

On motion by Hon. R. G. Ardagh, the debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 20th February, 1918.

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

For "Questions on notice" and "Papers presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."

RABBIT PEST SELECT COMMITTEE.

Request for member to give evidence.

On motion by Mr. SMITH ordered—"That a message be transmitted to the Council requesting leave to the Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom to attend and give evidence before the select committee appointed by the Assembly to inquire into the system adopted for combating the rabbit pest."

PAPERS—SUSPENSION OF A. C. KESSELL.

Motion by Mr. Draper read—"That all papers dealing with the suspension of the services of Mr. A. Colenso Kessell from the Government service be laid upon the Table of the House."

Mr. SMITH (North Perth) [4.44]: On behalf of Mr. Draper, I propose to move that this motion be deferred until later in the evening. Mr. Draper has found it impossible to be in his place at this hour, but he will certainly put in an appearance a little later.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it would be a bad precedent to establish. It is against the Standing Orders. The simplest plan would be to allow the motion to lapse, and to give notice of it again to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH: Could it not be placed lower down on the Notice Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: I could not allow that. The member for West Perth can give fresh notice for to-morrow.

MOTION—WATER METER RENTS, EASTERN GOLDFIELDS.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie) [4.46]: I move—

"That in the opinion of this House, the rents charged for water meters on the household water supply services of the Eastern Goldfields is vexatious and unjust, and should be abolished."

I may preface my remarks by stating that water meter rents on the Eastern Goldfields have been a source of friction and dissatis-

faction since January, 1903, or shortly after the goldfields service was established. By the very nature of things a centre that is far removed from the central government is likely to have its claims as far as its requirements are concerned, overlooked, but when we also find the position that that centre has an imposition placed upon it, that it has no parallel in the metropolitan area where the seat of government exists, the friction is intensified. The scheme I say is a national one reticulating an area of 16,000 square miles, which is one-fifth the size of Victoria. From being a purely goldfields water scheme it has so grown that at the present time there are no less than 12,361 services. Not only are places like Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, Boulder, Westonia, and from Southern Cross upwards—all the mining centres—supplied, but it is responsible for the water supplies of Northam, York, Beverley, Toodyay, Goomalling, and other small farming centres. A perusal of the output of the Goldfields Water Supply displays a remarkable state of things. Whilst Kalgoorlie and Boulder on their general services average a supply of at least 261 million odd gallons for the last two years, we find the metropolitan area has been supplied with an average of 202,000,000 gallons, nearly 203,000,000 gallons, as against a supply of 261,000,000 gallons for Kalgoorlie and Boulder. The revenue from the general services of Kalgoorlie and Boulder for two years average £48,000, whereas the metropolis has taken nearly as much as the general service of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, with a peppercorn rental of £2,500 irrespective of how much water is consumed. Whether they take, as we find in 1916-17 167 million gallons, or whether they take as in 1915-16, 238 million gallons they pay, shall we call it, a peppercorn rental of £2,500. For almost similar services Kalgoorlie and Boulder are debited with an amount of £48,000. I am not finding fault with the amount that is paid at Kalgoorlie for the service, but we are told that the reason why these small irritating water rents cannot be abolished on the Goldfields is because the service does not pay. I should like to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that in the metropolitan area practically no income is received, but that is not justified by general usage. Throughout the whole of the metropolitan area as far as the general services are concerned, no water rent whatever is charged, and when we come to Guildford, Midland Junction, and East Guildford, a strange anomaly exists. These are centres supplied direct from the Mundaring scheme and yet there no meter rent is charged. I appeal particularly to the members on the cross benches—the members of the Country party—because there are several centres that also pay meter rent for a small supply of water. The gain in revenue as far as the goldfields people's pockets are concerned, is not great because the number of meter services is not large. The amount paid in Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Coolgardie, and Kanowna is £2,850 per annum, a comparatively small charge, but it is the irritating nature of the

charge. The charge is made nowhere else, it is not justified by usage and I contend it is a fair simile to say the Government have no more right to charge meter rents than a grocer has the right to charge for the use of the scales with which he weighs the tea and sugar and other articles which the customer buys in his shop. The largest number of meter services is on the goldfields and I should like to know how the Government justify the fact that over a period of 13 or 14 years for some of the meters that cost as low as £3—that is what the Government are paying for the new American meters on the authority of the Minister for Works, than whom I can find no higher authority—how can the Government justify a meter rent of 10s. a year on the capital value of a meter that costs the department £3. It is true the Kent and Kennedy meters cost more—I believe the Kennedy costs up to £14, or it did in the old days—but to supply interest and sinking fund, which is so dear to the heart of the Treasurer at the present time, and rightly so, a charge of 20 per cent. will pay for the meter several times over.

The Minister for Works: There is the expense for upkeep.

Mr. GREEN: Yes, there is the oil and repairs, but the total cost of the meter has been met for the next 20 years as the Minister will readily see when he charges 10s. a year for 14 years.

The Minister for Works: Fourteen years ago meters were not obtained at £3 each.

Mr. GREEN: That is so and I am allowing a higher rate for Kent meters—up to £5. The main objection raised to the abolition of the meter rent, although it exists only in a small area of the State—it does not exist in the capital and in the centres that are using water from a similar scheme—but the main objection is that the water supply scheme does not pay. We shall be told that there is a deficit for the current year of no less than £76,000. There is one feature apart from the national character of the work. The gold mines on the goldfields, were it not for the water scheme, would to-day be practically non-existent, and the city would be non-existent. We should find the member for East Perth going about bartering as his progenitors did in the past. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that for £2,500,000, which is the recognised amount as loan on the water scheme, no less than three per cent. is set aside for sinking fund. In no other public work of this State, nor in any other State that I have been able to find out, has such a large amount been set aside for sinking fund, and the position therefore is that instead of the sinking fund being £77,473, as it has been this year, it would be a fair thing to pay out of the Consolidated Revenue the difference between one per cent. and three per cent. as a refund to the book-keeping balance sheet on this great undertaking. That would mean that instead of showing a deficit of £76,000 it would show a book-keeping debt on the scheme for this year of £50,916

less than if it was on a one per cent. sinking fund. It need hardly be mentioned to the House that a large number of public works pay as low as one-half per cent. sinking fund. The Treasurer has told us in his Budget speech that the Goldfields water scheme loan matures in 1927. What will be the position then? The whole of this sinking fund will be wiped out and as the leader of the Opposition reminds me, we shall be in possession at the expiration of the sinking fund in 1927 of having a surplus of half a million pounds, and we shall find that there was no necessity to provide the three per cent. sinking fund, because of the surplus of half a million pounds.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It will pay some of the deficit.

Mr. GREEN: Yes, and it will be promptly transferred to Consolidated Revenue. This is an unjust tax because of the enormous amount it has extracted from the people for many years, compared with the small value of the measuring instrument on which the tax is made. It is irritating also because of the fact that one section of the community has the tax imposed upon them. Such a tax is not imposed in the metropolitan centres.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have increased their rates 6d. in the pound.

Mr. GREEN: I can recognise that the hon. member is prepared to rush in whenever any interests affect his own constituency, but I believe on this occasion he will rise to the national plane and view this matter accordingly. If the hon. member can show me that anything in his constituency requires national treatment in the same way as this matter which I have brought forward, I shall be one of the first to support him.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I have advocated the reduction of meter rents.

Mr. GREEN: I have never heard that from the hon. member and it is a bad business for him to introduce it just now, when I am trying to draw the attention of hon. members to what they must see is an injustice. These meter rents are charged nowhere except on the goldfields and in farming constituencies, and up to the present time they have paid not only the capital upkeep of the meter but any sinking fund which might have been attached to it. If we allow for a legitimate sinking fund being imposed upon the whole of the scheme it then becomes a paying one. I hope the Government will see their way to remove this source of irritation which has weighed upon the goldfields people for many years. The metropolitan area absorbs nearly as much from the Goldfields Water Scheme as Kalgoorlie and Boulder, but they have no meter rents to pay. As the Government only receive a matter of £2,500 I think this might well be made a charge on the metropolitan bodies, who, I am sure, would not object to make up that amount which would be lost to the Government by the abolition of the meter rents on the goldfields.

On motion by the Minister for Works (Hon. W. J. George) debate adjourned.

Mr. Green: You will bring the motion on again this session?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

MOTION—REFRESHMENT ROOM, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, SALE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR.

Mr. STEWART (Claremont) [5.5] I move—
 "That in the opinion of this House the sale of alcoholic liquor on the premises of Parliament House should, on and after the passing of this resolution, cease."

In introducing a matter of this kind I know I am attacking the daily habits of hon. members.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are not the first one who has done it.

Mr. STEWART: It is unnecessary for me to assure hon. members that this motion is in no sense the outcome of anything that I have witnessed since I have entered the House. Nothing that I have seen is inconsistent with the character and reputation of hon. members. I say that in all seriousness, and I do not intend it as a vain compliment. Perhaps I would have delayed taking action, or I might have abandoned it altogether, had it not been for certain remarks which were uttered by members of the Government in regard to what I would call public policy. On the 24th January the Premier, speaking in this House, made use of these words—

People in the cities can go about their business and enjoy themselves while those in the country are slaving to endeavour to procure food for the necessary sustenance of the people of the State. The Government are prepared, and are daily engaged in an endeavour to bring about economies in every direction.

And what I am now going to read is the most important part of the Premier's remarks on that occasion—

It would be very much better for the country if they did not spend so much in extravagant living at the present time in Western Australia. People do not seem alive to the position. It is the people who need to wake up. If the people would only show the Government of the State that economy which they should show, it would be an advantage to Western Australia and it would be helpful to the Government of the day.

Therefore, the Government are seeking to place the onus of a lead upon the people of the country, when, as I consider what a Responsible Government should be, the lead should come from the Government and Parliament. The Treasurer, in the course of his remarks the other day, said that the people should be educated not to take as much as they possibly could from the State without giving something in return. Another member of the Government in another place, explaining the financial position, stressed the argument and said that only by separating from the Commonwealth could we hope to avoid public bankruptcy and industrial stagnation.

Hon. P. Collier: Is it all going to be saved by your motion?

Mr. STEWART: I am not going to pretend that it is, but I may show what the Government have advocated should be practised outside, and to be logical we should start from within. Perhaps, if I had been an older member of the House, I might have hesitated

before bringing a motion of this kind under notice.

Hon. P. Collier: The rashness of youth.

Mr. STEWART: I perhaps would have succumbed before this to the charming influences that surround parliamentary and club life. Of course I am very conscious of the difficulty which faces me when I propose to interfere with the daily habits of hon. members, especially those habits which are in the nature of luxuries.

Mr. Harrison: During the hot weather?

Mr. STEWART: I am aware that a change in our habits is one of the things we, as human beings, least desire.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is not too much luxury in this House.

Mr. STEWART: Then call it a privilege. I have reason to fear that we shall not get very far with this motion. The success, or otherwise, of it will depend to a large extent upon whether hon. members are able to rise above what I might call their more selfish personal consideration. I have the conviction that we, as a Parliament, have not yet done all we can in connection with the serious business of putting our house in order from a financial point of view, and there are four cogent reasons which I shall submit to hon. members:

Hon. P. Collier: Have you seen that whisky poster of the Scotchman saying "When?"

Mr. STEWART: Coming from the country where the Scotch national bard has given it such praise, perhaps it is extraordinary that I should be the one to introduce a motion of this kind to the House. Speaking on the question of the usefulness of drink, I might quote a few lines of Burns, who says—

But bring a Scotchman frae his hill.

Clap in his cheek a Highland gill;

Say, such a Royal George's will

An' there's the foe;

He has nae thought but how to kill

Twa at a blow.

While it may be necessary for a stimulant to be partaken of by, or administered to, men on the battlefield, surely we are generous enough to believe that no such stimulant is necessary in order that we may conduct the business of Parliament. There are four reasons which I think should commend themselves to the House in favour of my motion. The first is the question of economy, the second is the influence of example, the third is that Parliament should be a place for the conduct of business, and the last is that if the motion were carried it would serve as a salutary reminder that this country is engaged in the most bloody conflict which has ever shaken this world of ours.

Hon. P. Collier: Will this save the position?

Mr. STEWART: That is a matter which the leader of the Opposition can best answer in his own mind. The cry of the world is for economy—

Hon. P. Collier: Your motion is really a win-the-war proposition.

Mr. STEWART: Especially as regards the belligerent countries. Is it not reasonable or logical to suppose that, in the matter of the privileges enjoyed by members, there is an imperative demand for this sort of economy?

Hon. members seem to make light of the force of example which this House can give to the State. I believe that a self-denying ordinance of this kind would be welcomed by a considerable body of outside opinion, and would go a long way towards rehabilitating the good name of the House in the mind of the public. It may be known to hon. members that a motion of this kind was passed through the Assembly in New South Wales in October last. Surely if a majority of members in that legislative hall has concluded that a motion of this kind should be passed, this Assembly would do well to follow suit. This motion is no new thing, therefore, in the politics of Australia. I could perhaps anticipate some of the objections which hon. members will raise to this motion, but I am not going to discuss them at the present juncture. I have no desire that members should be inconvenienced, or that any hardship should be inflicted upon them, apart from what I conceive to be their duty in regard to setting an example to the country. At election time a great deal was said in favour of anti-shouting, and a considerable number of members was returned to this House in support of that principle.

Hon. P. Collier: Was the hon. member against it?

Mr. STEWART: I combated the anti-shouting legislation, and any interference with the existing conditions as affecting licenses or local option.

Hon. P. Collier: Your desire for reform, then, is confined to this House?

