

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 19th September, 1922.

	PAGE
Select Committee, Electricity Supply, report presented	778
Motions: Consolidation of Statutes	778
Fremantle Fish Market By-law, to disallow	782
Machinery inspection regulations	788
Immigration State-wide scheme	789
Bills: Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 3a.	784
Light and Air, Com.	784

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

SELECT COMMITTEE—ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Report presented.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the electric current agreement between the Government and the Perth City Council.

Report received.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the report be read.

The PRESIDENT: It is rather a long report, is it not?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is long. If members are satisfied to read it in print, I shall be content, and ask leave to withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT: That would be the better plan.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, report ordered to be printed.

MOTION—CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.37]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House, seeing that the statutes have not been revised since 1895, it is of urgent necessity that they should be revised and consolidated forthwith and that the work be put in hand at once with a view to its being completed within the next 18 months.

I wish to thank the Leader of the House for the information he has collected for me. This is of great assistance to me in placing the position before the House. The statutes have not been revised since 1895. Hon. members who have had occasion from time to time to peruse them have had great difficulty in finding what they required because of the numerous amendments which have been made, and because the Acts so amended have not been put into consolidated form. Illustrations of this are found in the Land Act and several other Acts which have been amended on various occasions. If the Government could revise and consolidate the existing stat-

utes, they would be supplying a long-felt want. For some time past it has been impossible to obtain a complete set of the statutes from the Government Printer. This state of things would certainly be inconvenient for a young man about to start practising law in Perth. People have frequently had to purchase second-hand copies of the statutes. When I was mayor of Subiaco I was anxious to obtain a complete set of statutes, but was obliged to purchase a second-hand set and pay a big price for it. I propose to quote some of the information that was given to the Minister for Education by the Under Secretary for Law. Mr. Hampton says—

Although Mr. Duffell is quite correct in stating that there has been no revision of the statutes since 1895, speaking broadly, there have been, as Ministers are aware, revision and consolidation of the more important Acts from year to year, and these Acts, as revised or consolidated, have been printed at the end of each volume of the statutes. For instance, take last year—1921-22—the State Children Act was thoroughly revised and consolidated. The previous year we had the Lunacy and the Justices Acts, in 1919 the Prisons Act and the Health Act, and so on. Going back, a good deal of work in connection with bringing specific Acts up to date has been undertaken.

There is no doubt Acts have been revised for the information of the Crown. In his private capacity the Under Secretary for Law has devoted a great deal of time to this work. This morning he showed me how he had brought up to date in leaflet form the various amendments which have been passed by Parliament from year to year for the last 10 years. He informed me that copies of these statutes had been supplied to Ministers, to police officers, and to magistrates in the State.

The Minister for Education: And to the profession.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: They have been printed in leaflet form and perforated, and prepared in such a way as to show the sections which have been amended. The profession, Ministers, and courts of justice within the State have been fairly well provided for in this way. Members of Parliament have not been afforded the same convenience, although I will admit that some leaflets have been sent to Parliament House. Some statutes we are supplied with have had these leaves inserted but that does not alter the fact that we should be provided with the statutes in concise form. The statutes up to 1895 are contained in three volumes. The Acts that are now being printed are of the same size as the Commonwealth Acts, and are more convenient for handling, more especially for a legal man who is taking a case in the court. I cannot say the same for the early statutes with their old-fashioned size and type. The Crown Law Department, I believe, will welcome the carrying of the motion in ac-

cordance with the suggestions I have made, because it will greatly facilitate their work. The matter has been brought up for years past on the Estimates, but the Government have not been able to proceed with the work because of the great cost on the one hand, and the very small amount of revenue to be obtained as a return on the other hand. The last consolidation of the Statutes of Western Australia was effected in 1895 by Mr. J. C. H. James, who was then Commissioner of Titles. He did most of the work in his spare time and when he was not otherwise engaged in his office, with the result that after he had revised them, he received a grant of £50 and was also given his return fare to England in order to supervise generally the printing in England of the consolidated statutes. The contract was let to Spottiswood & Co. and was for 2,000 volumes, the cost of which was £2,000. We have seen the result of that work. It was highly satisfactory. Some 500 copies were sent to Western Australia, while another 500 or 1,000 were tied into bundles and were also sent to this State. The 500 or 1,000, whichever was the number remaining, were retained in Spottiswood and Co.'s warehouses. They were held by the company for future requirements. A fire which demolished the greater part of the warehouse, resulted in the burning of the remaining stocks. Mr. Hampton in his statement says—

The Government decided to charge three guineas per set for the consolidation, and, speaking from memory, I believe the sales for the first three years—the busiest time—did not amount to 300 volumes. In those days the sales were effected through the Government Stores. In 1909 the Government Printer took over the sales and between 1909 and 1922, 80 sets were sold and 40 were given away. The average sales at present are six sets a year. After some three or four years, when it was found that the sale of the statutes would in no way relieve us of the stock or bring in any financial returns, the Treasury approved of the price of the consolidation being reduced from three guineas to £1 10s. The present price is £1 10s. for a consolidated set plus 10s. 6d. for each session, making a total of £15 3s. Every year I have prepared in this department a set of slips showing the amendments to the statutes, which are perforated and can be torn apart and pasted in the volume of statutes against the section or Act amended. It would probably take an ordinary clerk about a fortnight to amend a set of statutes up to date with these slips and, therefore, to have a set of statutes up to date at the present time, we must add about a fortnight's clerical pay to the £15 3s., or, roughly speaking, any person desiring a set of statutes up to date would have to spend about £20 to £24.

Legal work involved: In 1920 a suggestion was made that the consolidation might be undertaken in recess by the law officers

in their spare time. I then advised the Attorney General that such a proposal was absurd. The law officers have no spare time. To carry out the ordinary routine work of the law officers, every officer with the present staff is fully engaged. Moreover, the consolidating of statutes is not a matter that can be done in spare time. Anyone undertaking this class of work must be shut up in a room by himself with no interruptions. A special staff would therefore have to be engaged for this work and that staff would have to be of legally trained men commanding a high rate of salary. I cannot assess what this would run into.

Printing: The actual printing, as stated before, cost £2,000 in 1895. A very optimistic estimate, therefore, would be at least £3,000 at the present time and probably nearer £4,000.

Probable sales: We cannot look for anything but nominal revenue from the sales. There are about 250 solicitors in Western Australia and probably not more than half would take a new set. A few might be purchased by municipalities. As regards public libraries, etc., the Government is generally expected to present a set. The free list is, of course, pretty extensive. We have to send, under the Colonial Office regulations (vide Regulation 186) 12 copies to the Secretary of State and 15 copies to the various libraries of the courts of justice and the temples. We also exchange with the other States, British Protectorates, America, and several Continental countries. From these of course no revenue is received. We have 60 courts which would have to be supplied with a set, also members of Parliament receive free copies, and here again no revenue would result. You will note I am not anticipating such large sales this time as on the 1895 consolidation. There is a reason for this. Prior to 1895 no one made or kept amendment slips with a view to keeping the statutes up to date. As these have since been made every year it stands to reason that the more careful firms and offices have had an opportunity of keeping their present sets right up to date, although in a somewhat complicated manner, and it is highly probable that many offices with such complete sets would not go to the expense of renewing them.

Present state of the statutes: On application at present, the Government Printer can supply very nearly a complete set of statutes. There are, however, one or two lengthy statutes which are out of print, more noticeably the Bankruptcy Act. This is not being reprinted, as you know, owing to the fact that the Federal Government have had a Bankruptcy Act in hand for a number of years and each year we are given to understand that in all probability it will be brought before Parliament, thus rendering any reprint of our Act and rules an absolute waste of money. Our Bank-

ruptey Acts and rules it may be mentioned run into some 400 pages, so that it will be seen the expense involved would be fairly heavy.

Form statutes should take: If a consolidation and reprint is undertaken, it stands to reason that the lines followed by the Commonwealth and several of the other States should be followed and the consolidated statutes issued in alphabetical form. The two sets we have in this office, therefore, which have been kept completely up to date showing every amendment, would not be of great assistance to the draftsmen because these sets are in sessional order and therefore where an Act has been amended three or four times, it would practically require re-drafting altogether in order to put it in proper order. As far as one can give a rough estimate, therefore, the position is summed up from a financial point of view in an expenditure of, say, some £5,000, and the revenue at the outside, and possibly spread over a number of years, some £500 or £600. These facts, of course, make the work look prohibitive. It is my duty to place the matter before you as clearly as possible, although it is against the interests of this department, as no one would welcome a consolidation of the statutes more than the law officers who have to work now, like all outside solicitors, under very adverse conditions in so far as statute law is concerned.

