.8]: The Perth City Council went fully into this matter when they were asked to ratify the agreement with the Trotting Association. As hon. members will see, the position is that if this road closure takes place there will be a round drive on the river foreshore, instead of, as exists at the present time, the roads running to the river beside the recreation ground. The roads to be closed are roads in name only. When the improvements which the Trotting Association propose to make are completed, they will

convert that locality into one of the beauty spots of the City. There will be a two-chain frontage to the river and the Trotting Association are giving that not to the City Council but to the people of the State. The council have entered into an agreement to maintain that foreshore road. Up to the present time £2,000 has been spent on it. The Trotting Association, after consultation with the council, found that they will not require the whole of the land which they have bought and paid for. There are two acres of land, marked green on the plan, and they are giving that land to the people of the State. That will give the people access to the river right round the Trotting Association's property. At the present time it is a swamp, but the expenditure of £25,000, which is proposed by the Trotting Association, will improve it beyond all recognition.

Mr. LUTEY (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [6.12]: I view with suspicion the proposal to close that particular road. The Trotting Association no doubt have put up a good proposition and at first glance it seems that it will be advantageous to the people of the State. We should think seriously before we close any kind of a road which is an approach to the river. While the Trotting Association propose to provide for a road around their ground, a road which will give access to the river, I want to make sure that the area which is being reserved will be open to the public.

Mr. SPEAKER: The area which belongs to the Trotting Association has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. LUTEY: I take it we can discuss the fundamental change on the river frontage. There are roads there now and I want to see the rights of the people safeguarded.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. LUTEY: The member for East Perth made everything quite clear to the House. Seeing that we are dealing with the closing of certain roads and interfering with the rights of the people, I wonder the Premier did not go further back into the history of this matter, and let us know what title and right the Cricket Association had in the first place over this land, when they acquired it, and how the Trotting Association became interested in it also. I shall always be chary about giving away the rights of the people over these common lands which belong to them. We find that a bargain has been struck for certain lands. Clause 4 of the Bill says—

Subject as hereinafter provided, the roads and portions of roads at East Perth described in Part I. of the Third Schedule to this Act may be closed by proclamation, and thereupon all rights of way over such roads or portions of roads shall cease, and the soil thereof shall be revested in His Majesty as of his former estate: Provided that such proclamation shall not be published until the land described in Part 2 of the Third Schedule to this Act shall have been surrendered to His Majesty and proclaimed as public roads.

We are legislating not for to-day but for future generations. This association, I take it, has been given this land by the Government, and is striking a bargain for the freehold. I am opposed to the shutting up of these roads until a stipulation is made that the public have the full right to enter upon and use the ground for all time. The Premier did not make that point clear.

The Premier: It is their own property and freehold.

Mr. LUTEY: Did they buy it from the Crown?

The Premier: It was given to them some years ago.

Mr. LUTEY: It has been given to the association for the use of the people.

The Premier: It is for the use of the Cricket Association.

Mr. LUTEY: They are only the trustees for the people.

The Premier: They are the trustees for the Cricket Association.

Mr. LUTEY: I remember some time ago that the Melbourne Cricket Ground Committee were charging admission to their ground. Mr. McLean, a solicitor, on one occasion called upon the crowd to follow him, saying that they had no right to make a charge. The people did follow him, and a court case ensued, when it was found that the ground was really public property. I should like the Premier to find out the exact position so far as this ground is concerned, and ascertain whether it is freehold or the property of this association. I take it we are striking a bargain for an institution, which will become a commercial institution before many years have passed. Probably in 50 years time the people will say that the Lefroy Government were dunderheads not to strike a better bargain whilst they were at it. I should like to see some provision to ensure that the ground will be kept open for the people, except on those occasions when matches or other functions are being held, when it is right that a charge for admission should be made.

Mr. Foley: They are giving the rights to the foreshore to the people.

Mr. LUTEY: Perhaps the hon. member will tell us how far it is possible to go with regard to the foreshore. I remember a case some years ago in connection with riparian rights. That subject is always a difficult one to decide. The question is as to how far the Cricket Association can go with regard to the foreshore. I am sure the hon. member can explain such a simple question as that, and that his explanation would be a standing monument forever. There was also a question as to the foreshore on the Swan river, and as to the extent to which owners could build along it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill does not deal with foreshores.

Mr. LUTEY: I do not know whether you will confine me to a quarter of a mile, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must confine the hon. member to the area defined in the Bill.

Mr. LUTEY: The Bill deals with roads running around the foreshore of the river. We

have to jealously guard the rights of future generations. I hope the House will remember that as legislators we have to look after the common interests and rights of the people to the lands and reserves which really belong to the people, however the title may have been obtained.

The Premier: In this case the title was obtained from the Crown.

Mr. LUTEX: The Crown might have been just as careless as apparently we are going to be through giving away the freehold. Probably, too, that freehold was given when it should have been kept as a reserve for recreation purposes and for the use of the people. The Premier did not say how the Cricket Association in the first place became possessed of the freehold of this ground. Probably he will explain this later.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.42]: No persons should know better than those who live in a district as to what is required in this direction. These roads which it is proposed to close, in the third schedule of the Bill, are roads which are now already held and owned for the use of the people by the city of Perth. That land which will be given in lieu thereof is to be vested in His Majesty. Until it is handed over by the Government it will not be under the control of the city of Perth.

Mr. Hardwick: It is private property.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is Crown property. The land which is given in lieu of the land which is taken by closing the roads becomes the property of His Majesty. Before the Premier issues a proclamation closing the roads, I would ask him to get an undertaking from the Perth City Council that the land will become their property.

