all classes; but work and organisation are needed towards that end. Let men and money be applied to our soil, and all will be well. Are we longer to treat this country as if we were not responsible for its settlement and development, as if we had no responsibility to the people? Children yet unborn will have the right to ask whether we did our duty so that they might possess a white man's country. I hope we shall not make the development of Western Australia a party question; I sincerely trust that we shall come together in this great work, and that it will be done, and done very soon.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 9.11 p.m.*

# Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 19th October, 1927.*



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

## QUESTION — MILK SUPPLY, CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Has the dairy herd at the Claremont Hospital for the Insane, which supplies the milk to the Children's Hospital, recently been submitted to the tubercular test? 2, On what occasions has this herd previously been tested? 3, Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House the files relating to these tests? 4, Will he lay on the Table of the House the American Journal of Public Health for 27th August, Vol. 17, No. 8, now in the possession of the Health Department?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes; following the usual practice animals showing clinical signs were isolated and submitted to the test. 2, On the 12th May, 1922; 27th March, 1925; 24th June, 1926; 5th July, 1926; and 27th July, 1926. 3, The file will be made available for the perusal of the hon. member if he desires at the office of the Minister for Agriculture. 4, Yes.

## BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Forests Act Amendment.

2, Stamp Act Amendment.

Passed.

## BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.36]: In an early stage of his speech, Mr. Harris said: "It is quite possible that an amendment to the Federal Electoral Act may be introduced in the Federal Parliament at an early date, and the State Government should be quite sure that in that amending legislation there will not be something that will conflict with anything we may do." The Government are aware that such a Bill has been introduced into the Federal Parliament and, as the result of special inquiries, the Chief Electoral Registrar has ascertained that it does not in any way alter the present procedure in regard to enrolments or objections, so that the position is not affected by this happening. Regarding the reconciliation of boundaries of Federal divisions and State electorates, the importance of this matter was fully stressed when I moved the second reading of the Bill, and I then made it plain that it is anticipated there will be an alteration in the State electoral boundaries before the Commonwealth undertakes its next redistribution scheme.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It was not made too plain then.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope I shall not be misunderstood. This does not imply that we will alter our boundaries to suit the present Federal divisional boundaries as, with our fifty districts and their five divisions, we will, of course, give more attention to community of interests than to actual numbers. Our rapidly-developing