Mr. STEWART: I am seeking to prove, in contradistinction to the statements of the Premier, that the example should emanate from this House to the country. If we are sincere in believing that there is a great and wasteful extravagance going on, it is putting the cart before the horse if we contend that the people should show the Government the lead. That is inconsistent with my views as to what the responsibilities of a Government should be. It is all very well to look askance at a proposition of this kind, while personally I believe that there is something in it. I am not here to speak on behalf of temperance or other outside bodies. I am pledged to no kind of action with regard to the question, but I do feel deeply the insincerity and the unavailing platitudes which are indulged in when the question of economy or doing away with waste comes under consideration. I do not know but what a great deal of good could come from a self-denying ordinance of this kind. There are many hon. members here who, I think, would be prepared to surrender certain of their privileges for the sake of setting an example to the State. The bar of this House is open at all times of the day, and if we were consistent the bar would be closed at 9 o'clock. Parliament acts upon the supposition that it is a law unto itself, that it can prescribe to the people what they must do, but that so far as the privileges of members inside the House are concerned these are sacrosanct and must not be touched. I am appealing to the sense of honesty and logic in the minds of hon. members to do something, whether in this direction or otherwise, to effect economies also which can be further dealt with as the Estimates proceed. The Government and

Parliament might well do worse than to take this motion favourably into consideration because its terms verge so closely upon what I conceive to be a waste in this Parliament, while it would also tend to set a good example to the country in the way of economy. There is no gainsaying the fact that there is an endless waste of money connected with the expenditure on liquor. Even the proprietors of distilleries and breweries have admitted this. We are here engaged in the most awful conflict we have seen. If none of the arguments I have used appeal to hon. members it must be supposed that they prefer to continue to enjoy their privileges, and desire to set an example of needless waste and expenditure, whilst at the same time they are diligent in recommending to the country to close up its ranks against all kinds of waste.

Mr. Hardwick: Would you allow any concession in the case of snakebite?

Mr. STEWART: That would probably depend upon the condition of the patient at the time. My motion is not brought forward in any way as embodying adverse criticism upon the conduct of hon. members. That is far from my mind. I think I am justified in placing the motion before the House, and have therefore much pleasure in moving it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [5.26]: I second the motion, pro forma.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [5.27]: As leader of the House, I think I should at the outset express my opinion in regard to this important motion. I am surprised that a motion of this sort should come from the hon. member, who fought the last election on the total abstinence policy. I am at a loss to understand why he should move in this direction. I cannot follow his line of argument. I look upon this House as, to a great extent, the home of members of Parliament. We spend a great deal of our time here, and members upon election to this House receive an honourable position here. I have seen nothing within the precincts of the House that is derogatory to the honourable position enjoyed by hon. members on account of the fact that we make use of alcoholic liquors. We are here in our own house as members of Parliament. We have as much right to our glass of beer, or wine or whisky, if we desire to have it at the end of a hard day's work, as we would if we were in our own homes. I am surprised, too, that the hon. member should have supported his motion so strongly on the plea that it is designed to prevent extravagance. But I wish the country to know that the motion is really a reflection on the House. We are told practically that we have not the character, have not the control of ourselves, to be trusted to handle alcoholic liquors. I resent such a reflection. Never have I been amongst a body of men more temperate than the 50 members constituting this Legislative Assembly. Hon. members know well that the bar of the House is not used extravagantly, and for my part, I think it would be wrong to deprive them of the opportunity of obtaining refreshment during the course of a long sitting. If it were the law of the land that no drink should be

sold in hotels or used in private houses, that no drink should be imported into or manufactured in Western Australia. I would say at once that Parliament should adopt the same principle for its members. But until we make that the law of the land, I see no reason for closing the bar of Parliament House. If I thought the bar was being misused, I should be the first to support the motion. Perhaps the next suggestion will be that, on the score of economy, we should not have evening meals here. Surely we are allowed to make use of the good things the gods send us, so long as we use them properly. As regards drink being a luxury, it might also be considered a luxury to wear a collar.

Hon. P. Collier: Or to shave; one would save money by letting one's whiskers grow.

The PREMIER: An abstemious man—and most men are abstemious with regard to alcoholic drink—I think should be allowed to obtain what drink he requires in moderation, as is the case in this building. Hon. members use their privilege with discretion, and there is no ground for abolishing it on the score of economy. Then the hon. member asks us to set a good example. I say the members of this Parliament do set an excellent example to the public. Further, the hon. member says that the conduct of business does not require the sale of alcoholic liquors. We all admit that. We admit members could do without alcoholic liquors. But still, why deprive members of their privilege as long as it does not interfere with the proper conduct of business? Again, the mover said that the carrying of the motion would serve as a salutary reminder that the country was engaged in a bloody combat. My opinion is that if we do not have a little refreshment in the course of a long sitting, we may think a great deal more of the war, and regard our position as worse, than we would otherwise. A little drink in moderation is useful to some people, and cheers them up. I know I am glad to have a glass of whisky and water after a hard day's work, though I do not touch alcohol during the day at all. Further, the hon. member says that in carrying the motion we shall be rehabilitating the good name of the House. I have never heard that this House had a bad name as regards intemperance. I know the House has at times had a name for intemperate language. Let me suggest that the mover should consider the advisableness of temperance in language as well as of temperance in the use of alcoholic liquor. I do not consider that this House stands in need of rehabilitation in any respect. As leader of the House, I am proud of hon. members, proud of the fact that I lead a House whose members conduct their private affairs as they ought to do. I hope hon. members will not support the motion, though I am sure it has been moved in all good faith. I fail to see that any good object will be served by carrying the motion.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [5.40]: I agree that the motion has been moved in the utmost good faith; and I think the motion is to the credit of the mover, whatever we may think of its practicableness. When notice of the

motion was given, I did not think it would be carried. On the ground of honesty and logic, however, and as a supporter of anti-slopping, and also on the pleas of preventing waste and extravagance, I support the motion. I consider, nevertheless, that there should be no half measures; if the bar is cut out, the refreshment room should be cut out, for the refreshment room shows a loss while the bar shows a profit. Therefore I say, if we cut out one, let us cut out the lot. I am not and never have been a teetotaler, though I am not by any means a drinker; so the closing of the bar would inflict no great hardship on me.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [5.43]: Although the mover has the Premier and the clerk of the weather against him, I support the motion for the sake of consistency. During my election I was asked whether I was in favour of abolishing the sale of liquor in Parliament House, and I replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Lambert: You would get an awful shock if the motion was carried.

Hon. P. Collier: So would the mover.

Mr. ANGELO: The leader of the Opposition might say that the rashness of youth prompted me to make such a promise, but I regret to say the reason was more important. On the outskirts of the State, I am sorry to say, there are constant and numerous rumours of the gross ill-usage of alcoholic liquor in this House for a number of years.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Did those rumours help you to win your election?

Mr. ANGELO: I am pleased, after having had the privilege of associating with members for the last three months, to be able to go back to my electors and tell them that those rumours have not an atom of truth in them. Unfortunately, however, the rumours still exist; and, unless some drastic action is taken to give them the lie direct, they will continue to be promulgated throughout the length and breadth of the State. Having made the promise, I shall stick to it. Another reason which appeals to me is that advanced by the mover—the reason of example. At present the Sovereign of the British Empire and the King's representative in this State are both setting an example to the people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are you sure of that?

Mr. ANGELO: I think you, Mr. Speaker, will bear me out. It would be as well for Parliament also to set that example. I would suggest to those in authority that in the event of the motion not being carried, orders should be issued for the closing of the bar when the military authorities prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in the City. All through the City we hear it said that when the hotels and clubs are closed by military direction members of Parliament can come up here and get a drink.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.46]: I had not intended to speak on the motion, because as a total abstainer I am not very much affected by it. However, some of the remarks made by the member for Gascoyne have brought me to my feet. The hon. member declared there were certain rumours in the back country. Let me ask "Why is it that such rumours are spread?" It is because of motions such as this before the House. When motions of

this kind are brought in, people outside can only conclude that there is something going on up here which renders it necessary to close the bar. I have been here nearly 14 years now, and as a total abstainer I can say that I have never seen anything in the House that I was ashamed of.

The Minister for Works: Have you ever seen drunken men amongst members here?

Hon. W. C. ANGIN: I have seen drunken men amongst members, but not in this House. Members themselves are, to a large extent, responsible for the abuse aimed at them outside the House. It has become popular to-day in the Press, and more particularly among candidates for Parliament at election time, to point to the alleged privileges provided for members of Parliament. One hon. member drew attention to the luxury in which we live. I do not think I have ever had in Parliament House anything I have not paid for. In my opinion it is the duty of every member to do his best to raise the reputation of Parliament House amongst the people. To-day it is popular to say that a member of Parliament is a fool. Perhaps some of them are. I refer to those who have large businesses, notwithstanding which they waste their time here; because I know their duties here must interfere with their businesses. There is no doubt in my mind when I pick up a daily or weekly newspaper that the one object of the Press is to belittle Parliament and members of Parliament. No doubt this continuous policy has had some effect, at least on the people in the back country. Although a total abstainer, I am not one of those who try to force the temperance racket down everybody's throat. I believe that if men would abstain from drink it would be better for them. The Premier says he is better with it, but I have my doubts about that. If one wishes to show an example, let it be the personal example. I can never understand the man who publically protests against the use of intoxicating liquor, while keeping a little store in his own cupboard at home. Let such a man show his personal example, and it will have a far greater effect than the closing of public bars. The Press that to-day so frequently refers to the luxuries of Parliament will turn round next week and jibe at us if we close the bar. Would we not deserve to be condemned if we voted for a motion such as this? It would be a confession that the bar at Parliament House has been detrimental to the carrying on of the business of the country. The hon. member used that as an argument. He said we were brought here to carry on the business of the country. Are we going to admit that we are not capable of doing so, because we have not sufficient will power to keep away from the bar? Although a total abstainer, I refuse to vote for a motion that would lower the dignity of the House.

Mr. ROCKE (South Fremantle) [5.53]: I do not think the motion is intended as a killjoy. I was pleased to hear the mover say that it did not imply any reflection on

members. If it did I could not support it, because since I have been here I have seen nothing in the bar to which any man could take exception; in fact everything has pointed to a commendable temperance on the part of members. But there is a greater issue at stake. On every hand we hear the cry for increased efficiency and the elimination of waste. We know that the liquor traffic is responsible for exceeding great waste. It is responsible in a measure for the troubles and perplexities of Colonial Treasurers. We have a deficit approaching one million per annum, whilst our liquor traffic consumes £2,500,000 per annum.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is quite in order in discussing the whole of the liquor traffic of the State under this motion.

Mr. ROCKE: I think the object of the mover of the motion was to set an example. I believe that representative men should set an example. If it is right for us to urge efficiency and the elimination of waste—everybody has agreed that alcoholic liquor taken in quantities results in inefficiency—we might, I think, support the motion and show that we are willing to make some sacrifice. The Premier has pointed out that it is a sacrifice for a man to give up alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Green: What sacrifice are you making?

Mr. ROCKE: None at all in that line. I never knew any benefit from it. It has been said by the member for York (Mr. Griffiths) that the profits from the bar here make it possible for members to have meals at a reduced cost. If this is so I am quite willing to do without my meals here, or to pay a higher price for them. I could not consent to having the bar kept open just for the sake of providing cheap meals for me. I hope hon. members will remember that the motion is not a reflection on the House, but is merely an attempt to improve existing affairs and bring them towards a higher state of perfection.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [5.58]: All members recognise that the member for Claremont (Mr. Stewart) was prompted by the best intentions in moving his motion, but I fancy he lost sight of the fact that it is doing members an injustice. I was much struck by the support given to the motion by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo). He said that rumours had been going about his electorate to the effect that excessive drinking went on at Parliament House, and he said he would be pleased to go back and assure his constituents that it was not so. The idea of a North-West member going back to his constituents with such an assurance would move the gods to mirth.

Mr. Hickmott: He is open to back any of his constituents to drink more than all the members of Parliament put together.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member's constituency is the only one in the State that voted for increased liquor licenses. Considering that during the last 12 months the liquor consumption of the State has fallen by £700,000 I do not think we need trouble

very much about that phase of the question. I do not say that the member for Claremont has not a good intention; but to satisfy some stupid public demand by moving in this direction, to say the least of it, is indiscreet. While I desire to see liquor reform, I certainly resent the idea of outside organisations belittling Parliament and holding Parliament up to ridicule, for intemperance in Parliament does not exist.

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [6.2]: I do not think it is necessary to carry the motion with a view of reforming members of the House. That is not intended by the mover of the motion. I have had the pleasure of association here for some years and I can bear testimony to the good conduct of members during my association in the House. I do not think the motion is intended to cast any reflection on the House. It is purely with the object of setting an example to the people and I think that "example is better than precept." Because of this, I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I am sorry at the attitude taken by the Premier; it is so different from the attitude of the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, who said—

It is essential, and indeed vital, for the efficient conduct of the war that wasteful or unnecessary expenditure should be prohibited. It is beyond question that the use of liquor affects adversely the realisation of this purpose.

Mr. Lambert: What about the bowling green? That is rather a waste at the present time.