Mr. Foley: That assurance has been given.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not sure about that. My reason for demanding that assurance is that at other points along the foreshore the Government have gone to considerable expense in reclaiming land and making roads, and when the Perth City Council were asked to take over those roads they have declined to do so, and, in consequence, the Government have had to maintain them. Possibly it will be beneficial to East Perth to have the trotting grounds there, although other districts have declined to permit the setting up of such grounds. I do not see any objection to the passage of the Bill providing the Premier gets the necessary assurance from the city council.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascayne) [7.47]: The passing of the Bill will mean that Perth will have another recreation ground. I will always support any Bill for the creation of pleasure resorts and beauty spots in Perth or elsewhere in the metropolitan area. The northern and other country districts of the State send down a large number of visitors annually to the City, and with the advent of the trans-Australian railway there is a danger that a lot of those visitors will be persuaded to go to the Eastern States for their holidays. Therefore it behoves all concerned to make the metropolitan area as attractive as possible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

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

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Closure of portion of Nelson-crescent, etc., East Perth:

Mr. LUTEX: Perhaps the Premier will outline the exact position, and explain how the cricket association became possessed of the title to the land.

The PREMIER: The cricket association got the land on a grant from the Crown 30 years or more ago for the purposes of cricket. This ground is the freehold property of the cricket association, a body controlling cricket in Western Australia. Not only do the association own the ground within the enclosure, but they own a considerable extent of land to the north of the enclosure. The cricket ground proper is highly improved, the improvements having been effected at the expense of the association. They have disposed of the northern portion of their land, which is merely a wilderness, to the trotting association, and the trotting association have also acquired from private individuals a number of blocks, so as to have sufficient land for their trotting grounds. The Bill does not apply to that land at all, but deals simply with the closing of certain roads. In lieu of the ground contained in those roads, the trotting association will hand over other land of considerably greater area than is comprised in the roads to be closed. In regard to the point raised by the member for North-East Fremantle, I will see that it is properly settled before the matter is finalised.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is unsatisfactory to think that the fee simple of certain recreation reserves is vested in people independent of any local authority or other responsible body. It is a regrettable state of affairs and it is not usual in connection with other recreation grounds.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): This is not a recreation ground.

The Premier: It was handed over to the cricket association for the purposes of cricket.

Mr. LAMBERT: What is cricket but a recreation? The present control of this land deserves attention. The thanks of the Committee are due to the member for Brown-Hill-Ivanhoe for having brought the matter under notice. I regret that the land is used for its present purpose. A certain amount of trotting can very well be carried on in this State, but the ground is being run practically as a gambling ground. This aspect of the question needs closer attention. Racing generally, and proprietary racing in particular, should be restricted.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

The PREMIER: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 5: "On the land described in Part I. of the Fourth Schedule to this Act being surrendered to His Majesty and proclaimed a public road, all rights-of-way over that portion of the Richmond-crescent, East Fremantle, described in Part II. of the Fourth Schedule to this Act shall cease,

and the soil thereof shall be revested in His Majesty as of his former estate, and may be granted in fee simple to the owners of the land described in Part I. of the said schedule in exchange for the land surrendered as aforesaid."

The member for North-East Fremantle desires this new clause, and I am confident that he would not bring forward such a proposition unless he knew it to be in the public interest. The clause deals with the opening of a certain portion of land at East Fremantle, and with the closure of a certain piece of road there. The portion of road to be closed is I believe inaccessible, and the owners of certain blocks have offered to give portion of their land in lieu of the portion of road which it is proposed to close. The matter has been considered by the East Fremantle municipality, who strongly urge that the proposal be agreed to. These matters are always carefully considered by the Lands Department prior to the submission to Parliament and there is nothing to object to in the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This proposed new clause really means that there are three blocks between Surbiton-road and the dead end of Richmond-crescent. This dead end blocks the entrance to some residences on the hill over the Castlemaine brewery. The proposed exchange will also benefit some houses owned by the Government there. I requested the Premier to bring this matter forward urgently because the people owning the blocks are thinking of building, and unless they got the road here proposed the alteration can never be made. That would be detrimental to those people, and also detrimental to the Government as owners of the property to which I have referred.

New clause put and passed.

First, Second, and Third Schedules—agreed to.

New Schedule:

The PREMIER: I move—

That the following be added to stand as the Fourth Schedule:—"Part I.—All that piece of land being parts of Lots 45, 46, and 47, of Swan Location 64, bounded on the east by the western boundary of Lot 44 of said location, and on the North by 50 links of the south side of Surbiton-road; the opposite sides being parallel and equal. Part II.—All that portion of the Richmond-crescent bounded by lines starting from the intersection of southern side of Surbiton-road with the eastern side of Richmond-crescent, and extending in a southerly direction along said side of Richmond-crescent for a distance of 200.2 links; thence westerly 50 links along the southern boundary of Swan Location 64; the opposite sides being parallel and equal."

New schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—VERMIN.

Council's Message.