State demands this and the remote electorates, with smaller populations, must, it goes without saying, have a certain amount of consideration shown them in the matter of representation, seeing that they are in many cases the pioneers and prospectors of our potential wealth. If a State redistribution of seats precedes that of a Federal redistribution it is reasonable to anticipate that the Federal Electoral authorities will be predisposed, when their redistribution takes place, to follow our lead and adjust their divisional boundaries to coincide more nearly with the new State boundaries. Meanwhile the joint rolls proposed under the Bill will afford the electors much greater facilties than at present and, at the same time, result in a certain amount of saving to the taxpayer. We were told by Mr. Harris that "If the Bill becomes an Act we shall have the Federal officers doing the work that is now being done by the State officers, and it is essential that our Chief Electoral Officer shall have the necessary power and authority." It should be clear to all hon. members that, in a joint rolls scheme, such as is now proposed, the Commonwealth-State Electoral Registrar—one officer—must deal with enrolments and objections in an absolutely uniform manner. It is unreasonable to expect the Commonwealth to amend its electoral laws (which operate throughout Australia) to suit one State. I have already emphasised the necessity for as great a measure of uniformity as possible in connection with joint rolls. There will be one entry only in the Registrar's official joint roll, and one notice of objection only when the joint Registrar deals with any such matter. How is it possible, then, to vary the procedure without causing much confusion. The Commonwealth will provide the officers, and the State will formally appoint them as State electoral registrars as I have already explained during my second reading speech. When the Bill is in Committee I will explain fully the various proposed alterations in our present procedure but I can assure the House that, while we must conform to the Commonwealth electoral procedure, if the joint rolls are to be successful, that procedure does not differ greatly in essentials from our own. I have that assurance from our Chief Electoral Officer. With reference to the State Chief Electoral Officer, this is another matter to which I referred in my second reading speech. If hon. members will be good enough to peruse paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of the copy of the Commonwealth-Victorian joint rolls arrangement, copies of which have been distributed to them, the position and duties of the State Chief Electoral Officer, in the joint rolls scheme, will be made clear to them. Our arrangement with the Commonwealth will be in precisely similar terms (except in regard to electoral inspectors, who do not exist in this State). The terms of this arrangement form the basis of the Commonwealth Government's offer to this Government in connection with the joint rolls scheme. Mr. Harris further remarked: "Dealing with some of the clauses in the Bill before us, I would draw attention to Clause 5—'Application of this part.' It sets out that Divisions 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Part III. of the Act shall cease to apply to electoral matters relating to the Assembly. It is rather difficult to compare the Bill with the principal Act, and secure an intelligent grasp of what the amendments really mean, as the clause sets out that various divisions shall not apply . . . ." In reply, let me say that the wording of Clause 5 leaves no room for doubt as to what is intended. The Electoral Act, 1907-1927, as it will then be styled if the Bill be passed, will, when reprinted, contain the new Part IIIA as, so to speak, an addendum following Part III. It would be both inconvenient and confusing to so amend Part III. as to embody the amendments contained in the new Part IIIA, now before the House, more especially as the new Part will apply to the Legislative Assembly only and will take, for such purpose, the place of Divisions (2), (3), (4) and (5) of Part III., and, also, as such Part III. will still apply to the Legislative Council. There is nothing confusing in carrying out the provisions of the proposed new Part IIIA, and I fail to see why any objection should be raised to its insertion in this manner, which makes for simplicity rather than the reverse. Mr. Harris suggests the amendment of the principal Act in reference to postal vote officers. That is outside the scope of the present Bill which provides only for joint rolls and cognate matters. Questions relating to postal vote officers have no bearing on the measure. Touching the Legislative Council rolls for the general election of 1928, as I have already pointed out, this Bill is for joint Commonwealth-Assembly rolls and therefore the compilation of the new Legislative Council rolls is outside its scope.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who will prepare the Council rolls?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The State electoral officer. This arrangement refers only to Assembly rolls. Mr. Harris referred to Section 52 of the principal Act, which provides that claims received not less than 14 days before the issue of an election writ may be enrolled after its issue. That section being in division (5) of Part III. will undoubtedly be superseded by Clause 22 of this Bill, and the reason for this is self-evident. Would it be feasible or reasonable for a Commonwealth-State electoral registrar to register a valid claim forthwith for Commonwealth purposes, and make 14 days later a second registration of the same enrolment in the same roll for State purposes? It would, of course, be impracticable to do so. In this, as in all other relative matters, uniformity of procedure is essential and is the keynote of success of the proposed joint rolls. The same argument applies to objections to claims that are not provided for under the Commonwealth electoral law. On the other hand the provisions of Sections 188 and 188A of Part VII. of the principal Act would still apply as regards the penalty for making a false statement in a claim and would be enforced by the State Chief Electoral Officer whenever the necessity arose That is the only protection we have. Mr. Harris stated, "In Clause 18 there are some important alterations. One provides that any senator representing the State shall be entitled to have his name placed on the electoral roll for any subdivision or division he desires within the portion of the State he represents. I see no reference to members of the Legislative Council being entitled to enrolment for the districts they represent." The concesssion enabling senators to enrol for any Assembly district is granted for the sake of uniformity and to save the registrar specially marking their names as being enrolled as Commonwealth electors only. There are six senators only and as they are elected to represent the State as a whole they fully deserve the proposed right of State enrolment even though non-resident. Their case is not on all fours with that of members of this House who are compelled to claim enrolment for the State electorate and Commonwealth subdivision in which they reside. Members who claim a vote for the Legislative Council are living in the State and it does not entail much trouble to make application for enrolment. As to nomadic electors, I regard Subclause 4 of Clause 19 as one of the most important in the Bill, and if it is considered that camel-drivers and dingo and rabbit trappers should be included therein, I am prepared to accept such an amendment. The subclause, as it stands, is essential and will prevent the disfranchisement of many outback pioneers so situated as to find it impossible to comply fully with the compulsory enrolment provisions of the Bill. The Commonwealth deals with those deserving electors in a somewhat similar manner, and the Government decided to embody Subclause 4 in the Bill in order that legislative authority might be given to so important a matter. Mr. Harris referred to the penalty of £10 only for neglect of an officer to enrol a valid claim, while the State Act prescribes a penalty up to £200 for a similar offence. The £10 penalty is in the Commonwealth Act and has been inserted in the Bill for the sake of uniformity. There will be one claim card only for Commonwealth and State purposes, and therefore a defaulting registrar could be fined on one basis only. The Solicitor General has been consulted, and he is of opinion that the penalty of £10 would apply to each offence. The Solicitor General is further of opinion that Section 178 of the State Electoral Act, which is in Part VII., is operative and could, if necessary, be enforced by the State Chief Electoral Officer against a State electoral registrar, who was also a Commonwealth electoral registrar.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then there would be two penalties.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; the Chief Electoral Officer could decide under which section he would take action.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Consequently he would decide whether it should be a £10 or £200 penalty.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Our Section 178 appears in the Commonwealth Electoral Act as Section 155 (penalty £200) and it would depend upon the magnitude of the offence which of the two sections (£10 or £200 penalty) would be brought into operation. It will be seen, therefore, that the safeguards are wholly adequate, and if the Commonwealth Chief Electoral Officer did not take the necessary action to enforce one or other of the sections referred to, there would

