

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 30th October, 1929.

	PAGE
Question: State Labour Bureau	1226
Bills: Aborigines Act Amendment, 1r.	1226
Agricultural Products, report	1226
Dried Fruits Act Continuance, report	1226
High School Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1226
Mental Deficiency, 1r.	1231
Industries Assistance, 1r.	1231
Main Roads Act Amendment, Com.	1231
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2r.	1236
Vermitt Act Amendment, Com.	1237

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

QUESTION—STATE LABOUR BUREAU.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary,—1, What was the number of applicants for employment at the State Labour Bureau for the months of July, August, September, and October? 2, What were the engagements each month—(a) by Government departments; (b) by municipal authorities; (c) by other employers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, July, 2,468; August, 2,202; September, 1,844; October 1st to 29th, 1,864. 2, (a) July, 217; August, 85; September, 56; October 1st to 29th, 75. (b) Nil. (c) July, 260; August, 320; September, 306; October, 1st to 29th, 350.

BILL—ABORIGINES ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Honorary Minister and read a first time.

BILLS (2)—REPORTS OF COMMITTEE.

- 1, Agricultural Products.
 - 2, Dried Fruits Act Continuance.
- Adopted.

BILL—HIGH SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: I had hoped that in introducing this Bill very few words would have been neces-

sary from me in commending it and explaining it to the House. Unfortunately however, and very unexpectedly, certain opposition arose from a quarter that to me a any rate was least expected. No doubt members have read the various memoranda which have been sent out by the Diocesan Council of the Anglican Church protesting against the Bill. I am glad to say that, as a result of an interview between the chairman of the governors of the High School and some members of the Diocesan Council their opposition has been withdrawn on certain conditions. The diocesan secretary Mr. Fisher, has requested that the correspondence that passed between the governors of the High School and the Diocesan Council should be read to the House, in order that it may be recorded in "Hansard." It is my intention to read that correspondence in conformity with their wishes, and unfortunately that will involve me in making explanations and introducing an aspect to this Bill that I had hoped to avoid. To explain the opinion that arose it is necessary for me to acquaint the House with a certain amount of ancient history concerning secondary education in this State. In 1858 Bishop Hale, of the Church of England, was the first person to start a secondary school for education. He had certain ideals which were common at that day. Ideals in education have, of course, very much changed since then. When Bishop Hale started what was then known as Bishop Hale's School, he did so in order that a Church of England school might be founded, at which one of the subjects at any rate was that the scriptures should be taught in their original tongue. The constitution of the school consisted of its being governed by a body of persons, all being members of the Church of England, and three of whom had to be clergymen of that church. One of the conditions laid down was that the head master should also be a clergyman of the Church of England. The school flourished for a time. It started with 23 boys. It was largely supported through the pecuniary assistance of Bishop Hale himself. This involved him in considerable financial sacrifices in order to keep the school going. As one can realise, in 1858 the community was a scattered one; the people were poor, and it was a very hard task to keep a school of that kind

going. Bishop Hale made great sacrifices. It is extraordinary the number of boys who attended that school and who subsequently distinguished themselves in the history of the State. After a few years the school fell into financial difficulties. It then received a subsidy from the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and the name was altered to the Church of England Collegiate School. The constitution remained the same. This also had a chequered financial career, and Bishop Hale being translated to Brisbane as Bishop of that city, and his support, I suppose, then being withdrawn, the time came when the school would have been closed but for the fact that one of the masters who was there at the time, Mr. E. W. Haynes, afterwards known as Colonel Haynes, by arrangement with the church authorities, took it over as a private school, of course with the favour of those who had been running it. The same boys went from the Church of England Collegiate School to Mr. Haynes' school, but it was entirely a private institution and no longer under the direction of the Church of England. If it was impossible for the church to run the school, it very soon became apparent that Mr. Haynes could not do so from the financial point of view. An agitation then arose that the State itself should support a secondary school. In 1875, long before the days of responsible government, after very considerable opposition a Bill was passed through the Legislative Council of that day. The principal provisions of that Bill I have not been able to ascertain. In its passage through the Council it met with strenuous opposition, and on being presented to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the approval of His Majesty, it was disallowed. In the following year, 1876, another Bill was introduced to the Legislative Council, known as the High School Act, 1876, as a result of which the High School was established. It provided that the governors of the school should be appointed by the Governor in Council. It also provided that the education at the school should be exclusively secular and that the headmaster, instead of being a minister of religion, should be a university graduate and not a minister of religion. The school received a subsidy from the State, but that was subsequently withdrawn in 1912. Those are the facts. There is no dispute

whatever about them. The High School was established under the auspices of the State; the governors were nominated by the Governor in Council; the school was entirely devoted to secular education, and the headmaster was to be other than a minister of religion. It was mainly through the influence of the late Hon. George Randell, who was a member of the Legislative Council at that time, that the Act was passed. Of course, Mr. Haynes' school had been struggling along, and, by arrangement, the High School took over the boys from Mr. Haynes, and Mr. Haynes himself went to the High School as second master. He could not be headmaster because he was not a university graduate although a capable teacher. These are facts that cannot be disputed, and they show exactly the connection between Bishop Hale's School and the High School as it is to-day. But the interpretation placed upon those facts has given rise to considerable controversy. On one hand, there are a certain few of the old boys of Bishop Hale's School who never identified themselves with the High School. Mr. Alfred Burt is one of them, and they maintain there is no connection between Bishop Hale's School and the High School. On the other hand, there is Sir Walter James, who was one of the first boys to attend High School. He has a legal mind and has written—

Since the first boy attended on the opening day in 1858 of Bishop Hale's School, there is a continuing chain, without one missing link, binding the lad who joined yesterday with the oldest and first scholar—L. S. Eliot C.M.G., I.S.O.