The Council having insisted upon certain of its amendments and proposed new amendments as alternatives to other amendments which it had made, and which the Assembly had not agreed to, the same were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. Original Clause 2.—Strike out the words "are hereby repealed to the extent therein stated, but notwithstanding such repeal," and insert "shall cease to have effect in that portion of the State to which this Act applies: provided that":

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The amendment which the Honorary Minister asks us to agree to is consequential on one which we shall be asked to accept a little later on, and which was also made by the Legislative Council. It really has to do with the application of this measure to the North-West. If the Government intend to accept the amendment, with regard to the application of the Bill to the North-West portion of the State, they are perfectly safe in moving that the first amendment be agreed to. If it will save the time of the Committee, I am prepared to say that I will accept the alternative amendment which we shall be asked to agree to directly, made by the Legislative Council, with regard to the application of the Act to the North-West. The Council are not insisting upon their original amendment. They have amended it, and have extended the boundaries further north and eastward. That being so, we might accept the alternative.

Mr. TROY: As one who opposed the previous amendment, I am prepared to accept the alternative, which includes a large belt of pastoral country, and also includes the country protected by the fence.

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

No. 3. Original Clause 2, page 2, line 6.—Strike out the words "any Act hereby repealed," and insert "the said Acts":

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 35. Add a new clause, to stand as 96:—" (1.) It shall be the duty of the board to secure the enforcement against all owners and occupiers of holdings within its district of the provisions of this Act relating to the suppression and destruction of vermin":

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The new clause means that if the board are not doing their duty the Government will come in and disband them. It is of no use having a vermin board if they do not intend to do any work.

Mr. PICKERING: I would point out that this amendment originally had a penalty clause attached to it which read as follows:—

"If, in the opinion of the Minister, a board has neglected to exercise its powers or perform its duties in the suppression and destruction of vermin, the Minister may cause all such means to be taken as he may deem necessary, and the cost incurred shall be a debt due to the Minister by the board in default."

Without this addition the present amendment would be meaningless and be merely a pious expression of opinion. I shall vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: It appears that another place did not send back the full amendment. I think the hon. member is taking up a right stand. The amendment is not complete, and does not read with sense.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The hon. member is quite right. When the Upper House sent this back to us, insisting on No. 35, through some error the second part was omitted from the Notice Paper. I think, therefore, it should be treated as if the whole amendment had appeared on the Notice Paper, as doubtless it was intended that it should appear.

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

No. 1. The original amendment of the Legislative Council was as follows: Insert the following clause, to stand as Clause No. 2:—"This Act shall apply to the South-West Division of the State, except such portion thereof as is situated northward of the Government fence running westward to Bluff Point, but shall not apply to any other part of the State." The alternative amendment is as follows: Insert the following clause, to stand as Clause 2:—"This Act shall apply to all the South-West portion of the State situated west of the No. 1 Rabbit-proof Fence and south of the Rabbit-proof Fence running from Gum Creek Well westward to Bluff Point, but shall not apply to any other part of the State":

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: This next amendment appears on Schedule No. 2. As stated by the member for Mt. Magnet, the original amendment cut off considerable portion of the country in the neighbourhood of Nannine west of No. 1 fence and south of that which runs from Nannine to Bluff Point. This was an unthinkable position, and the Upper House amended it by extending the line. This will now include the country which was previously cut out. The rest of the State will, however, still be under the control of the Minister, and whereas the rate shall not exceed 1s. per hundred acres within the area, the country outside will not have that saving clause. This will enable justice to be done in certain districts where otherwise a special rate would have to be struck. I move—

That the alternative amendment be agreed to.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I am prepared to accept that also.

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

No. 7. The original amendment of the Legislative Council was as follows:—No. 7. Insert the following clause, to stand as No. 7:—"This Act shall not apply to unalienated lands of the Midland Railway Company of Western Australia, Limited, except such areas thereof as are certified by the chief inspector to be vermin infested or the breeding ground of vermin, and such areas as having been the subject of agreement for the purchase thereof are abandoned by the purchaser and except as provided in Section 81. For the purposes of this section lands under contract for purchase thereof shall be deemed to be alienated. The alternative amendment to No. 7 of the Council is as follows:—Add the following further proviso to Clause 50:—Provided also that unalienated lands of the Midland Railway Company of Western Australia, Limited, except such areas as having been the subject of agreement for the purchase thereof are abandoned by the purchaser, shall not be rateable, but for the purpose of this proviso, lands under contract for purchase thereof shall be deemed to be alienated":

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: With regard to No. 7, I move—

That the alternative amendment be agreed to.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like to have some reason as to why we should go back upon our former decision when the matter was very thoroughly debated.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who is responsible for the destruction of vermin on the Midland railway lands?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No one under this amendment. That is its object.

Mr. Maley: The road districts would do all the work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Anyone may do it so long as the company does not do it. I have not yet heard any argument which is good ground for our accepting this alternative. I must oppose it.

The PREMIER: Under the original amendment of the Council it was provided that the company should be in exactly the same position as any other owner in regard to the destruction of rabbits, but it exempted them from the rates.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who is going to pay for the administration of the Act over their lands if they do not pay rates?

The PREMIER: The reason advanced for the amendment is that practically all the best of the company's land has been disposed of and it is considered that, in view of the fact that they cannot dispose of the land still on their hands, they should be exempt from the rating. They will be compelled to destroy the rabbits; the Act will be enforced in regard to their lands just as in regard to other lands.

Mr. MALEY: The Premier has urged that the company owns to-day only huge tracts of inferior sandplain country. It must be remembered that that is the very country favoured by the rabbits. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. I do

not think the rating would impose any hardship on the company. The company should not be regarded as being different from any other landholder. The Premier has not urged any valid reason why the company should be exempt.