be nothing to prevent the State Chief Electoral Officer from doing so.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is not likely that the State officer would take up the matter if the Commonwealth officer failed to do so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Burvill, in his criticism, referred at length to a matter which I traversed in my second reading speech, namely, the overlapping of boundaries of State electorates and Federal divisions, and it will be seen that the Government are fully aware of the effect of such overlapping as applied to the joint rolls scheme. To overcome the difficulties that would arise at a polling booth the proviso in Subclause 5 of Clause 10 of this Bill was specially inserted. That should meet the hon. member's objection. Once more I desire to emphasise that we do not propose to hand over our Assembly rolls to the Federal authorities; we shall still retain control of them through our own Chief Electoral Officer. With regard to the redistribution of seats of which we have heard so much during this debate, I would again refer to my second reading speech in which it is said that the alteration of our boundaries will be made before 1932, when the Federal redistribution will take place. This Bill was introduced solely for the purpose indicated by its heading, namely for the preparation and use of joint rolls for State and Commonwealth elections.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do not you propose to have a redistribution before the expiration of five years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope so. The convenience of State Assembly electors is the principal consideration, as I have already stated. In his speech on this Bill Mr. Cornell dealt principally with the status of our Chief Electoral Officer, and his duties in regard to the proposed joint rolls and the general working of the State Electoral Department. I have already referred to those matters, but I may point out that as regards compiling the Legislative Council rolls the State Electoral Department will have access to the Commonwealth card index in the same way as it is now able to compare Legislative Council enrolments with the State card index. If the hon. member refers to paragraph 7 of the Commonwealth-Victorian arrangements he will see that such matters are fully provided for. I cannot understand Mr. Cornell's statement that he is not aware of any other State having joint rolls, seeing that in my second reading speech I distinctly mentioned Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia as having them. Joint rolls have been in operation in those States for some time. Mr. Mann mentioned the Sydney Electoral Conference of 1915, and I regret that I am unable at present to lay a copy of its report on the Table. He also referred to the Commonwealth system of enrolment and to mistakes made by postmen, but of course, isolated intances of error should not be taken as condemnatory of the whole system. With regard to the transfer of State officers who may be found in excess as the result of the adoption of joint rolls, I can assure members that such officers will be dealt with in a fair and just manner. Mr. Hamersley's speech would seem to consist entirely of hostility towards the Commonwealth and all its works. But the Government are chiefly concerned with affording greater facilities to Assembly electors and the joint rolls scheme is, in my opinion, a forward step in that direction. Mr. Seddon is disappointed with the Bill as he considers many improvements to the Electoral Act are necessary. The Government also recognise that the Electoral Act requires amending in different directions. But they have studiously avoided introducing controversial matter into this Bill, which, as I have repeatedly stated, has only one objective—the introduction of joint rolls. With reference to the now proposed new Federal Electoral Bill, I have already explained that the Chief Electoral Registrar is acquainted with its provisions and he says there is nothing in it that will clash with this measure. Postal voting, candidates' expenses, and North-West elections have nothing at all to do with this Bill. If we reach the Committee stage, I shall endeavour to supply members with all information which may have a bearing on the different clauses under review. Let me again remind members that the sole aim of this Bill is to simplify registration; that three other States—Victoria, Tasmania, and South Australia—have already done what we propose to do and with successful results. Although in the initial stages the Electoral Department may have a little extra work to do in the preparation of special rolls where necessary, the progress of time will find remedies for any inconveniences suffered until the combined machinery of Commonwealth and State can be adjusted to meet the new situation. I hope that members will recognise the importance of the Bill, give it serious consideration and place it on the statute book.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I be permitted to make a personal explanation. The Hon. Mr. Burvill who is unavoidably absent from the present sitting, asked me whether I would pair with him on the second reading of the Bill and I agreed to do so in the event of a division being taken. Mr. Burvill spoke against the Bill and intended to vote against it.

The PRESIDENT: As there are 18 members present, and as I heard no members express dissent when I stated the question just now, I declare the second reading carried by an absolute majority.

Bill read a second time.

## BILL—HOSPITALS.

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Powers of the Minister:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Paragraph (b) of Subclause 3 sets out that the Minister shall have general power to maintain an exchange through which hospitals may secure the services of matrons and nurses. Does this mean that it is intended to establish another labour exchange? Will the Minister explain what the paragraph means?

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no intention to create another labour exchange. Most hospital committees look to the department to supply matrons and nurses. I might also mention that collective buying of hospital requisites undoubtedly produces good results and the department assists wherever possible. A conference is also held in Perth every 18 months where the interchange of ideas is also found to be beneficial.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is there an exchange in existence now?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. The department will continue to function as an exchange, because as I have just said, country hospital committees look to the department to supply them with a staff without any cost to the particular institution.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—Medical funds:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Will the Minister explain how far this power will extend in regard to medical funds. I understand there are lodges, unions, and other institutions with established medical funds, and that those bodies pay all or a part of their funds to a local hospital or friendly society. Will the clause have any bearing, or will it affect in any way the funds of the lodges?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think it will have any effect on those funds. The clause has been inserted so that the local funds shall not be divorced from the present management; that is to say, the hospital committees will work in conjunction with the local organisations. The funds to which Mr. Harris has referred will not be jeopardised at all.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not quite clear about the position. The administration of the funds is provided for in the clause. What I wish to know is whether the organisations to which I have referred will still be permitted to collect their funds in the district just as they do now, and administer those funds entirely in their own way, or is it intended that any of the institutions, collecting medical funds must pay the moneys so collected into the funds of a particular hospital?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. There will be little or no re-adjustment. The organisations referred to will function——

Hon. E. H. Harris: As in the past?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Exactly. It is only a question of adjustment. There will be no restriction on any particular fund, but rather will the jurisdiction of the organisation be increased, and it will function in co-operation with the local institution. No difficulty can arise.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Paragraph (a) deals with the rates of subscription to any such fund and the benefits to be received by the subscribers. Surely the Minister has misunderstood the object of the clause!

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24-26—agreed to.

Clause 27—Power of local authorities to expend revenues on public hospitals:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: This provides that a local authority may spend up to 10 per cent. of its revenue on maintaining a hospital. It is going to be a double tax on some sections of the community. If one local authority spends 10 per cent. in support of the hospital, and the adjoining local authority fails to do its part, the deficiency will have to be met out of general revenue. So in one district the ratepayers will be doubly taxed, while those in the other will

go free. Furthermore, instead of the Government taxing the whole of the people for the purpose, the burden will fall on the local authorities, who in turn will increase their rates. It is manifestly unfair, for it means double taxation on some people.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is not a taxing measure at all. It is merely a machinery measure.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: But the machinery seems to be oiled by contributions from the local authorities.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The clause merely gives the local authorities an opportunity to do the right thing by the hospitals.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This looks like a money Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is not; it is merely a machinery measure. It puts the support of hospitals on an entirely new basis and gives each local authority some jurisdiction over its own affairs.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: All property owners in the district will be specially taxed by the local authority. An absentee owner will be paying for the benefit of local residents. Those who are generous enough to tax themselves for the support of hospitals will simply be relieving the Government. It is unfair.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The Bill applies to Perth as well as to country districts. The Perth Hospital draws one third of its patients from beyond the metropolitan area. If the City Council chooses to apply the power in this clause and allocate 10 per cent. of its revenue to the Perth Hospital, it will be contributing to the support in hospital of a great many people who have no claim whatever on the metropoli

