

interfere in any way with the Commissioner as to what coal he should take or not take.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The unions told him, though.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If they did, the Commissioner was not obliged to adopt their opinions. The unions had no power in that respect.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Of course they had.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the hon. member to refrain from interjecting.

Hon. J. M. DREW: As regards the loan made to the Griffin mine, it was made by the Government through the Council of Industrial Development. The Government hold proper security, and can enforce payment under the terms of the agreement. There is no doubt about that.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is that security better than the security the Government have as regards the Horseshoe manganese railway?

Hon. J. M. DREW: There are many other questions I should like to touch upon, but no doubt I shall have opportunities of doing so at later stages. Despite the fact that from time to time I may criticise the Government's actions and comment adversely on some of the Bills submitted, I shall endeavour not to be in any way wanton in my criticism, but to do my best to advance the interests of the State.

On motion by the Minister for Country Water Supplies, debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

House adjourned at 9.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th September, 1930.

	PAGE
Questions: Water Supply, meters	563
State Shipping service	563
Woorloo Sanatorium, X-ray plant	564
Bills: Limitation, 1R.	564
Local Courts Act Amendment, 1R.	564
Stipendiary Magistrates, 1R.	564
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, 1R.	564
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 3R.	580
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R.	581
Motions: Kangaroo and other marsupial skins, to discontinue royalties	564
Federal disabilities, to inquire by Select Com.	574
Standing Orders Committee, report adopted	580

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

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, METERS.

Mr. PANTON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that a Mr. Dillon had to pay £4 15s. 3d. for excess water on a meter that had never been on his premises? 2, Was the same Mr. Dillon charged £6 10s. 7d. for excess water on a meter that had been over-read? 3, Is it a fact that reports of meters under-read are received at the head office whilst meters that have been over-read are not so received?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No, but the matter is being investigated. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, All meter registrations, whether under-read or over-read, are dealt with at head office.

QUESTION—STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Chief Secretary: What amount of money has been paid into Consolidated Revenue from the State Shipping Service since its inception?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The total amount paid into Consolidated Revenue by the State Shipping Service since its inception, is £211,000. This amount was earned by the m.v. "Kangaroo" prior to 1920.

QUESTION—WOOROLOO SANATORIUM X-RAY PLANT.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Health: When will the X-ray plant for the Wooroloo Sanatorium, a subsidy for which is being provided by the Government, be installed?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: As certain portions of the X-ray plant for Wooroloo Sanatorium have been necessarily ordered from overseas, the date of installation cannot be stated. It will be installed immediately after the whole of the plant is available. Portions of the plant have already arrived.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Limitation.
 - 2, Local Courts Act Amendment.
 - 3, Stipendiary Magistrates.
 - 4, Transfer of Land Act Amendment.
- Introduced by the Attorney General.

MOTION—KANGAROO AND OTHER MARSUPIAL SKINS.

To discontinue royalties.

MR. PIESSE (Katanning) [4.40]: I move—

That in the opinion of this House the royalties paid to the State upon kangaroo and other marsupial skins should be discontinued.

My wish is to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister administering the Game Act, the protection afforded by which operates unfairly in some respects. Many settlers, particularly those in the agricultural districts, have a grievance against the administration of the Act, as under certain regulations royalties are collected by the State upon kangaroo and other marsupial skins. As to opossums, I am not clear, but I am convinced that many marsupials should be classed as vermin; indeed, I am not sure that the kangaroo itself should not. For sentimental reasons many of us think it nice to know that some of our native game is protected. As one born in the State I have always liked to see kangaroos roaming about the bush instead of the species having been entirely killed out. For good reasons certain marsupials, and particularly grey kangaroos, have been wholly protected. In-

vestigation discloses, however, that the protection does not extend to all the kangaroos roaming about the State. I have here a map showing a blue line running from Jurien Bay to the No. 1 rabbit-proof fence, down the No. 2 rabbit-proof fence and into the Eucla division. The first portion covers almost the whole of the South-West. Then the line runs further east and north, then east as far as the border, protecting most of the coastal area from Jurien Bay to Eucla. I have no desire to embarrass the Government in any way, but the question raised by the motion is a burning one in many agricultural districts. From progress associations and local governing bodies in my electorate I have received communications asking me to bring under the notice of the Government the increasing losses settlers suffer as the result of the depredations of kangaroos. Those settlers who have been fortunate enough to be able to fence against vermin and make their fences either dog-proof or vermin-proof, naturally do not suffer to the same extent as smaller farmers. More particularly in the early stages of the settlement of our lands does the farmer have the greatest difficulty to contend with as the result of kangaroos destroying his crop. Kangaroos travel very great distances, and it is generally accepted that during recent years they have been gradually increasing in number. One settler in the Mt. Barker district has written to me explaining that he had counted nearly 100 kangaroos in the course of a day. He says he has sometimes thought of putting a poison mixture in his paddocks with a view to poisoning the kangaroos. Of course that would entail a very great risk of poisoning his own sheep. Again, the small farmer who, during his first two or three years has very little income, and who is scarcely able to grow sufficient for his own sustenance, is greatly handicapped by not having adequate vermin fences to protect his crop against the kangaroos. Evidently it was the intention of Parliament to protect the brown kangaroo in all that country shown here on the map, from Jurien Bay to Eucla. However that may have been in years gone by, it strikes me the time has arrived when the Government should possess themselves of all the facts and obtain the fullest information relating to the losses that our farmers suffer from the depredations of kangaroos. It is certainly true that the Treasury benefits to

the extent of some £5,000 per annum by the fees derived from the royalty, but that is only a very small amount as compared with the extensive losses caused by the kangaroos, amounting probably to several times that figure, perhaps even to £50,000 per annum in the aggregate. There is no reason why the Government should protect vermin, amongst which kangaroos must be classed. I am quite sure the Premier and the Minister controlling the department do not desire to obtain revenue at the cost of the farmers' crops. Unfortunately I have brought up this matter at a time of financial stringency, and certainly one cannot blame the Premier if he tries to resist this motion and to continue getting as much revenue as possible from these fees. Local kangaroos, that is to say, kangaroos which do not leave a given locality, very often become exceedingly cunning, and in consequence two or three of them can do a tremendous amount of damage. It is not so much what they eat of the crop, but the brutes get into a paddock by night and roll about in the crop, causing a great deal of destruction. If they would only eat what they want and go away, nobody would complain.

The Minister for Railways: They must be very badly trained.

Mr. PIESSE: If so it must be the fault of the Government. If the Government will not train them properly, and take care of them, the Government ought to shoulder the blame. Some kangaroos will jump over any ordinary fence. I have known them jump over a fence into my crop and, later, jump out again. Certainly they should be trained not to do that. I suggest that the Government and those members who are inclined to speak kindly of the kangaroos should take a settler's view of the question now and again. It is a remarkable thing that the kangaroo and the emu, given prominence in our national Coat of Arms, should both be destructive. I am sorry that it is so, because we do not want to see them exterminated altogether, but I think they would be very much safer in the zoo than out in the open. I hope the Government will take steps calculated to encourage the destruction of kangaroos, rather than to discourage it. Under the Act the grey kangaroo is protected in certain areas south of the line marked blue on this map, which has been supplied to me by the department adminis-

tering the Act. The Act provides that certain areas may be exempted. Indeed, Section 6 provides that any district may be exempted from the proclamation. Section 12 provides that free permits and licenses may be granted—of which approximately 1,000 have been issued. As far as my inquiries have gone, only one district within the blue line on the map has been exempted, namely, the Gingin area, where kangaroos have been declared to be vermin. Let me point out that upon a full-grown skin the royalty is as high as 9d., while on half-grown skins it is 6d. On skins weighing less than $\frac{1}{2}$ lb., the royalty is 2d., and on smaller skins, it amounts to about $\frac{1}{2}$ d. each. The average weight of a full-grown grey kangaroo skin is $1\frac{1}{4}$ lbs., smaller skins ranging about 1 lb., which is also the average weight of the red kangaroo skin. According to what I have been told by many who have been selling skins, the sale prices vary considerably. Under the Act one can only kill a kangaroo for food, and so in an agricultural district very few would be found who make it part of their livelihood to kill kangaroos for profit. Before they can do it they have to take out a license, and the value of the skins offer but little inducement. On the face of it the prices do not seem to be so bad, if only one can preserve the skins and market them in good condition. But most people merely kill a kangaroo when they see one about; they do not go after kangaroos every day. According to Elder Smith's report, the prices of the skins vary considerably. For what are known as first greys, up to 3s. 1d. per lb. is paid, varying down to 1s. per lb. for the third greys. The first reds vary from 3s. 6d. per lb. down to 1s. 6d. for inferior skins. I am told that some varieties of skins are not worth anything at all, and therefore it does not pay even the average aboriginal native to go out and kill those smaller marsupials. Yet they can be very destructive, unless held in check by vermin-proof fences. The brush kangaroo, I know, can do a tremendous amount of damage. Settlers in my electorate, both east and west of the Great Southern Railway, have been complaining bitterly of the destruction and losses caused by kangaroos. At the last Road Board Conference the question was brought up and a motion was passed urging the Government to bring down a revision of this

Act and to discontinue the royalty, because it was felt that, in many instances, by the time the royalty is paid it more than equals the value of the skins. I have here several authentic accounts. One shows that for four kangaroo skins 1s. 8d. per lb. was paid, aggregating 10s., from which a royalty of 3s. had to be deducted. In the second account four skins realised 1s. 1d. per lb., or 4s. 4d. in all, while the royalty amounted to 3s.