That is the opinion of a trained legal mind. I have not a trained legal mind, but I should say that while there is a chain and there are links, those links have been twisted and wrenched, but never broken. I would prefer to adopt another simile and say that just as the phoenix arises from the ashes of a pre-existing phoenix, so has the High School risen from the ashes of Bishop Hale's School through the medium of Mr. Haynes' private school. There is, however, this important difference that whereas the phoenix arose from the ashes of an identical bird that was its parent, the High School is not identical with Bishop Hale's School, but is of a different plumage altogether. One of the grounds upon which the Diocesan Council protested against the High School adopting the name of Hale—it will be noticed that we are not asking permis-

sion to adopt the name "Bishop Hale," which is an important difference—as set out in the memorandum that has been circulated among members of the House, is that they say Bishop Hale established a school for boys with the declared object of teaching them the Scriptures in the original tongues. That may have been one of the ideals of the founder, but it was not capable of realisation. I do not suppose there is a secondary school in Australia to-day where the Scriptures are taught in the original form in the Greek or Hebrew language.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Were they the original tongues?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: So far as I know. I should imagine that was what was in Bishop Hale's mind.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The original tongues may have included Arabic as well.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Another ground of objection raised by the Diocesan Council is that the education to be given at the High School, as set out in the High School Act, is exclusively secular. That is quite true, but I think it is well known to the Diocesan Council that the governors of the High School, while conforming strictly to the spirit of that Act, have perhaps somewhat ignored the letter of it, inasmuch as for quite a number of years the day's programme at the school has always been opened with prayers read by the headmaster, and with the reading of a chapter from the Scriptures. The parents of every boy who attends the school are informed of that fact, and the intimation is conveyed to them that if they do not wish their boys to attend, the latter need not present themselves at the school until later on. As a matter of fact, I do not know that it will astonish members of this Chamber when I inform them that parents of all creeds or no creed, or even of creeds such as that of the Jews, send their boys along and are not offended because prayers and a chapter from the Bible are read in the presence of the pupils. Although the Diocesan Council base their opposition to our adoption of the name of Hale for the school on that ground, it is perfectly well known to them that the school does open in the way I have mentioned. The governors of the High School did not embark upon the framing of the Bill now before hon. members without seeking the permission of the Hale family. The representatives of that family who are still alive have

always been pleased to have their father's name connected with the High School, and in 1914 they gave their permission for the adoption by the High School of Bishop Hale's coat of arms as the school badge. When I was away during the war, I happened to meet Mrs. Bisdee, a daughter of Bishop Hale and the wife of Colonel Bisdee, the first Australian to win the Victoria Cross, which he earned in the South African war. In conversation with me, she expressed the appreciation of the family at having their father's name perpetuated in that way. Mr. Harold Hale, a son of Bishop Hale, forwarded a photograph of his father to be hung in the High School building. Before the governors embarked upon this scheme, they sought the permission of Mr. Hale to have his father's name associated with the present school, and they received a telegram from him expressing his great appreciation of the compliment and honour done to his father's memory. I myself received a letter from Mr. Harold Hale, who was an old Cambridge friend of mine, and was in Western Australia in connection with the Forrest River Mission. While in the Kimberleys he had the misfortune to be speared in the arm, which became paralysed, and he had to give up his work. The letter was dated the 25th September, 1929, and was as follows:—

It was a great pleasure to see your name amongst those of the governors of Perth High School, who have been responsible for such kind thought for the memory of my father. You will have seen my letter to the chairman telling how greatly I appreciated this.

Having received the sanction of the Hale family, it came to us as a surprise when the Diocesan Council saw fit to lodge a protest on the grounds I have mentioned. One would not have been surprised if the Diocesan Council had thought fit to associate any of the Anglican schools, which they themselves have established in Western Australia, with the name of Bishop Hale. Although they have started three secondary schools for boys and three for girls, they have not seen fit to honour the name of Bishop Hale in any way. I am afraid that this protest is perhaps in the nature of an afterglow of the intense sectarianism that used to prevail many years ago. I am glad to know that the spirit of sectarianism has died down to a large extent. As hon. members can see, at the time the High School was started, it was so intense that provision was made that the teaching in the school

should be entirely secular. Only the other day I attended a luncheon held by the Presbyterian Church in connection with its jubilee in this State. I think it was His Excellency the Governor who, during the course of the speeches at the luncheon, referred to the excellent relationship that existed between the churches of the different denominations in this State. He said he had been informed that this was probably largely due to the influence of the late Archbishop Riley. I notice that in yesterday's "West Australian" there appeared a statement by Archbishop Mannix regarding the appointment of Mr. Scullin to the high position of Prime Minister of Australia. In his comments, Archbishop Mannix alluded to the fact that Mr. Scullin was the first member of the Roman Catholic Church to be the Prime Minister of Australia, and he paid a tribute to the Australian people for the tolerance they exhibited in religious matters. For once, at any rate, I agree with Archbishop Mannix, and I was delighted to notice that he commended the spirit of tolerance that has spread throughout the community during my life time. That is entirely different from the spirit that prevailed while I was a boy. The Bill was drafted largely at the request of the High School Old Boys' Association. For a long time they have been anxious that the name of the school should be changed, and they preferred the name of Hale because of that link which, as I have indicated, exists between Bishop Hale's School and the High School. The governors thought that in this Centenary year of Western Australia, when we speak so much in honour of the memory of the pioneers of the State, we could not do better, when changing the name of the school, than associate it with that of Bishop Hale, who was the founder of secondary education in Western Australia. That is why we adopted that name. We do for a moment claim that the High School has any connection whatever with the Church of England. We do not claim that we are identical in any way with the school that was started by Bishop Hale; we have merely sought to perpetuate the name of Bishop Hale, who, we know, did so much for secondary education in Western Australia and with which we are a connecting link. I have referred to some great names in Western Australian history, names of those who went to that school of Bishop