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do they not pay for their treatment in the hospital?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Yes, but not nearly sufficient to meet the cost of the institution. Moreover, a large percentage of the ratepayers of Perth, although taxed for the maintenance of the hospital, would not be allowed to enter it themselves.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I agree with Mr. Harris and Dr. Saw. The simply affords opportunity to place further burdens on the ratepayers. Take the Pinjarra hospital. Just prior to the recent elections a tremendous number of nomadic voters were sent down to work on the road around Pinjarra. Those nomadic voters would be entitled to use the Pinjarra hospital while the local ratepayers, whose Assembly votes were being nullified on that occasion by those nomadic voters, would be compelled to maintain the hospital.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That would be a terrible pity.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If the Perth City Council were called upon to contribute 10 per cent. of their revenue to the Perth Hospital, it would represent something like £10,000.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Well, they spend enough on whisky and cigars.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: They are entitled to spend 3 per cent. in that way, but while I was there they never spent so much as 1 per cent.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: They are doing better now.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: This will be a tax on the local ratepayer, whereas the nomadic voters are to receive all the hospital benefits without paying anything.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That is not right. They would have to pay sustenance while in hospital. I think this provision is meant to encourage local authorities in the country to support their local hospital when an appeal is being made in the interests of that hospital. As to Sir William Lathlain's illustration, surely the men doing the hard work on our roads should be entitled to use the local hospital when they fall sick or are injured!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I agree with Mr. Harris and Dr. Saw and Sir William Lathlain, whose views I think must appeal to members. It may be, as Mr. Gray says, that the provision is intended to encourage local authorities in the country to support hospital appeals. The purpose of Subclause 3 is to validate what Katanning and Collie have already done. Still I do not think that justified us in enlarging the powers set out in the Municipalities Act and the Road Districts Act. These two Acts specify clearly the objects in connection with which the revenue of the different bodies may be applied. If it is applied otherwise the action may be ultra vires. If we desire to give such power as is proposed under this Bill, it ought to be an expressed power conveyed in an amendment to the Municipalities Act and the Road Districts Act. We should reject this clause except insofar as it validates the action of the Collie municipality and the Katanning Road Board.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no compulsion about this clause. It merely gives the local authority power to act upon its own initiative. It is better that this power should be given under this Bill than under either of the two Acts referred to by Mr. Nicholson. Perhaps a little time might be given to members to study this clause. I certainly do not want to see it struck out, lest it should discourage local authorities from functioning in the direction in which they have already done. I move—

That further consideration of this clause be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clauses 28 to 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Qualifications of person for admission to hospital:

Hon. H. SEDDON: Is it intended under subclause 2 that only a certain class of patient shall be treated in these particular wards?

The Honorary Minister: It is not intended that this subsection shall operate harshly in the case of anyone.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—Cost of relief to constitute a debt:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would draw attention to an important omission from Subclause 2. It says that hospital services granted to a married woman shall constitute a debt due by her husband. That is all right in the case of married people who are living together, but something should be inserted to make it clear that the liability applies only in such cases. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2, after the word "woman," in line two, the words "(not living apart from her husband)" be inserted.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: We may be running a risk if we pass such an amendment. In some instances the husband and wife may not be legally separated but may be living apart.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Under Subclause 3 the cost of hospital services rendered to an aboriginal is to constitute a debt due by the employer of such aboriginal. Why should an employer have to pay the hospital expenses of his aboriginal when he is not liable for the payment of hospital expenses for any other of his employees?

Hon. J. R. Brown: He gets the aboriginal for the cost of his tucker.

Hon. A. J .H. SAW: If we pass this, it will very likely prevent the employment of aboriginals.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And a good thing, too.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Apparently the hon. member does not want even aboriginals to work. No doubt, if he had his way, he would give them everything for nothing. It is a good thing that aborigines should work, and we should encourage their employment. I move an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: What is the position regarding half-bloods, and what percentage of aboriginal blood has to be in the employee before the employer is called upon to pay for his keep in an institution? The Commonwealth Electoral Act entitles half-bloods to vote.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Half-bloods are not mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No; but many half-bloods are employed in Western Australia. Would the subclause call upon the employer of a half-blood to pay for his keep in an institution?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have always understood—I am uncertain whether it is statutory—that so long as a half-blood lives in the bush as an aboriginal he is regarded as an aboriginal, but that when he dissociates himself from natives and lives amongst whites he is not regarded as an aboriginal.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The subclause should stand, since the liability is a fair one to place on the employer. Why saddle the general public with the liability of an employer who merely gives the native tucker and a little tobacco? Such an employer pays him no wages.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Some aboriginals employed on stations receive up to £2 per week.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I acknowledge that many esteemed pastoralists pay fair wages to their aboriginal employees.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Aborigines Department see that natives are not employed for tucker only. Some aborigines are better than white men on stations, and are paid up to £2 per week. Why should the employer be saddled with the liability proposed by the subclause?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The opposition to the subclause rather surprises me. The provision applies not only to pastoral-