It will be seen, therefore, that the remarks I made at the outset were fully justified by the valuable information supplied by the Under Secretary for Law. At the same time, I have to bear in mind that, although the cost would be probably in the vicinity of £5,000, the money would, in my opinion, be well spent. We should take into consideration the immense value to be derived from such a revision by members of Parliament, if the Acts were before them in consolidated form. I can only speak as a layman, but I am judging the position from the three volumes we have in the library. I believe the Acts could be brought up to date in three more similar volumes, and that they could be printed in a more handy size, which would suit the purposes of the legal profession. I suggest they should be similar to the form adopted by the Commonwealth Government. Since the Commonwealth Government came into being, they have twice reviewed their statutes and we already have Volumes 1 and 2, bringing their Acts up to 1913, and I understand that in the near future Volume 3 will be produced. If the Commonwealth Government see the necessity for this being done, how much more should we in Western Australia recognise the necessity for it and adopt the same procedure? It is possible that the expenses could be minimised very considerably when we take into consideration the fact that we have officers of Parliament who are quite capable of doing this work. Hon. members who frequent Parliament buildings during recess can see for themselves how difficult it must be

for some of those officers to find means to kill time. It is impossible for them to know what to do to fill in their spare time during the day. In addition, we have officers of Parliament who are quite capable of doing this work thoroughly and systematically and quite in accordance with the wishes of the Crown Law Department. If necessary, they could work under the supervision of the Solicitor General during the period Parliament is in recess. That is the reason I mention in the motion the period of 18 months for the completion of the work. If it were undertaken by the officers of Parliament, it would reduce the cost considerably, and I have good reason to believe that the whole work could be done for less than £3,000. If that be so, that £3,000 would be well spent. I am sure that the sales would be considerably larger if our Acts were brought up to date in consolidated form as I suggest. In the circumstances and with the information which I have placed before the House I again express my appreciation to the Leader of the House for the particulars with which he has supplied me. I submit the motion standing in my name.

Hon. J. Ewing: I second the motion.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.58]: The position is as Mr. Duffell has stated it. Last year when the Estimates were being prepared, I went into this matter very carefully with the Crown Law officers and we came to the conclusion that, much as we would like to see this work done, we did not feel justified in incurring the expenditure. This year the matter was again discussed. It is desirable, and I will go so far as to say it is necessary, that this work should be put in hand, but it is questionable that it is of such urgency as to justify us at the present time in spending £4,000 or £5,000 in this direction. As the motion stands, it is a direct expression of opinion on the part of this House that the work should be put in hand forthwith. If that be the wish of the House, it is competent for members to carry the motion, but I can quite understand that many hon. members will look at it from a slightly different point of view and, while admitting the desirability of this work, will be slow to pass a motion calling upon the Government to incur this expenditure at once. In order to test the feeling of the House I move an amendment—

That all the words after "consolidated" in line 5 be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu:—"As soon as financial considerations will permit."

I admit that the motion in its amended form would not bind us to anything, but I assure hon. members that the department is anxious that this work should be done when possible. If the motion is carried in the amended form, the work will be put in hand as soon as we can see our way clear to do so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.1]: It might be sufficient to meet the Minister's purpose if he contented himself by striking out the word "forthwith" only. If my suggestion is adopted, it will permit of the revision and consolidation of the Acts being taken in hand and completed within the next few months, and, with the knowledge I have of such work the expense should not exceed more than £150. There is a big difference between consolidation and revision. Consolidation is just the work one does himself. In my office I have a principal Act and, whenever an amendment is made, I note it in the margin. It would be a very simple matter for me at any time to place the amendments in their proper position in the principal Act.

The PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member intend that the words after "forthwith" be retained?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. Then the enormous expense of printing would not be involved. Revision is a different matter. I have had some experience of it, and when one comes to put into a consolidated Act the provisions of 12 or 13 amending Acts, little differences are discovered which have to be made good by revision, and there the skilled work is required. Even with the Acts passed since 1895, that ought not to take very long; the printing is the principal part. If the work of consolidation were put in hand straight away, we could, whenever an amending Bill was passed, include a clause to provide that re-prints of the Act should include all the amendments, so that in years to come when the finances warranted the expenditure, practically the whole of the work would be up to date.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: What is the difference between "forthwith" and "at once"?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I know that both terms are not necessary.

The Minister for Education: But you are straining at one end and leaving the other.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister has moved his amendment to test the feeling of the House. I suggest that, in order to test the feeling of the House in another way, we should undertake the consolidating work and leave the printing. The feeling of the House on this question could be tested by an amendment to strike out the word "forthwith."

The Minister for Education: It would be of no use doing the work until we were ready to print it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It would, because when we pass an amending Bill we can always provide that the Act shall be re-printed as amended. The particular Act would then be consolidated and in course of time all of the Acts would be consolidated.

The PRESIDENT: The striking out of "forthwith" would not do away with the Minister's objection on financial grounds.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister says the cost will be £4,000 or £5,000 which includes the quasi-professional work and the printing. My suggestion is that we undertake the quasi-professional work and leave

the printing to a more opportune time. Thus instead of incurring an expenditure of £4,000 or £5,000, we shall commit ourselves to an expenditure of only about £150. If the Minister objects to the remaining words, he can afterwards move to delete them.

The PRESIDENT: Does the hon. member desire that the Minister's amendment be withdrawn to allow him to move to strike out the word "forthwith"?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes.

The Minister for Education: To facilitate discussion I am prepared to withdraw my amendment, but I intend to move it afterwards.

Hon. H. Stewart: I hope you will stick to it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.10]: I have been trying to discover from the debate how the striking out of the word "forthwith" will result in saving £5,000. That contention is an utter absurdity. This is only a pious motion which will find its way into the waste paper bag with a good many more. The motion seeks to tie the Government down to something definite during the next 18 months, whereas the amendment provides that the work be undertaken as soon as the finances permit. I am in favour of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Lovekin has merely put forward a suggestion. The Minister's amendment is now before the House.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.11]: I support the amendment. I am surprised at the statement of Mr. Lovekin who, I have heard, is an authority on Standing Orders, although experience has not justified the reputation. He suggests that the consolidating part of the work be done and that the printing will be unnecessary. I cannot understand how the first would be of any use without the latter. From time to time the hon. member preaches economy and finance. Since I have been in the House nearly every amending Bill has contained a clause providing that the amendments be embodied in the Act. Therefore, the position is being remedied from year to year. Quite a number of old Acts have been amended during the last five years. To the list mentioned by Mr. Duffell might be added the Criminal Code and the Traffic Act. When an amending Bill comes before the House we have to ascertain its relation to existing legislation. Although it would be a great convenience to the profession and to officers to have this consolidation work carried out, the expenditure is not justified at present. There is one respect in which I have confidence in the Government; if it is a matter for convenience of the public or a section of the public be they solicitors, factory workers—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Or members of the Country Party.

Hon. H. STEWART: People who wish to help themselves with the bulk handling scheme cannot get support. If some such section as I have indicated requires Govern-

ment expenditure and the need exists, the expenditure is made without any resolution from the House instructing the Government to incur it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [5.15]: It will be generally conceded that the intimation which I gave to the House when moving the motion justifies my acceptance of the amendment. Because of the information given by the Leader of the House, I accept the amendment, feeling sure that as soon as the finances will permit it the Government will give effect to the desire I have expressed. I am glad to know that the Crown Law Department and all concerned are in accord with the object of the motion.

Amendment put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION—FREMANTLE FISH MARKET BY-LAW.

To Disallow Amendments.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN (West) [5.18]: I move—

That the amendments of By-law No. 96, made by the Fremantle Municipality, and laid on the Table of the House on the 27th July last, be and are hereby disallowed.