Mr. VERYARD: An immense amount of money is squandered in strong drink in this State and I think members might consider the little sacrifice which they could make. I do not believe in the use of strong drink in any shape or form, but I know a large number of people who appreciate their whisky and I have no right to find fault with what they do, but at the present time I think we might set an example to the public.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [6.5]: As it is said "example is better than precept," I should like to say the only reason I have for supporting the motion is that we should set an example to the rest of the State. In supporting the motion I am not casting any reflection on members, but we know that liquor reform is desired by various sections of the community. If the only object the member for Claremont has in introducing this motion is to reform, then I do not think it is going to have much effect. I maintain that there is a large number of people in the State who are desirous of having liquor reform, and I think it would strengthen their hands to a great extent if the Parliament of Western Australia was to follow the example of the Parliaments in the Eastern States and not have liquor in the House. I say that I have never seen the bar abused in any shape or form, but I support the motion because, if carried, it will be an example.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kalgoorlie) [6.7]: Everyone knows my feelings on the temperance question and yet I cannot help regretting that this motion has been brought forward at the present juncture, because it is

tinkering with the temperance question and placing a so-called reform in a wrong light. If we are to deal with a public evil, do it with it in a wholesale fashion, but to pretend that the members of this Chamber are more virtuous than the rest of the community is to assume the role of the Pharisee; it is to pretend and not to be. If members are convinced of the necessity of closing our bars because of the evil it is effecting, there is a direct way of doing it. Let every member resolve not to have a drink. The bars will soon close itself. Let every member himself set an example and not force his example on others. There is no need for reforming the Chamber, and if there is no need for reform why make a pretence of reform? This accentuating an evil which has very much taken root, apparently, in Gascoyne, would appear that members are the victims of inebriety and that they cannot stand forward and conduct the affairs of the country unless they are half full of tanglefoot. This is a general impression and it is catered to by some new comers into the political arena. It is a cheap way of getting popularity and fouling your own nest. It is not part of the duty of members to cater to calumnies. I am almost convinced that there are some of those who have spoken to-day in support of the motion who keep in their own cupboard their whisky bottle, or their poison, or the beverage, and indulge in it when they are not here. There are those possibly who do that. What hypocrisy! If they get up and drink it and then come here and say "It is wrong to drink; we will not allow it in the refreshment room of the Assembly it is pure humbug. If the bar in Parliament is closed, we may have men going out for drink when they should be in their seats performing their duties. If members desire to close the bar they can do so by not touching the liquor, by not going to the bar. But some members want to stand up pharisaical and say, "What great examples members of Parliament are; they are not allowed to touch it." I cannot believe in tackling a big subject in this pettifogging and pharisaical manner. The hon. member in his new born zeal on entering into the public life of this State believes he can pose honestly as a reformer by introducing a reform where he says it is not needed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. T. WALKER: The subject has been fairly threshed out. I wished, by what I have already said, to explain my reasons for the course I am taking. I trust the mover will not run away with the idea that I have slackened in my zeal for the reformation of the people as to their bibulous habits. But my contention is that the hon. member's motion serves neither as example nor as precept nor as a reform in any sense. It will not by a iota alter the habits already formed in any member of this Chamber. It will not prevent what the mover calls waste, but it may possibly lead to more waste—waste of time and fares in order to get to Perth in order to quench a thirst acquired in listening to a hon.

and fiery speech such as the mover delivered to-night. I object to being a party to a pretence, to playing to the gallery, to encouraging that attitude of thought towards representatives of this Chamber which is becoming altogether too cheap and popular. I object to advertising to the world that there is need for reform here when it is admitted that there is no such need. If the hon. member comes along with a genuine attempt to lessen the drinking habits of the community, to reform individuals tending towards indulgence in intoxicants, to attack the evil boldly and in a wholesale fashion, I shall be with him. But on this pharisaical motion, which is not worth the paper it is written on, I cannot stand by him.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [7.36]: This motion being relevant to temperance, on which question we all ought to take a stand, and on which my attitude, I feel, is being watched by many of my electors, I must declare myself. I agree with the member for Kanowna that it lies in the power of every member to make himself an example in this respect of temperance. Every member can adopt that course, and thereby close down the bar of the House. Were the motion one for putting a referendum on the liquor question before the country, I should be prepared to support the member for Claremont; because I said on the platform that I supported a referendum on that question. But I am going to record my vote against this motion, which I consider merely tinkers with the question.

Mr. STEWART (Claremont—in reply) [7.38]: I expected the bulk of the objections to my motion would centre round the fact that the motion does not represent a large measure of liquor reform. I made it perfectly clear that I did not set out either with the object of touching liquor reform at all, or with any purpose of recommending to hon. members any reform in their own persons. The carrying of the motion will leave to members the complete direction and control of their own tastes and habits as regards alcoholic liquor. I did intentionally refrain from indicating on which side of the liquor question I myself stood. In consequence, it was assumed in various quarters that I am a total abstainer. Perhaps that assumption represented an instance of the wish being father to the thought, the wish being that this motion should be introduced by one who belonged to the temperance party. In matters of liquor reform I have always allowed myself to take a broad view. I regret that my action to-day has been spoken of as savouring of pharisaism, or of playing to the gallery. For my part, I have always refrained from reading into men's minds motives which may be very distant from their thoughts. At the general election I fought the questions of anti-shouting and liquor reform tooth and nail, and opposed the so-called measures of reform which were very much in evidence at that time. But I do not consider myself bound by my attitude at the general election to refrain from bringing forward a motion such as this, which is the

outcome, in a sense, of a feeling of resentment against the Government for having demanded that the people should show them how to effect economies. This motion proposes a policy of economy through the elimination of waste. The saving I contemplate is not the actual saving in this House; it is the economy which will follow as a result of the example which the House will set to the country by carrying the motion. There are many men not on the temperance platform who openly declare that enormous waste prevails owing to the undue consumption of alcoholic liquor. I know that the same opinion is held by the manufacturers of alcoholic liquor, who all desire a sober community. So much for the pretence of tinkering with the subject of liquor reform. Hon. members who speak so voluminously as to the side they will take when a big measure of liquor reform comes along, might well, on this motion, do something to justify the confidence of their electors, instead of being content to make declarations that they will support so and so and such and such. That is where, to my mind, a charge of pharisaism would lie more legitimately than one directed against myself. I am only sorry for the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), who will return to his electors giving us all an excellent testimonial. For that, I am sure, the House will feel very grateful. With those who desire to see the Government set an example of economy I am taking this action because I believe it to be one which the Government and Parliament can well tackle. I appreciate the temperate manner in which hon. members have debated the motion, and I assure them again that there is nothing of a personal character whatever about it.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	35

Majority against .. 27

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Rocke	Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Smith	(Teller.)
Mr. Stewart	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Money
Mr. Brown	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munle
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Drusack	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. H. Robinson
Mr. George	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Green	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Jones	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

1. Local Option Continuance.
2. Broome Local Court Admiralty Jurisdiction.

Without Amendment.

RABBIT PEST SELECT COMMITTEE.

Message received from the Council stating that permission had been given to the Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom to give evidence before the select committee of the Legislative Assembly to inquire into the system adopted for combating the rabbit pest.

Resolved that motions be continued.

PAPERS—OBSERVATORY, TRANSFER TO UNIVERSITY.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth) [7.50]: I move—

"That all papers relating to the proposed transfer of the Observatory to the University be laid upon the Table of the House." This is a matter which affects the interests of some of my constituents, and it is also a matter which affects the public of the State. Hon. members will recollect that some correspondence was published in the newspapers in connection with the intention to transfer the Observatory to the University. I do not for one moment say whether that would be a good thing or not; I reserve to myself the right to discuss the matter on its merits when it comes before the House. So far as my recollection goes, as a member of the Senate, no proposal has ever been made by the Senate, or with the authority of the Senate, that the Observatory should be transferred to it. By some means or other, I do not know how, a proposal was received by the Government, but upon that, so far as I can ascertain, the Government have not acted. The Premier has kindly allowed me to peruse the file in connection with this matter of the suggested transfer. If it were a question of economy in the long run the transfer might be justified, but on the other hand, viewed from the scientific point of view—I am not giving my own opinion, which would not be worth anything—the transfer would be detrimental to the scientific work of the Observatory. Therefore, when the matter comes before the House, hon. members will have to consider to what extent the value of the work which has been done by the Observatory will be affected if the institution is transferred to the University. If the Premier will assure me that the Government will not sanction the transfer of the Observatory to the University without giving Parliament an opportunity of discussing the matter, I shall be perfectly satisfied. It is certainly a matter which the House should discuss. According to reports also, it is doubtful whether the University can take over the work of the Observatory and perform it in a thoroughly efficient manner. However, there is no need to go into that question just now; all I require

is the assurance which I have asked for from the Premier.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moor [7.56]): I can assure the hon. member that the question has never been seriously considered by the Government up to the present time. There has been a considerable amount of departmental correspondence, but nothing has been heard of the matter for the past few months. The correspondence dealt with the advisability or otherwise of the transfer, and it only got to a certain stage in November last, and there the matter remained. I have heard nothing more about it since and neither have the Government. The question therefore remains in statu quo. It is one of those questions which I think the House should express an opinion on. The change would be an important one. The Observatory has been under certain control for a number of years, and Parliament ought to be allowed to express an opinion on the subject. I can give the hon. member an assurance that the Government will not finally agree to any transfer until the question has been brought before this House and discussed. Some people think we might do without an Observatory altogether, but that is not the question at the present time. The Government have no intention of making a transfer without consulting Parliament, and can give the hon. member the assurance he has asked for.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8.0]: I might remind hon. members that a previous Parliament decided that the Observatory should be closed down, seeing that the Commonwealth would not take it over.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): That has been decided two or three times.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The last time was, think, in 1915. On that occasion it was moved by a member of the Opposition. I think it would be far better if that decision were given effect to. Just at present the State cannot afford to pay for the maintenance of an institution engaged in photographing the stars, work beneficial, perhaps, to the scientists of the world, but not of much advantage to Australia.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Preparing a chart which will not be finished for 1,000 years.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Observatory is handed over to the University, no doubt the University will want additional funds to maintain it.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Certainly nothing at all will be saved by handing it over to the University.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: For years past attempts have been made to induce the Commonwealth to take over the Observatory. The Commonwealth Government must be of opinion that the work being done by the Observatory is useless to Australia. If that is so, clearly it cannot be of any great benefit to Western Australia. Why, then, should this State continue paying for the maintenance of the Observatory, when the work it is doing is not of much good, even to Australia? The Meteorological Department has been taken over by the Commonwealth, and I think a further attempt

should be made to induce the Commonwealth to take over the Observatory. Alternately, we should close it down altogether, because we can no longer afford to pay for it.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth—in reply) [8.2]: I think that perhaps the observations of the member for North-East Fremantle are a little wide of my mark. Undoubtedly they will be very pertinent when the question of the Observatory Vote on the Estimates comes before us. Certainly it is a matter about which a great deal can be said. Personally, I am quite prepared to accept the assurance given by the Premier, and with the leave of the House I will withdraw the motion.
Motion by leave withdrawn.

MOTION—REPATRIATION, RIVERTON ESTATE.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne) [8.3]: My motion reads—

“That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the offer made by the owners of the Riverton Estate to give an area of sixty acres in the estate to the Government for the purpose of repatriation, be accepted.”

A little confusion has crept in in respect of the wording of the motion, and I ask you, Sir, for sympathy if I do not adhere strictly to the terms of the motion as printed on the Notice Paper. If it should so occur, I trust you will not apply those hard and fast rules of procedure as strictly as you would do in other cases, for this is a matter of very great importance. Also, I should apologise to the House for taking up time, as I am jealous of my interference with the consideration of the Estimates. My apology shall be based on the importance of the motion. I trust members will give me a little attention while I make the position clear. When I am finished I think that possibly members will agree that it is a question of pressing importance. I ask those members who have taken an interest in the block of land known as Riverton Estate, as a field for repatriation purposes, to temporarily liveat their minds of any conclusions they may have come to as to the quality or value of this land. It will be necessary that they do that, in order that they may attach due weight to the letters I shall read to the House. The first letter is addressed to Lieutenant A. T. Williams and dated 5th February, 1918. It reads as follows:—

Re land at Riverton. I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 30th January, 1918, and I have the honour to inform you that this company is prepared to hand you certificate of title of blocks Nos. 1170 and 1185 of the Riverton Estate, when certificate of title for these blocks are applied for by you. (Signed) J. F. Mullen, Chairman.

Following on that letter we have this, dated 3th February, from the Department of Industries to Lieutenant A. T. Williams, as follows:—

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 31st January reached me on the 4th inst. In reply I may say I have already passed your application along to Cabinet for consideration.

The difficulty is, as you know, that the Government experts turned this land down. In submitting your request to Cabinet, I will of course have to be guided by their decision. One of the questions involved is, apart from individual assistance, how are you going to get on without a road, and where is the money to come from to make it? Yours faithfully, (signed) R. T. Robinson, Minister for Industries.

Then, under date 11th February, we have this letter from Lieutenant Williams to the Minister for Lands, Perth:—

Dear Sir,—In reference to our conversation this morning, I have the honour to inform you on behalf of Messrs. Gaynor, Stafford, Main, Simpson, and myself, that we are willing to contribute £10 each towards the construction of the road to our land. The length of the road required is about 75 chains from the end of the road to Mr. Riley's gate. I have been informed by Mr. Riley, chairman of the Jandakot roads board, that they have a sum of £110 already in hand, of which £50 is settlers' money, towards the making of this road. With our contribution, there will be £160 available for the work.

The last letter I have is from the Department of Lands and Surveys to Lieut. Williams, under date 13th February, as follows:—

With further reference to your application on behalf of Messrs. Gaynor, Stafford, Main, Simpson, and yourself for assistance to settle under the returned soldiers' scheme on certain blocks of land in the Riverton estate, I am instructed by the Minister for Lands to inform you that this matter has received very careful consideration from the Government, and that it has been decided as follows:—(a) The Government to purchase the land, approximately 68 acres, from the Riverton estate at £4 per acre. (b) The purchase money to be applied to the construction of the road necessary to give access to the blocks, the balance of the money, say £500, required to complete the road, to be found by the roads board, and Riverton estate, otherwise the land not to be purchased. (c) The five returned soldiers to receive assistance in the ordinary way to an amount not exceeding the sum of £500. (d) No contribution by the soldiers, as suggested, by you towards the construction of the road to be made. (e) The returned soldiers to purchase the land on the usual terms. I am, your very obedient servant, (sgd.) John Camm, for Under Secretary for Lands.

I think I have made it clear now that these men had given to them, without conditions, the fee simple of 68 acres of land. No mention was made of a road; there were no stipulations whatever in the free gift that the owners of Riverton made to these returned soldiers. I do not wish to-night to go into the question of whether this land is of value, or whether the 68 acres selected is the best of the entire block. The fact remains that these men were given this block of land, and that they asked the Minister in charge of repatriation to give them the help which they had been led to believe the Government were prepared to give them. Instead of receiving that assistance,

they have been confronted with the difficulty of having to build a road to their land, or go without the land. It is very clear that these men are not likely to take on this big indebtedness for a start.

The Premier: They are not asked to spend any money on a road.