Hale's. There is the name of Forrest—both Lord Forrest and Alexander Forrest; the name of Burt—the late Septimus Burt; the name of Parker—the late Sir Henry Parker, who was Chief Justice, and, fortunately, we have two well-known Western Australian families represented and still living who went to Bishop Hale's school. They are closely associated with the High School in so much as they are governors—I refer to Sir Edward Wittenoom and Mr. Frank Wittenoom. I myself have a slight connection with Bishop Hale's School because my eldest brother went to that school. Unfortunately he died in early manhood when he was on the eve of starting a very successful career. It so happened that when I came back to Western Australia over 30 years ago to practise my profession, Mr. Haynes, who had taught my late brother as a boy when he was at Bishop Hale's School, told me that my brother was the ablest boy he had ever had through his hands during his long period as a schoolmaster. The older generation went to Bishop Hale's School, and their boys went and are still going to the High School to receive their education. Quite a number of them have attained distinction in Western Australia. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I thought it was important that I should make an explanation about the letters that have passed between the governors of the High School and the Diocesan Council. In conformity with the wishes of the Diocesan Council, I propose to read those letters—

Church Office, 22nd October, 1929.

Dear Mr. Davy,

This is to confirm the interview the Administrator (the Ven. C. Hudleston, M.A.), Messrs. G. F. Moore, and M. T. Padbury (Diocesan Trustees) and the writer had with you yesterday regarding the proposal to change the name of The High School to Hale School, whereby it was agreed—

1. That you endeavour to get the governors of the High School to withdraw the claim of the 1858 foundation (which you say you think they are not entitled to) and substitute the date 1876 on the school badge.

2. That at the next session of Parliament you introduce a Bill to enable religious instruction to be imparted in the school, and a minister of religion to be eligible for appointment to the position of headmaster.

3. The Bill to be delayed in the Legislative Council until the governors have had an opportunity to consider the position next Monday.

In the event of the above being given effect to the church authorities to withdraw their opposition to the Bill.

Yours faithfully,

JAS. O FISHER,
Diocesan Secretary.

The Governors of the High School met and considered that letter. They did not quite agree to those propositions, but they did agree that this letter should be written by Mr. Davy.

J. O. Fisher, Esq., Diocesan Secretary, Church Office, Perth.

Dear Sir,

I confirm my telephone conversation with you of a few minutes ago as follows:—

In consideration of the Church authorities withdrawing their opposition to our Bill, the Board of Governors of the High School are agreeable to the following undertakings:—

1. That we will withdraw our claim that the High School was founded in 1858, and delete reference to same from the school badge.

2. That we will use our best endeavours to induce the Government to introduce a Bill next session to delete from the High School Act the word "secular," and insert in lieu thereof the word "undenominational."

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) T. A. L. DAVY.

It will be seen that there is a slight distinction between the proposition of the Diocesan Council and the reply of the governors of the High School. The governors of the High School are quite willing to ask the Government to introduce a Bill to remove the words "exclusively secular education" and substitute "undenominational education." But the governors of the High School are not prepared of their own volition to throw the High School into the cauldron of controversy over sectarian matters. If the Government care to introduce a Bill, it will be welcomed by the governors of the High School, because it will only enable them to do by Act of Parliament that which is already being done at the school, that is, the reading of a prayer and the reading of a chapter from Scripture. The governors of the High School have entirely disclaimed any intention to ask the Government to withdraw the present ban of having a minister of religion as headmaster of the school. They do not desire it either in theory or in practice and they will not be a party to it. It is hardly necessary for me to read the whole of the correspondence that has taken place.

The Chief Secretary: Perhaps you had better do so.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Very well.

Church Office, 30th October, 1929.

Dear Sir,

Your letter of the 29th inst, with regard to the proposal to change the name of "The High School, Perth," to "Hale School" was considered at a meeting of the Diocesan Council held yesterday. In consideration of the governors withdrawing the claim that the school was founded in 1858 by Bishop Hale, and undertaking to use their best endeavour to induce the Government to introduce a Bill next session to provide that the school shall not be "exclusively secular," the Diocesan Council withdraws its opposition to the Bill. It was felt that this action of the governors would do much to remove any idea which might be created by associating High School with the name of "Hale," that the High School is a secondary school founded by an Anglican Bishop. Bishop Hale's object in founding his school was not so much to provide secondary education in the State as to ensure that such education should be definitely based upon "the principles of the Christian religion," and being an Anglican Bishop naturally as such principles are interpreted by the Church of England. To attempt to associate a school in which the teaching must be "exclusively undenominational," with a particular religious body, would be unfair to that body, and might be detrimental to the school as well. The opposition of the Church of England authorities to the proposed change to "Hale" was due to their desire to prevent any misconception of these points.

Yours faithfully,

J. O. FISHER,
Diocesan Secretary.

As I have already said, the High School is entirely undenominational. Its governors are appointed by the Governor in Council and no question of the religion of the governors has ever entered into anybody's calculation. I have had the honour to be a governor of the High School since 1895. As a matter of fact, so far as the last three governors who have been appointed are concerned, I do not know and do not care what their religion is. We have had prominent members of the Methodist body on our board of governors and never has the question of religion cropped up in connection with the school. That is true also as regards the appointment of the masters of the school. Not very long ago we had an excellent master at the school—the first assistant master—who was a member of the Catholic Church and we were very glad to have him. We do not inquire about religion: all we are concerned about is the

the masters shall be men of good character. At the present time I understand the head master of the High School is a member of the Methodist Church, but that does not concern us and we do not desire to be connected in any way or to represent in any way that we are connected, with any religious body. It may be weakness, but it is also strength. We have strictly endeavoured to carry out the spirit in which the Act of 1876 was framed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Mental Deficiency.

2, Industries Assistance.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 21:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That the words "Subsection (3) of," line 1, be struck out, and that after "by," line 2, there be inserted "omitting the words 'on his own initiative or,' in Subsection (1), and by."

Section 21 reads—

The Governor may, on his own initiative, or on the recommendation of the board, declare any road to be a developmental road for the purposes of this Act.