ists, but to employers in the metropolitan area and, in fact, throughout the State.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Aborigines are scattered through the Great Southern district.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and many of them are in domestic service. Having something to do with the Aborigines Department, I can certify that the proposed obligation is fair. Some employers evade the obligation. The subclause will not operate harshly. Indeed, most employers of aborigines have already recognised the obligation, particularly in regard to aborigines employed as domestic servants.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Under Clause 27, which has been held over, power is given to the board to debit an employer with 10 per cent. of the amount of his annual rates, because that clause provides that 10 per cent. of the rates is to be contributed towards upkeep of hospitals. The rates, therefore, will be increased to that extent. After paying that proportion, the employer is to be debited, under this subclause, with the cost of the maintenance of an aboriginal employee admitted to hospital. The employer is, therefore, to be fired at with a double-barrelled gun.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The State will be infinitely better off without the subclause than with it. If the subclause is retained, assuredly no one will employ an aboriginal; and if the aboriginal is not employed he comes on the State for charitable relief. It is far better to delete the subclause and thus let the aboriginal get some employment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Honorary Minister seems not to have weighed the subclause with the care usual in these matters. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman that aborigines are more prone to certain diseases—leprosy, for example—than white men are. One can easily conceive the case of an aboriginal developing one of the diseases and remaining in hospital for the rest of his days, when the unfortunate employer would be saddled with all the native's hospital expenses to the day of his death. The duty of looking after such cases is cast upon the Government. Moreover, the subclause provides absolutely no exemption.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Under Subclause 3 of Clause 31 people who cannot pay may be admitted to public hospitals. We know that many people who avail themselves of those hospitals pay nothing, being unable to pay anything; and that is chiefly what public hospitals exist for. Surely the people of the soil, people who belong to Western Australia, the aborigines should not be treated worse than other people, who are probably in better circumstances.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It may not be wise to take a hurdle before one comes to it, but if this subclause passes and Clause 34 also passes, it will mean that the unfortunate employer of an aboriginal will be liable not only for hospital charges but also for any charge that may be made in respect of maintenance in homes for aged and infirm people—homes that will come under this measure.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Nicholson did not grasp my meaning. I stated that many employers of aborigines are doing voluntarily what the subclause proposes. Mr. Miles knows that Kimberley pastoralists see, in their own interest, that native employees get hospital accommodation and treatment.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ayes | .. | .. | 16 |
| Noes | .. | .. | 5 |
| Majority for | .. | .. | 11 |

AYES.

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. C. F. Baxter | Hon. J. Nicholson |
| Hon. J. Ewing | Hon. G. Potter |
| Hon. W. T. Glasbeen | Hon. A. J. H. Saw |
| Hon. E. H. Harris | Hon. H. Seddon |
| Hon. G. A. Kempton | Hon. H. A. Stephenson |
| Hon. Sir W. Lathlain | Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom |
| Hon. A. Lovekin | Hon. H. J. Yelland |
| Hon. J. M. Macfarlane | Hon. G. W. Miles (*Teller.*) |

NOES

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. J. R. Brown | Hon. W. H. Kitson |
| Hon. J. M. Drew | Hon. E. H. Gray |
| Hon. J. W. Hickey | (*Teller.*) |

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

Clause 34—Homes for aged or infirm people:

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: In view of Subclause 2, further consideration should be given to this clause. Relying on the assurance we received from the Minister that the Bill was a mere machinery measure, I am afraid I have not given it the close attention that it warrants. The clause proposes to apply something that is not in vogue now. I hope the Minister will defer the clause for further consideration.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will agree to that course and I move—

That the consideration of Clause 34 be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clauses 35 to 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Regulations:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Subclauses 2 and 3 are apparently conflicting. The former sets out that a board may, and shall if the Minister so directs, adopt any model by-laws formulated under the Bill, whereas the latter sets out that a board may, of its own motion, by resolution adopt the whole or any portion of such by-laws. The Minister may direct that the whole of the by-laws shall be put into operation, but a board may decree that merely a portion of them shall be dealt with in that way. I think the Minister should carefully consider the wording of the two subclauses. In Subclase 4 apparently a new procedure is sought to be adopted. It reads—

Such resolution shall be published in the "Government Gazette," and thereupon shall operate with the same legal effect for all purposes as if the by-laws or portion so adopted had been passed by the board and duly brought into effect as provided in this Act.

Section 36 of the Interpretation Act reads, inter alia—

When by any Act it is provided that regulations may or shall be made . . . . . any regulation made under, or by virtue of, such provision . . . . . (d) shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 14 days after such publication, if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within 14 days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

Under the latter procedure, regulations may be disallowed by motions tabled in either House and agreed to. It will be seen that the procedure laid down in Subclause 4 of the Bill is new. Does it mean that it is an attempt to repeal that section of the Interpretation Act and thus do away with the right of members of Parliament to move to disallow by-laws? Before we deal with the Bill again, the Honorary Minister might look into that phase.

Progress reported.

## BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. POTTER (West) 6.10: The Bill should not occupy much time at the second reading stage, because on various occasions most hon. members have expressed themselves clearly on the question of closer settlement. From the Bill now before us, certain obnoxious provisions that were included in earlier Bills have been eliminated and I believe that the Bill, with a few further amendments, will be of great advantage to the State. It is obvious that the gist of the Bill is contained in Clauses 2 and 3. The former clause provides for the appointment of a board and the latter for the methods by which the board will operate. It is of major importance that the board shall be constituted in such a way as to merit the confidence of the people generally. Some may consider that a Closer Settlement Bill interests merely those members who represent country districts. That is far from true, because metropolitan members and their constituents recognise clearly that the progress of the metropolitan area and the success of secondary industries that are invariably established within the metropolitan-suburban area, depend entirely upon the progress of the country districts. For that reason the people generally are anxious that the State shall be developed in the most economical manner. When appointed the board will have very wide powers. They will be able to dispossess a freeholder of his land if, in the opinion of the board, the land is not put to its full economic use. In such circumstances grave consideration must be given to the appointment of such a body. The Bill, on the other hand, sets out that two of the board members shall be Government officers, one from the Lands Department and the other from the Agricultural Bank. From time to time we have noticed officers, some fairly highly placed, who have held ultra socialistic views. If it should so happen that those officers were employed in a department controlled by a Minister possessed of similar opinions, it is obvious that danger might threaten the whole system of security of freehold tenure. If the danger were not real, it might be suspected, and that would strike at the main incentive to settlement in that the inherent ambition of human beings to own property would be assailed. Fortunately the majority of our Government employees are not of the description I suggest, for they have well-balanced minds. In the past, however, from time to time we have noted that the effect of legislation has not been exactly what we intended. Only a few days ago an eminent authority in the Chief Justice of the State, dealt in a jocular way with