Mr. TROY: By what extraordinary reasoning are the Midland Company entitled to any more consideration than any other landholder? Because the company find themselves in difficulties is not to say that they should be exempt. Many others who have to submit to the Bill are also in difficulties. If it is difficult for the company to deal with their lands and comply with the Bill, is it not equally difficult for any other large landholder? It is amazing that the Government should be asking for this special consideration for the Midland Company. The company have already had more consideration than they were entitled to. Certainly they are not entitled to any further consideration at our hands. If the Government do give the company this concession a great deal more will be heard about it in the country districts.

Hon. T. WALKER: The Premier has said that the Midland Railway Company will be on precisely the same footing as the Crown. If that is so we have no redress, and will not be able to prosecute them if they fail to eradicate their rabbits. The proposed amendment is almost worse than the original one. We are exempting the North-West squatters from the full operations of the Bill, but those squatters are still under the existing vermin legislation, and the Honorary Minister has told us that those squatters can be rated up to 2s. per hundred acres, or twice as much as they could be if they were under this measure. To say to the Midland Company that their lands shall be entirely exempt from rates, is to give them an enormous concession. It will be a big expense to the company, but still only a relative expense. The moment the company sell a portion of their land, the intending purchaser will be rated. And the board in the particular district where the contract is made have been told to enforce the provisions of this measure. The Midland Railway lands would be a menace to the State in those conditions. I trust the Committee will not tolerate this extraordinary gift to a particular section of the community.

Mr. HARRISON: It would be most unfair if purchasers from the Midland Railway Company have to pay rates while the company escape payment of rates. Let the company pay as well as the purchaser from the company.

Question put and negatived; the Council's alternative amendment not agreed to.

As to procedure.

The Premier: Can this Bill be sent back to the Council again, Mr. Chairman? It has been there already.

The Chairman: The position is governed by Standing Order 315—

If the Legislative Council shall return the Bill with any of the Assembly's amendments on the Council's original amendments disagreed to, and shall insist on its

original amendments, stating the reasons for so doing, or shall agree to the Assembly's amendments thereon, with further amendments, the Message returning the Bill shall be ordered to be printed, and a day fixed for taking the same into consideration, which shall be in a Committee of the whole Assembly; and the Bill shall then be finally passed, or laid aside, according as the Assembly may agree or disagree to the requirements of the Legislative Council, unless the Assembly determines to request a conference.

The Premier: The Government do not wish to have the Bill laid aside. A conference would probably settle the matter in five minutes.

Mr. Troy: Do I understand from you, Mr. Chairman, that at this stage, when we have negatived the Council's requests, the Bill must be laid aside or a conference sought?

The Chairman: No.

Mr. Troy: I think so, Mr. Chairman. We have passed a resolution defeating the Council's amendment. It is due from us to ask for a conference. But that conference will not bind this House.

Mr. Piesse: Can we not ask for a conference under Standing Order 315? If that is in order, I will move that the Assembly request a conference.

The Premier: Originally the Bill contained a clause of a certain effect, and the Council sent this House a Message requesting the insertion of a new clause to stand as No. 7. We returned a Message stating that we could not agree to the new clause. That new clause does not come back to us with any modification, but the Council simply ask for an alternative in the form of a proviso to Clause 50. The proviso is really a new clause altogether. In the circumstances, I think it is wise for this Chamber, in the interests of Western Australian land owners, to ask for a conference.

The Chairman: I suggest the Premier let me report to the House that the Committee, having considered the Legislative Council's amendments, have agreed with some and disagreed with others. Then, the Speaker being in the Chair, the Premier could move for a conference.

Mr. Maley: I take it the time for a conference will not arrive until our Message goes to the Council saying that we do not agree to this alternative. Then will be the Council's opportunity to say whether they insist or not.

The Chairman: I have given my opinion. It is for the Committee to decide.

The Minister for Works: Standing Order 315 deals with specific things. But this is not a case of that sort. It is a case of an old proposition being put before us in a new guise.

Mr. Troy: I am inclined to think that we can dispose of this by sending it back to the Council as it is. This is not the original amendment. The Council do not insist upon the original amendment. The Council sent back an alternative, practically a new clause. Since it is not the original, we cannot deal with the original. I suggest, Sir, that you take the

matter in your hands, report, and send the Bill back with the usual Message.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The CHAIRMAN: I have to report that the Committee have considered the amendments made by the Legislative Council and have agreed to some and not agreed to others.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not think the Chairman has put the position fairly before you, Mr. Speaker. We have not accepted important amendments. We are just where we were. Certain alternatives which were new clauses were submitted to us, and they were accepted, and some alternatives have not been accepted.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the ordinary course is adopted and the Bill is sent back to the Council by Message, some members fear that that will be the end of the Bill. If hon. members think that we should ask for a conference—

Mr. SPEAKER: Our Standing Orders make no provision for dealing with alternative amendments from another Chamber. Strictly speaking, under our Standing Orders the Committee were not in order in dealing with the alternative amendments. I gather the Committee have accepted one alternative amendment and rejected another. The position now is that it is competent for the Minister in charge to ask the Council for a conference.

Question put and passed; the report adopted.

Request for Conference.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I move—

That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council informing them that we have agreed to all the amendments with the exception of alternative amendment No. 7, regarding which we request a conference with the Legislative Council, the managers from the Assembly to be Hon. T. Walker, Mr. Piesse, and the mover.

Question put and passed, and a Message accordingly transmitted to the Council.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council with amendments.