The Premier: Those skins must have been badly cured.

Mr. PIESSE: Very probably. As I have said, most of these skins are secured in small quantities by amateurs, and probably the skins are not properly cured. Then again, other skins are defaced by bullet holes. It seems to me unwise for the Government to allow this Act to be administered in the way it has been in the past. In my view we should have some help from the department towards the destruction of kangaroos. Instead of asking for a royalty of so much per skin, the department should be prepared to pay a bonus of so much per head. Most certainly in my district the kangaroos are causing more destruction than are the rabbits. Our farmers are called upon to pay a vermin tax, which is understood to cover the cost of the destruction of dingoes and eaglehawks. I have nothing to urge against that where it is necessary to impose it. But many of our settlers say they have not seen either dingoes or foxes for many years. Therefore those settlers and ratepayers wonder how it is that they have to pay vermin tax and yet are not able to get assistance in the destruction of such vermin as kangaroos, which are eating their crops. And not only do the kangaroos eat the crops, but many of them individually will eat more pasture than will the average sheep. My correspondent at Mt. Barker realises this, for he says he has lost quite a lot of pasture to the kangaroos on his property. Yet he is not able to take steps to destroy those kangaroos, unless he is properly authorised to do so. And they will not stop in his paddock, for they have the habit of jumping in and jumping out again.

Mr. Doney: They must go for water.

Mr. PIESSE: As I have said, my correspondent at Mt. Barker has been considering the idea of laying a poison mixture in his paddock. I urge the Government to follow up the matter and have inquiries made by

the land officers in each district. The Government would not be under any expense to have a special report made regarding the destruction caused by kangaroos. The districts I can mention are Kojonup, Katanning, Mt. Barker, Pingrup and Ongerup. As regards all those districts I can verify the reports that have come to me, and the Speaker has had letters regarding his own electorate bringing the matter forcibly under notice.

The Premier: They were scarce and the settlers wanted them protected.

Mr. PIESSE: I am afraid it is not so easy to get people to go out nowadays to kill kangaroo for food. The kangaroo works at night and does much damage. There is no incentive to go out and kill kangaroo for food when mutton is so cheap, and for this reason settlers are likely to kill fewer now than in the past. Section 6 of the Act provides that any district may be exempted from the proclamation. Perhaps the districts badly infested might be exempted from the payment of the royalty. When the Government make inquiries, as I hope they will do at an early date, they will probably find that the whole of the districts within the proclaimed area do not suffer in the manner I have indicated. but all my information agrees that something should be done to remove the royalty. The Primary Producers' Association recently dealt with the matter; at any rate they had a motion for the consideration of conference. It would not take long for the department to find out how serious is the damage being done. Since the price of some marsupial skins has been so low, the natives do not take the trouble to skin them. The natives in some cases take the portion they require for food and leave the balance, together with the skin, on the ground. The time has come when marsupials should be treated as vermin. Their numbers have increased considerably. When kangaroos were first protected, it was feared that they might be killed out, and some of the old members of Parliament considered it only wise to protect them. In my opinion they made a big mistake. Kangaroos have been protected too long, and the time has arrived when the Government should offer every inducement to experienced hunters and trappers to kill them. If the Minister desires it, I shall give him the benefit of any knowledge

I possess, and put him into touch with people who have had experience of the cunning of the marsupials, and they may be able to suggest some effective and economical manner in which the pest might be disposed of. The kangaroos are a menace to the country. They cause the settlers great loss, and at a time when incomes are so slender, we do not want to worry farmers any more than is necessary. The Government should discontinue the payment of the royalty, or offer some substantial inducement to deal with marsupials. I commend the motion to the House.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. N. Keenan—Nedlands) [5.7]: This is the first occasion on which I have addressed the House, except to answer questions, and I ask to be permitted to join with other members, Sir, in congratulating you on the very high and distinguished office to which you have been elevated, and to wish you many long years in the occupation of that office. I should like to crave the indulgence of the House to explain the position I occupy regarding the subject matter of the motion. The royalties on kangaroo skins, which appear to be the only matter with which the motion concerns itself, are collected by the Fisheries Department, so that it would appear as if, for the purposes of revenue they are treated as fish. I happen to be the Minister in control of the Fisheries Department, and to that extent I am made responsible for replying to this motion. I do not in my wildest moments suggest that I have any knowledge of the subject beyond the most common knowledge that we all possess, that there are kangaroos in the country, that in some instances no doubt they are a nuisance, and that, on the other hand, there has been for some years a considerable market for the skins. Although I am not in a position to express any opinion that I would ask the House to accept or be guided by, I can give members a good deal of useful information. In the first place, the Act under which this royalty is collected is a very old Act. It was passed in 1913 and enables the Treasurer to collect certain royalty. It has, therefore, been in existence for 17 years. The first thought that strikes one is that this is a considerable period to have elapsed before the farmers and other people discovered that it was

an imposition damaging to their interests. The royalty is collected on all marsupial skins, including opossum skins, grey kangaroo skins, and red kangaroo skins. The royalty charged varies. A grey kangaroo skin taken south of a line following the railway from Dongarra to Mingenew and thence to the railway siding at Gutha on the Wongan Hills line, pays at the rate of 9d. per skin. A skin weighs roughly a little over 1 lb. On the other hand, a grey kangaroo skin taken north of a line following the railway from Dongarra to Mingenew and thence to Gutha pays only 2d. per skin. All red kangaroo skins, from whatever part of the State they may come, pay only 2d. per skin. It strikes me as something requiring a great deal of effort on the part of the mover of the motion to convince us that 2d. per skin is going to make a very big difference in the number of kangaroos killed, which would probably be red kangaroos.

Mr. Withers: It would pay for the shooters' ammunition.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That would depend upon the number of shots he needed.

Mr. Munsie: If he missed many times, it would not pay him.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not suppose it would. Is it reasonable argument that 2d. per skin is going to make all the difference between the kangaroos being killed and not killed? However, that is a matter on which other members might address the House. The royalty is payable on the skin only when it is offered for sale. A man can kill kangaroos and make a rug of the skins, or use them for any other purpose, and pay no royalty. It is only when they are marketed that the royalty is charged. The royalties return a considerable sum to the State. During the last financial year the royalties totalled £5,431.

Mr. Doney: In 99 cases out of 100 marketing is the only use for the skins.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But if they are used for any private purpose, or, as I suppose they would be used in some instances for both skin and meat, no royalty is paid. Only when they are used as an article of commerce and sent out of the State is the royalty charged. The scale is a very small one.

Mr. Withers: I think there have been abuses in that respect. I am almost sure

royalties have been charged on skins not used for commercial purposes.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The royalty is charged only at Fremantle, and that is where the skins go into the market. I should like to mention in passing that this revenue costs nothing to collect. Most revenue is very largely lost in the cost of collection. This revenue is collected by the Fisheries Department, and the Treasurer receives net the amount of the royalty. No portion is deducted for the cost of collecting. I should like to tell the House, too, the prices fetched by these skins and point out that independently altogether of the times being now adverse from the point of view of the sale of these skins—I am informed that there is a great slump in the market—they vary extraordinarily from year to year and also within the year. But the biggest variation arises from this factor: There are certain skins known to the trade as hunters' skins, that is skins of animals that have been chased and captured and taken by skilled men—by hunters. They fetch top prices, 3s. 6d. to 4s., and always have done. On the other hand, a number of skins come to the market that are the result of inexperienced people capturing them, or killing them with shot guns or dogs, or at the wrong time of the year. The winter skin is far and away a more valuable article than the skin of an animal killed in summer. So, for various reasons, the price varies from as much as 4s. to 1s. 1d. or 1s. The result is due, not to the market being over-supplied, but to there being a great deal of difference in the value of the skins. These are facts which must be taken into consideration when the question is raised whether the royalty has any real effect on the number of kangaroos destroyed. As I have told the House, the amount received is considerable—£5,500 in round figures—and there is no reason to suppose it will be any less this year. In order that the House may understand the position I propose to give certain figures. I am going back to 1922, to show the extraordinary fluctuations there are from year to year in the number of skins put upon the market for sale. In July, 1922, 11,000 skins were put on the market, whereas in July of this year the number was 20,000. That appears to be a very substantial increase. It would be only honest on my part to say that in the intervening years the supply was either