In order to explain why I wish these amendments disallowed, I must make a short statement concerning the conditions at the Fremantle fish market. The by-law in question sets out that 2½ per cent. shall be charged on the gross sales of all fish at the market. It means that on the whole of the fish sold in the Fremantle fish market the Fremantle Council collect 2½ per cent., which percentage goes into the general revenue of the council. The Fremantle fish market was handed over to the Fremantle Council by the Public Works Department as far back as 1910, a pepper-corn rental of 1s. per annum being imposed. Thus the Public Works Department made the Fremantle Council a free gift of the whole of the buildings, appurtenances and furniture of the market. Since that date, the Council have not spent one penny on the upkeep of the market, though some few years ago the Public Works Department made certain absolutely necessary repairs. The council carried on the market and provided an auctioneer, charging 6¼ per cent. on sales of all fish, this percentage covering all charges.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Including the 2½ per cent to the council?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: No. The council carried on for 11 years under that arrangement. During the last three years, with their own auctioneer, they made a profit of £68 per annum after payment of all expenses. The lease from the Government to the council provides distinctly that the council shall not sublet without the consent of the Government. In April of 1921, the council decided to call tenders for the leasing of the market, and they did so without consulting the Government. The successful tenderer was

Mr. Langsford, and his offer was a rental of £300 per annum. After a contract and a sublease has been drawn up between the council and Mr. Langsford, that body woke up to the fact that they had not received the consent of the Government, and consequently could not sublet. Thereupon they approached the Government, and the Government—rightly I think—objected to any subletting whatever, telling the council that if they desired to carry on under the old arrangement they could do so. The history of the transaction is too long to relate here, but I may say that during the time the council operated the market Mr. Willis was the municipal auctioneer. He also was a tenderer for the sublease of the market, but at a lesser sum than that offered by Mr. Langsford. A majority of the fishermen held the belief that if Langsford was to pay £300 rent annually, he would look to get that amount back from the fishermen, and could not possibly do that and continue selling at 6¼ per cent. With the rental added, the fishermen thought, the charge for selling might very well go up to 10 per cent., or even 12 or 15 per cent. The fishermen saw, too, that they would be entirely at Langsford's mercy, because there would be nobody else to sell their fish. Mr. Willis had the confidence of the fishermen, having sold for them during a period of about 11 years; and they arranged with him to hold fish sales at the market. The matter went to court, and it was then found that the council had no right to prevent any licensed auctioneer from selling fish in the market. Mr. Willis has been carrying on there ever since. When Mr. Langsford found that he could not carry on, his solicitors wrote to the council claiming about £150 compensation. A sum was paid by way of compensation, and the council ruled that Mr. Willis and any other auctioneer could sell fish in the market. After that, the council applied to the Government for the gazetting of certain regulations. Those regulations contained a scale of charges for selling fish, one item being a charge of 2s. 6d. per sale for each of seventeen tables in the market, two sales being held per day. Moreover, there was an exorbitant charge for inspection. Some influence was brought to bear—nobody can quite understand how—and the Fremantle town clerk wrote a most extraordinary letter to the Under Secretary for Public Works. The letter is dated the 28th September, 1921, and was received at the Public Works Department on the following day. I wish hon. members to note those dates. The letter reads—

I have the honour, by direction of the Fremantle Municipal Council, to inform you that at a special meeting held on Tuesday, the 27th instant, it was resolved that a letter be written to the responsible Ministers informing them that unless the by-laws for the regulation of the Fremantle fish market, which were forwarded approximately six weeks ago, are gazetted on or

before Saturday, the 1st October, 1921, the council will withdraw its auctioneer and hand the premises back to the Government.

Talk about holding a pistol to a man's head! The Fremantle council on the 28th September issue to the Government an ultimatum which expires on the 1st October.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The council are copying another organisation.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The Minister for Works called a special meeting of Cabinet, with the result that the desire of the council was obeyed and the by-laws were gazetted.

The Minister for Education: How do you know that?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Because the by-laws have been gazetted. There is no doubt at all about it. I have seen the "Government Gazette" in which the by-laws appear.

The PRESIDENT: Under the Standing Orders the time for the discussion of motions has elapsed.

[Resolved that motions be continued.]

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: These by-laws that were gazetted gave to the Fremantle council a net return of £16 or £17 weekly. Mr. Lynn and I saw the Colonial Secretary, who was astonished to find the council were getting so much revenue from fish. He brought the matter under the notice of the fisheries inspector, who made the necessary inquiries. The Under Secretary's letter on the file distinctly shows how grossly unfair it was that the previous by-law should ever have been gazetted. The letter goes on to say—

The fish market was established for the benefit of the public and of the fishing industry. It was arranged for administrative convenience that the Fremantle council should control the market, but it was never intended by the Government that the council should make the market the means of deriving a substantial revenue. The contention that a large revenue is being derived is supported by the scale of charges, which certainly appear to be excessive, and can be reasonably assumed to have the effect of returning a large profit to the council. It is stated that this system of charges is killing the small buyers, cases being instanced in which fishermen, in order to avoid the charges, are selling their catches privately to larger operators who can afford to buy in large quantities. . . . In the opinion of the Minister the fairest and most equitable means of levying charges is on the basis of a percentage on the value of the sales. This is the general practice in reward to marketing of commodities, and there seems to be no sufficient reason why it should be departed from in the case of fish. By the adoption of this system, there would be the further advantage that the expense of paying a man to weigh the fish would be avoided.

At that time they had in the fish market a man to weigh the fish and determine where it came in the scale of charges. In view of the inspector's report, the Minister wrote to the council, informing them that their charges were altogether excessive, and suggesting that two per cent. should be charged. A majority of the council accepted that, and agreed that the by-law should be repealed and a charge made on a percentage basis, two per cent. being the rate agreed upon. However, at the next meeting that was rescinded, and 2½ per cent. adopted. That is the by-law I wish to have disallowed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is it a question of the difference between two per cent. and 2½ per cent.?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: No. I say that one-half per cent. should be sufficient. The Minister suggested two per cent., and the council agreed, but afterwards went back on their position, and finally decided to make it 2½ per cent. The rate of 2½ per cent. gives the council a net return of £375 per annum, which is altogether excessive. For that the council do nothing at all. It is quite simple for an officer of the council to go down periodically and inspect the sales book. The only responsibilities the council have, are lighting and water. At the time of the dispute the council estimated the cost of lighting and water at £26 per annum. During four or five months of the year practically no lighting is required, the markets not being opened until 5 a.m. In winter they do not open until 5.30 a.m., and of course it is broad daylight by 7 a.m. The cleaning of the markets does not cost the council anything, for the auctioneer has to look to that.

Hon. H. Stewart: There is the inspection of the markets.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The council's health inspector merely walks down to the markets when it suits him. The £375 is an impost on the industry, and is not a fair charge at all. One-half per cent. would return to the council £75 per annum and one per cent. would return them £150.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Who originally built the markets?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The Works Department, and they still own the buildings. They could resume possession at any time.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They will if the market becomes profitable.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Another question to be borne in mind is that just as much fish is sold outside the markets as is sold through the markets. All the ice boats come into the wharf and there sell their fish to the bigger buyers. The council have power to force all that fish through the markets. They should do that, if only for considerations of health, for the fish sold at the wharf is subject to no inspection whatever. If the council were to force all that fish through the market they could afford to charge only one per cent. and still collect a much greater revenue than

they are collecting to-day. I ask the House to disallow the by-law.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMEND- MENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair, the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause, "and a paragraph is added to the said section, as follows:—'But no such grant shall have effect or be enforced so as to prevent the erection of any building on the alignment of a street to a depth of not exceeding twelve feet.'"

Hon. A. SANDERSON: As this is a measure which, in its own department, is of considerable importance, I wish to know whether it has been carefully considered.

The Minister for Education: Yes.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Then it is an extraordinary thing that the Minister should bring down an amendment. That is not evidence of careful preparation on the part of those who are responsible for the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not evidence of lack of consideration. I am quite prepared to leave the Bill as it is. It is perfectly right as it appears before hon. members, but certain members said they were not prepared to leave the matter to the discretion of the Governor-in-Council, and they wanted this particular point specifically protected. That is why I have moved the amendment, although I do not admit it is necessary.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If the Minister is satisfied that the Bill is in order as it stands, he should stick to his guns, especially with the majority that he can always command in this House. This is a matter that should have been referred to the parties interested and they, I take it, are fairly represented by the legal and architectural professions. Have these professions been consulted?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The measure was urged upon the Government by a leading firm of solicitors at the request of a leading firm of architects. The latter found that they could not proceed with their building operations unless something of this kind was done.

Hon. A. Sanderson: We are actually getting information.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I told the House this when I moved the second reading.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I was unfortunately unable to be present at that time but to tell me that an important Bill of this kind was asked for by a private firm of solicitors at the request of a firm of architects convinces me that it should be referred to the Architects' Board. I protest against this method of procedure, especially as the Press have suspended operations—I hope that is the correct way to put it. Surely the architects as a body should have the compliment paid to them of being officially consulted. Were they consulted?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Other people have been consulted.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The channels are perfectly clear and open. The Government I maintain, should have communicated with the Architects' Board.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This is an amendment to protect the city.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That introduces another party, the City Council. Has the City Council been consulted? It seems an extraordinary way of doing business.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move—

That the following new clause be added:—"Section two of the principal Act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'air,' in the third and fifth lines of the section, the words 'or to any overhanging eaves or projections of any description.'"

I have already explained that the object of the amendment is to extend the provisions of the Bill not only to light and air but also to overhanging eaves and other projections.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill affects the city of Perth more than any other part of the State, therefore I would like to be satisfied that the City Council have had it before them. Do they actually know that the Bill is before Parliament? I made one mistake last session by agreeing to a Bill which had not been submitted to the local authority. I may be in the same position now. The local authority should be consulted, so that we might see whether there is another side to the question. At the present time we know that outside people have no means of ascertaining what is going on here.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know that the City Council have been consulted, but I do know that the members representing the Metropolitan Province have discussed the Bill, and the amendments, and, so far as we can judge, the amendments are in the interests of and for the protection of the city.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do they go far enough?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Surely the hon. member, in a matter of this kind, will not put the members representing the Metropoli-

tan Province against the considered opinions of the parties principally interested?