BILL—FORESTS.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 24 amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General and Minister for Woods and Forests in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 5, Subclause (2).—Add the following words: "and the provisions of this Act so far as they are inconsistent with such rights shall not, except as hereinafter expressly provided, apply":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Although I do not know precisely why the amendment is asked for, I do not see any objection to it. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2. Clause 8, Subclause (2), paragraph (a).—Add the following words: "and a professional officer who has obtained the degree or diploma of a forest school recognised by the Senate of the University of Western Australia":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think this amendment is quite a good one. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not see why we should set the University above the Governor-in-Council.

The Attorney General: It is a question whether the degree is to be recognised by the Senate.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why? In many of these amendments we find the University is coming in. What has the University to do with it? I am not going to set the University above the Governor-in-Council. If we are not careful we shall have in all our Acts a provision of this kind, that we may not do this, that, or the other without the gracious permission of the University.

Mr. Pilkington: Does the University recognise these degrees now?

The Attorney General: Yes, they have recognised Mr. Lane-Poole's diploma.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There may be men with diplomas who will not be recognised by the University. It would be humiliating to this House to be unable to appoint some man in the civil service unless the University approved of it.

Mr. PICKERING: I support the leader of the Opposition. I think we should disagree with this amendment.

The Attorney General: I do not mind.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 3. Clause 14.—Strike out the word "Governor" and insert "University of Western Australia":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 4. Clause 19, Subclause (1).—After the word "shall," in line one, insert "with the approval of the Minister":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 5. Clause 21, paragraph (b).—Strike out the word "may," in line four, and insert "shall":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 6. Clause 22.—After the word "Governor," in line one, insert "subject to the consent of Parliament":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.
Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 7. Clause 23.—After the word "Governor," in line one, insert "subject to the consent of Parliament":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.
Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 8. Clause 24, paragraph (a).—Strike out this paragraph and insert "After such area has been cut over for saw-milling purposes or":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.
This amendment requested by the Council renders this Bill entirely unworkable. The object of the Bill was to so deal with the forest assets of the State, that they might become a source of permanent wealth to the country. The Government provided that there should be no hewing in State forests. This House came to the conclusion that the course was a little too severe, and that the hewer should be allowed to pursue his calling in such cases where in the opinion of the Conservator timber suitable for milling purposes had already been felled, or in localities where in the opinion of the Conservator it was impracticable to remove timber. In that case the hewer was allowed to follow his calling.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Under such restrictions that he would starve.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not my amendment.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It was the best we could get.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was forced on me by hon. members. That is how the Bill left us to go to another place. The Legislative Council, however, has altered the clause out of all knowledge.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have done better.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Every safeguard has been thrown away and the control of the forests is gone. The hewers can now operate without restriction after an area has been cut over for saw milling purposes. The Council use the word "such area." That means a timber concession, a timber lease, or a sawmill permit, and it shall be lawful for the hewer to hew within any of these places. The Conservator has estimated that there were 1½ million acres still left of our best forest land, and it is into such area that the hewer may go. The Council recognised that some condition had to be attached to these words and they put in "if such area has been cut over for saw milling purposes." "Cut over" means, according to the Crown Law Department, that when one log has been taken away an area may be said truthfully to have been cut over. Instead of the words "cut over" we might just as well have the words "look over" for all the value they are. The hewer can, therefore, go in without waiting for any permission.

[Mr. Munsie took the Chair.]

Mr. O'Loughlen: You assume that the various companies will crowd their areas.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am only dealing with the words of another place. As they have put in these words they must be told what we think of them. It may be urged that the Conservator will be the judge of whether or not it has been cut over, and it may be urged further that the words are used subject to regulations. That is not correct. If the amendment is passed the Conservator will have no say whatever, and once a mill log has been hauled out of the forest that forest will have been cut over.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you were in court you would not use that argument, but would take what has been the custom.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment will not permit of any interference by regulation or by the department, but will open the door wide to the hewer.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Has he ever been let in there before?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, he has never had a free hand before, because we have never had these words before.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Surely it must be subject to regulation.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: You cannot regulate a thing which Parliament says shall be done. Some persons may argue that the people who hold the timber rights will not be such fools as to destroy their leases by allowing hewers to come in. But there are certain firms who have declared their intention of putting hewers into their concessions.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Well, it is no more than the declaration made by your officers in the other direction.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Those people propose to do that, probably because this House has not given renewals of their leases on certain terms. They contend they have the right to hew. If it suits their business they will allow the hewers to come in.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They had the power previously.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In every one of their leases and concessions they have been subject to regulations, and regulations have never been made to deal with the hewers. If the amendment is agreed to it will be impossible to make regulations. The result will be that all the timber which should go to the big mill will pass out through the hewer. The small mill will go, and when the hewer has done with the forest, the timber trade will practically cease to exist. No hon. member would tolerate such a position. I cannot very well discuss this amendment without referring to a further amendment dealing with the rights of the returned soldier. The question of the soldier hewers was fully debated here, and is amply provided for in Clause 24. I had an interview with the representatives of the returned soldiers, and they wanted to know

whether Clause 24 would cover returned soldiers. Certainly, it was the intention of the House that the clause should cover returned soldiers.

Hon. P. Collier: That was all the House asked for.

Mr. Draper: We did not want to make a special class.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause applies to all hewers, and there is a proviso providing that no person shall hew who was not a hewer prior to the passing of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the Committee are not going to discuss the returned soldier on amendment No. 8. If that is done we shall have the discussion all over again on amendment No. 9.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: What we did does fully protect the returned soldier. However, another place are not satisfied with that, but want to make specific reference to returned soldiers. Under the Bill as we passed it, the returned soldier who has been a hewer in the past may hew in the future, outside of virgin forest. Another place has caught that up and defined virgin forest as forest from which no timber has been drawn. Is there any place in Western Australia which no timber has been drawn?