greater or less. In 1923, for instance, the number of skins was 10,000, and in 1924 it had risen to 22,000. Can anyone suggest there was any reason for this other than that the market between 1923 and 1924 was more active? In 1925 the number went down to as low as 4,700, and in 1926 it was down to 4,200. In 1927, however, when the member for Hannans was in charge of the Fisheries Department, the number dropped to 2,400. Then the figures took a sudden jump from 8,400 to 9,000, and to 20,000 odd this year. The figures for August are much the same, showing similar fluctuations from year to year. These fluctuations cannot be accounted for by stating that the animals are greater or less in number, but it is certain that the market is more active in one year than it is in another. Surely on the evidence of the figures the market this year is sufficiently active to warrant the destruction of a large number of these marsupials without interfering in any way with the royalty charge upon them. I began by telling the House I did not intend to express an opinion on the policy of maintaining this royalty, or the capacity of the Treasury to do without it. There are certain facts which any commonsense person would require to be placed before him as a prelude to passing this motion. Why assume that the mere difference of 2d. will produce the result that has been stated? Why must we assume that if we reduce the cost per skin by the royalty of 2d., it will lead to a larger production of skins? I see no rational hope for the abolition of the royalty producing the result suggested by hon. members. As that is the case, and the Treasury badly needs the money, and there is no chance of that money being thrown away or used in any way but to advantage, I propose to resist the motion.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.17]: Last year, when we were considering the Chief Secretary's Estimates, I brought this matter up, and was supported by the member for Cue (Mr. Chesson), the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale), the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall), the member for Pilbarra (Mr. Lamond) and the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor). I should like the House to remember these names, as they are those of members who represented pastoral industries. They know what a menace the kangaroo has become to the pas-

toral industry of the State. I am pleased the member for Katanning has moved this motion, for it is an indication that on this occasion our farmer friends have the same view as the representatives of the pastoral areas. The Chief Secretary has just said this is a 17-year old Act, and that no great steps were being taken to abolish the royalty. I have heard requests made in this House for the last four or five years that the royalty should be taken off. Why compare the position of 17 years ago with that of to-day? Twenty years ago I could travel 300 or 400 miles through the Gascoyne district without seeing a kangaroo. To-day, in making a similar journey, I have seen more kangaroos than sheep. I have known stations on the Murchison and the Gascoyne where the owners thought nothing of killing 10,000 kangaroos in a year. If they kill 10,000 how many must still be alive and doing damage to the feed? Unfortunately the kangaroo takes the best part of the feed. If there is any green grass about he will have it. These marsupials are doing great damage. I am perfectly certain that there are double the number of kangaroos in the Gascoyne and Murchison districts than there are sheep. Those members who have an acquaintance with the pastoral districts in the North, will bear me out. The kangaroos have come there in recent years. They were not there 17 years ago. It is the provision of wells with troughs, artesian drains, etc., that has enabled them to breed up to this extent. The Chief Secretary says the royalty amounts to about £5,000. He cannot understand why the 2d. makes any difference to the kangarooers. I do not know whether it is sentiment or not, but the kangarooer has a decided objection to paying this royalty. It was made a burning question during the elections in the Gascoyne district, and, if the member for Guildford were here, he would bear me out. On various occasions when the candidate he was supporting spoke, and he himself was speaking, the remark was made, "What about this kangaroo royalty of 2d.?" These men do not know why they should pay the royalty.

The Minister for Railways: They all pay it.

Mr. Withers: You are keeping election-eering promises now, are you?

Mr. ANGELO: It was not an election-eering promise with me, for I urged that the royalty should be taken off last year, long before the elections.

Mr. Coverley: You had an advantage over your opponents.

Mr. ANGELO: Because the Minister of the day had declined to lift the royalty. That did not do me any harm. A few kangarooers have in the past abused certain privileges accorded by them to pastoralists, but as a rule pastoralists are only too glad to see the kangarooers on their stations, and are prepared to give them rations, and some of them pay a bonus for the destruction of kangaroos. They are willing to do this, but the Government are now pulling another way and asking for the royalty. I cannot understand the morality of the attitude to declare a thing as vermin and then ask for a royalty for its destruction. Why do not the Government ask for a 1d. royalty on rabbits? They constitute a better vermin for the trapper because he can sell the carcase. The kangarooer has nothing but the skin to sell. He strongly objects to the deduction of 2d. on the very small amount he gets. If the Government were to forego this royalty they would get the money back time and again in extra income tax, harbour dues, etc., that would come from pastoralists and from the wharves. Knowing that, I shall certainly suggest that something should be done in the way indicated by the member for Katanning. I am sorry to say that many kangarooers will not now go out after the vermin. It is the royalty that decides them against taking on the business. Some of the pastoralists are now beginning to poison kangaroos. That is dangerous. It is also an economic loss. Why not encourage the kangarooers to go out, eradicate the vermin, and earn something for themselves? We have a lot of unemployment. I feel sure if this royalty were taken off and the pastoralists were to assist in the matter, and perhaps give a little help to the kangarooers, the pest would be greatly reduced and useful employment would be afforded to numerous persons during these strenuous times. The Chief Secretary says the Government cannot agree to the motion. I should like to know if he has consulted the Treasurer. I am sure the Treasurer is a gentleman who does not change his mind in a month or two. I should like to go back to last year when I spoke upon this matter.

The Minister for Works: But the times have changed.

Mr. ANGELO: A number of members supported me. We asked the then Minister (Mr. Millington) to give us some idea of what he was going to do in answer to our request. We could not get an answer out of him for a while. The Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, then got up and said—

I am sorry to trouble the Minister, but I think we should have some information regarding the matters that have been referred to, particularly regarding the royalty on kangaroo skins. In some parts of the North-West the pastoralists desire the kangaroo to be declared vermin, and if that is done I suppose they will seek some return from the vermin tax. I do not think the millions of kangaroos in the North could be destroyed at the expense of the landowners of Western Australia. If it is expected that it can be done from the Vermin fund, the rates from which are already a fairly heavy burden upon the people concerned, the fund will quickly be exhausted. We cannot take money from the fund for the destruction of kangaroos, but we might relieve the pastoralist of the royalty charge. As an indication of our feelings I move: that the vote be reduced by £100.

I do not think we need go any further. Everyone will agree that if our present Premier could make such a statement at the end of last session, he is not likely to have changed his opinion, as suggested by the Chief Secretary just now. We can take it for granted that the request of the member for Katanning will be acceded to.

MR. LAMOND (Pilbara) [5.31]: Last year I made reference to this question in this Chamber and I support the motion on this occasion. Kangaroos are increasing in the North-West at an extraordinarily rapid rate. The good seasons experienced for several years past have enabled them to increase to such an extent that they now are a menace to the pastoral industry. The Chief Secretary argued that the royalty of 2d. per head, if dropped, would not represent any inducement to the kangarooers to destroy the pest. That is not so. The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) was right when he said there was an objection to the amount of the royalty and that men had refused to go out kangaroo shooting while the royalty had to be paid. I think the motion should have gone further and should have provided for kangaroos being declared vermin.

The Premier: We ought not to kill off the kangaroos altogether.

Mr. LAMOND: In some parts of the North-West kangaroos have been declared vermin and yet the Government collect royalties.

The Chief Secretary: No, they do not.

Mr. LAMOND: In the Port Hedland and Marble Bar districts kangaroos have been declared vermin, but in the adjoining district of Nullagine they are not vermin, and royalty is collected on the skins. That applies also to the Roebourne district. The Vermin Act should be amended by bringing kangaroos under the definition of vermin and provision should be made for a bonus to be paid from the central fund in respect of kangaroos that are destroyed. It is true that the pastoralists contribute towards the fund, but they do not receive much benefit as a result.

The Minister for Agriculture: What about dingoes?

Mr. LAMOND: Long before the Vermin Act was passed, the people of the North-West had the dingo well under control.

The Minister for Agriculture: Most of the dingo bonuses are paid in the pastoral areas.

Mr. LAMOND: But that is more in the Kimberley end of the North-West. In my part of the North-West the kangaroos were under control before the Act was passed. It has been customary for station owners to select one of their best paddocks so that they can spell the rams there after the season's work. It is useless to endeavour to do that because the kangaroos eat off the feed. There is nothing left for the rams when the time arrives for the muster. Then again, it is not merely a question of the feed consumed, but of the grass destroyed by the kangaroos while feeding. Every assistance possible, small though it may be at times, should be extended by the Government to the pastoral industry at the present time. Those engaged in that industry have received a severe knock back, but the industry should be encouraged. A royalty of 2d. per skin may not appear to represent a heavy impost, but I have heard kangarooers say from time to time that the royalty represents the cost of cartridges.

Mr. Doney: The royalty is 9d. on heavy skins.

The Premier: Not in the North.

The Chief Secretary: It is 2d. on these skins all over the State.