Hon. A. Lovekin: We discussed it with the Minister.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Minister does not impress me. The measure is small but it may be of great importance to different people, to the City Council, the architects and lawyers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It cannot do much harm.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We have done enough harm here already by legislating on matters we did not understand, and did not have time to consider. People living in provinces other than the metropolitan should be consulted in this matter, as well as the architects as a professional body.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And the town planning people.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am glad the hon. member has mentioned them. They, too, might be able to throw some light upon the question. If a select committee were appointed to make investigations, all the people concerned would have an opportunity of giving expression to their views.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I must protest against the unwarranted statement made by Mr. Sanderson that any attempt has been made to rush this Bill through. I moved the second reading a fortnight ago, and since then every member has had an opportunity of considering the measure and also the amendments that have been placed on the Notice Paper. Evidently the hon. member has not read the second reading speeches, but now accuses me of an attempt to rush the Bill through.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I endorse the remarks of the Minister for Education as to plenty of time having been accorded to members to look into this matter. The only parties concerned in this Bill are the owners of property. Members of the Metropolitan Province have considered the Bill, and agreed that it will be beneficial to the State and to the people. Its main object is to prevent owners of property from acquiring prescriptive rights by lapse of time. The purpose of the Bill is to rectify that which is thought to be an evil.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Minister for Education seems to be singularly thin-skinned. With regard to Mr. Nicholson's remarks, I well remember the time when he gave the House certain advice in connection with a Bill, and the position we found ourselves in after following that advice. The Committee may be satisfied to accept his assurance on this matter, but I am afraid I cannot do so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I should have thought members of the Metropolitan Province would have taken the opportunity to consult the principal local authority concerned about this Bill. I look upon the City Council as an authority which can speak with some force and energy upon a question of this sort. If the matter were brought before them they might point out some other amendments which may be as necessary as those that we

are now dealing with, and in that way avoid further amending legislation at a subsequent date.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The Bill will meet with the general approval of the City Council. It has always been felt by the City Council that there is not a close enough relationship between the Legislature and the city corporation, as representatives of the ratepayers. When any question comes before Parliament that affects the city, the Perth corporation should be consulted.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am in agreement with the desire of Mr. Nicholson, as shown in the series of amendments he has put forward. I am afraid, however, that the Bill under consideration is not the one in which the amendment should be included. The object sought by the hon. member is well known. I have in mind the instance Mr. Sanderson mentioned, and it does not inspire me with confidence that sufficient consideration has been given to this matter to justify an amendment in the Bill by a private member. I would like to have an assurance from the Leader of the House that these amendments have been reviewed by the Government or by the Crown Law authorities. There may be many other matters that could be included if the further consideration of this Bill were postponed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The point raised by Mr. Stewart regarding amendments to the Bill and the title was present in the mind of the Solicitor General in view of these amendments. It is not a matter that escaped his attention, because I raised the question with him. He seemed to think that the mere fact of the title of the Bill being one relating to light and air would not prevent the inclusion of amendments dealing with eaves and other projections. I agree that there might be other matters that could be introduced with advantage. It is no wish of mine, nor is it, I am convinced, the wish of the Leader of the House, to unduly rush the measure through. Ample opportunity, however, has been afforded hon. members to consider the Bill as a whole, and possible amendments. They have had that opportunity for a fortnight.

Hon. H. Stewart: I am not questioning the Bill, but the matters sought to be introduced by way of amendments.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Those matters were considered by the Solicitor General.

Hon. H. Stewart: I did not know that you had consulted him.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I informed the House that I had done so. The measure has been thoroughly discussed and it certainly has not been unduly rushed. Members generally will admit that it is only right that some protection should be afforded to owners of property against owners of adjoining properties who purloin rights that are existing. If the prescriptive right has been ab-

olished regarding light and air, surely it is equally reasonable that we should abolish other considerations!

The Minister for Education: Does not this matter arise under the Property Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not know.

The Minister for Education: Would it not be better to place your amendments in the Property Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They certainly could be dealt with in that measure. This Bill deals with the prescriptive right limited under the old Statute, passed during the reign of William IV. These rights were abolished in Western Australia by the 1902 Act. At the time—perhaps the matter was overlooked—the other rights were not also abolished.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the relationship between these amendments and the old Act of William IV.?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In that Act there are various other rights. I have suggested in my amendment a new Clause 4, which will repeal Section 5 of the principal Act, and will insert a new provision setting out that Section 2 of the Imperial Act passed in the 2nd and 3rd years of the reign of William IV., Chapter 71, intitled the Prescription Act, 1832, so far only as it applies to overhanging eaves or projections, and also Section 3 of the Act, shall cease to have operation within the State. Section 3 deals only with light and not with air. Section 2 deals with a variety of rights.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have already expressed approval of the amendment put forward by Mr. Nicholson. I have also discussed it with the Crown Law authorities and I do not hesitate to say, nor do they, that the object sought is a perfectly right one. I am afraid, however, that the inclusion of these amendments in the Bill may risk the measure. Although Mr. Nicholson said there might be many other things it was desirable to include, the purpose of the Bill is to meet a case that has actually arisen and which will be bound to arise with frequency in the city. To-day people are putting up permanent buildings, and unless they have their permanent light easements they will not proceed with such works. For the last four months a big building has been hung up on that account, although the property owners concerned wished to give a perpetual lease. There is no reason why that lease should not be given and it is necessary that these permanent easements shall be available throughout the city. We do not want to go on hanging up the erection of substantial buildings in the city. There is some fear that the inclusion of the amendments may be regarded as foreign to the Bill. I do not think any harm would be done by holding over the consideration of these matters until the Property Bill is before us.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It would be quite proper to include them in the Property Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Bill is for a specific purpose, and as we do not wish to prevent the growth of the city,

we have brought forward the amendment for the purpose I have indicated. For that reason, I would like the Bill to go through as it stands.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In view of the wish of the Minister, I have no objection to my amendment being deferred until the larger Bill, dealing with the law of property, is brought down. I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Property Bill is not on the file.

The Minister for Education: It is not printed yet. It contains 500 clauses.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I must congratulate the Minister because he plays on the Committee—

The Minister for Education: I do not play on anyone.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: He plays on the Committee as a master plays on an old fiddle.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the question whether this amendment shall be withdrawn.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: It is obvious that the Minister now has Mr. Nicholson and his amendments out of the way. I would like to see these amendments included. Are we going to delay what is admittedly of some importance, in order that a building may be put up?

The Minister for Education: You do not want to hang people up unnecessarily.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The three parties I have mentioned are entitled to be communicated with as a matter of business and of courtesy. If the Minister and his supporters think it unnecessary, I must content myself with entering a protest. I repeat that progress should be reported in order that some of the legal firms and architects and the City Council might be communicated with through the Minister, thus giving all parties interested the fullest opportunity to look into this matter.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: After looking at the Prescription Act of 1832, I think it would be well if the hon. member withdrew his amendment, allowing it, with other amendments indicated, to be incorporated in the Property Bill, or in a separate Bill.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

MOTION—MACHINERY INSPECTION REGULATIONS.

To disallow.