Mr. TEESDALE: They may not be asked to spend any money, but the company that presented them with the land in the first instance have been told that their scheme will not be approved, and that, as an alternative scheme, the Government will purchase the land at £4 per acre, the identical land offered to the soldiers for nothing. We are asked to buy back our own land, and the Government propose to devote this money, 68 acres at £4 per acre, to the part construction of this road. No one has asked for this road. These men got so tired of beating up against this wall of officialdom—I do not wish to reflect on the Minister, but I do think there has been a lack of consideration shown these men—they were so discouraged with the one hundred and one obstacles placed in the way of this scheme of theirs, that they decided to pay £10 each to help along this road. I consider that was a splendid offer from men who have been away to fight, and have come back here with a few pounds towards starting some little avocation of their own. And the Government have seen fit to refuse this offer. They say in this letter of the 13th February that unless this money is applied to the construction of the road necessary to give access to the block of land, the land will not be purchased. They also say that this £10 that each man has agreed to contribute, will not be received. I am an outsider in the matter. I do not know the promoters of the Riverton Estate, but I know that these returned men have been walking the streets of Perth for weeks and weeks, and that they are now practically despondent about the way in which they have been treated. Whether it has been intentional or not it is not for me to say; the Minister should know. But it is clear that there is something radically wrong when these men have to be continually going backwards and forwards to the departmental officials about a little matter like this. These men are quite prepared to take up this block without the advantage of a road; they are prepared to tackle it tomorrow. They are not Hay-street soldiers, but fine, strapping, virile men, well accustomed to the wielding of the axe. They are not nambly pamby soldiers; I have seen them personally. They are rattling good men, the very sort of men we require to keep here. Already there is a section of returned men here so disappointed at the treatment they have received at the hands of officials that they propose to appeal to the Government of Queensland, because their own Government have practically—I won't say denied them consideration and sympathy, although such a phrase would almost be justified. These men should be sympathised with. Hon. members all admit that these men deserve our sympathy. They have been away to fight for us. They have enabled us to sit here in comfort and security to-night. If it were not for these men the Estimates would not be troubling us; the only Estimates we would be likely to be considering would be es-

timates concerning the payment of the indemnity levied upon us by Germany. I ask hon. members to support me in giving these men some satisfactory answer to their weeks of padding up and down the streets and dancing attendance upon Ministers. These are men who have had experience. One of them has had 25 years' experience in this State, and another has been through four campaigns. I see from their discharges that they are men of first-class character. I have made personal inquiries concerning them, and am confident that the more one inquires about them the more one can be satisfied that they are the kind of men we want to settle upon our lands. I have the personal assurance of Mr. Camm, the repatriation officer, who was sent out to inspect the block by the Government, that this is first-class land, and that he was surprised—

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): What is that?

Mr. TEESDALE: I have had the personal assurance of Mr. Camm that this is first-class land, and he also told the applicants in my presence that this was so. Furthermore, he was surprised to see the quality of the land, as instanced by the properties of Messrs. Riley and Metcalf Bros. adjoining. There is some consideration due to these men who gave up lucrative positions and went to the Front to do their duty. They have done their duty and have returned, and now ask the Minister for that consideration that they have been led to believe is to be given to them, by means of the money collected from the public to aid such men in getting back into either their old callings or some other occupation. All they ask is to be helped by loans from time to time to enable them to build their homes in the country, or wherever they can select land, or to get some occupation which is remunerative and not too heavy for their state of health.

Mr. Draper: Do they ask for this particular land?

Mr. TEESDALE: This land was selected by them five or six weeks ago. They have a full knowledge of the block and are satisfied from personal tests and from Mr. Camm's inspection that it is a good block. I have seen numbers of holes that have been sunk in this particular block, and can vouch for there being humus and loam there and everything else necessary to make a satisfactory garden area, provided that it receives the necessary attention, which I think these men will give to it. They have shown that they are men of solid parts by their having stuck to this matter for over eight weeks. They are not even now discouraged, although they have had to bring their grievance before the House in this manner.

Mr. Pickering: Where is this block?

Mr. TEESDALE: It is roughly about half an hour's drive from Perth.

Mr. Pickering: Do you refer to the swamp portion of the land?

Mr. TEESDALE: The ground is perfectly dry. It may, however, be said to be moist

although it is not swamp land. It is situated on the rise. This is ground into which one can plunge an arm up to the elbow in loam if one desires to do so. It is certainly not wet ground, but it is perfectly suitable for growing certain produce. Only a wire fence separates the ground from the adjoining property, on which the owner has had six crops of rhubarb in one season. He has averaged a price of 3½d. per lb. for some tons of this vegetable, and has had as high as 6d. per lb. for it. I do not wish it to be thought that this land is only suitable for rhubarb. I have seen some of the finest strawberries and pears that one could wish to set eyes upon growing upon it. It can grow fruit and strawberries and also good potatoes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The strawberries are very good.

Mr. TEESDALE: These men are quite satisfied with the produce which they have seen growing on the other side of the wire fence. I will leave it to hon. members' intelligence to judge as to whether ground can alter so materially when only a wire fence divides it from another block. For fear that there should be any doubt in the minds of hon. members as to the value of the ground, I repeat that Mr. Camm in my presence said he was surprised at the good quality of the land, and took the trouble to walk over the whole of the 68 acres, in fact, he took far more trouble than I expected he would take.

Mr. Pickering: Is the land of uniform quality?

Mr. TEESDALE: It is of very uniform quality so far as I can judge, and Mr. Camm remarked to me that it appeared to be very fine soil. He had a man on the ground with a spade, who dug a hole wherever Mr. Camm desired, and he never once faulted any hole. I ask hon. members to support me in this motion, because I have heard many of them from time to time speak with enthusiasm upon the repatriation schemes which have been proposed. I also ask them in this instance to remember the speeches they have made, and to say whether I have not given them a case which appeals to their sympathies with regard to the applicants I have mentioned. These men only desire fair play. They have no particular grievance. They have not made any fuss, but have just sat back and depended upon the officials to do their business to the end that the result they so earnestly desire may be brought about. They have not been making themselves objectionable. They only said to me that they were tired of going through the ordinary channels, and asked me to bring this matter before the House to see if some satisfaction could not be given to them, and finality reached. They have walked the streets of Perth and their money has been expended. They came back to this country with only a small capital. Are we going to see these men walk the streets until they are footsore? I am not speaking bitterly, but am trying to explain to the House that these men are reaching the end of their resources. They are becoming irritated, and we cannot afford to irritate them. They have done their share,

and have helped us, and enabled us to be here to-night. All that they ask is justice and decent treatment. I ask the Minister for repatriation to waive these hard and fast rules, and for once to give these men the satisfaction they want, so that they can go upon this block to-morrow morning, without having to expend a single farthing. A that they will ask for is for a little money to provide for upkeep, fencing, and the felling of timber. That is all they will want at the hands of the Minister. They desire the same facilities which have been given at Osborne Park and other parts of the State in which people have taken up blocks. They only require loans from time to time to enable them to build homes, and become contributors to the revenue of the country. At the same time they will be only too pleased to be able to support themselves and clear themselves of debt. I hope that members will join with me in an effort to prevail upon the Minister to do something in the matter. I have, therefore, much pleasure in moving—

"That in the opinion of this House the applications for assistance from funds at the disposal of the Government made by certain returned soldiers desirous of settling on certain blocks of land granted to them by the owners of the Riverton estate, should be approved by the Minister in charge of repatriation without delay"—

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): What is this; it is not the motion on the Notice Paper?

Mr. TEESDALE: I am rather surprised at the Honorary Minister beginning to indulge in pinpricks regarding the substitution of the word "Government" for the word "proprietors." If this is an example of the attitude that he intends to adopt in regard to my motion to-night, I must say it augurs very badly for the success of my endeavours.

Mr. Green: You are beginning to find him out, are you?

Mr. TEESDALE: May I not move an amendment to the motion on the Notice Paper?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must move the motion as it stands on the Notice Paper.

Mr. TEESDALE: I should like this matter to go before the public in its proper form.

Hon. P. Collier: You can get another hon. member to move an amendment.

Mr. TEESDALE: Very well. I have much pleasure in moving the motion standing in my name.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.24]: I second the motion, pro forma.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth) [8.25]: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "that" in the second line be struck out and the following added:—"The applications for assistance from funds at the disposal of the Government made by certain returned soldiers desirous of settling on certain blocks of land granted to them by the owners of the Riverton estate, should be approved by the Minister in charge of repatriation without delay; the officer dealing with repatriation having inspected the land and having de-

clared that the blocks form ample security for the amount advanceable under the Commonwealth Repatriation Act."

I move this amendment in order to facilitate the discussion on the really urgent matter, which the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) has brought before the House. If these returned soldiers are desirous of settling on blocks of land which have been granted to them by the owners of the Riverton estate, and the value of that land for the purpose of security has been approved by the Government officer, surely the House does not require to go any further than to grant their request. These people are satisfied with the land, and the Government officer is apparently satisfied with it. They desire to settle on this place and make it their home, and under these circumstances, there should be no red tapeism in the way which would prevent the application being promptly granted. These returned soldiers are ready and willing to go on the land at once, and I feel sure that members of this House will facilitate the matter and enable them to get to work. There may be something to be said which contradicts some of the facts I have mentioned. I merely give this to hon. members from hearsay. I feel confident that the matter, which has been brought forward by the member for Roebourne, and the real motion which he is bringing before the House is through my mouth, is at any rate one worthy of the utmost consideration.

Mr. H. ROBINSON (Albany) [8.30]: I second the amendment.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.31]: I consider this is the introduction of the question of repatriation. There are several questions which have been brought before the House, and I say it is time we had a case like this presented to us so as to realise how serious is this matter. On the Address-in-reply I stated that I saw certain land on the Riverton estate which I considered unsuitable for repatriation purposes, but I said the land shown to me was represented as the worst on the estate, and that I had not seen any of the swamp country.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member seen the 60 acres?

Mr. PICKERING: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the only portion of the Riverton estate under discussion now.

Mr. PICKERING: I cannot speak of the 60 acres, but I know the papers have been placed on the Table of the House dealing with the Riverton estate in which are reports by officers of the Lands Department relating to the lands in the estate and the 60 acres referred to must have been included in that report.

Hon. P. Collier: The report placed on the Table is one of condemnation.

Mr. PICKERING: What is the position of hon. members if we are to have placed on the Table of the House a file by officials condemning the estate and then have brought under our notice by a member of this House a remark that a responsible Government officer has denied the truth of the reports, and that it is stated the land is of first class quality.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The same thing applied to Osborne.

Mr. PICKERING: If this is the way the Government are going to proceed with the scheme of repatriation, then the sooner we deal with it in a proper manner, the better.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing the question of repatriation. The 60 acres apparently have been refused and this motion is to have it accepted.

Mr. PICKERING: I go further and say as an endorsement of the report of Mr. Camm that the Government are prepared to buy the land at the price of £4 per acre. Why they want to buy the land when the land can be given to these men is beyond my understanding. I consider this is not a fair deal to men who are asking to settle on this land. If we find a company generous enough to give this land, it seems presumptuous on the part of the Government to take away that right from these men; to buy the land and charge the land up to these men out of their £500.

Mr. Thomson: Do they say they are to be charged with it?

The Attorney General: Why not give the Minister a chance of explaining?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must complete his remarks now. He has been speaking for some little time.

Mr. PICKERING: In a letter submitted to the House it is said that the land is not to be purchased unless the money can be utilised for the making of roads. That is one statement there, and it seems to me that it is the desire of the Government not to settle men on the land, but to put every obstacle in their way.

The Minister for Works: Nonsense!

Mr. PICKERING: I have been an advocate for a repatriation scheme for some years, and it is time that something was brought forward, yet it seems to me that every time the question comes up some excuse is put in the way, either the Commonwealth Government are in fault or the State Government cannot take any steps. I say it is the duty of the Government when there is an opportunity to settle men, to decide definitely whether their officers are correct, to say if the report of Mr. Camm is a correct one.

Mr. Teesdale: Are you prepared to abide by Mr. Camm's report?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Which one?

Mr. PICKERING: This one as given by Mr. Teesdale.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister-Nelson) [8.35]: I was exceedingly surprised when it was stated that Mr. Camm had declared that this land is first class and entirely suitable for the purpose of repatriation. With the permission of the House I will read Mr. Camm's opinion of this land; it is dated 22nd January, 1918. He says—

In view of the analyses, which would seem to show that there is practically little plant food in the soil I think that the owners' offer to allow the Government to permit these returned soldiers to establish themselves there should also be refused, as it would be difficult to justify any expenditure whatever in view of Mr. Mann's report. If you approve of the offer being turned down, I will advise those interested. Hon. P. Collier: Do you endorse that view?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I endorse the view of the gentlemen who have inspected the estate as a whole. I want to say at once as far as the 60 acres go that it has been offered to the men and I consider it is the best land in that estate. I go further and will state that when Lieutenant Williams and other men approached me to know what the Government were prepared to do regarding this land, I asked them this question: if the Government are prepared to assist you to the tune of £500 per man on this 60 acres of land, are you prepared to state definitely that you will not come on me in the immediate future for a grant to build a road? Did I get that assurance, Mr. Speaker? No, I did not get that assurance. They said of course in the near future they would have to have a road and I quite agree with them. If those men are to have any chance of success, then they must have a road to that country. The Government made this offer: they would purchase the land at £4 an acre conditionally that with that purchase money they would give facilities for the building of 80 chains of road, the company to put up an equal amount and the roads board to put up an equal amount. These men, had that offer been accepted, would have immediately been placed on the land and could have drawn on their advance of £500 per man. That is the true position.

Mr. Teesdale: The conditions are impossible.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): They are not impossible. I ask hon. members here, who is going to benefit by it?

Hon. P. Collier: The outsiders who never paid a farthing.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): No, there are no outside settlers because the land belongs to the Riverton estate. The estate will benefit enormously by the settlement of these men on the 60 acres and the building of one mile of road.

Mr. Teesdale: They never asked for it.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I have stated that these men did ask for it. They asked me who is going to benefit by the road. If these settlers were the only people, they would be perfectly justified in coming to us and asking for full assistance. The owners of the estate are going to benefit to a large extent by these people settling on the 60 acres, and they have £500 per man. Will they not benefit, is it not up to them to put their hands into their pockets and pay something towards the road?

Mr. Green: Is not the grant of land itself worth something?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The grant of land is worth what the Government have offered, in my opinion, £4 an acre.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the worthless land.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I said it is the best of the 2,000 acres.

Hon. P. Collier: Nevertheless it is worthless.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): It is valued by the company at

the small amount of £1,350, that is what they value the land at.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the whole estate.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): No, the 60 acres.