When the 1925 measure was before this Chamber, an endeavour was made so to frame the Bill that either the Minister or the Governor could act on the advice of the Main Roads Board in declaring a main or a developmental road, and to remove entirely the possibility of any Government

utilising the board's powers. After the select committee's recommendation to that effect had been approved almost throughout the Bill, the board being substituted for the Minister in practically every instance, the Government asked for the insertion of the words "on his own initiative." These words constituted a vexed question during the final passage of the 1925 Bill. The Government declared it was intolerable that a Minister or the Government should not have developmental roads built where they were needed, and contended that the Main Roads Board might refuse to declare a certain road to be a developmental road where this was desirable, or to build a developmental road where it was required. But for those words, the board would be the deciding authority in both respects, and work could not be done on such roads without the board having first satisfied themselves, and advised the Minister, that such a position should obtain. The retention of the words was finally approved by the managers as a compromise, "the Governor" being substituted for "the Minister." Last session's select committee on Main Roads Board administration obtained evidence showing that the position under which payment of £35,000 has been refused by the Federal Government to this State—and the refusal is likely to be permanent—on the ground that the work was done by day labour instead of by contract, could not have arisen.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Stewart's object is to deprive the Governor of the power to declare a developmental road on his own initiative. Mr. Stewart desires to render a recommendation from the Main Roads Board necessary to that end. To place such a power in the hands of any person or body not subject to Parliament would be most unwise. The construction of developmental roads should be an important phase of general policy. Such roads feed the railways. A body like the Main Roads Board, not in any way subject to Parliament, could take up such a stand against developmental roads as would be opposed to the best interests of the country; and if Mr. Stewart's amendment is carried, the board would be quite within their rights in doing so. The existing Act empowers the Main Roads Board to recommend, but also empowers the Governor—in other words, the Minister—on his own initiative to take action, and then to seek the endorsement of the Executive

Council. Mr. Stewart's amendment proposes to tie the Minister's hands as to declaring developmental roads, notwithstanding his having been convinced by members of Parliament and local representative men, who would have a better knowledge of the situation than the Main Roads Board could have, that the declaration or construction of a developmental road was essential to the progress of a particular district.

Hon. H. STEWART: The argument just used by the Chief Secretary secured the incorporation of the words in the 1925 measure. There is no need to labour the question. No Main Roads Board could exist if placed in a position to decline to recommend a developmental road desired by the Government. If the members of the board were not conversant with public requirements in that respect, they would be unfit for their positions. They are now investigating road work for the Government in every direction. The Government look to them in most instances for advice of this very nature, and so do the Development and Migration Commission as to the 3,500 farms scheme. The Committee will be safe in carrying the amendment. The taxpayers would have been better off to-day had the select committee's original recommendation been adopted.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	6

Majority for 8

AYES.

Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. G. A. Kempton

Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. H. Seddon

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. E. H. Gray

Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. G. Fraser

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 7, 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Amendment of Section 28:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"The said section is further amended by deleting the words 'subject as hereinafter provided,' in paragraph (b) of Subsection thereof."

The Solicitor General informs me that those words, "subject as hereinafter provided," are now meaningless.

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

Clause 10—Repeal of Section 30 and substitution of a new section:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Subsection 3 of the new Section 30, "traffic" be struck out, and "license" inserted in lieu thereof.

The word "license" appears elsewhere throughout the Bill. I do not know how the word "traffic" got in.

Hon. H. STEWART: I should like to know the reason for this amendment. The question arises whether the proposal should not apply exclusively to motor licenses, leaving out horse-drawn vehicles.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am informed that to bring it into harmony with the Act, and with the remainder of the Bill, the correct word is "license." If the hon. member desires, we can go further into the matter, and if necessary recommit the clause.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Bill provides that the contributions by the local authorities for 1925-26 are waived. That was the first allocation under Section 30 of the Act. On the second reading I read a letter from the Williams Road Board pointing out how it would affect them. They put up the same case to the select committee of the Assembly, but the points raised were not answered by the chairman of that committee and do not seem to have been taken into account by the committee. Another allocation has since been made, and a third is to be made. I am informed that the money collected when the Federal tax was in operation was quite sufficient to render unnecessary those allocations, and that there is no reason why No. 2 and the one still to be made should be collected. But those allocations have been made and an annua

payment asked for from each of the local authorities affected. I should like to know definitely from the Chief Secretary whether, if the Committee decides that the local authorities shall make contributions on the basis of the second and third allocations, the contributions will be required for one year only, instead of annually for a 10-year period, or whether the amount allocated is to be an annual payment. It is of very great importance to the local authorities. Suppose, say, the Greenough Road Board had to pay £64 per annum for a considerable period in accordance with Section 30 of the principal Act, which has now been wiped out. The Bill does not provide for the waiving of the second allocation. If we are to let the second and third allocations go through, we may involve the local authorities in the payment of contributions up to 22½ per cent. and in addition they may have to pay for a period of years an annual amount to cover the interest. We want from the Minister a clear pronouncement as to whether the second allocation is to be waived. Under the second allocation the local authorities may be asked to pay for two years, and under the third allocation they may be asked to pay for one year. Although Section 30 will be repealed, unless the position be safeguarded the local authorities may be penalised with the annual payment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under the Bill the assessment made for the one year 1926-27 will be waived but no more. What the amounts are I do not know.

Hon. H. STEWART: Further information should be made available before we pass the clause. Let me quote from the select committee's examination of Mr. Herbert Carne, secretary of the Williams Road Board—

Under the old scheme, too, it is presumed that the percentage arrived at was based on the understanding that some boards would ultimately benefit. If that was in the mind of the board in framing the allocations, they must have allowed for that. Under such arrangements some boards have been hit unduly hard, while others have benefited considerably because of the work already done in their districts. If there is to be any wiping off, it should be for the lot, and a fresh start should be made. We are in favour of the 25 per cent. deduction, recognising that the Main Roads Board must have funds to enable them to function.