MR. LAMOND: There are different types of skins. To give hon. members some idea of the way the kangaroos have increased in the Pilbara area, during the past year 10,000 were accounted for on one station. No difficulty is experienced in destroying them by poisoning the water during a dry period. That will serve to indicate how the kangaroos have become a serious menace to industry in the North-West. If the Government can agree to the motion, they should do so. This question should not be discussed from the point of view of revenue. The Chief Secretary stated that the department received £4,000 in royalties last year. He will readily admit that if we rid the pastoral areas of the kangaroo, the increased number of sheep carried on pastoral holdings in the North-West will more than double that revenue to the Treasury. I hope the motion will be agreed to.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [5.36]: I support the motion. The kangaroo does tremendous damage in certain zones, more particularly in the North. In the areas between Perth and Albany, the animal is not so plentiful, but many people are engaged in shooting kangaroos in order to augment their food supplies. By disposing of the skins, those people are able to earn a few more shillings to help them carry on. I cannot quite understand how other animals come under the heading of marsupials. I always understood that a marsupial was an animal that carried its young in its pouch. In addition to the kangaroo, we have many smaller varieties including the brush, the tamma, the wallaby, the kangaroo rat and the dalgite. In the district where I live we had many of the smaller rat type. I have poisoned as many as 200 at a time. There is the kangaroo rat and the boodie-rat. Some people seem to think they are the same, but there is a difference. The boodie rat has a white tip to his tail. Then we know the boodie holes that are to be found throughout the agricultural districts, as well as the great crevices and mounds, which the boodie rats are responsible for. For my part, I believe the dalgites have a lot to do with those formations as well. The dalgite is a delving animal. We can go to certain parts of the Great Southern and kangaroos are occasionally seen crossing the roads. A close season was instituted for

the purpose of protecting the animal. Naturally, no one would like the native fauna to be totally eradicated, but from what I have seen in different parts of the State there is not the slightest danger of that. Then again, the price of the skins is not so very low, as has been suggested. I have had a look through Elder Smith's report and I find that first quality red skins are quoted at 3s. 5d. a lb. Those are North-West skins. The finest kangaroo skin procurable is the grey, and that animal is indigenous to the southern portions of the State. If the royalty of 9d. per skin on those finer types were taken off, there might be some incitement to people to kill off the animals for the sake of the skins and in order to secure food for poor people. Early in the session I asked the Chief Secretary if he would be prepared to dispense with royalty on opossum skins, and he replied that he was not. The royalty on opossum skins was fixed at 18s. per dozen and at that time those skins were bringing several pounds per dozen in the London market. I have it on good authority that they will fetch as much as £3 per dozen in that market to-day. During the winter months the fur of the marsupial is much better than it is during the summer months. Should the close season be removed during the later period, the quality of the pelt will not be as good as it is at the present time. The Chief Secretary cannot see his way clear to dispense with the royalty. Although the price of skins has come down, the Government desire to collect the same royalty of 18s. per dozen on opossum skins. If that royalty were removed, hundreds of people would be able to go into the bush and make 30s. or £2 a week and—

Mr. Sampson: Wipe out the opossums.

Mr. BROWN: It would be impossible to do that because they are increasing so rapidly.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are not allowed to kill opossums under present conditions.

Mr. BROWN: I have seen opossums running across the road at night in the country districts.

Mr. Coverley: And you can see them in King's Park too.

Mr. BROWN: I would not like to see opossums exterminated, but I am confident there is no such danger. Information I have received indicates that the Victorian

Government dispensed with the close season in order to afford the unemployed an opportunity to secure work. Evidently the Chief Secretary in this State does not hold such views and thinks it better to keep men at Blackboy costing the State nearly 17s. 5d. per week per man, although many of them could go out into the bush—

The Minister for Mines: And starve. Not one of them could catch an opossum.

Mr. BROWN: If the unemployed cannot set a snare and catch opossums in the bush, they must be very poor individuals.

Mr. Munsie: Many of them would catch sheep and imagine it was an opossum.

Mr. Marshall: Could we not supply them with salt and let them catch opossums in the ordinary way?

The Minister for Mines: The same applies to the talk about prospecting. They would die. It is nonsense.

Mr. BROWN: Many people have engaged in wallaby catching and in various ways have been endeavouring to make an honest shilling.

Mr. Sampson: There are not many kangaroos in the hills surrounding Perth.

Mr. BROWN: They can be seen crossing the road on the way from Perth to York.

The Premier. There are not many there.

Mr. BROWN: Not many, but a few. People are hunting them in order to collect a few shillings from the sale of the skins. In the present time of financial stress, I do not think we would lose much revenue if we agreed to dispense with the royalty. I would like the Government to agree to the motion because it will be in the interests of the community as a whole.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.45]: I was not controlling the department in question at that particular time, but I do remember now that the then Leader of the Opposition favoured the removal of the royalty. I had some experience in the North-West during last year, and I can bear out what was said by the member for Pilbara (Mr. Lamond). I suggest that the Chief Secretary should get away from metropolitan circles and take that trip, proceeding from Meekatharra through Roy Hill to Marble Bar and Nullagine, and in covering a couple of thousand miles he would see some kangaroos and would then be able to argue the merits of this question with the North-West people. I warn the Chief

Secretary that it is difficult to get the real truth about the North-West from any other source. In discussing this question with the pastoralists, I found that they do regard the kangaroo as vermin, and that it is a menace in that part of the State. We know the expense pastoralists have been put to in the way of providing water supplies, fencing, etc., and I am credibly informed that where paddocks were for the time being reserved, that instead of their recovering, they became, not sheep runs, but kangaroo runs and were completely eaten out by the kangaroos. This, too, will interest the Chief Secretary: In addition to other things I found that kangaroos in the Marble Bar district are bullet-proof. Many attempts were made to shoot them, but the kangaroos seemed to be able to carry all the bullets that were fired at them.

Mr. Kenneally: Did you fire at any time?

Mr. MILLINGTON: We all had a try, and, of course, it would not be right to mention names. Joking apart, it can be understood what a menace the kangaroos are, and I am satisfied that the existence of the industry is at stake if the pest cannot be combated. I am not going to suggest that the hon. member's proposal should apply to the whole of the State, but I do think that in the North-West, in view of the difficulties experienced there by the pastoralists, consideration should be given by the Agricultural Department to any proposal to declare kangaroos vermin where the request is made by the local vermin board. I do not think I ever refused a request from a local vermin board to declare kangaroos vermin, and in some districts emus also. This is a matter that should be dealt with on its merits, and all requests from local vermin boards should be so considered. The position is serious in the North-West, where the kangaroo menace is much greater than in any other part of the State. Consideration should be given to those districts in the North where it can be proved that kangaroos are a pest. I suppose the suggestion will be resisted by the Premier because it will encroach upon the revenue of the State. During my administration of the department, I had to be very discreet, and particularly when I was asked a question that affected a department I was not controlling. I know that proposals made then were resisted because of their prejudicial effect on the rev-

ence. But there is the other aspect, that if the pest menaces an industry it should be good business even for the Treasurer to give some consideration to those places where it can be proved that the kangaroo is really a menace.

Mr. Angelo: I applied that Gascoyne and Murchison should be exempted, but you refused.

Mr. MILLINGTON: If a local vermin board makes application to declare kangaroos vermin in that board's area, that area can be put on the same footing as other districts where the kangaroos have been declared vermin.

The Premier: A million were killed in one campaign in Kimberley.

Mr. MILLINGTON: To the extent suggested the Government should consider any request that comes from North-West members. I do not for one moment consider that kangaroos are a menace in all districts. I assure the Chief Secretary that the pastoralists of the North-West are in a far worse position now than they were when I was in that part of the State. We know that prices of wool have fallen, and it seems to me that some consideration is due to the pastoralist. I do not know that I can support the wholesale motion moved by the member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse), but I do declare that undoubtedly he has directed attention to a matter that has to be regarded as a far greater menace in districts other than his own.

Mr. Angelo: Let us exempt all but Perth.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I do not say that this is a proposal that can be applied on a wholesale scale, but it certainly merits inquiry in certain districts because of the danger to the industry on which those districts depend. To that extent the Chief Secretary might reconsider his general opposition to the proposal. The North-West members could place the facts before the Minister and I am convinced that they would submit very solid reasoning why the proposal should apply in their districts. After all, the pastoral industry merits the sympathy and support of the Government. We know that the royalties are a source of revenue, and no Government is at any time willing to forego revenue. I suggest that if the Government stick to the collection of royalty on kangaroo skins they will still get something from that source, but there remains the danger of destroying the pastoral industry. I refer only to the districts where I

am satisfied the kangaroo is an undoubted menace. I suggest that the Chief Secretary give consideration to the special cases that have been referred to.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.54]: I cannot let the opportunity pass without subscribing to the motion, and I should like to point out that if the Chief Secretary is going to meddle in this matter in the manner suggested, the position will be little better after he has finished than before he commenced. I represent one of the biggest pastoral districts, and it is not included in the North-West. The point is that if there is any advantage to be gained by the abolition of this particular royalty then it must apply to all the pastoral areas. It is very little use discriminating and taking a line of demarcation and saying that only north of the Tropic of Capricorn shall be exempted. If the contention of the previous speaker is adopted by the Chief Secretary, it will mean that the pastoralists on the areas exempted will derive some advantage while the others will have to pay. I want to disillusion those members who believe that the kangaroo is liable to total extinction if anything is done in the way of a vigorous attempt to destroy it wherever it is a pest. Strange to say, the kangaroo is not like other vermin, in that with the development of the State the kangaroo is offered opportunity for rapidly multiplying. In respect of other vermin, wherever settlement takes place that vermin almost invariably becomes extinct. Usually where population increases or where development takes place pests disappear; the more we develop our areas the fewer the pests become, but with the kangaroo the opportunity is given it to multiply. The kangaroo gets water where previously it was not to be obtained. With the subdivision of pastoral areas and the carrying out of improvements, water has to be provided, and we know that the kangaroo can get through a fence that is sheep-proof. Again, the kangaroo can travel a greater distance than can sheep to get at the water provided for sheep. A kangaroo may be 20 or 30 miles away on good feed, and provided by Nature with the means of rapidly getting over the country it has no difficulty in reaching the water supplies. It can choose a given spot for its feed and then go to the squatter's property for liquid refreshment. So that the more the pastoral areas are developed the greater

the menace becomes. I do not want the Chief Secretary to tinker with this matter in piecemeal fashion as the previous speaker suggested.