Mr. O'Loghlen: It is an impossible definition.

Hon. P. Collier: Members of another place, posing as authorities, have made consummate asses of themselves over this.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member has said precisely what I think. These two amendments, one of which is much more hurtful than the other, will destroy the effect and purpose of the Bill.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But do not strengthen your case by referring to a subsequent amendment, to which the Committee may not agree.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not think the Committee will agree to it. I have no doubt that the amendments of another place aim at the destruction of this measure.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The mover of this particular amendment had no wish to destroy the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendments deny the right of control which this Chamber gave to the trained forester. Another feature to which I must draw attention—

Mr. O'Loghlen: I hope we shall take the amendments as they come.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: But the Committee must be told of this. A new clause has been inserted limiting the provisions of Clause 24, in relation to hewing permits, so that they shall not have force beyond the 30th June, 1923. Some hon. members might think these amendments are going to last for only 4½ years. But that limitation relates only to the new permits. It is a camouflaged provision.

Mr. Pilkington: What does the amendment mean?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know. I have cross-examined the man who

drew it, and he does not know. These amendments make the Bill unworkable. I feel sure I can look to hon. members of this Chamber to restore the clause as it was, and to disagree with these amendments.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is somewhat difficult to reconcile oneself to the effect of the clause as it left this Chamber, and the amendment which has come from another place. Since the Bill left this Chamber, I have been trying to find a half-way house relatively to this very important clause, but I have been unable to discover one, and the Minister is in a similar predicament. While buttressing his case, the Minister has anticipated discussion on three or four subsequent amendments. Those subsequent amendments, however, may not pass this Chamber. I at any rate disapprove of some of them. Consideration of this particular amendment should not be prejudiced by references to other amendments. If the amendment of the Upper Chamber is agreed to, conditions will be exactly as they are now. I believe however that will be the lesser of two evils. The basis of the Bill is still there; the Bill has not been utterly destroyed. Many clauses of the Bill clothe the Conservator with considerable powers. I have never been in favour of precipitate changes. Experience has demonstrated the necessity for further powers being granted to the Conservator. If it is found that the companies are taking advantage of loopholes, and are crowding their areas with an undue number of hewers, the House will give the Conservator further powers. Apart from one instance, I have no knowledge of a company crowding its areas with an undue number of hewers. It is the object of the millowner in this State to get every possible log he can. The biggest firm in this State did once crowd on an area a number of hewers, but that was on account of cut throat competition for sleepers extending over a period of three or four months. It has been stated by the Minister that at the present time the companies are crowding men on and are openly stating that they are going to do it to a greater extent. Is it not a fair proposition that the Minister should come to this House with a statement of the numerical strength of the axemen employed in our forests? What has been the increase during the past 12 months? How many additional licenses have been issued by the Forestry Department during the last few months? The Conservator can supply those figures, and they will demonstrate that there has been no wild rush by men to take up the hewer's calling. The clause as it left this House was ample to cover the claims of every returned soldier hewer. I pointed out at the time that there was no probability of 2,000 hewers being at work in our forests. Of all the men who have returned, and with whom I am acquainted, not more than a dozen are going back to hewing.

The Attorney General: You know that a lot of hewers have been put on at Kirrup and East Kirrup. They left areas where they were cutting, and they also left Welling-

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They left those areas because the bush granted to them was so poor that they could not make a living. However, there is a great gulf between what the Upper House proposes and the clause as it left here. While the Minister has given us the opinion of the Crown Law Department, I must point out that on several occasions the Crown Law Department's opinions have proved to be worth very little. If timber is taken off an area, that area is cut over. On the other hand, if the Conservator holds the opinion that the hewer is a menace to Western Australian forestry and should be got rid of, what does it mean? I know the Conservator's opinion as to hewing, and possibly it is an opinion most foresters would hold. But the companies take for the mill all logs that are easy to handle. It may be that in competing for sleeper hewers they might put on hewers to get certain quantities of sleepers within a limited time, and in that case put them on country which should not be hewn; but if that should occur, the Conservator could come to this House and seek additional powers. I would not feel so keenly on this matter did I not know the antipathy felt by the Conservator against hewing, an antipathy which may be felt by the majority of Conservators. Our Conservator holds, rightly or wrongly, that there should be no axemen whatever in our forests. But in contradistinction to that view, let me point out that Forestry Departments as well equipped as ours are advertising for hundreds of sleeper hewers. In New South Wales 200 are employed and in Queensland 500. This is the one clause to which I attach the most importance. I realise that in its present amended state it may have defects. If the Conservator finds that he has been shorn of power necessary in policing the timber areas, and he comes to Perth and asks for it, the extended power will be given to him.

Mr. PICKERING: It should be possible to arrive at some solution of this difficulty, and to my mind we ought to appoint a board who should decide the question. We should have on such a board the concessionaire, a member representing the hewing industry, and the Conservator of Forests. I would commend that suggestion to the Minister as one being worthy of consideration. I am concerned in this matter, as many members of my constituency are engaged in the sleeper hewing industry, and I am anxious to see that a fair measure of justice is extended to them.