By the Chairman: I think the explanation of the position you have referred to as between your board and the Armadale board is that a large percentage of the expenditure

you mentioned did not come from within the four corners of the scheme at all; it was a special grant by the Federal Government?—No, that £45,000 was spent under the joint scheme.

I know some money was spent on that road, about £20,000. It was a special grant from the Commonwealth?—From the Main Roads Board's report you will see that under the Federal Aid Road Act Joint Agreement of 1926-27, Armadale had £20,000 in the one year and £25,000 in the next year, while Gosnells had £22,000 and £28,000 respectively. During that period only £763 was spent in the Williams district. Yet Armadale in 1926-27 was asked to pay £900, and in the next year the contribution was dropped to £435, while ours was still left at £989.

By Mr. Clydesdale: What will you be contributing under the 25 per cent. proposal?—Roughly £250 per annum. Our tax for the first year was £64. In the next year it was £30 for maintenance, plus £64 at 6½ per cent. on £989. The next year the contributions were the same. But under that system within ten years we would be paying back nearly the whole of our rateable revenue.

By Mr. Lindsay: What is the mileage of main roads in your district?—It is 31 miles. That is the Perth-Albany road.

Eventually you will be relieved of the maintenance of that road?—Yes.

For your board it is a reasonable proposition?—Yes, but not for the outback boards.

If we pass subclause 5 as printed, the allocation over the 30 years may still continue. To remove anomalies, safeguard the future and clarify the position, I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause 5, "year 1926-27" be struck out with a view to inserting in lieu the words "years 1926-27, 1927-28, and 1928-29."

I do not know whether I am doing right by proposing to strike out "year 1926-27," but I see no other way of adding the "s" in order to cover the other two years.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Does the amendment to be proposed by the Chief Secretary affect the question raised by Mr. Stewart?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Stewart's amendment would mean the wiping out of the whole of the assessments since the inception of the board. Speaking on the spur of the moment, I should say that over £1,000,000 of State money has been expended on the construction of main and developmental roads, and Mr. Stewart now proposes with a stroke of the pen to wipe out that liability to the Government. How will the State meet interest and sinking fund on that money? It is a singular amendment for Mr. Stewart to move because he was responsible for the Act that has brought about the pre-

sent state of affairs. Now, after a lapse of three years, he proposes to deprive the Treasury of interest and sinking fund for moneys spent on road construction.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Can that be done under the road agreement between the Commonwealth and the States?

Hon. H. STEWART: I am seeking information. The Minister should be able to explain the exact position. His amendment on the Notice Paper confirms my impression that whereas the executive of the Road Boards Association have a certain understanding with the Government, they do not expect under the new arrangement to have to make an annual payment extending over 30 years in connection with the second allocation. I do not think the Government intend to collect the annual amount, which in the case of a number of road boards is £64. Under the new arrangement the Williams Road Board will be contributing £250 a year from their traffic fees, whether work is done in their district or not, and other local authorities will be making similar contributions. I want to know what we are doing. My amendment refers only to the payment for one year. The road board executive are not anticipating having to pay each year at the rate of £64, plus another £250. We cannot have two methods in operation at the one time. I do not wish to deprive the Government of the means of finance, and I have no desire to penalise local authorities for any lack of understanding on our part. Under the Bill the Government will receive more than if they carried on under the old scheme. We should have a clear statement so that we may be able to inform local authorities upon the subject.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill speaks for itself. Only one year's assessment will be waived. If the Williams Road Board have a grievance it must be the only one amongst all the local authorities. If the hon. member applied to the Main Roads Board he would be given full particulars of the matter.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I take it that for 1927-28 and 1928-29 the assessments will be made in accordance with the previous arrangement, in which case only one year will be waived. Mr. Stewart wants to know whether the annual percentage assessments for these two years will be carried on for the succeeding period, or whether the new arrangement will supersede them.

The Chief Secretary: The old assessments will be carried on.

Hon. H. SEDDON: And in addition the road board will pay 22½ per cent.

The Chief Secretary: That started on the 30th June last.

Hon. H. Stewart: I am sure the road board's executive do not appreciate that position.

Hon. H. SEDDON: If that is so, there is something in Mr. Stewart's contention. The road boards do not know that they will have to carry on under the old system for 30 years, and in addition pay the 22½ per cent. provided in the Bill.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Representatives of local governing bodies have repeatedly asked me questions about this matter. I understood that the percentages were to be fixed with the allocations. I am now afraid that in many instances the whole of the revenue of local authorities will be absorbed.

Hon. H. STEWART: The feeling in the country is that the Bill will do away with all payments under previous allocations as from the 30th June last. Road boards do not expect to have to make annual payments on the basis of previous assessments. I can find no authority for the statement that boards will pay only on two allocations. The fear is that they will be called upon to pay £64 per annum on one allocation either for 10 or 20 years. I want to know whether the £64 will have to be paid for one or two years or for the longer period.

The Chief Secretary: When were the assessments made on the basis of £64?

Hon. H. STEWART: They come in under the 1928 assessments. Are the traffic contributions to wipe out all the old assessments?

Amendment (that the words proposed to be struck out, "year 1926-27," be struck out) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	19
Majority for				1

AYES.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. E. Rose

Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. Ewing

(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. G. Fraser

(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: I have recorded my deliberative vote with the noes.

Amendment thus passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Just prior to the tea adjournment the Committee had resolved to strike out the words "year 1926-27" in Subclause 5, with a view to inserting other words. The question now is: That the clause, as amended, be agreed to.

Hon. H. STEWART: I will move that the words I indicated be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: I can allow an amendment only so far as the words "1927-28 and 1928-29" are concerned. The Committee resolved that the words "1926-27" be struck out. In the circumstances "1926-27" cannot be re-inserted by the same Committee.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: When Mr. Stewart was speaking he mentioned that phase, and said he did not know how he could secure the deletion of the word "year" with a view to inserting "years."