The Premier: Don't you think a bonus should be paid?

Mr. MARSHALL: What I suggest is a sort of bonus that will increase the value of the skin to the kangaroo hunter, and if that does not induce men to go out to destroy the pest in sufficient numbers, they can then be declared vermin. Squatters have made individual and bold efforts to exterminate the kangaroo or to keep it under, but the pastoral industry is no better off to-day than is any other industry, and pastoralists, as we know, are hard pressed to eke out an existence, on account of the low price of wool. All are suffering alike and I suggest that these proposals will offer some inducement—if the Government will stand out of the road—to those who are desirous of destroying the pest. I was going to suggest that with the abolition of the royalty, if any increased activity takes place in the destruction of kangaroos, the export of skins will be of benefit, just as is the case with rabbits, and we know the amount of money that is paid out annually as a result of the destruction of rabbits. The Chief Secretary mentioned the duration of the life of the Act, which is an old one. The hon. gentleman pointed out the lengthened period it had existed without exciting serious comment from members of this Chamber. But people have been endeavouring to eradicate the kangaroo on their own initiative. They find, however, that instead of being got rid of he increases. At all events, he is increasing more rapidly than he is being destroyed. Yet some hon. members say we must be careful lest we bring about the total extinction of the kangaroo. While the North-West is held by individuals in large pastoral areas, there is no more chance of eradicating the kangaroo than of rubbing out the rabbit.

The Minister for Railways: Would the number of kangaroos killed be increased if the royalty were abolished?

Mr. Piesse: Undoubtedly.

The Minister for Railways: To what extent?

Mr. MARSHALL: At present only a small number of men follow the occupation of kangaroo shooting. The number would admit of increase to-day by reason

of the economic depression, because of work not being available in other directions. Undoubtedly the removal of the royalty would have that effect. The occupation is most irksome; it means shooting all night and pegging out skins all day.

The Premier: Some of those engaged in it make big cheques.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, and what a pity it is that they do not make even larger cheques.

The Premier: Certainly.

Mr. MARSHALL: Men say, "Why should I go out and make a sacrifice of myself to destroy vermin?"

The Minister for Railways: Would the abolition of the royalty mean doubling the number of kangaroos killed?

Mr. MARSHALL: In the present state of affairs that is probable. While the market is good enough—

The Minister for Railways: That is the point.

Mr. MARSHALL: While the market is good enough, the Government should not oppose the motion.

The Minister for Railways: The market is not good enough.

Mr. MARSHALL: I hope the motion will be carried.

On motion by the Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

MOTION—FEDERAL DISABILITIES.

To inquire by Select Committee.

MR. PIESSE (Katanning) [6.6]: I move—

That a select committee of this House be appointed to consider the disabilities from which the State is suffering as a result of Federal enactments, more especially in regard to the burden of the Federal tariff and Federal taxation; and that the Legislative Council be requested to appoint a similar committee to act jointly in the matter.

I greatly regret that the motion is not in abler hands than mine. This Chamber must realise that the taxpayers of Western Australia are most anxious to learn what is the attitude of Parliament towards the much discussed topic of secession. To bring about a drastic alteration in the government of the State or of any portion of the Commonwealth is a matter of the highest responsibility. There is no objection to meet-

ings being held throughout Western Australia on the question of secession, but some lead should be given by Parliament to indicate how far the Legislature countenances the movement. I was one of those who worked and voted against Federation. At the time there was excellent reason for doing so. The view I took was that held by many other old Western Australians and by people who had made their homes here. We held that the time was not ripe for Western Australia to enter into the bonds of Federation. However, we had to bow to the decision of the majority. Without desiring to cast any reflection upon the people then resident on the goldfields of Western Australia, I believe I am right in saying that, had it not been for the undue haste they displayed, this country would have entered Federation on much better terms than was the case. Western Australia was even threatened with separation, that movement taking the form of a petition to His Majesty the King. The Secretary of State concerned, in commenting upon the petition, concluded by saying that he personally would be very sorry to be the future Treasurer of Western Australia. Apparently he was not far out, for ever since we entered into Federation our State Treasurer has had an anxious time. At no period of our history as a State or as a member of the Commonwealth has the Treasurer of Western Australia been faced with a more anxious problem. I trust hon. members will approach the motion entirely free from any party spirit. I believe the country demands that whatever decision this Parliament may arrive at as to taking a referendum on the question of seceding from the Commonwealth should be preceded by the fullest investigation. My motion may not go as far as many hon. members desire, but I move it feeling that the present economic situation, brought about largely by the unfair incidence of Federal enactments, should be discussed from a business and constitutional standpoint. This Assembly having just been elected, it would be strange if the people were not given an opportunity to learn what the House thinks of the situation. To judge from the Premier's remarks, Ministers themselves are not at one regarding the issue; and therefore individual members of the Administration have a right to express their individual opinions. I sincerely hope the whole question will be discussed free from all party

interests. It is hardly necessary for me to remind members who have been here longer than I have that our first duty is to protect the sovereign rights of the State. I take it that any suggestion of seceding without due inquiry would be quite improper, and would in fact amount to an encroachment on the dignity of Parliament. We should first obtain knowledge of the effects secession would have upon this State and upon the Commonwealth. Our primary duty is to protect our State rights, sovereign rights reserved to us when we entered the Federation. Our chief complaint against Federal enactments is that they seriously encroach upon State rights. As I said on the Address-in-reply, if this Parliament sits by idly—if I may use that expression without wishing to reflect upon the Legislature—and raises no serious objection to those encroachments, we shall before long drift into unification.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. PIESSE: Before tea I was endeavouring to show that unless Parliament—and this opinion is shared by many people with whom I have come into contact, both inside and outside the Chamber—unless Parliament makes some decisive and united opposition to the encroachment of the Federal authority upon our rights, there is not the least doubt the people of this country will look towards secession as the only alternative. The trend of legislation is undoubtedly in the direction of one central Parliament, and I do hope this House will take the earliest opportunity as soon as the Budget is disposed of to indicate to the Federal Parliament our decided disapproval of the lack of Federal sympathy and help in the direction of developing our primary industries. I have no desire to labour the question, and I have purposely refrained from quoting any figures to-night because for some considerable time past on occasion a great deal of information has been supplied, both at public meetings and in the local Press, and that information has been highly educational. Still, to a large extent we have had only one side of the position put before us. I take it that when this House does discuss the matter—and I hope it will be discussed freely and fully—we shall be able to see that there have been some advantages accruing from Federation, that it has not been

a failure in every direction, and that there is some hope that by constitutional means our grievances may be redressed. Certainly they should be redressed at the very earliest opportunity, because we are in so serious an economic position that the Government of the State must find it very difficult to carry on. We have it from the evidence of men whom we hear every day, and not only from the remarks of Ministers but from our own judgment, that we are in a very serious economic position. For that to a large extent we have to blame Federation, to blame the high protective tariff enacted, through which the primary producers of this country are asked to build up in one generation highly protected secondary industries. That is not merely my own opinion; it is borne out by evidence and it has been repeated in the Press time and time again. We who have had practical experience in the development of our farm lands know the cost of clearing and developing virgin country. We were sufficiently handicapped in the early days prior to Federation, but we are more than doubly handicapped now by the high cost of production in every direction. We are not going to get out of Federation, I think all will agree, in a hurry, and perhaps in the end it may not be found to be desirable. But certainly we have a just claim for consideration, and if our claim is properly put forward and backed up by a majority of the members of this House and of another place, it should carry very much more weight than resolutions passed at public meetings. Very often there is a tendency to get only one side of the question. For long past there has been a cry for separation from the Federal union and one can rightly say that that cry is a very deep-rooted and earnest one. I believe that if a referendum were to be taken to-morrow, a majority of the electors of this State would be found voting in favour of separation. I think that would be scarcely desirable until we had previously exhausted every constitutional means to get redress for our disabilities. The only businesslike view to take of this situation is that Parliament, the directors of the destinies and welfare of this State, should intimate unanimously to the Federal Parliament what these disabilities are, and ask for their redress. I would suggest that the Premier might take us into his confidence and tell us how far the Gov-