that phase. He referred to the way in which judges were asked to interpret laws that were supposed to represent what Parliament intended. Although his remarks were made in a jocular way, attention could well be paid to them. Before the Bill is passed, there should be no mistake regarding what is intended. There must be no ambiguity and the board, when appointed, should not be in a position to place interpretations upon various provisions of the measure that we did not intend should apply.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. G. POTTER: I was stressing the necessity for the board having a true perspective of the best use to which the land could be put, that is, its best economic value and purpose. On that question there would be many differences of opinion, even amongst practical men. A market gardener, riding in a train or passing along a road, might see land that he considered was not being put to its best use, but he would be viewing it from his own angle, that of a market gardener. I have heard men with claims to practical knowledge dilating upon the fact that certain land should be growing wheat. On closer investigation it was found that the land was being devoted to stud stock purposes. One of the party said, "There is plenty of room farther back for stud stock. Let us develop the land near the railway line for wheat growing." It is essential for men dealing in valuable stock to be situated close to a railway, because the merest tyro understands that when stock is travelled for a long distance it deteriorates in value. Some people argue that large areas, which are being farmed, would be of greater advantage to the State if they were divided into small holdings. I doubt whether they would be. Almost invariably large sums of money have been expended on such lands to provide outhouses, dams, etc., and bring them to a state of fruition. If such areas were cut up, one portion would be left with costly buildings and overhead charges that would make profitable farming on it impossible. There is another point that must not be lost sight of. There is such a thing as creating a soil. Land that 40 or 50 years ago was comparatively poor has, by cultivation and by the running of stock, been improved wonderfully. It would be almost impossible to assess the value of the improvement to such a property. Consequently, when the board are assessing the compensation for land resumed, it is necessary that they should walk warily lest they do an injustice to a man who has done good work for the State. Provision should be made for a person who took up land years ago and who has a family growing up. The property may have passed into the hands of the second or third generation, but I maintain it would be commercially immoral to deny the sons and even the daughters of their heritage and the right to own the property on which they and their parents were reared. The board would have as members two Government officers. They may be expert administrators, but I doubt whether it would be possible always to get men with practical knowledge to guide them as to the right thing to be done. I trust careful consideration will be given to that clause, so that not the slightest suspicion may attach to the activities of the board and so that the right of an individual to hold property without fear of being dispossessed may be preserved. We should ensure that the measure does not create a spirit of distrust in the future settlement of the land of this State. I support the second reading.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [7.37]: I do not propose to reply at length to the speeches of hon. members. In fact there is very little opening left for me to do so. The Bill has met with a cordial reception from the House, and I can only hope that the hospitality extended to it at its entry will continue until its sojourn has come to a glorious close. Mr. Stewart is usually a keen critic of any legislation submitted to this Chamber, but Mr. Stewart says of this Bill that it is a temperate measure with nothing in it savouring of confiscation. Mr. Potter expressed the fear that under a Minister or board of socialistic tendencies the freehold rights might be destroyed and the property might be confiscated. Nothing like that could occur under this measure. There is nothing in the Bill that savours of confiscation. Land might be taken, but the owner would receive compensation for it. Mr. Stewart thinks, as he has thought on many occasions previously, that a slight amendment of the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act for the compulsory acquisition of land for discharged soldiers would serve the purpose equally

well, if not better. It may surprise Mr. Stewart to learn that insofar as the compulsory acquisition of land is concerned the provisions of that Act have been found valueless. The intention was that the Government should be given power to resume compulsorily for soldier settlement, but owing to a flaw in the Act it was found impossible to put it into operation, and the fact remains that it has never been used for the purpose contemplated. Any estates purchased had to be purchased with the consent of the owner, as such a thing as forcible acquisition could not be attempted owing to the faults in the Act. Our experience of that measure should be a warning to members to be careful that nothing is done to destroy the value of the present Bill. Mr. Stewart referred to the 9,000,000 acres of light lands suitable either for wheat growing or for oats and sheep. I am glad Mr. Stewart touched on this subject, as it enables me to furnish another strong argument in favour of the Bill. It will no doubt come as news to Mr. Stewart and to many other members that shortly after the publication of Mr. Bostock's report there was such a demand for light lands in the wheat growing areas that at the present time there is practically none suitable for farming vacant within 12½ miles of a railway.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Mr. Bostock's report had a good effect.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. It will be seen from this that there is such a hunger for land that large areas of second and third class land have been snapped up in a brief space of time. Mr. Holmes, in the course of his speech, stated that the Agricultural Bank at present has 726 abandoned farms with £450,000 owing on them. As is well known, those are largely soldier settlement blocks, and comparatively few of them are in the wheat growing districts. Mr. Holmes's figures date back to the 30th June, 1926. Since then 86 of the blocks have been disposed of with the result that the indebtedness has been reduced by nearly £100,000. The Assistant General Manager of the Agricultural Bank has supplied me with the following information and comments in regard to them:—

The figures quoted by Mr. Holmes, M.L.C., represent the position as it stood on the 30th June, 1926. At the 30th June, 1927, the number of abandoned farms on the department's hands had decreased to 640, distributed as follows:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Perth metropolitan district (including Esperance) .. .. .. | 176 |
| Bunbury (South-West) .. .. | 170 |
| Katanning (including Denmark and Ongerup) .. .. .. | 131 |
| Northam .. .. .. | 64 |
| Narrogin .. .. .. | 42 |
| Kellerberrin . .. .. | 23 |
| Bruce Rock .. .. .. | 14 |
| Kununoppin .. .. .. | 13 |
| Geraldton .. .. .. | 7 |
| | 640 |

The relatively large number of abandoned properties in the metropolitan, South-West, and Denmark areas is due to lack of demand for the class of property we have for sale, mostly dairy and poultry farms, small orchards, and market gardens.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Those are small areas outside the towns?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes; they were not repurchased properties, but were lands taken up from the Crown. The report continues—

In the other districts the properties on hand are mostly sections which, through insufficient area, low productivity, or other causes, have been found incapable of supporting settlement. There is a large unsatisfied demand for wheat or mixed farm areas capable of being profitably farmed.