Debate resumed from the 13th September on the following motion by Hon. E. H. Harris:—

That the regulations of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, laid upon the Table of the House on the 1st day of August, 1922, be disallowed so far as regards the following:—Regulation Charges—1,

Boilers. 2, Digesters. 3, Vulcanisers. 4, Steam-jacketed vessels. 5, Receivers for compressed air or gas. 6, Machinery (not worked by steam). 7, Winding engines worked other than by steam. 8, Holman hoists. 9, Hoists, the cylinders of which exceed 6in. in diameter. 10, Extension certificates. 11, Machinery driven by steam. 12, Special work (boilers and machinery). 13, Testing pressure gauges. 14, Search fees. 15, All fees enumerated in the Seventh Schedule.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [7.50]: I support the hon. member in his efforts to get these regulations disallowed. I do so because it is time this House put a stop to government and taxation by regulation. If the people are to be taxed, let us do it by Act of Parliament. In the previous Machinery Act the fees were set out in a schedule to the Act and Parliament approved of them. Now we have come to a new order of things and we are to have fees put up from time to time by departmental officials. Certainly this House has an opportunity of reviewing such fees, but there is a great risk of fees being imposed before this House can get an opportunity to consider them. I believe that already quite a number of fees have been imposed before Parliament has had an opportunity to discuss them. If members look at these regulations they will find that not only high fees but in many cases fees twice as great as those provided in the old schedule are stipulated, and where no fees are prescribed there is a dragnet regulation on page 23 which allows the department to prescribe any fee for special reports, valuations, engine indicating or other special inspection work not defined in these regulations as may be assessed by the Chief Inspector, subject to the approval of the Minister. If the Chief Inspector says there shall be a fee for special work, the Minister may approve, and Parliament has no voice whatever in the matter. That is the principle on which I support the hon. member. No harm will be done to the country or to the department by disallowing the regulations, because it will be quite easy for the department to put up new ones framed in such a way as to meet with the wishes of members of this House. There will be no loss of revenue, except perhaps the loss of exploitation which these regulations would bring about. When discussing these regulations the Minister kept telling us that it was not the intention of the department to collect the fees. In answer to interjections, the Minister said the department could not very well collect the fees after it had been stated by the Minister that there would be no attempt to collect them, and he instanced the digester on the Table of the House. That is not the way Acts of Parliament or regulations are interpreted. The other day, before the select committee on electricity, the question arose as to the intention of certain words in the Act, and we were calmly told that the intention was

that expressed by Mr. Scaddan when moving the second reading of the Bill. No court would interpret an Act on those lines. The court takes as the interpretation the reasonable intention to be deduced from the words used. The Minister says there is no intention to impose fees on a digester such as this one, although a fee of £1 is provided; the department would not think of doing such a stupid thing. But the regulations provide that for every digester not exceeding 50 cubic feet capacity a fee of £1 shall be paid. No matter what the intention is, there is the law, and if any inspector liked to put that regulation into force, the owner of such a digester who had not registered could be adjudged guilty of an offence. The same applies to a little vulcaniser which anyone might have in his garage to mend a tyre. The Minister says there is no intention of imposing a fee on a vulcaniser, but the regulations provide that for every vulcaniser the fee shall be £1. We should not approve of regulations of this character. If the department do not intend to tax things of this kind, they should say so. They should state in words what they intend to tax and what they do not intend to tax. I have a statement from Mr. Crocker of the Perth Electricity Department, who complains that the whole of the fees for inspections are very much higher than under the old Act. That is quite true. He adds—

It is particularly objectionable that no provision is made for a reduced fee where more than one boiler or kind of machine is inspected on the same occasion. It was always recognised that an inspector, being on the premises, it was much less expensive to inspect several boilers or machines and, therefore, that the fee should be less for those in addition to the first one.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is one of my chief objections.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Quite so. If we disallow these regulations the department can put up a new schedule in accordance with what is fair and just to the users of the machines. Mr. Crocker added—

It seems to me that the whole of the new Act and regulations as designed and passed will have the effect of seriously hampering industrial undertakings, adding additional expense to such undertakings, creating a further number of classes of certified employees, creating an extensive and expensive additional Government department, and one which in the past has existed for the protection of the public and has fully fulfilled the requirements at a very much less expense.

Mr. Crocker has suggested another point which the House should seriously consider. The Minister asked—"Should the general revenue make a loss? Should the Act not be self-supporting?" No one will question that, although in other places, as the Minister has shown, this class of Act is not self-supporting.

If we approve of these fees, the department may increase its staff and then come along for more fees because the department is not paying. Then the staff may be increased again and more fees be sought, and where are we going to end? In the interests of industry, we should say to the department, "You may incur a reasonable cost for this work, but you shall go no further. We are not going to put into your hands the power of year by year increasing the cost, and then coming down with regulations to increase the fees." On these grounds I shall support the motion to disallow the regulations.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East—in reply) [8.16]: In replying to the criticisms on my motion, the Leader of the House made it his chief point that the department concerned should be self-supporting; and he said that the charges had been increased in order to obviate loss. But we have no guarantee that if these fees are permitted, there will be no loss to the department. If we had statistics indicating the various classes of machinery and the amount likely to be obtained in fees, we should then be able to form a fairly accurate estimate of the revenue. The answer given by the Leader of the House on this motion was very weak. It is the weakest case he has put up for some considerable time. I have looked up the revenue of the department for the past four years. The Leader of the House indicated ... last year the revenue was approximately £3,000, and he said that these increased charges were expected to yield a further £2,000. Thus the department say they are asking for a 40 per cent. increase in their revenue. The 40 per cent. may be an estimate covering the State, but since this matter has been raised here the mining companies on whose behalf chiefly I have moved the motion have furnished me with a list of the machinery of the following mines, chiefly in the Kalgoorlie district: The Associated Northern, Golden Horseshoe Estates, Ivanhoe Gold Corporation, Lake View, Great Boulder, South Kalgoorlie Consolidated, and Oroya Links, and also the Kalgoorlie Power Company. It appears that under the old rates those companies would pay £477 5s. for inspection of machinery, whereas under the new rates they would pay £910 5s., representing an increase of £433, or some 90 per cent. Let hon. members compare this with the departmental estimate of the increase as 40 per cent. The machinery covered by the list is 136 boilers, 105 motors, 27 air receivers, 36 winding engines, 27 hoists, and 4 gas engines. The industry is one which can ill afford to pay the present fees. The Leader of the House referred to my statements regarding the charge on winding engines, and I wish to correct an error I made. I stated the inspection fee at £1 10s; it is £1. While on the subject of winding engines I wish to supply an omission I made when moving my motion. I said that under the regulations it is provided that winding engines, as defined, worked other-

wise than by steam, shall bear a fee decided by the horse-power of the motor. The regulation continues, "The fee shall be double the fee in the above schedule." I have in mind the Celebration Mine at Celebration City, which has a gas engine of about 220 horse-power. The fee chargeable in respect of that engine would be £3, and if it is driven otherwise than by steam the fee is doubled. Thus the fee for a small engine would be £6. The Act also provides a fee for winding engines based on the diameter of the cylinder. As this is a hoist, there would, in addition to the double fee chargeable for the engine, be a further fee chargeable for the hoist. Mr. Duffell made reference to the department having charged for the time of an inspector who went to inspect a particular work. From some correspondence which should have reached me before I moved the motion, but only came to my hands on the following day, I want to quote an extract. It is an extract from a communication made by the Inspector of Machinery at Kalgoorlie to the Gwalia Consolidated Gold Mining Company at Leonora. The company had had a special inspection, for which a bill of £7 14s. was rendered. Among other things that bill contained a charge for office expenses, £1 5s. The company wrote the inspector—

With regard to the item of £7 14s., we do not agree to this amount, and we shall be glad if you will enlighten us as to why this has been charged. Apart from any other matter, we feel that the charge of £1 5s. for office expenses is altogether over the odds.

This inspector replied to the company—

As the charges are strictly in accordance with the Chief Inspector's instructions, it would perhaps be best to write direct to him on the matter.

This is a case where the company would have to close their mine down in order to have the whole of the machinery inspected at one time. Not desiring to adopt that expedient, they had a portion of the machinery inspected; and the second inspection was a special one. For this they were charged 25s. as being portion of the inspector's time. The company, in my opinion rightly, objected to the charge. Further, they are charged such items as rail and motor fares, salary, sustenance, and office expenses. No vouchers are produced to the company, and they have no means of checking the amounts. I mention these matters to show that the departmental charges are unwarrantably high. As to the department's revenue, it appears that during the years from 1918 to 1921 the amount has been fairly even for boilers, though it was a shade more for machinery latterly. These facts show that the department have not received any considerable additional revenue for the number of inspections they have made. I should like to learn how the department arrive at the increased cost, which they state as equal to 40 per cent. of the revenue. Of thorough inspections of boilers the average for the four years was 1,385.

Applying that number to the department's revenue for boilers, it appears that each thorough inspection averages 42s. 9d. There is an average of 156 working inspections, and if we add these to the number of thorough inspections the average works out at 38s. 6d. per boiler. The Leader of the House said that it was hardly fair to go from the minimum to the maximum, and pointed out that there were only 50 boilers on the highest fee. I believe that is substantially correct. The major portion of the boilers are used in the gold-mining industry. I give these statistics in order to demonstrate that the average fee which the department receive from the small boilers, as low as 8 horse-power, up to the maximum, runs out at 42s. 9d. The hon. gentleman said that no fee was chargeable for digesters. The regulations, however, distinctly say, "For every digester." If it is not for every digester, let us say, "For some of the digesters." The Leader of the House further stated that the fee could not apply to vulcanisers used by private persons. But the regulation provides so much for every vulcaniser, and so much for every steam-jacketed vessel. It also says, "For every boiler." If the fee is not applicable to every digester and every vulcaniser, is it going to be applicable to every boiler? I say it is. If it is going to be applicable to every boiler, then in turn it will be applicable to everything else the department choose. I brought a small motor into the Chamber, and the Leader of the House questioned my methods in bringing such a small motor into the discussion, and rather ridiculed my action. But the position is very clearly set out in Section 4 of the Act—

This Act shall not apply to any boiler or machinery if such machinery is driven by a motor as defined of which the power is less than one horse power.