Hon. P. Collier: Who valued it?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The chairman, Mr. Mullen, valued it himself at £1,350. The Government value it at £4 an acre. I am afraid I shall have to weary the House a little by going back a little, to show what an extraordinary position has come about. The estimated cost of building the road is £800. There is this about the whole business, and it is just as well the House shall be seized of the facts. The company who own the estate have been push, push, push for the last 14 months.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member is outside the motion and amendment more than the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) was.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): I take it that I have to lead up to the matter. We have been accused of having no sympathy with the men, and of placing all sorts of obstacles in their way. Every effort has been made to try and settle the men; we have to save them against themselves. It is our duty to see that they are settled and to give them the advance of £500 each, but they must have a chance of making good. Nobody is more sympathetic towards these men than I have been. They have been described as fine men by the hon. member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale), able-bodied, strong men. I want to say that every man yet who has been discharged as a returned soldier has been discharged because he is not physically fit to go back to the Front. I say in all sincerity that anyone who takes on this land can take it on for one purpose only—market gardening. Is there anyone here who knows what the life of a market gardener is? If so, he will agree with me when I say it is a very strenuous life of toil. Market gardeners have competition on all sides of them; they have even to compete with Chinamen. The competition is such that, in order to make good, market gardeners must work early and late. I inspected the Riverton estate, and had a long talk with these men; and I was prepared to deal with the men sympathetically, and to help them in every possible way. But I am not prepared to see the company who own the Riverton estate make a profit for themselves and gain kudos to which they are not entitled.

Mr. Thomson: Posing as patriots, while they are nothing of the sort.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): A genuine offer was made to the company. If they were really anxious to assist these returned soldiers to settle on the estate, they would not have turned down the Government's offer in the contemptuous manner they did. The matter was still open for negotiation, and could have been discussed. But no; the company turned down the offer, and treated the Government to a contemptuous letter. That offer of 60 acres was not made till the 15th January. To hear hon. members who have preceded me, one would think that the offer of 60 acres was made months ago,

years ago. It was, in fact, made on the 15th January.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, the 60 acres; but not the big block.

Hon. P. Collier: What was the date of the Government's offer to pay £4 per acre?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The 16th February.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The matter had been going on for months.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Certainly, the whole question had been. But I take it I would be outside the motion and the amendment in dealing with the question of the purchase of the whole estate. The purchase of the whole estate was being negotiated for 14 months, and was definitely turned down by the Minister for Lands 12 months ago. But still the company, unwearied, returned to the charge.

Mr. Teesdale: The company, or the men?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The company. Every time the company.

Hon. P. Collier: The owners of the Osborne estate were turned down, too, and they returned to the charge successfully.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The statement of the member for Roebourne as to the statements of the responsible officer for repatriation, Mr. Camm, is very wide of the mark. The papers have been lying on the Table of the House, and hon. members have had an opportunity of perusing them and of reading the remarks above Mr. Camm's signature. I would be an astounding thing that that officer should have made those statements.

Mr. Teesdale: On that day, do not forget.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): It is astounding to me; and, until I have the matter corroborated by Mr. Camm himself, I must form my own conclusion as to the accuracy of the member for Roebourne. It has been stated that a petition was forwarded. That is so. A petition was forwarded, but not as regards the 60 acres. With respect to the 60 acres, if those men are prepared to go on the land, prepared to accept the offer of the company—it is not for the Government to accept the offer, but for the men—and if those men are then prepared to mortgage the land in order to obtain the advance of £500, all I say is that the initiative lies with them. But the question is, can they make a success of it, if they have to pull their produce for one mile through heavy sand? I say they have absolutely no chance of succeeding. It would be cruel to put them on that land under those conditions. I hope and trust the House, in its mature deliberation, will arrive at the conclusion that if those men are to be settled on those 60 acres and are to obtain the assistance of £500—

Mr. Thomson: How many men could be settled there?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Five men. I say I hope it will be on the condition that a road is put in and that the owners of the Riverton estate pay their fair proportion of the cost of the road.

Mr. Thomson: How many acres does the whole estate contain?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): Two thousand acres. Hon. members will see that the owners of the estate will benefit by the mile of road put directly into their property, which is now on the market for sale. Has the property ever been offered to anyone else in the metropolitan area, and has it been turned down? It has been turned down time after time, take it. In spite of that, however, since we consider the 60 acres to be the best of the property. I am prepared, on the condition offered, to place the men on that land tomorrow.

Mr. Teesdale: They will go on. I guarantee that.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans) [\$52]: I would not have spoken on this motion had it not been for the astounding statement made by the Honorary Minister (Mr. Willmott) just before he resumed his seat.

Hon. P. Collier: A most extraordinary statement.

Mr. MUNSIE: To me it does seem strange that the Minister should put to the owners of the Riverton estate the condition that in addition to giving 60 acres of land for the purpose of repatriation, they must also give £400 in cash for the building of a road to that land.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): How do you make it £400?

Mr. MUNSIE: I take it that would be about the company's share.

The Minister for Works: Their share would come to about £260.

Mr. MUNSIE: Let us say £260, then. The Minister demands that the Riverton estate people should, in addition to giving 60 acres of land, pay £260 cash before he, as a member of the Government, is prepared to take any steps towards the repatriation of the five men who wish to make homes for themselves in that locality.

The Minister for Works: The offer is sprat to catch a mackerel.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Honorary Minister's statement is astounding, seeing that the Premier, in reply to a question asked here some little time ago, stated that the Government had up to that date spent about £14,000 on the repatriation scheme, and that the largest portion of that money had been expended in sending surveyors to Nornalup Inlet.

Hon. P. Collier: Eight thousand pounds spent on surveyors.

Mr. MUNSIE: Another question asked was answered by the Government to the effect that in order to obtain access to the place where the Government proposed to place the returned soldiers £200,000 would have to be expended on the construction of a railway. I fail to understand the logic or the reason of a Government who come forward with proposals of that description. However, after the demonstration given last night, nothing that Ministers in future may say in this House will surprise me.

Mr. H. Robinson: There are settlers at Nornalup now.

Mr. MUNSIE: I believe there are three settlers at Nornalup. The member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) said so, and said it was a wonderful place.

Hon. P. Collier: Those three settlers got there 50 years ago, and have not been able to get away.

Mr. MUNSIE: I have no particular objection to offer to the policy of the Government if they are going to assist returned soldiers in sending them to Nornalup. But what I am objecting to is that while they want to send returned soldiers to a place which will demand an expenditure of £200,000 in order to provide means of communication, they refuse to settle men on an estate close to Perth unless the company owning the estate, who are prepared to give the land, will also pay £260 towards the cost of making a road.

The Minister for Works: The Government object to being exploited by a land company.

Mr. MUNSIE: I know something of some of these returned soldiers, and I can bear out what the member for Roebourne has said with regard to most of them, although I do not know all the names read out by the hon. member. I know they are anxious and willing to try to make homes for themselves. It has been said that the House should be very careful in carrying such a motion as this, because the effect might be to place the Government under an obligation to the Riverton estate people. I do not regard the matter from that standpoint at all. If the Riverton estate people have been good enough to select the best 60 acres in their state—as the Honorary Minister says—for the purpose of giving the land to these returned soldiers to make homes for themselves, then in future years the increase in the value of the remainder of the land, which they are not offering to the Government, will recompense them, and the Government will then be under no obligation to the company.

The Minister for Works: But the trouble arrives when they come along for a road, as they will do.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Other people do the same.

Mr. MUNSIE: How long is it since the Government have adopted that attitude? In fact, our friends opposite are the very people whose policy for the last six or seven years it has been to encourage people to settle right out in the back blocks and then come to Parliament and agitate for a railway on the ground that they did settle in the back blocks.

The Minister for Works: There it is a case of Government land. Here it is a private estate.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am surprised at the report read by the Honorary Minister and at the statements made by the member for Roebourne. In moving his motion the member for Roebourne made certain statements, which, if the report as read by the Honorary Minister is correct, are altogether incorrect. If, on the other hand, the statements of the member for Roebourne are correct, the Government ought to get rid of Mr. Camm to-morrow morning, because he would not be a fit man to have in that position.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You do not think the member for Roebourne gave wrong information?

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not know who is giving correct information.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The member for Roebourne said he had witnesses.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am positive that the member for Roebourne has not in any way attempted to mislead members of this House. I am quite sure of that. I am certain the hon. member has said what he honestly believes to be true.

Mr. Teesdale: I know it to be true.

Mr. MUNSIE: If that is the case, if that officer made those statements to the member for Roebourne before witnesses, and if that officer then put in the typewritten report to the Government as read by the Minister, I say that so far as the repatriation of soldiers is concerned, either in connection with the Riverton estate or any other estate in this country, we shall never do any good until Mr. Camm has been removed from his position.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle [9.0]): I intend to support the amendment. I confess that I am not an expert so far as land is concerned, but I have been over this estate, and I have seen the gardens referred to by the member for Roebourne. The property is only just outside my electorate. What the hon. member has said with regard to the products of the soil from this estate is quite true, and so far as Riley's place is concerned, it has returned about £600 per annum. The Attorney General was successful in getting that information when he was there. There is a road already close to the area which has been chosen. An attempt has been made to make a soldiers' settlement on this estate. The Government were not sympathetic; perhaps they were justified in the action they took with regard to the whole of the estate, but we have it from the Minister to-night that 60 acres of this property, which the company are prepared to give to the soldiers is the best land in that area. I thought the Minister would have given some information when the member for Sussex sat down as to whether the money they intended to pay to the company was to be charged to the men.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): How much?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have not any information from the Minister, but the inference is that the £4 per acre, which it was proposed to pay for the purchase of the land, would be charged to the soldiers in a manner similar to that adopted in connection with ordinary land settlement, that is to say that payment would be spread over a number of years. I thought the Minister would have told us whether it was intended to charge for the land which the company had given free of cost. That is a big consideration so far as the men are concerned. The member for Sussex expected to get that information when he sat down, but it has not been given, except by way of the interjection, "how much," which means they intend to charge the soldier settlers for the making of the road. The Minister for Works has stated

that the company were asked to pay £260 out of their own pockets towards the making of this road, and that the roads board and the Government were expected to contribute a similar amount. The men, of course, will be asked to repay that. I, like the member for Ivanhoe, know some of these men. I visited the estate, and it was pointed out to me that several of the men who intended to settle there had had practical experience so far as working the land was concerned. I was told that they had had experience in Victoria and in this State, and that they were perfectly satisfied, if they had the opportunity of settling on this land, that they could make a good living out of it. There is no doubt whatever about the fact that these men know something about land, and they were not jumping into this proposition without having given it consideration. Suppose the land were sold to private people, and suppose a portion of it were bought for market gardening and the buyers were not soldiers, would the Government have anything to say in regard to the road; would the Government make it a condition that before these people settled there a road must be constructed?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): No, but if you advance them £3,000 you want something done.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If those people had approached the Government and pointed out that they were producing and adding to the wealth of the State, they could ask to be served in the same way as other settlers.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Decidedly, and they would get a road.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The honorary Minister is making a lot about giving the £3,000, but I would remind him that the State is not giving a penny. This money has been advanced by the Commonwealth.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Who has to pay?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Those who take up the land will have to pay. The Government have admitted that this land is suitable for settlement; they admitted it by offering £4 an acre for it. I regret the interjection of the member for Katanning, that the company were posing as patriots. I only wish we had a few more such patriots. It is a pity we cannot find a few more owners of land willing to hand over 60 or 70 acres for soldier settlers. The Government, contrary to the reports of their officers, and contrary to the advice of the Lands Purchase Board, paid £7 an acre for land at Osborne Park no better than that at Riverton.

The Premier: Not contrary to advice.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would like to see the reports and the statements of Ministers in regard to the matter. One of the gentlemen has written to the Press about it, but the Press will not publish the letter, and that gentleman is supposed to be one of the most reliable men in Western Australia. I am only showing that, for some reason or other, an obstacle has been put in the way of the soldiers, who are desirous of making homes for themselves on the Riverton Estate.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): The offer of 60 acres was made on the 25th January.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister himself has told us that these men have been trying to get there for 14 months. Then the owners come along and say, "We have confidence in this land; we believe it is good for market gardening, and to show the Government that they are wrong we will give the soldiers 60 acres so that they may test it."

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): The Government have no power to prevent the soldiers accepting it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The whole thing shows that deception has been practised. The men were led by the Government to believe that the land was suitable, and then reports are made to the Government that it was not.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): What do you mean to insinuate?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I only want to express the hope that the House will support the member for Roebourne and, by giving their vote in favour of the motion, show in reality that they are prepared to assist soldiers who have returned, especially when those soldiers are prepared to help themselves.

Mr. MONEY (Bunbury) [9.15]: We have had an admission made by the Honorary Minister (Hon. F. E. S. Willmott) that this particular 68 acres of land is suitable for the settlement of soldiers. So far as I can see or hear, the only objection put forward is the fact that the road over which they will have to pass consists of sand. In my humble opinion that is altogether an insufficient objection. Of my own knowledge I know where market gardens are successfully carried on in Western Australia, notwithstanding that the men working them have to traverse, not one mile of sand, but three miles of sand. Yet those gardens have been most successfully carried on for the last ten years. The objection of the sand road is easily overcome by having a horse sufficiently strong to pull over that sand. The objection is not an insuperable one at all. In fact, I would prefer a sand road in the winter season, when we are having our copious rains. I think the hon. member himself will admit that other country which is not sand, but which constitutes a good road in the summer months, is impassable in the winter months. The advantage of a sand road is that it can be used all the year round, and seeing that there is no made road at all, it is rather an advantage than an objection. And apparently the sand road is the only objection to this offer being accepted. I know of many successful settlers in Western Australia who would be only too pleased if they had a road accessible to them at all periods of the year. I do not wish to say much on this subject, but I feel that these returned soldiers are most anxious to settle at Riverton, and that therefore we should give them every encouragement that lies in our power. I feel that it is not for us to utilise any particular district or estate for our returned soldiers, but it is for the returned soldiers themselves to take a keen interest in their blocks and engender the spirit of selfhelp. When they indicate their desire to be on the Riverton Estate, close to Perth, and are satisfied with it after due in-

quarry, I think it is but right that the House should express the opinion that the desires of those men should be acceded to.

Mr. BROWN (Subiaco) [9.18]: I support the amendment. I regret exceedingly that the Minister should have seen fit to contrast the fitness of these soldiers to occupy this particular land with the fitness of civilians.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): I said that the returned soldiers had all been discharged as unfit for active service.