Hon. H. Stewart: I received no guidance from the Chairman.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Mr. Stewart intimated what he wished to do, and I understood he had to follow the course he pursued in order to deal with the word "year."

Hon. H. Stewart: I told the Chairman that I did not know how to secure the amendment with regard to the word "years."

The CHAIRMAN: I specifically asked Mr. Stewart to write out his amendment. The proper way for the amendment to have been moved, in order to achieve his object, would have been to strike out the word "year" with a view to inserting "years," and then after "1926-27" to have inserted "1927-28 and 1928-29."

Hon. H. STEWART: I quite realise that what you say, Mr. Chairman, is correct, but I ask for your ruling as whether "numbers" are "words."

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, they are words.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Before we proceed further with the subclause. I suggest we should get a statement as to what is involved in the clause as it stands and in

what it will be if amended in accordance with Mr. Stewart's desires. Perhaps the Chief Secretary will report progress so that we may get a definite idea of what the position really is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: During the tea adjournment I had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Minister for Works, and I found that the attitude I took up was strictly sound. If the clause were amended as Mr. Stewart suggests, it would mean that the Government would be deprived of all interest and sinking fund charges due to them in connection with the construction of permanent works and also in connection with maintenance on work carried out since the inception of the board. I would refer hon. members to Section 30 and they will see that if the subclause is amended as suggested, all apportionments will be wiped out as well as all interest and sinking fund charges due to the State for a period of 30 years. That will be the position.

Hon. H. STEWART: We now have a definite pronouncement from the Leader of the House. I think I am correct in saying that the executive of the Road Boards Association and every local governing authority in the State are under the impression that that is not the position they agreed to when they negotiated with the Minister regarding the deletion of Section 30, and the substitution of the principle of contributions on a percentage of traffic fees. I would like the Minister to defer the final consideration of the clause until we have an opportunity of finding out the attitudes of the roads boards. If that is done, and I am clear in my mind as to the position, I shall not proceed with the amendment. Now we have received that pronouncement from the Government, there may be a rude awakening on the part of the executive of the Road Boards Association and others regarding the agreement arrived at.

The Chief Secretary: I said that was the position from the first.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I take it, as a result of the Minister's statement, the position will be that all boards have had an allocation for 1928 and 1929, and will be due for such allocations for a period of 30 years, in addition to the 22½ per cent. mentioned in the Bill.

The Chief Secretary: That is the position.

Hon. H. STEWART: If progress were reported, we could deal with the whole position in a different Committee.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I suggested that the consideration of the clause should be postponed, but Mr. Stewart persisted in discussing it. I am agreeable to reporting progress.

Progress reported.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 22nd October.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [7.41]: The Bill is an important one, but I cannot see eye to eye with some of the amendments to the parent Act that are suggested. Some of the amendments were included in previous measures that we have had before us and even then we could not altogether accept them. For instance, there is the suggestion to change the name of road boards. I have always held that the present designation of road boards is definite and indicates the relative position occupied by members of local governing authorities in the localities over which they exercise jurisdiction. I cannot see that any benefit will be obtained in altering the designation of road boards to district councils. It seems to me that it will bring the boards into the political atmosphere. Already there are councils, with their presidents, in connection with the Primary Producers' Association, with political organisations and with other interests. It would be a mistake to change the name of road boards to councils from that standpoint, and there is just the danger of creating a feeling of political control or organisation. For many years past the road boards have carried out their functions ably and well. The Government did not see fit to make the alteration when they appointed the Main Roads Board, which is presided over by a chairman. I cannot understand the reason for the proposed alteration. It is claimed that the duties of the members of the boards have grown in recent years. But I fail to see that the mere altering of the title of the chairman of a road board to that of president of a district council will

in any way more clearly define the function those people will be called upon to perform. I am pleased that the Bill does not touch upon the voting proposals that were a feature of the Bill that was previously before Parliament. From time to time this House has shown very plainly that it believes in giving additional voting power to those who pay the major portion of the rates in a particular locality. With regard to the Bill generally, many of the proposed amendments will be helpful. The duties of local authorities are increasing and we are aware that many members of country boards take a keen and active interest in their work. Particularly do we know that they are specially interested in valuations. There are clauses in the Bill dealing with this aspect that may require close scrutiny because they propose to give to the Minister powers that will enable him to override the court. At the present time, if an individual is not satisfied with a valuation, he can appeal to the court.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Which court?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The local court. It has been the practice that the Minister has arranged with the Taxation Department to send their officials along and so safeguard the interests of that department. A clause in the Bill will give the Minister particular power. My impression is that though it may be quite right, it should receive our close attention. Ministers come and Ministers go, and we are aware that many people pay rates not only to the road boards but to the State and Federal Governments as well. The question of values is very much involved and one valuation is wrapped up with another. If we give the Minister power to override the local court, it may prove a departure that may act harshly. When we are able to appeal to a magistrate, we feel a sense of security, but we have not that same feeling when we appeal against a decision of the Taxation Department. There the appeal is from Caesar to Caesar. It is claimed that there are very few appeals against the Taxation Department's assessments. We know, however, that that department boasts that it sits over everybody and consequently any person who tries to dispute any of the department's decisions is foolish. If the department do not catch you in one way, they are bound to do so in another. I know of an instance where a man felt that he was harshly treated by the de-

partment. He had not the money with which to pay his taxation and asked that it should be held over until an amount of £50 owing to him by the Government was paid to him. His request for time to pay was refused, in spite of the fact that he had nothing with which to pay, and that he was willing to pay on receipt of what was due to him by the Government. He thought that he could win on an appeal, but he declared that it would be useless because if he won the department would set out to catch him in some other way. When the Government discharge their debt to him, he will then pay not only his taxation but the fine imposed by the department. Fears are expressed that taxpayers will be robbed of their right to appeal to the court.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They will still have the right under the Bill to appeal to the court.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Possibly I have not read the Bill correctly, but I am under the impression that the Minister will be able to override the court. Anyway, there is no harm in drawing attention to the matter. I do not approve of the proposed method of electing members of the board at the one period. That is a drastic change to effect. The existing system has worked very well; members retired in rotation in a manner similar to that adopted in connection with the constitution of this House. In that way there were always two members of the board remaining and they were au fait with what was going on. The radical change of electing all the members together may have a serious effect, especially where boards have been looking ahead for a year or two, and where consistency in policy is essential. I am convinced that the new proposal will not work to the advantage of any district. One new member can always learn something from those who have served the district for a time. The idea of a clean sweep is objected to by many of the ratepayers. If a change has to be made, it should be made gradually. We know what mistakes can be made by having a clean sweep of a board. It is easily possible in this way to fall out of the frying pan into the fire. I hope in this respect it will be possible to amend the Bill. In other respects I support the proposals.