ernment are prepared to go in this direction, in releasing if necessary the State from its bondage of Federal enactments which press so hardly on the State. I am quite safe in saying it is utterly impossible to go on and successfully develop our virgin country or even to keep on the land many of the people who are already there and who have done their best, put everything they possess into it, and have taken on big financial responsibilities. Many of them for years have been engaged trying to make a living on the land. Some have not been completely successful in building up assets so that they might be able to finance themselves. While we have this high protective tariff against everything the farmer and the primary producers uses to-day, I wonder what we are going to do in regard to the development of the immense tracts of undeveloped country that we have. I do not want to repeat what is so often said here and outside, namely, that agricultural machinery has more than doubled in price, trebled in some instances. It seems to me that one thing this House should undertake at the earliest possible moment is forcibly to place that position before the Federal Government and ask for some relief in that direction. The Federal Government, through the tariff, are asking the primary producer of this country to do an almost impossible thing, namely, in his short lifetime—which, after all, is only one generation or at most a generation and a half—to build up these heavily protected secondary industries. I think the whole policy is wrong. If it is in the best interests of Australia to carry those secondary industries—and of course we are all proud of Australian-produced goods—and if it is considered advisable to give those secondary industries such a high protection, it is only fair that the whole of the people of Australia should be carrying the burden of it, instead of leaving that burden to those in one industry, the primary producers and the farmers, who are asked to build up and make good those secondary industries in the short period of 20 or 25 years. That is one thing which I think Parliament should concentrate upon. I am quite sure we have both sides of the House with us in the view that our costs of production to-day are a long way too high. Not only agricultural machinery, but almost everything required by the primary producer,

the farmer, the wheatgrower, and the wool-grower, the fruitgrower and the butter producer—all their requirements are unduly inflated in price. The very first thing that a man who goes out on the land has to do is to buy an axe. He cannot clear virgin country without an axe. And axes to-day are 50 per cent. dearer than they used to be. When it comes to the axe handle, it is 200 per cent. dearer than it was 20 years ago when it could be purchased for 1s. 2d., whereas to-day the price is 3s. 6d.

Mr. Sleeman: Good axe handles are being made at Bunbury.

Mr. PIESSE: This principle of asking the primary producer, who has enough troubles of his own, to build up highly protected secondary industries is altogether wrong. It should have been the policy of the Federal Government first to build up the primary industries, when the secondary industries would have followed. The movement has gone so far that we now have no control over it; we can only make suggestions and put up a case. Already a very strong case has been put up. One of the first duties of Parliament should be to develop that case. If we make our inquiries on sound lines and formulate a good case backed up, not from any party point of view, but as the unanimous opinion of this House, it cannot fail to carry great weight. I have thought that this very question of the State's disabilities might be better dealt with by a convention. To some extent that would be getting away from the party element. It seems to me that after the Budget has been disposed of and urgent Government business brought down, Parliament might be adjourned for a month to permit of the sitting of a convention consisting of 25 members representing both sides of this House, and 15 from another place, with the addition of our Federal members. That convention could discuss our disabilities from all angles. It might not be thought constitutionally right to do it that way. That was what I thought of moving in the first place, but I have taken the more modest course of moving that a joint select committee of both Houses be appointed to go into the whole question of disabilities and put up a case to the Federal Government, saying, "This is what we want. Unless we get redress we will have to consider whether it is not possible for us to get out of Federation." That is the proper, business-like course to take. When the Fed-

eral Government sees that this Parliament is dealing with the matter it will know beyond all shadow of doubt that the Parliament has the country behind it. I think that is the soundest way and the most business-like way in which to deal with this very important question.

Resolved: That motions be continued.

Mr. PIESSE: I wish to read one or two references that have appeared in the Press. A few days ago the "West Australian" expressed very clearly what I am now trying to impress upon members. It said—

That a conference between the Governments of Western Australia, South Australia, and Tasmania should discuss the disabilities of the smaller States due to Federation is a workmanlike and promising suggestion that should be acted upon. The fact that these Governments differ in political complexion should remove any suggestion that their representations are influenced by party bias. The preparation of a cogent case is a matter requiring skill, patience and detachment, for the economic handicaps placed on these States by the operation of Federal policy must be carefully disentangled from those due to the general economic position, and to the results of their own economic sins. It would be wise, therefore, to entrust the final preparation of their common claims on the Commonwealth Government to a trained economist conversant with the facts. The name of Professor Giblin, formerly State Statistician in Tasmania, now Research Professor of Economics in Melbourne, suggests itself. Unofficial conferences between business bodies in the three States—such as that suggested by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce—will do good so far as members take the necessary care to get the relevant facts carefully separated and defined. A good case can be spoilt by trying to prove too much. A well-documented representation by the three Governments could not be ignored.

We would do well to follow those lines. Senator Sir Hal Colebatch recently delivered an address—a very impartial address, I think—

Mr. Kenneally: It would be impartial from that gentleman!

The Premier: It would be from some other gentleman I know.

Mr. PIESSE: Sir Hal Colebatch put the position very effectively. The report stated—

Melbourne, September 15.—An address on the secession movement in Western Australia was given by Senator Sir Hal Colebatch before members of the Melbourne University Conservative Club to-night. In the first part of his address Sir Hal spoke of the rapid development of the State before Federation,

and its subsequent disabilities, which were due, he said, to Federal policy, particularly to the high tariff and to the State's proportionately small representation in the Commonwealth Parliament.

"It is not a case of Western Australia wanting to get out of her bargain," he went on. "She deliberately sets up the claim that the bargain has been broken by the dominant partners in the Commonwealth, and that consequently she should no longer be bound by it. I leave it to you to inquire how the policy pursued has advantaged the other States. For a time the big cities of Melbourne and Sydney benefited by the Australian-wide market that was secured for certain of their manufactured goods, and values and population in those cities expanded abnormally. But that benefit disappeared when the level of prosperity in the outlying States of primary production began to fall.

"What is the remedy? First a recognition of the fact that the well-being of Australia depends upon the development of the whole of its resources, and that this in turn depends upon the following of a public policy that will not burden certain industries for the advancement of other industries. As we in Western Australia see it, there are two ways out of the common trouble:—(1) The adoption of a policy suitable to the requirements of the whole of Australia; or (2) the dissolution of the union, on just terms, of course, so that each State may be free to work out its own salvation under the policy best suited to its requirements.

"I feel very strongly that not one of the gross economic errors that have landed Australia in its present unhappy position would have been possible with six independent and competing States. In our efforts to stifle competition between one State and another we have made it impossible for Australia to compete with the rest of the world. The question to be decided now is not merely whether or not Western Australia shall be allowed to secede, but what course is best in the interests of the Australian people as a whole? A prosperous Western Australia rapidly developing and quickly expanding its population though entirely free from the federation, would be a far better asset to the Eastern States and to the Empire, a far stronger bulwark of Australian freedom, than a Western Australia bound to the Commonwealth, but crippled in its expansion and robbed of its proper wealth-producing capacity by a Federal policy which has been proved by almost a dozen independent investigations to be at once burdensome and unjust."

I think Sir Hal Colebatch expressed the opinion of most people in this State, at any rate those with whom I come into contact. Federal disabilities not only affect this State, but are felt very keenly by South Australia and Tasmania. Quite recently when the Premier visited the Eastern States he conferred with the Premiers of South Australia and Tasmania, which was a very wise move. At

a meeting of business men in Hobart, a conference was suggested. A Press report stated—

At a meeting of business men to-day, it was decided to forward the following telegram to the Premier of Western Australia (Sir James Mitchell):—"We have just concluded an important meeting of representative citizens who are members of the Tasmanian Disabilities Committee regarding Federal Acts and finance, and their effect upon the smaller States. We suggest a meeting at Adelaide, as soon as possible, between delegates of your Dominion League and our representatives from Tasmania to discuss matters appertaining to the relationship of the smaller States with the Commonwealth. Will you get in touch with South Australia with a view to their taking part in the conference, and fix an early date for the meeting?"

The other States are ready to confer with us. We have reason to believe that the smaller States are similarly affected, and are suffering to a marked degree, and we should encourage their co-operation. It would strengthen the position if we could show that our Parliament was behind the movement, irrespective of party considerations. We do not want a joint committee representative of only one party. We want equal representation of all parties, so that there shall be no suspicion in the minds of the Commonwealth authorities that the movement is marked by any party significance. Action should be taken without delay. We must realise that the people of Western Australia are sick of Federation, and are blaming Federation for the ills they are suffering. Certainly they have much to blame Federation for, and unless the disabilities are removed, greater encouragement is shown to our people, a more truly Federal spirit is displayed, and adequate protection is granted us, the Commonwealth will have to bear the consequences. My plea to-night is that in every step we take, we should present a united front. We should be able to put up an unanswerable case. While I am not a secessionist, I hope I shall not be forced to become one, because I cannot see that it is impossible to have our grievances under Federation adjusted. The prices being realised by our primary producers have fallen to an exceedingly low level. Wheat and wool have fallen below the cost of production. Almost every other primary product has fallen considerably in price, while costs of production remain high. The time is ripe for us to move. We should not wait until wheat again reaches 5s. a bushel—it is not above its value at 5s.

a bushel; we should not wait until wool goes up to 2s. 6d. a lb.—it is not above its value at that figure; we should not wait until we have dug ourselves out of our present difficulties, but the earliest opportunity should be seized to demonstrate clearly what is needed to relieve the situation. I have suggested a joint committee. I am not the first member of this House who has suggested inquiry by a committee. On the 7th September, 1921, the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) tabled a motion, which was subsequently carried, reading—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in view of the contemplated convention to review the Federal Constitution, that a joint select committee of both Houses of the Western Australian Parliament be appointed to inquire as to the effect the Federal compact has had upon the finances and industries of Western Australia, and to advise as to what amendments of the Constitution are desirable in the interests of the State

Mr. Sleeman: The member for Gascoyne wanted to give away our North-West.