Mr. BROWN: And the implication is that they are not physically fit for any strenuous work. I contend that these discharged soldiers are perfectly fit and able to do all ordinary work. I have here a plan of the estate. This little bit down here represents the 60 acres offered to the returned soldiers. Interjections were made that if this land were taken over by the repatriation scheme, that 70 chains of road would materially influence the value of the whole estate. I say that that 70 chains of road would have very little, if any, influence on the market value of the estate. As a matter of fact, the proposition to purchase the whole of the estate has been turned down, and I believe rightly so.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. Munsie: Would any part of the road have to pass through any part of the estate?

Mr. BROWN: No, it is a boundary road between Riley's estate and Metcalf's estate, which have been occupied for 17 years. During the whole of that time those people have been able to make a decent living off their land. I contend that the returned soldiers willing to go on this land require only the usual assistance. It has been claimed by Ministers that they merely desire to safeguard the men against themselves. But it must not be supposed that these men do not know their responsibility in taking up the land. As a matter of fact, before they can get any assistance in the ordinary way they must have the usual certificates. If these men fail in their enterprise, not the whole of the £500 will be paid to them, because they will not have the necessary certificates. I think the repatriation scheme is well guarded through its own officers. The one thing I am distressed about is that on the 25th January, Mr. Camm, the officer in charge, said that this land was unfit for the purpose. Yet the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) has told us that, in company with other gentlemen, he had an assurance given him that the land was worth a certain amount of money. The very fact that the Government are prepared to buy the land and insist upon the money being used for the road proves that the Government are not altogether afraid of the possibilities of this land. But they want the owners of the estate, plus the men the land has been given to, to provide a road for all future requirements. It has been said that this road would benefit only the five returned soldiers. As a matter of fact it would benefit Metcalf and Riley considerably. The question is whether we are to take such care of returned soldiers that we will not

give them a chance to occupy the land they desire. I think that men willing and anxious to go on this land should be encouraged in every way. All they want the Government to do is to give authority for them to go on the land under the repatriation scheme. I trust the Government will see fit to alter the conditions they have imposed, and to do as I hope the majority of the House will ask them to do.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [9.23]: It appears to me that one requires some further information before giving an intelligent vote on this question. It is the policy of the Government to inquire into the fitness of the men about to go on the land, and to see that the returned soldiers go on suitable land, where they will be able to make good. Up to the present I have been rather confused as to how I should cast my vote. The casting of a vote on this motion is more serious than we realise. It involves the question of repatriation, which to Western Australia is a very heavy obligation. I would like to give an intelligent vote, and therefore I desire further information. It would appear from the Honorary Minister (Hon. F. E. S. Willmott) and other speakers that the chief drawback to the settlement of these men at Riverton is the formation of a certain road, in respect of which the Government want to get undertakings that certain payments will be made in three parts, one from the owners of Riverton, one out of the funds of the soldiers, and the third from the funds of the Government. There are but 80 chains of road altogether, according to my figures, which total £740, or £9 5s. per chain. It seems to me a very heavy cost for road-making, representing nearly £740 per mile, or well-nigh as much as the cost of an agricultural railway. It does not square with my knowledge of road-making in various parts of Australia. It has been stated here to-night that the soil on this estate has no food value for growing crops. Already we have had experience of putting men on land where there is a lack of soil food for production. I refer to wodjil land. We do not want these men to be put there only to discover after years of toil that they cannot make a living. To my mind the difficulty is that I have not sufficient evidence before me to enable me to cast an intelligent vote for or against the motion. I do not know the indigenous timbers that grow there, and I hope some responsible Minister will tell us more about it before we are asked to cast a vote.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [9.27]: I understand the motion proposes that the Government should accept a grant of land comprising 60 acres which, for the purpose of repatriation, was given by the owners of the Riverton estate.

Mr. Draper: Admittedly good land.

Mr. TROY: I know nothing whatever of the estate, but I saw a good deal of correspondence in the Press regarding it and, knowing the devious methods of land agents and others, I have held the opinion till now that the Government ought to be very careful in regard to any speculation in this direction. I do not know what the Government propose to do in regard to repatriation, because that is exclusively one of their responsibilities. We on this side hope that the

Government are doing something, for the work of repatriation is very urgent. I am given to understand that men are leaving this country and going to Queensland. I do not wish to draw comparisons between this Government and the Government of Queensland, for I believe that the Government of this State are just as sincere in their desire to settle the soldiers on the land as are the Government of any other State. But I see no harm in agreeing to the motion moved by the member for Rosbourn. If the soldiers are anxious to get this land, and if this land be good land—

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): It is good for market gardening.

Mr. TROY: If these men have a knowledge of market gardening, and if the land is good for anything, it is rather unworthy of us to hold suspicions and refuse what may be an offer genuinely made.

Mr. Munsie: The Government want to pay £4 an acre for it, and make the soldiers pay it back.

Mr. TROY: I am not sure that it is an offer made genuinely, but I know nothing to the contrary.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): The condition, first of all, was that we should buy the whole block.

Mr. TROY: I am not agreeable to binding the Government by a resolution of this House to do anything of the sort. Ignorant as I am of the estate and its possibilities, I am not going to vote to place on the Government such an obligation as the purchase of the estate. I have no objection to agreeing to hand over the land to the soldiers, but I do not desire that any obligation should be placed on the Government regarding the whole of the estate. I am not agreeable that this should be the first step towards influencing the Government to take on the rest of the land. I am going to support the amendment. I have heard what may be a most unworthy suspicion in connection with the owners of this land, but since they offer the land as a free gift, what am I to say? This may encourage others who hold better land, situated under happier circumstances, also to offer land, and I give my vote with a view to encouraging people to be generous. I am not going to ask the Government by my vote to accept any obligation whatever regarding the estate in agreeing that they should accept this land on behalf of the soldiers. I will not allow my vote to be used in this House for the purpose of furthering the scheme of any band of land owners or land agents. I am convinced, in connection with the repatriation of soldiers, that there will be agitation after agitation, and that every influence in the country will be worked to get the Government to buy land, and the people from whom they buy will not care a rap whether the persons for whom it is bought succeed or not.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): The number of people who offer to sell their land at four times its value for repatriation purposes is astonishing.

Mr. TROY: I will vote for the amendment because I cannot find it in my heart to re-

fuse the offer of these people. My vote, however, imposes on the Government no obligation to purchase any more of the land.

Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [9.33]: On a matter of this sort a private member naturally requires some information, but I do not think we have had to-night all the information to which we are entitled. I know some of the soldiers concerned, because they saw me in connection with this matter. I also made some inquiries, and the conclusion which I arrived at was that the attitude of the Government was, that in their opinion it would be impossible for the soldiers to make a success in settling on this land without a road, that the Government would not be justified in building a road for five men, and that consequently they considered they were not justified in using this money, which is to be used for repatriation purposes, in a way that would probably result in its loss. Whether it is regarded as money of the Commonwealth, and therefore trust money in the hands of the State Government, or whether it is regarded as the money of the State and therefore to be safeguarded by the Government, makes no difference. The Government are entitled to say, "We will not use this money for the purpose of repatriating soldiers on to land if we are satisfied that the conditions are such that they cannot make a success of the venture." I can understand that attitude, and can follow it, if it is the attitude of the Government. My inquiries having been made, I understood that this was the attitude of the Government. But since hearing the debate to-night I have been driven to think that there is another reason in the mind of the Government, namely, that they think that this Riverton syndicate is going to make something out of it, and that it ought not to make something out of it. If that is the reason for their attitude, it is the most futile reason ever advanced by sane men. If the Government have come forward to-night and said—"We hold this money in trust. We will not advance it unless we are satisfied that the soldiers to whom we advance it have a reasonable chance of success. We cannot afford to build a road for five men, because we would be doing too much then for only five men."—We could have understood their attitude. But that, apparently, is not the attitude of the Government.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): That is exactly the attitude I took up.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I did not understand that from what has been said this evening. The Honorary Minister has referred to this company as a company which was making something out of the deal. It does not matter if it makes a million out of it. If, as a repatriation scheme, this is a good scheme it does not matter two straws whether these people make money out of it or not.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): I said if we built the road.

Mr. PILKINGTON: The point taken by the Minister is apparently that if the soldiers are put there a road will ultimately be built, and the company will derive gain from that fact. The whole point so far as the Government are concerned, should be this: if we put the soldiers there without a road and if they have

this money given to them, they have a reasonable chance of success. I gather from the debate that they have a good chance of success.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Let them try it.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am entirely without any personal knowledge of this subject, or of this class of business, but I gather from the debate that the soldiers would have a fair chance of success even without this road being built at all. I gather that this is not the main ground upon which the Government base their objection. The objection of the Government seems to be that this syndicate is trying to work points, to put it bluntly. Surely, it is perfectly unimportant whether the syndicate gets a gain or not, if in point of fact the repatriation money is spent so that the soldiers are repatriated with a reasonable chance of success, and so that the gift of this company to the soldiers is made use of.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies) [9.37]: I wish to commend the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) for his desire to do something to settle soldiers upon this piece of land, and I agree with the member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) when he states that he does not feel justified in taking upon himself the responsibility of giving a decision upon a matter such as this, on evidence that we have been able to gather here to-night. I do not, in making a statement of this sort, intend to disparage the member for Roebourne for the manner in which he represented his case. That hon. member has gone fully into the matter, he has met these soldiers who are desirous of settling upon this land, has visited it and inspected it personally, and has had a conversation with the repatriation officer, the man upon whose report the Government or this House must largely depend. He is, therefore, in an infinitely better position to express an opinion upon the justice or otherwise of this case for the soldiers than a number of other hon. members who have had the matter brought under their notice to-night for the first time. This motion, and the amendment, are really asking members to carry on the administration of a very important department in the State. Will any hon. member here say that he is sufficiently quick in grasping the whole of the facts of a case such as this, when they are simply put before him as they have been to-night, to be able to come to a correct judgment in the matter? I have here the papers dealing with the case. I have also the amendment which was moved by the member for West Perth (Mr. Draper), and we have besides the admission of the Minister that the Government have offered £4 per acre for this land. The motion as proposed to be amended reads as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the applications for assistance from funds at the disposal of the Government made by certain returned soldiers desirous of settling on certain blocks of land granted to them by the owners of the Riverton estate, should be

approved by the Minister in charge of repatriation without delay; the officer dealing with repatriation having inspected the land, and having declared that the blocks form ample security for the amount advanceable under the Commonwealth Repatriation Act.

Thus we have the word of the member for Roebourne, which no member of the House would doubt, and the statement of the officer responsible for advising the Government in matters connected with the Commonwealth Repatriation Act, who says that the blocks form ample security. Now we have the report of the same gentleman, the first portion of which deals with the estate as a whole and has no bearing on the question before us to-night. The latter portion of the report has, however, a very direct bearing upon it. In dealing with the whole of the 2,000 acres, which I believe the estate comprises, he says—

In view of the analyses, which would seem to show that there is practically little plant food in the soil—

He goes on to say—

I think that the owner's offer to allow the Government to resume 60 acres without compensation in order to permit these returned soldiers to establish themselves there should also be refused, as it would be difficult to justify any expenditure whatever in view of Mr. Mann's report.

If you approve of the offer being turned down, I will advise those interested.

There are the two reports. One is signed by Mr. Camm, the officer in question, and the other is the statement by that same officer given here to-night by the member for Roebourne.

Hon. P. Collier: And yet the Government propose to give £4 an acre for the land.

Mr. MULLANY: There is also the admission that the Crown offers £4 per acre for this area of 60 acres. In view of the conflicting statements, or reports, made by the responsible officer, I want to know how any hon. member can be justified in coming to a decision one way or the other on the question to-night. Whilst I may possibly be as dull of comprehension as many other hon. members, I freely confess that I have been unable to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to the rights or otherwise of the case. In view of what I have already pointed out I think that some further inquiry should be made, and believe it would be advisable to have a select committee appointed. The estate is within a few miles of the City, and could readily be visited. The papers are also available, as well as the men in question. A few days would see the whole thing through, and I believe that the best way of dealing with the matter is to appoint a select committee to report to this House on one day in next week. I cannot give an intelligent vote on the question to-night.

Mr. Munsie: If the reports are true, Mr. Camm is not a fit and proper person to be where he is.

Mr. MULLANY: If I am not able to move in that direction just now, I throw it out as a suggestion that a select committee should be appointed to deal with this question.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [9.45]: I should like to say a word or two in connection with this matter. Hon. members complain that they have not obtained sufficient information upon it and I offer them my fullest sympathy. It is undoubtedly a difficult matter to consider any question in regard to the value of land unless one has seen the land, and unless one has some knowledge of the subject. In the first place, many hon. members have not seen the land; and many of them will admit that, even had they seen it, they would not be capable of forming an opinion. Regarding the estate as a whole—I must refer to the estate as a whole—the Government, after having the fullest inquiry made, refused the offer made by the owners. That finished the matter for the time being. The owners then came forward with an offer to give 60 acres to six returned soldiers free of all cost. The 60 acres are admitted to be the best of the estate. It is not land on which I, for my part, would choose to put returned soldiers. I have been over the land twice. Hon. members must not be led to imagine that this country is like the land at Osborne Park, with its rich swamps, where green fodder can be grown for dairy cows, and where vegetables of all kinds can be produced. Most of this land is the ordinary sandy country to be found in the neighbourhood of Perth.

Hon. T. Walker: Some of that is fairly good.

The PREMIER: The peculiar feature about this land is that there is no limestone in it. With limestone, sandy country can be made reproductive.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is clay underneath.