On motion by Hon H. Stewart, debate adjourned.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 24th October; Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, Hon. H. J. Yelland in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2, "Amendment of Section 100a," to which an amendment had been moved by Mr. Hamersley, "That the following be added to the proviso:—'unless such holding is used for agricultural or pastoral purposes.'"

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The amendment should be withdrawn, as the adoption of it would create a curious position, altering the established practice in regard to rating these properties. Indeed, I wish the proposed exemption went further. It is unfair that orphanages, charitable institutions, and church organisations controlling such properties as farms for the public good, and chiefly for the benefit of young people, should be taxed under measures like the Vermin Act. If the amendment is carried, those controlling church properties will still be compelled to keep down vermin; the proposal is merely to exempt them from being rated.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	7
Majority for					5

AYES.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. G. A. Kempton
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. G. W. MILES: On behalf of Sir Edward Wittenoom I move—

That the following new clause be added, to stand as Clause 3:—"The Third Schedule to the Vermin Act, 1918, is amended by adding at the end thereof 'and kangaroos north of the 26th parallel of latitude.'"

In the North, kangaroos are vermin, and possibly do more damage there than rabbits do in the south. Northern pastoralists cannot during lean periods spell a paddock, because the paddock is eaten out by kangaroos before stock can be placed on it. Sooner or later, it seems, the question will be whether sheep shall be protected or kangaroos. Further south, in what may be termed the middle North, emus are a pest to which the Vermin Act should also apply. Sir Edward Wittenoom's new clause merely empowers the Minister to schedule kangaroos as vermin.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I see no objection to the new clause. A number of Nor'-Westers to whom I have spoken on the subject are unanimous as to kangaroos being a menace which should be checked.

Hon. H. STEWART: "North of the 26th parallel of latitude" should be struck out of the new clause. I have just been busy among my constituents, and serious representations have been made to me concerning the damage done by kangaroos. At Nyabing a man whom I have known for some years as a fine settler, and one who has put up a great struggle to succeed, told me that the kangaroos were as bad as the rabbits. I had intended to interview the Minister administering the Vermin Act on that subject. If the royalties demanded by the Government were wiped out, it would help towards the eradication of kangaroos, the skins not being worth much. Here is an illustration of the necessity for not only carrying this amendment, but for carrying it when given a wider significance.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can achieve his object by striking out all words after "kangaroos."

Hon. H. STEWART: I may conclude by doing so. This Nyabing settler declares that in one year on 130 acres 300 kangaroos and brush were killed by traps, in addition to which large numbers were destroyed by poison. In the same district is another settler who declares that 30 per cent. of his crop is lost to kangaroos. He contends that but for this pest, the settlers would not have to go to the bank for extension of time for the payment of interest and for other considerations. It is the ravages of the pest that serve financially to embarrass the settlers. I move an amendment—

That the words "north of the 26th parallel of latitude" be struck out.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I accept the amendment, and I hope the Committee will agree to emus being included in the third schedule.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The amendment if carried would have disastrous consequences. If there were anything like a general demand for the amendment it would come in from the farmers and settlers to the Government. Such a drastic provision should not be agreed to, except in the form of a Government Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I think the Government will accept the amendment. I have discussed it with the Minister for Agriculture, who said the original Vermin Act was brought in practically at the request of the pastoralists and the agriculturists. They are the only people contributing to the fund under that Act. The Minister assured me that if the pastoralists and farmers would request him to bring the kangaroo under the Vermin Act, there would be no difficulty about it. All that the pastoralists and farmers are asking is that they should be allowed to use the fund for the destruction of these pests. The Minister told me there was no need to amend the Act, that the power was already there.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Well, why not act on it?

Hon. G. W. MILES: If the Committee agree to the amendment, it will be an indication to the Government that it is required. Then we could have these two pests brought under the Act.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am in sympathy with the people of those portions of the State where kangaroos and emus are a menace, but I realise there are other portions of the State where they should be preserved. Already the Minister has power to act if representations be made to him that emus and kangaroos should be declared vermin in any particular district. Yet I have not heard of many such requests.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The Chief Secretary went to Northampton recently to receive a deputation on that very point.

Hon. G. FRASER: That was only one request. We should not, on the say-so of one or two members, agree to this drastic amendment. If any local authority wants kangaroos or emus declared a pest, it is only necessary to make representations to the Minister.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I would be prepared to support the original amendment, but it

has now been given a different shape. I remind members that there is a certain amount of responsibility in preserving wild life, and that while kangaroos and emus may be a menace north of the 26th parallel, below that line their fate might well be left to the discretion of the Minister.

Hon. H. STEWART: Under the Vermin Act, vermin are defined as any animal or bird mentioned in the third schedule, and such other animals or birds the names of which the Government may by proclamation add to the third schedule. The new clause prescribes that kangaroos north of the 26th parallel shall be included in the third schedule. I propose to extend the scope of that.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Committee will not agree with you.

Hon. H. STEWART: A few of them may not.

Hon. E. H. Gray: A lot of them will not.