Mr. PIESSE: I am not concerned about that at the present moment. We have to consider the people who have settled on the land and embarked in our industries. They should be assured of a reasonable opportunity to make a livelihood, and should not be forced to leave their properties or be placed in such a position that it will be impossible to sell their farms if they desire so to do. If we cannot carry on our rural industries successfully on the prices received during the last four or five years, it is not likely that we shall succeed on the prices at present ruling. Members may think that I am merely covering ground that was covered five years ago. I do not think that view can be justified. I have taken the earliest opportunity to fulfil a promise I made to my electors to get an expression of opinion from the House on its intentions in the direction of securing lower costs of production. Such a step as I suggest would not only assist those people who are already on the land, but it would assist the Government in pursuing an active policy of development on agricultural lands at present unoccupied. Seeing that the gold mining industry has declined so greatly, primary production is the only hope that remains for the State. Everyone in the State is dependent upon primary production. I do not say they are the only people who make up the country. We want everyone who is engaged in the building up of the

country, not only the producers, but those connected with the other industries, to be able to earn a reasonable livelihood and live in reasonable comfort. No doubt the time has arrived when everyone must exert himself. All will have to work harder and probably work longer; and in most instances, it will not hurt us to do so. We do not, however, want to become slaves to the Federal Parliament. The Federal Parliament, by its unwise legislation and by the creation of highly protected industries, may easily bring us down to the lowest level of beggary. We can say we are going to have our grievances redressed by constitutional means, or we may have to consider the other alternative, that of secession. After that motion was carried a committee was appointed and it sat under the chairmanship of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo). A great deal of important evidence was taken, and subsequently I understand a Royal Commission was appointed by the Federal Government. Many of the clauses of the report furnished by that commission have been referred to in this House. I do not wish to take up too much room in "Hansard" and to have republished what has already seen the light of day. I do, however, want to refer to one portion of the findings of that commission which deals with Western Australia's peculiar disabilities. One of the most important recommendations was the following:—

Your Commission is of opinion that if the State of Western Australia had not joined the Federation, that State might have imposed customs duties partly protective and partly revenue producing, and derived advantage therefrom; that having joined the Federation whatever benefit the Commonwealth protectionist policy may have conferred upon other States of the Commonwealth, it has not benefited the State of Western Australia; that the primary producers of the State of Western Australia have to pay more for their agricultural machinery, etc., than the primary producers of the Eastern States; that the primary producers of the State of Western Australia have not the benefit of home markets like Sydney with its 1,008,500 population, or Melbourne with its 885,700 population—home markets of such value that three-fourths of the primary products of New South Wales and Victoria, other than wheat or wool, are consumed within those States; that the primary producers of the State of Western Australia have to sell their products in the markets of the world; that it is impossible to give the primary producers of Western Australia relief by way of reduced customs duties without injuring the secondary industries of

the Eastern States; and that the only effective means of removing the chief disability of the State is to restore to the State, for a period of years, the absolute control of its own customs and excise.

The evidence and the findings of that commission should carry great weight with any new committee that is set up. They should support that committee in making a report to this House for the amelioration of our disabilities. No doubt there will be other recommendations referred to by the commission that would be of help to the committee. I hope the House will deal with this matter as early as possible. We should get to work at once. Surely no one can better deal with this subject than the 50 members who have just been returned to this House. The position is very acute, and it is difficult for the State Government to carry on. Most of our State rights have gradually been whittled away. Quite recently the sales tax was brought down, and the tariffs have been further increased. This was done without any thought of what the Parliament of Western Australia felt. This Chamber was not asked for any opinion. Our Parliament was never consulted nor asked for an opinion. Before such a drastic step was taken as the imposition of the sales tax we should have been asked for our view. This is one of the few avenues that could have been left to the State to assist the Government in carrying on its affairs. There are very few avenues left to the State in which to raise revenue. It is certain we cannot stand any further taxation of income. Very little income has been earned this year by our agriculturists. We cannot go any further in the matter of land taxation. I do not know how we are to carry on and provide the necessary services for the country, our education, health, transport facilities and the like, without money. The Federal Parliament and the Federal Government have acted in a very mean manner at this juncture. I hope that if a committee is appointed we shall be able to deal with the matter from every practical standpoint. Western Australia has been misled, and Federation has failed from our point of view, both in spirit and in effect. We might as well be in the South Sea Islands if we are to continue to receive the treatment we have had as the result of thoughtless tariffs and thoughtless legislation generally. I hope the motion will re-

ceive favourable consideration at the hands of the House and that it will be carried. I leave to the House the question of the number of members who should constitute the select committee.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

STANDING ORDERS.

Report of Committee adopted.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [8.10]:
I move—

That the following Standing Order be adopted:—Interpretation—No. 422: In these Standing Orders the words and phrases following shall have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them, viz.:—“Subject Matter of a Bill” means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the committee.

The joint committees of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly met and were unanimous in agreeing to this interpretation. A few words of explanation may be necessary from me to members generally. Interpretation refers to Clause 277 of the Standing Orders which reads—

Any amendment may be made to a clause provided the same be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill.

The word “relevant” is somewhat elastic in its meaning, and there have therefore been some disagreements between another place and this House as to what should be amended in a Bill. Members who have been here before will remember that the interpretation given here was to the effect that no clause could be discussed or amended outside the Bill as it was presented in Committee. In another place the interpretation was viewed differently. We discovered from time to time that after a Bill had been passed through the House it came back amended, and the new amendment referred to some part of the Act not mentioned in the Bill. As will be seen from the report which is before members, the joint committees have now agreed to fall into line with our inter-

pretation. Members will therefore know that when a Bill goes into Committee, nothing beyond the clauses of that Bill may be discussed or amended. If members desire, prior to the Bill going into Committee to amend it further, or to add some new clause relating to the Act it seeks to amend, they can effect their desires by moving that an instruction be given to the Committee accordingly. That can only be done prior to the Bill reaching the Committee stage. If any member thinks something in the parent Act requires amendment beyond what the Bill actually discloses, he has only to move in the House that an instruction to the Committee be given accordingly. The hands of no member will be tied if he desires to move in that direction.

Mr. Munsie: Such a motion would have to be carried by a majority.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Quite so. Hon. members will recollect that on several occasions Bills have been passed through the Committee stage, amended, then sent to another place, and have been returned with amendments to further sections of the parent Act. Valuable legislation has been lost because hon. members in this Chamber would not accept the Council's amendments. It will be realised that we are not asking the House to agree to any alteration in the accepted usages of this Chamber, nor to act contrary to interpretations placed upon the Standing Orders by previous Speakers or Chairmen of Committees. We have merely induced the Legislative Council to fall into line with our Standing Orders so that there will be uniformity. I submit the motion for the favourable consideration of the House.

Question put and passed.

Report of Standing Orders Committee adopted.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [8.17] in moving the second read said: The Bill is a short one but will mean quite a lot to Western Australia if it is agreed to.

The Premier: If it were agreed to, you would have the crop left in the field half the time.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In 1909 the present Premier, when he was Minister for Lands, did exactly what I am trying to do this evening.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will prove what I say before I sit down and quote what he said in 1909. His assertion that the Bill, if agreed to, will mean that half the crops will be left in the field is a libel on the workers in the country and the people of Western Australia.

Members: No.

Mr. SLEEMAN: In these days, tens of thousands of pounds are sent out of the State each year for the purchase of agricultural machinery. Most of that money goes to the Eastern States and the rest is sent abroad. We have heard members this evening discussing the disabilities suffered by this State under the Federal regime and those supporting secession should be the first to approve of the Bill. What disabilities are there? We are being flooded with agricultural machinery imported from the Eastern States, whereas we ought to be making it in our own State. In the next few years more agricultural machinery will be required in Western Australia than hitherto. We have just as good tradesmen in Western Australia as are to be found elsewhere, and we can procure the same class of materials as are obtainable in the Eastern States. That being so, every effort should be made to have our agricultural machinery manufactured within the State.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: What about the patents?

Mr. SLEEMAN: There are some patents that will have to be taken into consideration, but the people who want to do business will be prepared to manufacture their machinery here and so capture the trade.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: But they would not be likely to start a factory merely to make a few dozen articles.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Bill will prevent money going out of the State.

The Minister for Works: That is quite right. That is what you will prevent if you have the Bill passed.

Mr. SLEEMAN: There is no doubt about that.