The PREMIER: There is no clay under the greater portion of it. There are portions of the estate which are well watered for a time, but which are not swamps in the ordinary acceptance of the term; and, save in an exceptionally wet season, they would not hold water at all. No doubt after such a winter as the last we have had, the water would remain there for a considerable time. When I visited the land about two months ago, the water had nearly all dried up. However, the presence or absence of water there at the present time has little to do with the question. The question is whether we should be justified in settling these six returned soldiers on that land. I believe the men might make a living on the 60 acres if they were adapted for that class of work. Everything would depend on the men themselves. If they are men who will work, and have some knowledge of the work on which they propose to embark, and if they will stick to it, they might make a success on the 60 acres. Had the whole estate been of the same character as the 60 acres, the Government might have viewed the purchase of the estate, at the price mentioned, in a very different way from that in which they did. On the reports before them, and with the knowledge Ministers themselves have of the land, the Government certainly could not purchase the whole estate. As the 60

acres represent the best part of the land, and as these returned soldiers are anxious to settle there, the Government are anxious to afford them an opportunity of doing so. I am not one of those who wish to impute to the company any motives in offering the 60 acres, except motives of pure patriotism. The company certainly were desirous of selling their land, and all owners of land are liable to be. When the Government found that the Government would not purchase the estate, they offered to give 60 acres of the best of the estate. The land is not tiptop land. Even the land in the neighbourhood on which people have been settled for 20 years or more is not land which would be called first class.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Those people are nearer the river, too.

The PREMIER: That is quite correct, and they have the best of the land, the land with the greatest amount of moisture, land with a certain proportion of swamp, and adjoining the river. The Government were prepared, at any rate, to let these returned soldiers have an opportunity of settling on the 60 acres; and they thought it advisable to make this offer to the company, "If you pay one-third of the cost of constructing the road which is required, the Government will pay a third, and the road board the remaining third." That is the position at the present time. If the House considers that the Government would be justified in spending a larger amount, the Government are prepared to do it. At the same time, we must be very careful in the expenditure of money in this direction, very careful to see that the land which is to be taken up, and which the road, if constructed, will serve, will be permanently occupied, and not thrown up. The cost of making the road has been estimated at £10 per chain. I consider that a high estimate. I could make a road which would suit for a very long time the light loads of those men, at very much less cost.

Member: Three times a day the resident goes through to the markets.

The PREMIER: There is a great deal in what the member for Bunbury (Mr. Money) has said. The country about Riverton will never get boggy, and the settlers will be able to travel a road there at all times of the year. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) knows that market gardeners have, with success, carted their produce over sandy roads for years and years. At the same time, of course, they prefer good roads. I do not think these six men actually demand that a good road should be constructed at once. If later, they prove their suitability for the work they contemplate undertaking, the Government would be justified in helping them to obtain an efficient road for the conveyance of their produce to market. But we have not yet arrived at that point. I would like to see the men try how they get on with settling this land. I believe they are all able-bodied, and not in any way invalids. I do not know why they have received their discharges; I do not think it is on account of any extreme physical disability.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Some of them have been wounded.

The PREMIER: They may probably be all right now. It is our duty to help them to carry on the avocation in which they de-

sire to engage. I think if it was made a condition that the Government should spend £1,000 in constructing a road for these five men, we would have a right to decline. It would, in my opinion, be wrong to incur so much expenditure for a road to serve five settlers. To the motion moved by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) an amendment has been moved by the member for West Perth (Mr. Draper), making the motion read as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the application for assistance from the funds at the disposal of the Government made by certain returned soldiers desirous of settling on blocks of land granted to them by the owners of the Riverton estate, should be approved by the Minister in charge of repatriation without delay; the officer dealing with repatriation having inspected the land and having declared that the blocks form ample security for the amount granted under the Commonwealth Repatriation Act.

I cannot accept that amendment, because the officer in question has never declared that the blocks form ample security, as stated. We have no record of that. On the contrary, the officer in question has rather urged the Government not to assist in this direction. In a later file, which is not on the Table of the House, the officer expressed a view to the effect that this was the best of the land and that the men might be able to make a living off it. That was about the strength of the decision to which he came in the last instance. The Government are prepared to deal with these men out of the repatriation fund, if the land is secured to them from the men, to whom it is to be granted by the company. If the Government advance money out of the repatriation fund, they must have security over the holdings on which the money is advanced.

Mr. Lutey: The men do not object to that, do they?

The PREMIER: That must be a *sine qua non*. We cannot advance money unless we get the security of the land, because the improvements which would be effected with the money advanced would form part of the land. Consequently, the Government must have security over the land and the improvements. That security will have to be given in all cases of repatriation. The Government are, therefore, prepared to assist in placing these men on that land if the men can show that they will be able to give the Government security over the land.

Hon. T. Walker: That is exactly what is wanted.

Mr. Munsie: Will the Government insist on the condition contained in that letter, that they are prepared to give £4 per acre for the land, and that they will have it only on that condition?

The PREMIER: Negotiations have been going on in regard to this question and this new phase has only cropped up during the last 10 days; it has not been hanging over for months. The negotiations have not been concluded; the company could not agree to the

conditions imposed by the Government in the first instance. The Government are still anxious to give the men an opportunity of settling on this land. If the men are prepared to waive the question of constructing a road there at once the Government will assist them out of the repatriation grant, if the land is offered.

Mr. Munsie: The men are quite prepared to do that, but they are not prepared to pay £4 an acre for land which has been given to them.

The PREMIER: I do believe that the men can make good on this particular bit of country, but not on the balance of the land. They would have to work hard, and late and early, and be determined to stay there. The Government have taken many risks in the past and I suppose they will take many in the future. If the Government did not take a certain amount of risk in connection with settlement, we would never get people on the land. At the same time the Government want to use every effort to see that those who are settled on the land are suitable for carrying out that particular avocation. I have seen these men and I have visited the land with some of them on two occasions. The men are physically constituted to make a success of settlement, and the Government are prepared to close with them on the conditions I have stated. If the member for Roebourne had waited a little longer before moving the motion, and allowed the Government to complete the negotiations they were carrying on, no doubt a settlement would have been arrived at.

Mr. TEESDALE (Roebourne—in reply) [10.5]: In view of the Premier's assurance that these blocks will now be given to the men, on the understanding that the construction of the road is not asked for, I have great pleasure in withdrawing the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for West Perth will have to withdraw his amendment first.

Mr. Draper: I have no intention of withdrawing my amendment.

Mr. TEESDALE: Having secured what I came here for I am prepared to withdraw my motion because there is now no occasion for it.

Mr. Draper: The member for Roebourne is more fortunate than I am, because I have not got what I came here for.

Mr. LUTEY (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [10.7]: I have been somewhat confused during this debate at the attitude of the Government. The Honorary Minister appeared to me to be utterly opposing the motion of the member for Roebourne and now, after a protracted debate, we find that the Premier is backing right down, after having obtained the sense of the House. It seems to me that there is someone lacking in backbone. The Honorary Minister says one thing, and after the House has expressed its opinion, the Premier backs down against the Honorary Minister. These men are prepared to take up that land; they are not particularly anxious about the road, but we have proved that there are settlers who have been on the adjoining property for years and who have proved the land. It may have been thought

that the road would lead to the centre of the estate, and was probably a point to try and induce the Government to take up the whole of the estate. On looking at the map, however, we find that the road only runs to the edge of the estate and will only serve a few of the blocks of the company. Personally I hope the member for West Perth will stick to his amendment, and I hope the House will carry it.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [10.9]: I move—

“That the debate be adjourned.”

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

Ayes	8
Noes	30

Majority against .. 22

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Maley	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Plesse	(Teller.)
Mr. H. Robinson	

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Money
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Brown	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Chesson	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Draper	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Roche
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Green	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Jones	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller.)
Mr. Lutey	

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. THOMSON (Katanning) [10.12]: When I moved the adjournment of the debate I was not endeavouring to block a settlement of this question. I must confess that hon. members seem to know very little about this subject. I am entirely in accord with the member for Menzies when he suggested that we should have a select committee to investigate the matter. That was one of the objects I had in view. The mover of the motion asked the permission of the House to withdraw it because he said he had got what he was after. After bringing the matter before the House we have this remarkable position, that an amendment is moved by the member for West Perth which is a direct contradiction of the signed statement on the file by Mr. Camm.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier said there is another report from Mr. Camm since that one.

Mr. THOMSON: I can only deal with the information before the House.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I will take the word of the Premier.

Mr. THOMSON: We have a definite statement from Mr. Camm that the request should

be refused. I want to satisfy myself that the soldiers are going to make a living out of this land. I will take second place to no one in my desire to see that justice is done to those men who have fought for us. Those of us who live in the agricultural areas know what a hard fight a great many of the citizens had to put up, and I am not going to induce the returned soldier to go on the land where he has no hope of making a living. I say that nothing is too good for him, that he should have the best land available. I am prepared to move that the soldiers shall have the land for nothing; they deserve it.

Mr. Teesdale: They have it now.

Mr. THOMSON: Seeing that the hon. member is satisfied that these soldiers are going to get the land for nothing, I cannot understand his action in moving the motion, and in voting against the adjournment when, just previously, he had said that he was prepared to withdraw his motion. I hope the House will not come to a decision on this question to-night. There is a vital principle underlying this. I am not going to impute motives to the owners of the land, although I may have my own private views on the matter. But I say distinctly that I wish to be satisfied that this land is suitable. In face of the evidence contained in this file, showing that responsible officers have one and all condemned the soil on that estate, we are asked to settle our soldiers on land which, according to the experts, is absolutely unsuitable.

Mr. Teesdale: Not these 68 acres.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with this report from Mr. Camm, which treats of the 60 acres. Mr. Camm makes this definite statement—

In view of the analyses, which seem to show that there is practically little plant food in the soil, I think the owners' offer to allow the Government to resume 60 acres without compensation in order to permit these five returned soldiers to establish themselves there should be refused, as it would be difficult to justify any expenditure whatever in the face of Mr. Mann's report.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You know that the Premier said there is a later report than that.

Mr. THOMSON: This report is dated 22nd January, and to-day is only the 20th February, so if there is a second report it cannot be very much later. When an officer like Mr. Camm sends in a report like this it makes one wonder what is behind it. I want the soldiers to get a fair deal. The member for Roebourne has stated that these men are satisfied. That may be so. Unfortunately I could take the hon. member to several settlers in my district who were placed on land represented to them as capable of returning a living. To-day they know that the thing is impossible. Let us see to it that these soldiers do not go on land unsuitable for their purpose. In view of the contradictory evidence we have before us, and of the seriousness of the position, the House should pause before coming to a decision. I will move an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot do it at this stage. The amendment before the House must first be disposed of.

Mr. THOMSON: Then I appeal to hon. members not to come to a decision to-night. I think we should pause before committing the Government in the manner proposed. Ministers have considered this question and have turned it down, and I think it would be unwise for us to come to a decision on the unsatisfactory evidence before us. I will give place to no one in my desire to see that our soldiers get justice.

Mr. Teesdale: Then why do you not consult that later report?

Mr. THOMSON: I can only deal with what is before us. If there is a later report the hon. member should have quoted it.

Mr. Munsie: He has not seen it. He is accepting the Premier's word about it.

Mr. THOMSON: I trust the amendment will be defeated, and that we shall have a select committee to inquire into the whole question. Such a committee could make its investigations and report next week.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [10.22]: I do not think any member can do absolute justice to this question on the motion and the amendment, because they are confined to the 60 acres offered to these soldiers by the owners of the estate. Before anybody could judge of the whole question it would be necessary to see the report on the whole of the estate, and to know the whole of the facts connected with the estate. Under the rules of the House it has been impossible to furnish all the particulars in a discussion of the motion, it has been necessary to keep to the 60 acres. But one has only to read the file that has been here for several days to appreciate the ramifications of the whole business concerning that large estate. If we had before us all the information available, we would be able to form a better judgment. I am not opposed to the appointment of a select committee, for probably such a committee would come to the same conclusion as have the Government. But in regard to the 60 acres, I, as Minister in charge, was mixed up in the negotiations. These soldiers came to me, and I told Lieutenant Williams that I was personally prepared to recommend the Government to advance to him and his comrades £500 per man on those 60 acres, but that if he wanted a road made it was an entirely different proposition, because I was limited to £500 per man, and therefore could not recommend an additional £800 for road making. My letter, which the member for Roebourne read to-night, clearly showed that that was my view. All that the soldiers had to do was to come to me and say "We do not want a road," and the thing would have gone through in the ordinary course. I was prepared to recommend it to Cabinet. They did not get my recommendation as responsible Minister, for the reasons that I have given. Now the member for Roebourne says that the soldiers do not want a road. Why, then, did not these men tell me so, or tell the Minister for Lands so? Had they done this they might have been settled on the land to-day.

Mr. Munsie: The Honorary Minister said that he asked those men to give him a guar-

antee that they would not ask for a road at any future time.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): I said in the immediate future.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been to the Riverton estate on two occasions, the Premier has been there twice, and the Minister for Lands has been there twice, while Mr. Underwood also has been there. Again, a number of expert officers of the Government have been over the estate. As the motion deals with 60 acres specifically, I cannot tell the House what the reports of those officers were, but they are all to be found on that file.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is the estate in your electorate?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No. I would be very glad if I had in my electorate such an estate with the soldiers on it. If a select committee is appointed, and some of our farming friends go over and have a look at those 60 acres, they will be able to judge for themselves and form their own conclusions. The 60-acre area is higher land than either Metcalf's or Riley's land. Metcalf's land is good, black sand, but the other is scrubby bush, with a tremendous lot of banksia, and a fuzzy bush that grows on only the poorest land. It is a series of undulating hills, lying a quarter of a mile apart. In the valleys there is what the people there call swamp land, but what the people of Osborne Park would turn up their noses at. Most of the men who have seen it utterly condemn it. Most of those who have handled land will know that even if it is sand land it is the man who handles it who constitutes the greatest factor. I have told these soldiers that, knowing as much as I do of gardening, if I were in their position I would not be afraid to tackle it. By the same reasoning, if I thought they knew as much about gardening as I do, I should advise them to tackle it. It is poor soil, requiring an immense quantity of manure and of work, and, above all, humus. It is utterly deficient in that now, but Riley can grow a natural crop, and so too can Metcalf, because their sand is black stuff and is full of humus.

Mr. Teesdale: It does not all stop at the fencing.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It may go a yard or two beyond, but the soil on this 60 acres is of a different character.

Mr. Pilkington: Then why recommend that the soldiers be put there?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Because I think that on these swamps, as they are called, allowing each man a double area of land, and knowing the type of men as I do—

Mr. Pilkington: The land is good enough.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the circumstances, yes; and I believe those men would make a do of it. I have told the House that the only obstacle in my way was the road, and that I was not justified in recommending the expenditure of £800 for a road for five men. Hon. members cannot come to a conclusion on this matter without seeing the file and the land itself.