Hon. H. STEWART: Like the hon. member, I put entirely beyond the rights of kangaroos the well being of men, women and children who are suffering shortage of food, clothing and comfort because of the depredations of those animals. The amendment many not achieve my objective. I suggest to Mr. Miles that in seeking to place kangaroos in the third schedule he achieves nothing in regard to their destruction. The amendment of the Vermin Act, passed in 1926, imposed a tax on pastoralists and farmers for the eradication of wild dogs, eagle hawks and foxes. But that would have nothing whatever to do with the eradication of the kangaroo if the kangaroo were included in the third schedule. If Mr. Miles seeks from that special fund aid for the eradication of kangaroos north of the 26th parallel, he will meet with some opposition.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If Mr. Stewart's amendment be carried, kangaroos will come under the Act, and their destruction will be compulsory. At present it is not obligatory to destroy kangaroos, though any one can get permission from the Minister to destroy them if they are a menace. In the settled areas there is a growing sentiment in favour of the preservation of native fauna, and our marsupials are of special interest. If protection be removed, settlers will be under the obligation to destroy kangaroos. If the members representing the North are prepared to accept the responsibility for the amendment, they may do so, but I am op-

posed to the general application of the proposed new clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If application be made as stipulated in the Act, kangaroos may be declared vermin in any district. In the Port Hedland, West Kimberley, Nullagine, Marble Bar, Roebourne, Tableland, Murchison, Ashburton, Gascoyne, Minilya and Meekatharra districts, kangaroos have been declared vermin at the request of the local authorities. Consequently there is no need to amend the Act as suggested. The department have no objection to declaring kangaroos vermin wherever they are proved to be a menace. Mr. Stewart's suggestion to declare kangaroos vermin throughout the State would be too far-reaching. If the farmers in his electorate are suffering from the depredations of kangaroos, consideration will be given to an application to have them declared vermin.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You could not operate on the central fund?

The HONORARY MINISTER: This has nothing to do with the central fund. I referred the matter to the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game and he does not recommend that kangaroos be declared vermin in the country north of the 26th parallel.

Hon. H. STEWART: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Reference has been made to the members for the North wishing to get at the special fund. I think there has been a misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Miles regarding the two Acts. I believe the point was that if the pastoral representative and the agricultural representative agreed that kangaroos should come under the provision, we would offer no objection. The Act was passed for the special purpose of bringing about the destruction of dogs, foxes and eagles, but the Government should take drastic steps to exterminate kangaroos and emus. I have seen emus in droves of 50 running through crops 250 miles from Perth. They are becoming a perfect menace in the central North. The kangaroos in the far North are in thousands, and they flock to where good feed exists. They are a serious problem. I hope something will be done to bring both the kangaroo and emu under the special Act dealing with dogs, foxes and eagles.

Hon. H. Stewart: Are you serious?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Did not the hon. member express solicitude for the struggling farmers whose wives and children were going hungry because of the depredations of kangaroos?

Hon. H. Stewart: I did not suggest touching the central fund for the purpose.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the hon. member was serious; why not include kangaroos and emus?

Hon. H. Stewart: Because it would be a breach of an honourable understanding.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not aware of that. It is idle for Mr. Fraser to argue that nothing is ever heard of this trouble. The people out back are so accustomed to being neglected that they have given up hope and just battle along. The greater the number of people, the greater the noise they make; and the greater the noise, the more they get done. Some of the people to whom I refer do not receive more than four mails a year. They are too few to make themselves heard, but they are the people who suffer.

Hon. E. ROSE: I support the new clause. I know something of the great increase of kangaroos in the North and of their depredations. Not only do they eat the feed out, but in dry seasons they scratch out the roots of perennial grasses.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What are the niggers in the far North to do if the kangaroos are exterminated?

Hon. E. ROSE: Kangaroos prevail not only in hundreds but in hundreds of thousands. There are more kangaroos in the Kimberleys than cattle and sheep combined. The new clause is necessary for the protection of pastoralists in the Kimberleys. In no part of the State are kangaroos breeding so quickly as there.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about the cost of exterminating them?

Hon. E. ROSE: People have been shooting them in thousands, but they are increasing faster than the sheep; in fact the sheep owners are being driven out of the country. Unless something is done to cope with the menace, the whole of that country will be ruined. I do not know what would have happened to the Kimberley settlers if they had not taxed themselves for the destruction of these pests. Only those who have lived in that part of the country know the extent to which the kangaroos have increased, and

the destruction for which they are responsible.

Hon. G. W. MILES: This amendment was put forward by my colleague, Sir Edward Wittenoom.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Are you making apologies for it?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am not making any apology. People who know Western Australia will understand what a menace emus and kangaroos constitute. I misunderstood the Minister for Agriculture when I was speaking to him. What he conveyed to me was that he was referring to the central Vermin Act. He stated that if the pastoralists and primary producers could agree, and put up a case to the Government, Cabinet would be prepared to bring emus and emu under the operations of the Act. From what I can gather from utterances of members of the Country Party, there is no hope of such an agreement being arrived at. Something will have to be done to assist producers in the Central and Northern Provinces to combat these two evils. With the permission of the Committee, I will withdraw the motion to insert the new clause.

New clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 8.49 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 30th October, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: Land settlement,—1, 3,500 Farms scheme; 2, Exemption from taxation ...	124
Unemployment, manufacture of machinery ...	124
Police, Jolimont Sweep ...	124
Motions: Aborigines Act, to disallow regulation ...	124
Main Roads Board, contributory local authorities ...	124
Bills: Mental Deficiency, 3A. ...	124
Industries Assistance, 3A. ...	124
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, report ...	124
Criminal Code Amendment, Com. ...	124
Alsatian Dogs, 2A. ...	124
Wheat Bags, 2A. ...	124
Electoral Provinces, 2A., Com., report ...	124
University of Western Australia Act Amendment, Council's amendment ...	124
Licensing Act Amendment, 2A., Com. ...	124
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2A. ...	124

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.3 p.m., and read prayers.