Mr. MULLANY: I cannot agree with the suggestion made by the member for Sussex as a solution of the difficulty. We might just as well accept the amendment of another place as to appoint such a board as here suggested. Unless some compromise can be arrived at, I intend to support the clause as it was originally passed by the Assembly.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am of opinion that the clause as it left this Chamber was useless. To stop hewing immediately would be a scandal so far as the State is concerned. The clause as it left the Legislative Council is better than the clause we sent to them. It now ensures the right of the hewer to follow his occupation.

The Attorney General: This Bill is not to protect the hewer but to protect the forests.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no doubt that we have a duty to perform, and I intend to support the amendment of the Legislative Council. I hope the proposed amendment will be adopted.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I agree with the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down. If the clause remains in the Bill the Conservator will have absolute power to prevent hewing.

The Attorney General: He has to administer it justly.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I think both the amendments are unreasonable, but I do not see why we should not modify the Council's amendment, if we so desire. In my opinion, the forest which has had one tree cut out of it cannot be considered to have been cut over. There is a lot of timber in the State which has not been marketed as it should have been.

Hon. P. Collier: You ringbarked a lot of fine trees.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I have never ringbarked any jarrah or karri forest. The Attorney General said that I had destroyed a great deal of jarrah timber but he corrected the mistake afterwards. There ought to be some safeguard. If I had to decide between the two amendments I should support that of the Council. The existing custom has lived for a long time and I do not know that so very much timber that could be used has not been used for milling purposes.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I agree with the Attorney General in casting ridicule on this amendment of the Council. I would point out that a bush boss may leave a particular part of bush and go to higher country because of the wet weather. When the season comes around he again has a cut out of that bush. Sometimes there are three cuts taken out of the same piece of country. I think the hewer should not be allowed in until the cutting over has been finished. I am of opinion that the clause in the Bill itself is better than the Council's amendment. When a permit is given to a man to hew, the locality is set down on the license. Would any sane Government stand behind a Conservator who would sell a license to a man to hew in an area in which there was nothing for the man to make a living out of?

Mr. O'Loughlen: That has been the case at Kirrup.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Some 14 years ago at Hester, the men said that the bush was cut out. As a matter of fact after that a million sleepers were taken off that area, and there will be cutting going on for years to come. It is impossible to cut out true jarrah country.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Every sleeper cutter in the Kirrup district had to cease cutting and look for other work owing to the action of the ranger.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): We do not want the hewer to go into cut-over bush. In days gone by the men who held the leases put the hewers on to virgin forest and cut out the

country on the face. When I was a forest ranger I pointed out how wrong this was. I am of opinion that a board would be too cumbersome. It is necessary to leave it in the hands of the Minister or the Conservator. If men are being treated in the way stated by the member for Forest, justice will be done if the matter is laid before the Minister.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The power is in the hands of the Conservator.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): What Conservator would set himself up against the Minister?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is the object of the Bill. He is engaged for seven years.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Then such a Conservator should have short shrift. There is virgin forest in the State which is only fit for hewing. East of the Bridgetown line there is country which will not pay any mill to start working in, and is only fit for hewing. There is not a considerable amount of timber on it, but there is enough for hewing. I would always raise my voice in protest against any injustice to the hewer.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I suppose you remember the regulations which got through without your knowledge in regard to stacking tree tops.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): What happened when these regulations proved to be futile? They were withdrawn. So will these provisions be withdrawn if eventually they prove to be unsuitable.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You know how hard it is to get any regulations upset that are once made.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): If an injustice has been done, as stated by the member for Forrest, I am sure the matter will be put right.

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

Ayes	27
Noes	9

Majority for 18

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Broun	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Brown	Mr. Maley
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nalrn
Mr. Draper	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Duff	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Durack	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Foley	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Hickmott	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Rooke
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Pickering	(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 9.—Clause 24.—Add at the end of the clause the following:—"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section it shall, subject to the provisions of Section 76 of this Act, be lawful for any person holding an active service discharge from the Australian Imperial Forces who satisfies the Conservator that prior to the passing of this Act he followed the occupation of a sleeper hewer in this State, to hew timber for railway sleepers on the area of any timber concession, lease, or permit granted before or after the commencement of this Act, but no such permit shall be granted within any virgin forest." For the purpose of this section "virgin forest" means forest from which no timber has been drawn:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

I have already shown that the soldier hewer is included in the timber hewers who have the right to cut or hew timber. The arguments I have given on the other amendment apply to this one. There is no desire to exclude the soldier hewer or the other hewer.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The desire is there, of course it is.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Conservator no doubt would be glad to see all the timber converted by the sawmill, because he is of opinion that that is the most servicable and economical method of conversion. But we have the hewers, and there is some country where hewing may be done, and the Committee may accept my statement that the Conservator will honestly try, whilst conserving the interests of the State, to find work for the hewers. In the karri areas there are many places where it would be advisable for the hewer to follow up. Every endeavour consistent with the preservation of the timber asset will be made to find work for the hewer.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 10.—Clause 24.—After the words inserted in the last amendment add the following proviso:—"Provided that no person shall be entitled to enter on the area of any concession, lease, or permit without first obtaining the consent or approval in writing of the owner thereof:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: For the same reason I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 11.—Clause 29, after the word "any" in line 3 insert "concession, permit":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 12.—Clause 32, strike out Subclause 3:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

In the previous discussion in this Chamber this provision got in by mistake.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 13—Clause 40, Subclause 2, strike out in line 2 the words "or sooner determination":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Mr. PICKERING: If these words are struck out it will be necessary to provide compensation. The intention of the amendment is to give compensation when the land is resumed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As it was, no compensation was payable. If we strike out the words it means that if the lease is determined before the end of its term, and if there are improvements, we shall have to pay for them.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