Mr. H. ROBINSON (Albany) [10.30]: Although we have had a number of hon. mem-

bers, and three members of the Government, speaking on this question, I cannot even now see exactly what the position is. Two members of the Ministry have said they are prepared to take the land over, but one states that the Government should not take it over except under certain conditions. Are the Government going to take it over in the face of the report of the Government official which has been read by the Honorary Minister?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Not the right one.

Mr. H. ROBINSON: The Honorary Minister read the report of this Government official. Members are asked to vote, and if there has been a report furnished since, we should have it read to us. I have no doubt the Premier is sincere, but it is his duty to let us have that information, with the qualifying statement as to why the Government official in such a short time should make two contradictory reports on the same land.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): That is just it. If only you knew the facts! They cannot be discussed yet.

Mr. H. ROBINSON: I understood that we would get these facts when the Honorary Minister got up to speak. I am most anxious to help these returned soldiers, but will not record my vote until I am clearer in my mind that the land is suitable for them. It is immaterial to me that the Riverton estate should get some benefit out of this, or that the Government should have to provide a road afterwards. The main point to my mind is as to whether this land is suitable for repatriation. After all the Government have to consider that, under the conditions under which the money is coming from Melbourne. I am surprised that after such a tremendous controversy in the papers, and the definite decision of the Government, that the matter should be brought up to-night, and, further, that from the Government we should get practically two decisions. I hope a select committee will be appointed. In that way we shall get a statement from Mr. Camm as to whether he did or did not say what is attributed to him by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale), and why he apparently made two contradictory statements in such a short time with reference to the same block of land.

Question (that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion) put and negatived.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore—on amendment) [10.36]: I should like an opportunity of speaking on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already discussed the amendment. The motion itself was not before the House.

The PREMIER: It was proposed to insert certain words, and an amendment to effect this was moved by the member for West Perth (Mr. Draper).

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment itself was under discussion, and the Premier has spoken on the amendment. The member for Roebourne, after some discussion had ensued, desired to withdraw the motion in favour of

another one. The motion itself was not before the House, but the amendment. I asked the member for West Perth if he would first withdraw the amendment, so that the motion itself could be withdrawn in favour of the amendment. The motion itself has now been defeated and that is what the vote was taken upon. The amendment was to strike out certain words. These have now been struck out, and the question before the House is that the following words be inserted.

"The applications for assistance from funds at the disposal of the Government, made by certain returned soldiers desirous of settling on certain blocks of land granted to them by owners of the Riverton estate, should be approved by the Minister in charge of repatriation without delay; the officer dealing with repatriation having inspected the land, and having declared that the blocks form ample security for the amount advanceable under the Commonwealth Repatriation Act."

The PREMIER: Am I not permitted to make a remark with regard to the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly.

Hon. P. Collier: That is directly opposite to what you stated, Sir, last evening.

The PREMIER: I wish to ask the hon. member to amend this amendment of his.

Point of Order.

Hon. P. Collier: On a point of order! I submit that on the ruling given by you, Sir, last night the Premier is not in order.

Mr. Speaker: The Premier has already spoken to the amendment.

Hon. P. Collier: Last night you ruled the hon. member for Menzies (Mr. Mullaney) out of order for precisely the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: It was not exactly on all fours with this particular matter.

Hon. P. Collier: Under the same ruling and Standing Orders the Premier is not in order in speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: The Premier is not in order in addressing the House unless by way of explanation.

The Premier: May I make an explanation? We have not had this amendment before us because you, Sir, have only just read it. It has not been read to the House until now.

Hon. P. Collier: It was moved by the member for West Perth.

The Premier: You have only just now put this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: When the member for West Perth (Mr. Draper) early in the debate moved his amendment, I proposed the amendment from the Chair; and the amendment then was under discussion, and it has been under discussion up till a few moments ago, when a vote was taken on the original motion. The Premier has spoken to the amendment, and is not in order in speaking again. Any hon. member who has not spoken is in order in speaking to the amendment; but members who have spoken are not in order.

The Premier: I merely rose to make an explanation. As leader of the Government I thought I would be permitted to offer some

explanation regarding the amendment, because I was really under the impression that all this time we have been discussing the original motion of the member for Roebourne. I have not had an opportunity of obtaining information with regard to the amendment.

Mr. Munsie: On a point of order, I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Premier, when speaking to the question before, deliberately read out the amendment, and said he could not accept it.

Mr. Speaker: The Premier is out of order.

Debate resumed.

Mr. PIESSE (Toodyay) [10.44]: I desire to move the following amendment: That after the word "that," in the first line, all words be deleted, with a view of inserting the following:—"That the offer made by the owners of the Riverton estate to give an area of 60 acres in the estate to the Government for the purpose of repatriation be referred to a select committee, to report next Thursday."

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot accept that amendment, because the hon. member has in it words which are contained in the amendment which has become the question. It is quite competent for the hon. member to move that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the question.

Mr. Piesse: If I am in order in moving in that direction, I shall have much pleasure in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the hon. member right. If it is the desire of the House that a select committee should be appointed, it will be necessary for the hon. member to move the striking-out of all the words which now are the question. When those words have been struck out, the hon. member can move for a select committee. But these words must be got out of the way before the select committee can be appointed. The question before the House now is that all the words after "that" stand part of the question.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is it not necessary, before a select committee can be appointed, that notice of motion should be given for the appointment of a select committee, because that is dealing with a different subject?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not necessary to give notice of the appointment of a select committee on a subject before the House. For example, when a Bill has passed its second reading, it is competent for a member—after the Minister in charge of the Bill has moved that the Speaker leave the Chair for the purpose of consideration of the Bill in Committee, or just before that motion is moved—to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee. Then, instead of being referred to a committee of the whole House, the Bill is referred to a select committee. This question is practically on all fours with a Bill at that stage, and it is competent for a member to move that a select committee be appointed to consider this question. But the amendment must be negatived first. The question now is that the words proposed to be inserted be inserted; that is, the amendment of the member for West Perth.

Question (that the words proposed to be added be added) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	24

Majority for .. 8

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Money
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Draper	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Green	Mr. Roche
Mr. Jones	Mr. Stewart
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. O'Loughlen

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Broun	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Brown	Mr. H. Robinson
Mr. Davies	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	
Mr. Mitchell	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. PIESSE (Toodyay) [10.53]: Shall I be in order now in moving in the direction of appointing a select committee for the purpose of inquiring into the offer of the 60 acres of land made by the Riverton Estate to the Government?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. C. Hudson—Yilgarn) [10.54]: A slight confusion appears to have arisen over this matter and as it seems to be the desire of the House that a select committee should be appointed to inquire into this question, that can only be done now by the addition of words to what has been left of the original motion which was moved by the member for Roebourne. The remaining words are—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the." The words which the member for West Perth desired to add have been defeated and the words which I suggest should be added will complete the motion. I move—

That the following words be added:—

"the matter of the Riverton Estate is worthy of consideration and that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the offer made by the owners of the Riverton Estate to give an area of 60 acres in the Estate to the Government for the purposes of repatriation."

Mr. Piesse: I will accept that.

Mr. Munsie: Will that permit the select committee to inquire into the contradictory reports of the Government officers?

Mr. SPEAKER: The committee will have full power to inquire into the offer made to the Government, and if there are any con-

tradiictory statements it will be their duty to sift the matter to the bottom.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Or in connection with the Estate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Committee will only have power to deal with the 60 acres, I suppose.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The motion at present is "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that."

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what is left of the original motion.

Mr. TROY: What does the hon. member for Toodyay propose in that amendment? Is it not concerning the whole subject of the purchase of the estate?

Mr. SPEAKER: No; only the 60 acres. In reality, instead of the original motion that the Government accept the offer made, if the amendment be carried the House will ask for a select committee to consider the matter.

Mr. TROY: Would not the hon. member's purpose be served if he moved, after "that," "a select committee be appointed"?

Mr. SPEAKER: That would be only an expression of opinion; it would not be a direction.

The Minister for Mines: I have made it read "it is a matter deserving of inquiry, and a select committee be appointed."

Hon. P. Collier: We shall have an extraordinary position if the amendment is carried, for it will then read "that in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the matter is worthy of consideration." A second class school boy would be caned for constructing such a sentence. Yet that is what we have arrived at after hours of discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Apparently there is a desire to refer this subject to a select committee. In order to do that, we have to use words which will fit in with all that is left of the original motion. Let me read the motion with the amendment moved by the Minister for Mines—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the matter of the Riverton Estate is worthy of consideration, and that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the offer made by the owners of the Riverton Estate to give an area of 60 acres in the estate to the Government for the purposes of repatriation.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [11.9]: May I suggest that the motion be allowed to lapse, and that the hon. member give notice to move for a select committee to-morrow? We will be here yet for another six weeks or more, and so ample time will be afforded. Just now we seem to be making confusion worse confounded, and I think it would be far better if the hon. member gave notice to move for a select committee to-morrow.

Question (that the words proposed to be added—amendment by the Minister for Mines—be added) put and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members will now proceed to ballot for the select committee.

Mr. PILKINGTON (Perth) [11.15]: May I rise to a point of order? It appears to me that we have before us, for the first time, the amended motion or the remnants of the original motion, with certain words added providing for the appointment of a select committee. When that was carried then the remnants of the motion became amended. There was then before the House the amended motion that a select committee should be appointed. That motion, to my mind, has never been put or carried, although it appears that a ballot is being taken for the appointment of a select committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I overlooked the matter. I will put the question now.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I am desirous of voting against the appointment of a select committee, but have had no opportunity of doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had an opportunity of voting against the amendment.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I wish the motion to be amended in order that it may be before the House, and then I would have an opportunity of voting against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a mistake on my part. The question is "that the motion as amended be agreed to."

Question put and passed; the motion as amended agreed to.

Ballot taken, and a select committee appointed consisting of Mr. Broun, Mr. Jones, Mr. Mullaney, Mr. Munsie, and the mover; with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and to report this day week.

Mr. JOHNSTON: In connection with this select committee, I desire to move a similar motion to that moved last week in connection with the select committee to inquire into the rabbit pest, that the evidence be typewritten, and not printed. I move—

"That the evidence taken by the committee be not printed but be made available in typewritten copies limited to ten."

Mr. MULLANEY: I should like to be clear on this matter. I think the resolution carried last week was unnecessary, because the chairman of a select committee presents the report in typewritten form and then moves that it be printed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The report of the evidence taken by the select committee is then already printed. Each member of the committee receives printed reports of the evidence as the committee's inquiry proceeds, and each witness is furnished with a printed proof of his evidence. In order to avoid the expense involved, an hon. member moved last week that the evidence to be taken by the select committee referred to should appear in typewritten form.

Mr. TROY: As to the printing of evidence taken by select committees Standing Order 357 provides—

Upon the presentation of a report no discussion shall take place; but the report may be ordered to be printed with the documents accompanying it.

That has been the custom of this House always. I had no idea that there was a prac-

tice of printing evidence before the order of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is the usual practice.

Mr. TROY: The Standing Order is clearly against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been the custom, ever since I have been in the House, that select committee evidence is reported by the "Hansard" staff in the same way as the proceedings of this House, and sent to the Government Printer exactly in the same way as speeches delivered in the Chamber. The evidence is printed on foolscap sheets, on one side only; and it is thus submitted to the members of select committees and also to the witnesses. On the completion of the investigation, the chairman of the committee drafts a report to the House, which is discussed by the committee, and, when approved by them, presented to the House by the chairman, who thereupon moves that the report and evidence, as a whole, be printed. But the evidence is already printed. The expense has been incurred, because the type has been set up. Hon. members who have served on select committees are aware that this has been the practice. It is in the typesetting that the expense is occasioned; and, in order to obviate that expense, it was decided, on the appointment of the last select committee, that the evidence should be presented only in 10 type-written copies at the first stage.

Mr. Troy: That is the original copy?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.28 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 21st February, 1918.

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

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

ELECTORAL—METROPOLITAN PROVINCE.

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following letter from Mr. Boan—

It is with extreme regret that I feel called upon to tender my resignation as a member of the Legislative Council. I am taking this course because two days ago my attention was drawn to the fact that we have had for several years a branch of the State Savings Bank on the business premises of my firm, and that this might possibly be held to be a contravention of Sections 32 and 34 of the

Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1899. Under these circumstances, I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Legislative Council, and I may add that I have returned to the Treasurer to-day the whole of the remuneration I have received during the period for which I have been a member.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Select Committee, Extension of Time.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.34]: I have to ask for an extension of time for bringing up the report of this select committee. This is due, not to any inattention to duty on the part of the committee, but owing to the volume of work they have had to undertake. We have examined a large number of witnesses, and now all that remains to be done is to hear the health authorities in rebuttal or confirmation of those witnesses. This will be done on Tuesday next, when the department will be in a position to reply to the statements of the various witnesses. The committee will be able to report this day week. I move—

"That the time for bringing up the report of this committee be extended to this day week."

Question put and passed.

PAPERS—MALAY STATES AND JAVA, TRADING POSSIBILITIES.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.36]: I move—

"That in the opinion of the House it is desirable, in view of its importance and interest to the producing community of the State, that the report furnished to the Government by the Hon. Walter Kingsmill on the possibilities of trade between this State and the Malay States and Java should be laid on the Table of the House, and printed as a parliamentary paper."

This motion is the outcome of numerous inquiries which I have received from people interested in fruit growing and other industries. At the same time I am reminded that various extracts from Mr. Kingsmill's report which have appeared in the Press from time to time, and which have been acknowledged by various societies, associations, and others, have been regarded as of very great importance as showing that there is a market in those islands for the produce of this State. We must also bear in mind the fact that Mr. Kingsmill, during his recent trip to the Malay States and Java must have gone to no end of trouble and inconvenience in preparing the information which he has so well compiled, and which I consider should be made available to all those desirous of securing that information. Those are the reasons I have for moving the motion, and I have occasion to believe that hon. members will agree that information of this nature should be made available to those in this State who are producing from the soil such commodities as will readily find a market in the centres referred to in Mr. Kingsmill's report.

Hon. Sir. E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.39]: I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I do it in my capacity as Acting