Now a safer guide in deciding whether the policy of land acquisition in the past has been a success is the experience with repurchased estates; and in order to be able to place before the House some reliable data in this connection, I asked the accountant of the Lands Department to prepare a profit and loss account of the different estates repurchased. I was pleased to find that the books of the Lands Department are kept in such a way that there was no difficulty in affording me the information desired, and I got it within a day or so of my asking. The document supplied me is not a rough haphazard statement, but as I said before, a profit and loss account for the period ending 30/6/27. I find from the document that 33 estates in all have been acquired since the Land Purchase Act first came into operation, and taking them all in all there is a net profit to the 30th June last of £29,452 0s. 3d.—that is, after deducting all losses. For instance there is a loss shown on the Yandanooka estate of £4,720. And no wonder! It was bought just before the Great War and when hostilities broke out

it was decided not to throw open the estate for settlement till the soldiers came back. Meanwhile the estate was used as a holding ground for cattle, and only a comparatively small rental was received. During this time the estate was debited with £5,600 a year interest. There may be other somewhat similar instances, but the position is this, taking the least profitable with the most profitable, the State has come out £29,452 to the good. That is sufficient to prove the success of the policy of acquiring estates for closer settlement independent of the tremendous increase of wealth which has resulted to the State from the bringing of these lands under cultivation. I have here a list of the estates that have been repurchased and hon. members will be in a position to say whether their repurchase since the passing of the Lands Purchase Act, has been an advantage to the State. I will read the list so that members may be in a position to decide for themselves whether the purchases have been a success or not:—Annebrook, Avondale, Bolgart, Bowes, Brunswick, Bucklands, Coondle, Clifton, Cold Harbour, Dudawa, Guranu, Gwambygine, Henty, Homebush, Jelcobine, Jingalup, Karoolup, Marjidan, Mendel, Mt. Erin, Mt. Hardy, Narra Tarra, Norman, Oakabella, Porongorup, Stirling, Throssell, Ulijugalup, Wollya, Woodlands, Weirs, Wanneru, Yandanooka.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What about Noombling?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not on this list.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Those estates were repurchased apart from closer settlement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly. Of the few attacks made on this Bill I regard one of the proposed amendments of Mr. Nicholson as the most serious of all. If it be carried, well then it will certainly mean the end of the measure. Mr. Nicholson proposes that no matter what mortgage may be on the estate, the Government, if they resume the land, must discharge that mortgage before securing possession. He states that a bank, out of sympathy with a settler in a period of drought, may have advanced money on the land beyond what would be awarded under arbitration, and that the mortgagee should be protected. In the first place it is difficult to understand that any bank would advance on land not properly utilised a sum in excess of it worth, and if such were done it would indicate a degree of risk on the part of the bank that is not borne out by those who have had experience of these institutions. I am aware that our old Western Australian Bank lost a good deal of money in trying to help the gold-mining industry. But it realised at the time that it was taking big risks. Still it took those risks in an unselfish manner in the interests of the State. In connection with agricultural land, however, I am not aware that any of the private banks have suffered much loss. Mr. Nicholson says oftentimes when a sale of land is made it does not realise sufficient to pay off the mortgage. That may be so, and, if it is so, no one comes to the rescue of the mortgagee and meets his deficiency. To do what Mr. Nicholson suggests would be contrary to all practices, and would leave a very wide door open for the defeat of the objects of this Bill. An owner of a big estate could secure as large an advance as possible on his property from a bank or private individual, and he could then fix up a bogus second mortgage to his wife or relatives, making the total liability on the estate such a figure that no Government would dream of discharging it in order to acquire the property. Now, the procedure followed in this Bill is that adopted in connection with all resumptions by the Commonwealth or State If, for instance, two acres of land were required in the city for public buildings, the land would be resumed, and all the mortgages on it would become first charges on the amount awarded under the Public Works Act, 1902. The Government would not be called upon to pay off the mortgages before taking possession. I feel certain Mr. Nicholson will not be successful with his amendment which has no precedent to commend it, so far as I know, and which would make this Bill so much waste paper in the hands of designing individuals. Mr. Nicholson quotes the losses on soldier settlement as an argument against this Bill. There have been losses, and big losses everywhere, in connection with soldier settlement, and the reason is easy to find. When it became known that the Commonwealth Government intended to settle thousands of soldiers on the land in Australia, the prices went up in a succession of bounds, and estates were recklessly bought at prices which spelt disaster from the very outset.

Hon. J. Cornell: They were bought against the advice of experts.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Probably, but that information is not in my possession. I am just quoting the results. Mr. Nicholson told us that closer settlement had been going on in Victoria for many years, and that there was still owing to the Government out of the 27 millions odd advances, a sum of over 23 millions.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not know how many years; I said some years.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In view of that statement I asked the Assistant Under Secretary for Lands to wire the Director of Land Settlement, Melbourne, for information on the matter. The Acting Under Secretary complied with my request, and he received the following reply:—