Anything from one horse power upwards comes within the scope of "group of machinery," and the minimum charge for a group of machinery is 5s. Looking over the records of the department I find that the total machinery inspections made for 1918-19-20 were 3,464, 3,462, and 3,247, while in 1921 the total was 4,189. The total engine certificates issued without fees were: 1918, 567; 1919, 556; 1920, 562, and 1921, 630. It has been suggested that the purpose of the Act was not to widen the scope afforded for bringing in fees; but I should like to know how many engines previously certificated without fee will continue to have certificates issued for which there are no fees? The regulations provide for extra search fees, extra fees for special visits, and extra fees for digesters. It is quite new to have fees for vulcanisers, steam-jacketed vessels, receivers for both air and gas, Holman hoists, and other winding engines of the classes defined. These are all new, and should considerably augment the revenue of the department. Again, there are the double fees for winding engines driven by gas producers.

Why these fees have been imposed, it is difficult to imagine. Then the new industries which we hope shall be created will all be driven by some form of power coming within the scope of the Act, and so will tend to augment the fees collected by the department. However, I leave it to hon. members to say whether the fees imposed are equitable or whether they are excessive.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	5

Majority for .. 10

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. A. Creig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

MOTION—IMMIGRATION, STATE-WIDE SCHEME.

Debate resumed from the 14th September, on the following motion by Hon. G. W. Miles—

That in the opinion of this House, the Government should, at once, enter into negotiations with the Imperial and Commonwealth authorities in order to arrange joint schemes for development and migration, which shall apply not only to the South-West Division of the State, but also to Eucla, Central, Eastern, North-West, and Kimberley Divisions.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.24]: First of all I wish to congratulate Mr. Miles on the work he has done in making known throughout the Empire the necessity for peopling this part of the Empire. The people of the North, of the State, of the Commonwealth, and of the Empire owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Miles for the work he has done. I am sorry, however, that the hon. member should have tangled up with this Empire question a proposal which does not meet with my approval. When the hon. member is on the question of peopling the empty North, he is doing good work. The present position, as outlined in Press cables which we see, not in the Press, but posted up in shop windows, emphasises the menace of the empty North. So far back as 1820 the Imperial Government sent out two warships

to examine the harbours on our North coast between Derby and Wyndham. Even then the authorities realised the necessity for giving attention to that portion of Western Australia. In view of recent developments that necessity is much more urgent to-day than it was 100 years ago. Again, 120 years ago a French navigator cruising around the North-West coast reported—the report is to be seen in the records of the Lands Department—that in one of those harbours he saw 22 Malay ships engaged in slave trading, pearl-shell fishing, and goodness knows what not. When we remember that 120 years ago those Malay vessels could lie in there and only by accident be discovered, we must realise that we are up against a much more serious proposition to-day than obtained then. Mr. Miles complained that the Premier had not given full attention to his proposal. I think the hon. member has been treated fairly well. I myself have much more serious cause of complaint against the Premier. Three years ago the Premier asked me to take the chairmanship of a committee to inquire into and report on the best means of settling that big stretch of country up North. That committee was composed of practical men. I knew the shipping and business side of the question, and I selected Mr. Blythe, whose father went to Kimberley man years ago and reared a family of sons. I do not know how much the sons made, but they sold one station for something like £80,000. Another member of the committee was Mr. Percy Hutton, who came from the Eastern States to manage Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel's big stations, but quickly discovered that it was more profitable in that country to have a station of his own. The fourth member of the committee was Mr. Durack, whose people 35 years ago came overland from Queensland to Kimberley, taking 2½ years on the journey, and pioneered that country successfully. That committee three years ago put up a proposal to the Premier. However, nothing eventuated, or at most Mr. Easton was sent up there to examine and report; there the matter ended. So Mr. Miles has not a very great deal to complain of when he says the Premier has not taken his scheme in both hands.

Hon. T. Moore: Two wrongs never make a right.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have yet to be satisfied that Mr. Miles's scheme is right. The members of that committee recommended that on the rich country along the rivers and on the basalt a quarter of a million acres was sufficient, and in the rough country a million acres. But under Mr. Miles' proposal it is set out that 200,000 acres of inferior country will be sufficient. Our committee provided that no one should be put into that country without previous experience. We pointed out that a lot of people in the agricultural areas, with a thousand acres, if they did not understand agriculture only had to look over their fence to see what their practical neighbour was doing

and then do likewise. But when we put people 25 miles apart and never give them a chance of seeing each other, except perhaps once or twice a year, it is hopeless to expect the inexperienced to carry on the undertaking successfully. We urged that the people who were put into those areas should be experienced men, and, further, that they should have financial backing to see them through the first five years. The proposal now is to put inexperienced men in doubtful country. Who are we going to send? If people desire to go there now there is nothing to prevent them doing so. The peculiar thing is that people looking for pastoral country do not appear to have taken up the whole of the areas which Mr. Miles claims are available. According to the plans it certainly looks as if somebody has been through and taken that which they thought was good and left that which they thought was bad. I am not speaking without knowledge of this country, and I am not speaking as one of the creakers referred to by Mr. Miles. Whilst, perhaps, I do not have much to say as to the possibilities of the State, I am doing what very few people in Western Australia are doing at the present time, I am demonstrating to a large extent by the expenditure of money—I am spending it like water, some people would say—what can be done in a recognised rainfall area in a time of drought. The first essential in connection with any proposition, pastoral or agricultural, is rainfall, and at the right time of the year, too. Personally, I am a convert to the American theory that all land is good provided you have rainfall. With rainfall you can apply science to agriculture and you can get good results. The one redeeming feature in the Premier's South-West scheme is that there is an assured rainfall. The Imperial Government recognised that. We are told that the people in the old country did not know anything about these matters. But let hon. members read the agreement between the Imperial authorities and the Western Australian Government and they will express the belief that those people had lived in Western Australia all their lives. They have provided for every pitfall and every contingency.

The Minister for Education: The Premier drew up that agreement.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then I should like to make agreements with the Premier every day of the week; it would not be necessary to call in my solicitor to assist me. Mr. Miles has told us what can be done, provided the State Government or the Commonwealth Government assist by way of furnishing the interest for the first five years. I suppose I am taking up a reasonable attitude when I say the British people are likely to pay more attention to the Premier of Western Australia than to the hon. member. I do not say that out of disrespect, I say it because the Premier's position commands more respect and carries more weight. I intend to tell the House what the Premier told the people of the old country.

Hon. T. Moore: I wish you would.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I shall also tell the House afterwards what the British people in the agreement told the Premier. Let me refer first to the "Daily Mail of the 20th May, 1922. We find there an article by Sir James Mitchell under the headings "Farms given away." "How to get them." The article reads:—

The scene is in the bush in my own country of Western Australia. The fire that has been lit more for cheerfulness sake than for warmth flings dancing light and shadows on the huge boles that hark the forest wall. The little band of youths and men who are hewing out homes for themselves on the timber covered slopes lean on the big logs or lie on heaps of leaves around the companionable blaze.

This is what he told the British people. The article continues—

They are tired after a hard day's toil that roughens and toughens the body but keeps the mind clean. A rustle in the forest tells of some innocent creature of the wild astir. For what are these men working? Immediately and visibly, for the Government subsistence allowance of 9s. or 10s. a day. But they are doing something more than that. They are working for themselves; they are paying their own wages; and the Government of Western Australia is lending them the money to do it.

That is what the Premier put up to the people of the Old Country.

Hon. H. Seddon: No wonder they are coming out.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is the article signed Micawber?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is what the Premier put up to the people of the Old Country. What did he get? He got the promise of a rebate of one-third interest—the Commonwealth Government are to provide the other third—on six millions of money for five years only, on certain conditions. The conditions are that he must bring 75,000 people to the State, I think to the South-West. It is a fine point as to whether it is to the South-West or to the State; that is not quite clear.

The Minister for Education: Chiefly in the South-West.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: He has to establish 6,000 of them on farms in the South-West, and when they are established the Imperial Government will rebate one-third of the interest for five years—they do not borrow any money, they only come in on the rebate of the interest. They say "When you have done this work, we will rebate the interest." The sum of £1,000 is to be the maximum expenditure for each settler established.

The Minister for Education: That is the maximum that is to be provided for any one settler.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is the same thing.