The Minister for Works: You will prevent money being procured for our wool and our wheat.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister for Works and those who preach secession ought to be

most anxious to prevent our money from leaving the State, and ought to support any effort made to overcome some of our disabilities.

The Premier: A unificationist ought not to support this sectional work!

Mr. SLEEMAN: At present we are faced with the problem of thousands of unemployed. There is no more pitiful sight than that of men walking about looking for work and unable to get it—notwithstanding the Premier's promise to find work for all. Should he support the Bill, it will be one step in the direction of fulfilling his promise.

The Premier: You won't let men work.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If we agree to the Bill, it will provide a means by which our boys, on leaving school, will be absorbed in trade activities. At present there is no opportunity for them to be apprenticed to a trade, nor can they learn a trade. If we can set up our manufacturing industries, our boys will have a chance to secure work and there will be employment for blacksmiths, fitters and turners, moulders, patternmakers, plumbers and all the other types of workers whose services will be required.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Why did not your Government pass this legislation?

Mr. Withers: No one thought of it then.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: You have just awakened, now that another Government is in office.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We thought this was the time when possibly the Government wanted something done to assist them in finding employment. Here we have people talking about the difficult times—mostly with their tongues in their cheeks—and when they get a chance to agree to a Bill that will provide more work for our people and keep our money in the State, they quickly oppose it. There is another phase. We have heard members talk of our Western Australians.

The Premier: You are not a Western Australian.

Mr. SLEEMAN: We have been told of the members who belong to old Western Australian families. If they wish to be consistent, particularly those who support secession, they will deal in Western Australian products.

The Premier: The motion before us this evening did not deal with secession.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, but the proposal was for the appointment of a select committee to deal with the disabilities of the

State. If they are sincere, then these big Western Australians should be prepared to support me. There is that other big Western Australian who, in 1909, supported the manufacture of agricultural machinery in Western Australia and now, in 1930, he should at least support it again.

The Premier: It did not result in any machinery being made here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The hon. member, who was then Minister for Lands, must have been partly responsible, because he incorporated a similar provision in the Act and now he says it did not help.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Who removed that provision from the Act?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The present Premier, when Minister for Lands in 1909, when moving the second reading of the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill, said—

A new clause is to be found in this Bill for the first time; that is the clause referring to the purchase of agricultural machinery, which must be made in Western Australia. Last year we imported £104,000 worth of agricultural machinery, largely from the East. In the olden days a great deal of our agricultural machinery was made in Western Australia, and we believe it could be made here still. I remember that 20 years ago, in the Northam district, there were workshops busy turning out ploughs and strippers and other agricultural machinery. They are doing some of it to-day, but not what they were then—not nearly so much.

The Minister proceeded to deal with other phases and then continued—

All the machinery needed by the farmer, with the exception perhaps of the reaper and binder, can be made in the State. The Eastern manufacturer at present can compete too favourably with the Western Australian manufacturer. He has his plant and buildings in the East, and all the things needed for turning out all the machinery sufficient for this State, and he will continue to manufacture it in the East so long as the farmer of Western Australia is willing to pay the freight. There are many reasons for making the machinery here. If we build up an army of manufacturers here they would all be taxpayers, and the increased revenue on them would mean something. A great many men will be required in this manufacture. If we are to be an Australian State of any consequence, we must endeavour to foster local industries and make population possible.

That was what the Premier said in 1909, when he moved the second reading of a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank Act by inserting a definite stipulation that assistance to the extent of £100 available for settlers for the purchase of machinery

was to be contingent upon that machinery being made in Western Australia. I find that the operations of the Agricultural Bank last year showed that £45,981 was authorised for the purchase of machinery and that the number of applicants was 349. The greater proportion of that amount was sent outside the State, whereas it should have been kept here. What was included in the 1909 measure is what I seek to have included in this Bill in 1930. The principle is the same. It will mean that money will be kept in Western Australia and its circulation will help to provide work for our unemployed. During the last few weeks, Ministers have been making statements in various parts of the country stressing the necessity for patronising local industries. At a meeting of the Chamber of Manufactures, the Premier went so far as to say that it should be made necessary to patronise locally made articles. In one place he said we ought to make our agricultural machinery here. It is useless the Premier saying one thing outside and then acting in a contrary manner when he has an opportunity to vote for a Bill such as I am introducing.

The Premier: The mere fact that you include such a provision in the Bill does not mean that the machinery will be manufactured here.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But this is the start. The Premier indicates that he will turn the Bill down.

The Premier: This is simply ridiculous.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If that is so, then the Premier is calling himself names because he proposed the same thing in 1909.

Mr. Sampson: He has seen the light.

Mr. SLEEMAN: He has slipped considerably since 1909.

The Minister for Works: What you have referred to happened 21 years ago. Surely he can change his mind!

Mr. Withers: Wisdom with old age.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister for Railways has made statements to the effect that preference must be given to Western Australian manufactures in the purchase of goods from money supplied for sustenance purposes.

The Minister for Railways: I have not asked them to eat agricultural implements yet!

Mr. SLEEMAN: The principle is the same. It is just as right to say that in spending money made available for the purchase

of agricultural machinery, the people receiving that assistance shall have to purchase locally manufactured machinery. If we are to build up Western Australia, we must patronise our local products. At present the Agricultural Bank trustees make advances to settlers under favourable conditions. In fact, our settlers enjoy the benefit of the best land laws operating in any part of the world. Men can come here without a shilling and get a block of land, and the State will assist them in their farming operations until they get on their feet. It is the duty of the country to assist the settlers to make good. As the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) said the other evening, we cannot live by wheat alone, and if it is our duty to assist our settlers to become good farmers, it is also the duty of the farmers in return to assist in building up our secondary industries. No member in this Chamber can argue logically that the Bill is not sound. They may laugh and oppose it, but in their hearts they know it will be for the good of the State. It is all right for the Minister for Works to sit in his seat and grin. He has always been a most bitter opponent of the manufacture of farming machinery at the State Implement Works.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: On every occasion possible he has made that clear.

The Minister for Works: I have bought many more of the State manufactured machines than you have, and you are a farmer.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister has not bought too many of them.

The Premier: Do you use Western Australian-made articles?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Minister for Works has made the statement on several occasions that he has bought a lot of the State manufactured implements, but that is not so. Statements have also been made by the Minister for Works which led me, if not the House, to believe that quite a lot of State machinery was to be found on his farm. I do not think he has too much on his farm.

The Premier: Not now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, and he never had.

Mr. McCallum: I know what he bought; he bought very little. I looked up the accounts. He misled the House.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am glad that I am right for once. The Bill is quite simple, and if there is any objection to dealing with the State Implement Works simply because it is a State trading concern, the

Bill will not compel people to deal there. I believe, however, it will be good for all if there are implement works established in various parts of the State.

Mr. PARKER: Why not bind the farmers to deal with the State Implement Works?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I am not prepared to create a monopoly at the State Implement Works although I believe the only justifiable monopoly is a State monopoly. Anyway, I do not propose it; I am giving other parts of the State the chance to have machinery made outside of Fremantle and there will be nothing to prevent anyone starting implement works at Northam, Katanning or anywhere else and thereby keeping within the State the money that is devoted to the purchase of agricultural machinery. I do not expect there will be very much opposition to the Bill, at any rate not from anybody who gives it serious consideration, and the support it deserves.

Mr. Sampson interjected.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will be surprised if the hon. member supports it because we know that in connection with his own business he imported cards from Great Britain that could have been made in the State. He is not standing up to his job by not supporting local industry. If everybody did as the hon. member does, the State would not prosper. I hope the Bill will go through. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Point of Order.

Mr. ANGELO: On a point of order; I desire your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not this Bill is ultra vires the Federal Constitution. I think you will find a section in the Federal Constitution which prohibits any State from giving bounties or assistance in connection with the local production of goods or any preference to the manufacture of goods in other States. I ask your ruling as to whether the Bill is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Gascoyne has raised a point of order as to the validity of the Bill now before the House. Section 90 of the Constitution reads—

On the imposition of uniform duties of customs the power of the Parliament to impose duties of customs and of excise, and to grant bounties on the production or export of goods,

shall become exclusive. On the imposition of uniform duties of customs all laws of the several States imposing duties of customs or of excise, or offering bounties on the production or export of goods, shall cease to have effect, but any grant of or agreement for any such bounty lawfully made by or under the authority of the Government of any State shall be taken to be good if made before the thirtieth day of June, 1898, and not otherwise.

I should like to give the matter consideration before giving my ruling.

Mr. Sleeman: There is no provision in the Bill for a bounty or anything else in any shape or form.

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be any discussion on the point of order.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 18th September, 1930.

	Page
Standing Orders, report of Committee ...	584
Address-in-reply, fourteenth day, conclusion ...	585
Bills: Wagin Hospital Validation, 2s. ...	597
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 2s. ...	597
High School Act Amendment, 2s. ...	599
Roman Catholic New Norcia Church Property Act Amendment, 2s. ...	599

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

STANDING ORDERS.

Report of Committee.

The PRESIDENT: I have to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Standing Orders Committee furnished in pursuance with the instructions given by the Council on the 3rd. December, 1929, with reference to certain Standing Orders.