987,000 acres acquired at a cost of £7,550,000. Advances £2,630,000. Total receipts up to date £6,610,000. Repayments principal land £1,800,000. Repayments advances £1,100,000. Profit on revenue account on the whole transaction to 30th June, 1927, £3,800, after reserves had been credited with £172,000. Applications granted 7,500. Areas available 40,500 acres. Probable losses referred to in your telegram are in respect of soldier settlement accounts, which are kept separate.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think I explained that I quoted from an article, and I suggested that you should get the information from the Victorian "Hansard."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I know the article; it refers to soldier settlement. It is the same right throughout Australia in regard to soldier settlement. It will be seen from these figures that the appalling losses referred to by Mr. Nicholson have not occurred in Victoria; that 987,000 acres have been acquired at a cost of £7,550,000 and that the total receipts so far are £6,610,000; while there are still 40,500 acres to be disposed of. Moreover, the profit and loss account shows a credit of £3,800 after transferring £172,000 to reserve. Of the advances of £2,630,000 already £1,100,000 has been repaid. This land has been sold on lengthy terms, repayment being in 73 half-yearly instalments, and it will be seen that already £1,800,000 of the principal has been met. That seems to me to be a splendid record for Victoria I have not communicated with any of the other States, but I have the report of the Royal Commission on Rural Settlement appointed for the purpose of introducing closer settlement legislation in South Australia. It deals exhaustively with the question as regards the different States, and I cannot find it in any references to losses due to the compulsory acquisition of land. On the other hand the Commission strongly stressed the importance of promoting closer settlement. The report was laid before the South Australian House of Assembly on the 2nd December of last year. Let me quote this from the report of the Commission; it is headed "The Importance of Promoting Closer Settlement." It reads as follows:—

The economic settlement of the land and the utilisation to the best advantage of the wealth-producing properties of the soil are of fundamental importance to the progress and prosperity of a nation that is dependent primarily on rural production. The future development of the component States of the Commonwealth will be determined largely by the degree to which their lands are exploited, and hence it is difficult to overstate the value to the community of any measures or schemes that make for extension of settlement and improvement in cultural practices. The basic principle of such a rural settlement policy should be the right of the nation to demand that all lands be made as fully productive as possible. It is recognised amongst political economists that property in land differs fundamentally from any other form of property in that "ownership of land is never absolute, whereas ownership of goods is never anything but absolute." Theoretically all land is owned by the Crown, but in actual fact the possessor of an estate in fee simple is practically the full owner of the land. Again, under the lease in perpetuity tenure, which applies to large areas of land in this State, the lessee has almost unlimited rights, except in regard to disposal. Inasmuch as the growth and progress of a nation are bound up with the proper utilisation of the land, however, it is the duty of the Crown to devise ways and means of overcoming all obstacles in the way of agricultural expansion and advancement, and consequently a well-conceived land settlement policy should provide for the development of all lands, irrespective of the manner in which they are held. It is incumbent on the Governments of all States to increase agricultural production, encourage permanent rural settlement, and ameliorate the conditions of country life, and it is obvious that, unless the distribution of the land is within their control, they are destitute of the power requisite to the accomplishment of these purposes. The moral right of the Government, acting on behalf of the community as a whole, to insist on land being made fully productive, and to render available for settlement lands that are adapted for agriculture, has already been conceded by the Parliaments of Australasia, which have passed laws sanctioning the resumption of freehold lands for closer settlement. It may be logically deduced from this that the right to possess land is regarded as a conditional right and subject in all cases to the land being made to produce to its full capacity. In other words, the owner of the land has, in return for the right of possession, an obligation to the State to make full use

of his property, and if he fails to do so the Crown is justified, as trustee of the public interests, in transferring it to those who will.

During the discussion we have heard from the few opponents of the measure a good deal about the possible injustice of driving persons off the land who are utilising it in the best profitable way. I hope that the administration of this Bill, if it becomes an Act, will not be conducted on those lines. There is surely enough practically unimproved land in this country for the board to get to work upon without harassing bona fide settlers. It is forgotten also that if the Government set out to acquire highly improved properties on a resumption basis they would require the Bank of England behind them. And it seems to be overlooked that the Government have the final say as to whether a property shall be resumed or not. I cannot possibly imagine that any Government could continue or even attempt to resume a property that was being utilised in any way satisfactorily. Such a Government would be condemned by the general community, and their lease of life as a Government would be very brief indeed. According to the report of the South Australian Commission, the practice in the Eastern States, where power is given to resume land compulsorily, is first to exhaust every effort to secure the land by the voluntary process, and no doubt the same course will be followed here. That is the policy of every Government of every State of Australia, and a similar policy will be carried out in Western Australia. I should like to point out before concluding that there are several amendments on the Notice Paper having similar objects in view, and I suggest that some effort be made to consolidate them before the Committee stage is reached. I do not propose to take the Committee stage before Tuesday. That should give members ample time in which to prepare their amendments, or consolidate those that are of similar character. I feel sure that on this occasion the Bill will became law, and I trust that hon. members will not agree to any amendments that would tend to prevent that result.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 8.7 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 19th October, 1927.*



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

## QUESTION—TROTTING, CHARITIES MEETING.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Premier: 1, Were the total gross proceeds of the meeting of the W.A. Trotting Association held on Saturday, 24th April, 1926, for the benefit of certain benevolent institutions paid over without taxation? 2, What amount of tax was payable on the gross proceeds?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, £591 3s. 9d.

## QUESTION—STATE LABOUR BUREAUS.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Hon. H. Millington (Honorary Minister): 1, What number of men were picked up at the Perth Labour Bureau during the past two weeks for Government works? 2, What numbe. were picked up at the Fremantle Bureau during the same period? 3, Will he see that the promised quota is picked up fro each bureau respectively?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON replied: 1, 86. 2. Eight. 3, Yes.

## QUESTION—MOOLA BULLA STATION

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Hon. H. Millington (Honorary Minister): 1, Are tenders for Moola Bulla carting advertised? 2. If so, how? 3, Why are local firms not given an opportunity to tender for saddlery used on Government stations?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON replied: 1 and 2. No tenders have been advertised since 192' when an agreement was entered into with