The Minister for Education: No. A lot of the money may be used for a different purpose altogether.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In this case we do not get any rebate of interest. But 6,000 people must be settled in the South-West and the total expenditure on each is not to be more than £1,000. In that way we get the £6,000,000, and when we have done that the Imperial Government will rebate a third of the interest for five years. The Premier told the people he had six millions to spend, and those who hope to participate in this expenditure entertained him after a torch-light procession through the streets. But the rebate of interest will be made on condition that we bring 75,000 people to the country and of that number place 6,000 in the South-West. If we bring only a third of the 75,000 here, the Imperial Government will say that they will provide only a third of the interest, namely £333 6s. 8d. and the rebate will be on that amount instead of the thousand pounds.

Hon. H. Stewart: There will be no trouble in bringing 75,000 people here, if they cost nothing, but the trouble will be in keeping them here.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Government undertake that they will find employment in the country for them.

Hon. T. Moore: The Government undertake to keep them here.

Hon. H. Stewart: The records show that they do not stay here.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You are not juggling sufficiently with the figures.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am getting down to facts. The State Government undertakes to see that all migrants are placed in suitable employment in country districts. It would have been far better if we had gone on in our own way. We should establish our own people in our own way, pay our five or six per cent. and have done with it. We should not impose all these conditions. The Premier does not draw up agreements as well as he manages Parliament in another place. I find from the agreement that the State Government will provide each settler to whom a farm is allotted with reasonable stock and equipment. I presume that is in addition to the £1,000.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: What has that to do with Mr. Miles' speech?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Miles wants the Government to negotiate for other schemes in other divisions. I do not want a scheme of this kind in any division. I want something much better. The Empire Settlement Act of 1922 provides that the Imperial Government can take responsibility for half the cost extending over a period of 15 years. If there is one country that is entitled to the full consideration of the Act, surely it is this big empty portion of the Commonwealth! We get one-third of the interest rebated for five years under the agreement. I should say, when the British Parliament put through a Bill like that, providing for half the responsibility for 15 years as a maximum, they were prepared to make agreements under these conditions for some portion of the Empire, and there is no better part of the Empire

than Western Australia, and no place where a greater necessity exists for such a thing than in this State.

Hon. H. Stewart: Or that deserves it more.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill provides for half the cost to be borne by the Imperial Government over a period of 15 years, but the agreement provides for one-third of the cost being borne by the Imperial Government for five years.

Hon. J. Ewing: Is the cost limited?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It provides for £1,000 per man—75,000 people and 6,000 settlers and for a rebate of interest on six million pounds. That is followed up by the provision that the £1,000 per man is contingent upon our taking 75,000 people.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Has that been signed or is it a draft agreement?

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is only a proposed agreement.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Leader of the House can say whether this is an original document or whether it is only a draft. On the last page it is said that the agreement is ready for signature when Mr. Hughes authorises a signature on behalf of the Commonwealth. This is put up to the House as an agreement.

Hon. A. Sanderson: You cannot call it an agreement until it is signed.

The Minister for Education: The agreement has been signed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Prime Minister has advised the Government by telegram that he has, by cable, authorised the High Commissioner of Australia to sign on behalf of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Has Western Australia signed?

The Minister for Education: Yes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This is the agreement the Premier announced upon his return had been entered upon. He told us he had six millions of money to be spent in the South-West. He has nothing of the kind. They said to the Premier, "It is all very well telling us that men build their own homes and pay their own wages in Western Australia, and that the Government are lending them money with which to do it: you go back and do it, and then come back to us and we will rebate portion of the interest." Mr. Miles says that, provided he can get either the State or the Commonwealth Government to guarantee 5 per cent. for five years on a total outlay of two million pounds, he has a scheme for the establishment of 100 sheep or cattle stations upon an area of approximately twenty million acres. The Leader of the House says this is doubtful country. I know it is. Anyone who knows anything about the proposal would not dream of spending some two millions pounds on 100 stations in that locality. We are told the carrying capacity of the land is 10,000 sheep for 200,000 acres, or 2,000 cattle. There is no hope of its carrying that.

Hon. J. A. Greig: What do you think it will carry?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I cannot tell what the unoccupied country will carry. Some selections have been made there and presumably the best land has been picked out.

Hon. J. A. Greig: What are the stations that have been selected now carrying?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Speaking generally, in the safe areas half a million acres at least are required, year in and year out, to carry 15,000 sheep. No one would dream of spending £25,000 on a station to carry only 10,000 sheep. That would be out of all reason. A man would not expect to spend more than £5,000 or £10,000 on such a station in the locality referred to. They can only be looked upon as breeding stations, and I would not have one even for that purpose. Unless I had country in a safe area on which to put stock in case of drought, I would not touch it. Those who have land in safe areas are the people who should pioneer that country in favourable seasons. No one is developing it at all at present. The money with which they should be developing their country is taken by the State and Federal Taxation Departments to boost up the Federal capital city and other undertakings. I will tell hon. members what happened in the case of a Kimberley station last year. Some cattle were to be sold to the Wyndham Freezing Works, but the Wyndham Freezing Works did not operate. The station, however, had to be carried on at a cost of about £2,000. One good horse was sold for £25 and approximately 2,500 calves were branded. The Federal Government said the income from the station was £5,025—2,500 calves at £2, equalling £5,000, and the sale of the one horse £25, making an aggregate of £5,025, less £2,000 for the carrying on of the station. That position has been altered to some extent, but no great relief has been afforded to the pastoralist. The men who should be developing this country and pushing out into other places are being hampered in this way by taxation. The industry has been brought to a standstill. To overcome this difficulty we are now faced with two more trading concerns, one an agricultural trading concern in the South-West and the other a pastoral trading concern in the North. The Government are asked to guarantee these trading concerns for the first five years, and after that they will have to stand upon their own bottoms. The difference between these trading concerns and others is that in the case of State trading concerns the Government get any profit there is. Under these proposals, if there is a loss, the Government foot the bill, whereas if there is a profit either the pastoralists or the agriculturists are to get it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you say this scheme I am putting up is a trading concern?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is Government money that would be used. It is proposed to form a syndicate which will do something which those who understand the business say cannot be done, conditionally on the Government guaranteeing interest for the

first five years. I do not want to condemn the proposal. I want to see this country prosper, for everything I have is centred in it. I do not want to see schemes put up that will reflect upon this country. We ought to put up our best schemes first, and later on we may be able to do something more. If we want to establish confidence amongst the British money lenders we should put up our best schemes first. There is any amount of room in the Kimberleys for cattle and sheep within safe areas and in safe rainfall. I go nap on the safe rainfall. I would not ask anyone politically or otherwise to put a penny piece into a pastoral or an agricultural concern that I would not invest in myself. Until I know something more about the country referred to by Mr. Miles I will not be a party to putting people upon it when we have plenty of safe country we can make available. The Empire builders all say we must begin at the safe place. If Mr. Miles will put up a proposal for the safe rainfall area in the Kimberleys, or along the coast, and make the proposition a reasonable and a sound one, I will support it. I say, with all respect to the hon. member, he will not accept advice from those who understand. He listens to people who do not know very much about the business. I heard this remark in a theatre and I have always remembered it, "If the stomach is sick, send for the physician; if the heart is sick, send for the woman." Those are very safe lines to go on. If one wants to know anything about agriculture, one should go to someone who understands it. The same may be said in regard to the pastoral industry. If the hon. member would carry out this principle, and would bring up a proposal that had the endorsement of people who know, he would get plenty of support from us here.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government classifiers must know something about the business.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know all about the Government classifiers. Some eight years ago I put 6,000 strong wethers on the country referred to, and after 10 months the mortality amongst the sheep represented a loss to me of £4,000. While I agree with the motion, I cannot endorse it, if it is proposed to follow the lines of the South-West agreement. As I said at the outset, while agreeing with the motion, I regret that Mr. Miles has put up what I regard as the worst proposal first. There are plenty of good propositions that could be advanced. If we are to bring people here and establish them in our country, then there should be no speculation about the business. We must be pretty sure of our ground. I am prepared to support all practical proposals that may be advanced to further the interests of the country. Anyone reading the agreement entered into in connection with the South-West proposal will come to the conclusion that they know as much about Western Australia at Home as we do. They know where we should