No. 14—Clause 41, Subclause 2, strike out the words "one-half" and insert "three-fifths":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

It will be remembered that in respect of the forest revenue we decided that the gross revenue should be divided and that one-half should be credited to Consolidated Revenue, against which administration will stand, and the other half credited to a special afforestation fund.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 15—Clause 41, Subclause (2), before the word "revenue," in line 1, insert "net":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 16—Clause 41, Subclause (2), add the following proviso to this subclause, and strike out the same proviso in Subclause 5: "Provided that a scheme for such expenditure shall be submitted annually to, and shall be subject to the approval of, Parliament":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We had the proviso at the end of the clause. The Council consider the proviso had better be added to Subclause (2). I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 17—Clause 41, Subclause (4), add at the end "with the approval of the Minister":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is no objection to this amendment. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 18—Clause 47, strike out Subclause (3):

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This clause was fully debated here, and the Committee finally agreed that a Forestry officer calling for assistance should have it. By striking out Subclause (3) we shall again alter the whole clause. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It has been well pointed out by the Minister for Works that it is unnecessary to provide by Act of Parliament power to fetch assistance to prevent fires from destroying a national asset. In any part of Australia people are fully prepared to give a hand in order to put out fires. This subclause is really a reflection on the people of Australia.

Mr. LUTEY: The man who inserted this subclause does not understand the Australian character.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment made.

No. 19—Clause 53, add the following subclause, to stand as Subclause (2): "(2.) The minimum pecuniary penalty for any forest offence shall be one-twentieth of the maximum, and no court shall have power to reduce such minimum":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 20—Clause 56, strike out the clause:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 21—Clause 65, strike out the clause:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not like striking out this clause, which is intended to prevent the practice of letting cattle stray about State forests. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 22—Clause 66, strike out the clause:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Similarly, I think this clause should stand. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The matter is not worth debating.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 23—Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 75, as follows: "The area comprised within the boundaries of the Greenbushes State Forest, excepting any area within such boundaries the subject of any timber lease or permit, is hereby excluded from the provisions of this Act, and shall be subject to the Mining Act, 1904":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The point here is that people who have tin mines at Greenbushes want to have straight jarrah for firing their engines. They have taken all the timber off their own leases, and there is a State forest in the neighbourhood. The question of handing this State forest over to the Mines Department is a peculiar one, because the Mines Department could not possibly exercise control over it, and nobody could stop persons from entering it and removing timber. I do not care particularly about the clause one way or the other. I admit that the Conservator is up against the tin miners. For the reasons I have indicated, I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Mr. PICKERING: In this connection the secretary of the Greenbushes Mine Owners' and

Mine Managers' Association writes me as follows, under date of the 22nd November:—

With regard to the Forests Bill now before the House. Until recently the mine owners here have had the right to cut all green jarrah timber for fuel or other mining purposes. The Forestry Department now prohibit us from cutting any green jarrah except unmarketable and useless trees. The dredges depend for their existence on fuel at a reasonable cost. Curly, unmarketable, green timber is utterly useless for fuel. Fuel cut from green timber is the only possible fuel for this field. My association have been fighting hard for the past ten months to have the prohibition removed, but have failed to get any satisfaction. Under the new Forests Bill this prohibition would become permanent and irrevocable, and this would be fatal to all the interests in Greenbushes tin mining. My association consider the most equitable way out would be to remove the Greenbushes mineral area from the scope of the Bill, and place it under the Mining Act. My association therefore desire that you will kindly give this serious question your most careful attention, and strive to protect the tin mining industry of Greenbushes from being strangled by hasty and ill-conceived legislation. The dredges alone are paying £4,500 in wages per month.

I am not a representative of the tin fields, which however have a representative here. The Government's policy relative to the area has, I understand, been an in and out policy, one mine being allowed to cut in the State forest while another mine is stopped. There is very little timber of any value left around Greenbushes, apart from this State forest. The tin mining industry is of great value, paying £4,500 monthly in wages, and it should receive consideration from Parliament. Therefore it is only a reasonable proposition that the forest should be transferred to the Mines Department and that the tin miners should have the full use of the timber there.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I support the Council's amendment, because it is desirable that there should be only one control over the timber. What is the result of the present dual control by the Mines Department and the Forestry Department? The hewers have been put in there to the detriment of the mining industry. The mine owners formed a deputation with the result that the hewers were put out. I was district ranger there for 17 years, and we had no less than six changes for and against the hewers in that time. In this particular area the hewers should not be permitted to enter; they should be kept out altogether. If the Mines Department are given control the timber will be reserved for mining purposes only. There will come a day when we will have been mining at Greenbushes, and then we shall require the timber. We must not have dual control.

Hon. P. Collier: We should not exclude this area from the operations of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When Mr. Moss and the Greenbushes Company came to

me I found, on reference to the file, that the State Mining Engineer had said that this particular jarrah should not be used for firewood, because it would be required for mining purposes. I am prepared to respect the wishes of the State Mining Engineer.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	8

Majority for .. 10

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Draper	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Duff	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Foley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. George	Mr. Troy
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Hickmott	(Teller.)
Mr. Hudson	

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Luty	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Munis	Mr. O'Loghlin
Mr. Nairn	(Teller.)
Mr. Pickering	

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 24. Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 76, as follows:—The provisions of Section 24 of this Act in relation to the issue of hewing permits shall have effect from the commencement of this Act until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and no longer:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

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

House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.