begin and where we should end. Mr. Miles cannot object to my criticising his proposal at this stage and say that I am criticising it at the eleventh hour. He knows that before he went to England, I beseeched him not to put up any such proposal to the British public. I told him that it was no good going to the British people and talking to them about negotiating with the Government for 32,000,000 acres of country. What is the good of telling people that? They know that under our Land Act the limit is set at a million acres. To tell them that one is negotiating for 32,000,000 acres of country is little less than absurd. If the hon. member wished to go forward with any such scheme, I advised him that he should get his concession from Parliament first and then go to the British public and tell them what he had obtained. In these circumstances, seeing that I spoke to him along these lines before he went to England, he cannot blame me if I criticise the scheme now, seeing that I criticised it before he left the country. I am prepared to support any practical scheme for the development of this country. In the recognition of the possibilities of this State, I give way to no man. During the last 5, 10 or 15 years, evidence of what can be done with this country has been furnished where I did not think such results were possible. I believe that we must have in mind the importance of rain in connection with any scheme that is advanced for the development of this State, and any such proposal must refer to land within the recognised rainfall area. If any such scheme is confined to that area, and the science of agriculture is applied, one can get almost anything desired from the land in Western Australia. Any proposal put up to this House or to the British public must be on sound lines. It must be equitable and must originate in safe country. Let us establish our development in safe country and we can deal with the doubtful country afterwards. I do not know that I need add anything further, except to say that I support the motion and regret that the hon. member, in moving the motion, set up what I regard as a most doubtful scheme, particularly when there are so many good workable schemes that can be advanced. Of those schemes, there was the one evolved by practical men who had pioneered the Kimberleys. That scheme was submitted three years ago, and it could be analysed by Mr. Miles. There was no doubt in that proposal as to the rainfall, nor was there any doubt as to the country. We have had no explanation as to why that scheme was abandoned. It would appear that the Imperial Government adopt the attitude that Australia should people the north and the newcomers from England should be allowed to settle in the south. If the Imperial authorities adopt that view, it becomes the duty of the Government to deal with the proposition, and to put up a scheme to move our own people north and replace them by newcomers in the south. I support

the motion, and will give general support to any equitable scheme.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.5]: A question of such importance cannot go through without discussion. We have had two admirable speeches on the subject, but we have to realise our responsibilities as legislators in this great State. I look at the matter from a point of view entirely different from that of Mr. Miles, and even from that of Mr. Holmes, although they both speak with a special knowledge of the north country. I certainly congratulate Mr. Miles on the work he did for Western Australia while on his visit to Europe and America. What, however, is the essence of the contract so far as we, the general taxpayers of this country, are concerned? Do we think that we, by ourselves, can build up the Empire and make a great addition to this country and to Australia, as well as to the Imperial assets? I say point blank that we cannot. We have not got the men nor have we got the money. One of the first requisites to success in any venture is to recognise freely our limitations and what we are setting out to do. If the British Government are coming into this scheme, it is difficult, from an Imperial point of view, to put up the figures as to what is necessary for the development of the country, just as it is difficult to put up definite figures as to what population is necessary for the defence of this country. I put this to Mr. Miles, with his special knowledge of the financial conditions of this State, the Commonwealth and of London. I will not deal with any specific proposal that may be advanced. Is the British investor, or the man representing British investor, is the banker or the man controlling a large amount of capital, having responsibilities to clients for the money he controls, to subscribe to Government loans and, on the other hand, is he to support private enterprise in Western Australia? With his special knowledge—I will assume that he has special knowledge of Australia and also assume that he is perfectly reasonable as to his patriotism, not a wild extravagant patriotism, but the sound, sane patriotism possessed by that class in London, with a keen desire to see the Empire expand—does he think such investors would not realise the necessity for any scheme for the advancement of the State being put on a sound foundation? I ask Mr. Miles, having in view these aspects, whether he would recommend anyone under the present conditions in this State to put money into private enterprise here? I am not dealing with any specific proposal. If the British investor can get six per cent. for money with an Imperial, State, and Commonwealth guarantee for his interest, and the whole capital is repayable on fixed terms, can we offer him, from the private enterprise point of view, anything much better so far as Western Australia is concerned? I do not think it is possible under present conditions to get a penny

piece in England for any large scheme of private enterprise in Western Australia, unless one exploits the Government, which is a big industry in this State at the present time, to guarantee capital or interest. That, however, is opening up another story. If we take the two points of view I have mentioned, what are we to embark upon? Are we to advocate a scheme to load up the country with an added public debt? Are our people not taxed sufficiently, from a financial point of view, already? How many people who have invested their money here, be the amount large or small, will say that every six months they get their interest regularly and do not lose a penny piece of their money? That is a magnificent record. It is put up by the British investor. I ask Mr. Miles whether he wishes us as residents in Western Australia—and we may look upon ourselves in this Chamber more or less as permanent residents, both in ourselves and the people we represent—to take the responsibility of loading the country with another six million or ten million pounds debt? I think that is not an unfair statement.

Member: It is a question of two millions.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am not dealing with any specific amount. The amount is immaterial. It does not come into the argument. We must decide on the main issue. I frankly admit that, without wishing to be in any sense a croaker, and whilst recognising what a magnificent heritage we have, I am much concerned as to whether we are putting it on a sound foundation. It would be absurd to say that the next few generations will see Western Australia develop to its limit. All we can do is to place the work upon a sound foundation, on which those who come after us can build. I ask anyone who has made an agreement of this character or who brings forward a proposition urging the Government to enter into further negotiations with the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments, if he means that we will load ourselves with a further liability? Does anyone think it is a sound proposition, either for ourselves or for the people we represent?

Hon. G. W. Miles: If we have the organisation to absorb more people, it is sound.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If this State development business will work out well, Mr. Miles has gained his point, but certainly we have not great evidence of it at present. I do not wish to prejudice, or in any way deery the performance of the Premier and the agreement he has made in connection with the immigration proposals. I do not think it makes much difference whether we criticise him or help him. We must recognise that the great bulk of the people are looking after themselves. They have come here to benefit themselves from a cash point of view. If one benefits himself from a cash point of view, he will, whether he likes it or not, benefit the country he lives in and the Empire to which he belongs. The essence of this proposition is that the Government of Western Australia shall be practically the only means of communication by which the British capital will

flow into Western Australia. If people are determined to have it so, I do not think we can do anything else at the present juncture. I agree with Mr. Holmes, that unless one has his concession from the Government, it is idle to ask the people in England to embark upon any such scheme.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We are not asking for anything until the Government consider the proposal.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We are dealing with a specific motion. It is perfectly clear.

The PRESIDENT: You will notice that the motion does not refer to any particular scheme.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I know, and that is why I do not wish to discuss any particular scheme. I do not think it is fair to the scheme or to the motion before us, but I ask the hon. member whether we should not first decide whether we are going to continue on the lines of State development or throw open this country to private enterprise. Looking at the past history of this State when did we have one magnificent development and spurt from 1892 to 1901. How did it come about? From private enterprise, from people drawn from all parts of the world. They did magnificent work, but what happened? The whole State was taken in hand on lines of development, partly due to traditions of the Crown colony regime and partly to the system which obtained in other States, and we handed on the system of Government development. Having started on that system, it is difficult to say where we are going to stop. Now we have arrived at the position when everyone on our side is complaining against State enterprise, and yet we are loaded up to our necks with it. Does the hon. member wish to continue this? It does not matter whether the Imperial Government or the Federal Government undertake the work; from the State point of view it would be private enterprise.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I prefer private enterprise.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: It is not a question of preferring private enterprise. The question is whether the hon. member thinks the State Government should be permitted to enter into negotiations. If we send our Premier back to England, we might be confronted with another agreement like the one before us. This is a draft agreement—

The Minister for Education: Within the last few days the Prime Minister has signed it.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I should hesitate to repudiate a Premier who has gone to England and made what he considers the best terms with the Imperial Government. It would be a very serious responsibility to repudiate his action. Apparently we cannot even do that. It is signed, sealed and delivered by the three parties. Even if the State wished to withdraw from the agreement, it could not do so.

The Minister for Education: If we do not carry it out, that is the end of it. If we do not like it, there is no harm done.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is important.

Hon. H. Stewart: That aspect is being gradually developed.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Quite so; day by day we are gaining a little more valuable information regarding the Premier's agreement. Returning to the motion, if it will give the hon. member any pleasure, I shall support him; but I do not think the motion will make the slightest difference. I do not think the Premier will go to England again. He has quite enough on his hands with his own agreement. I should like to send him back to repudiate his agreement, but I do not think his colleagues would let him go.

Hon. H. Stewart: He could hardly get another halo.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If the people of this country have definitely decided on State enterprise, I cannot see how it is going to work out with benefit to them. Nothing has been said during the debate on this motion to indicate that we shall benefit. If this motion is to be a kind of grand finale to the hon. member's return from his world tour, just as the Premier had his at the picture palace, I would suggest that we pass the motion in recognition of the good work the hon. member has done for the country. But as a serious contribution to the problem of looking after the electors of Western Australia, I cannot see that either this motion or the Premier's agreement will in any degree benefit the people we represent. I think the draft agreement will lead to serious financial embarrassment. I do not suppose the hon. member thinks his motion will be of the slightest practical value.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not think it will, with the crowd we have in office.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Is the hon. member prepared to assist to get them out?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We are making advances day by day. I warmly congratulate the hon. member on having elicited that valuable information which we shall be able to use later on.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Harris, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.22 p.m..