That section corresponds almost exactly to Section 25 of the old English Act. There is a long list of decisions which have been given on the interpretation of that section. There is no provision for these shares being issued as fully or partly paid. There should be something inserted to provide that if bonus shares are issued they should be fully paid. It may be worth while adjourning the matter for further consideration.

The Minister for Education: I have no objection to that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We want to give the shareholders something that they expect to get. They may receive shares which will carry a liability.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the company may continue to get increased capital.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A company ought not to be allowed to increase its capital by the issue of bonus shares beyond a certain limit, otherwise it may be receiving capital which is not bolstered up by any assets.

Progress reported.

BILL—MARRIED WOMEN'S PROTECTION.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate on the second reading of this Bill.

On motion by Hon. J. Ewing, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 24th October, 1922.

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

BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

Mr. DURACK (Kimberley) [4.37]: The Bill has been clearly dealt with by the Colonial Secretary in moving the second reading. A few amendments have been brought forward in it with the object of tightening up the Pearling Act and doing away as far as possible with the practice of dummying. Most members know that aliens were introduced into the Kimberley and Broome areas to develop this industry, and that they were allowed to enter the State only under certain conditions. It appears now that the industry is to a great extent getting into their hands, due to the tactics of unscrupulous operators who, I suppose, will always be in our midst and cannot be entirely got rid of. The Bill, I consider, is a good one, and it should meet the desires of the association. The system of dummying is carried on in two or three different ways. In one case a man allows his name to be used by an alien as the owner of a boat on the payment of a sum of £200 or £300. The shell is brought in and sold by the owner of the boat and the proceeds are handed to the alien. The pearls, I understand, are also sold by the owner and the alien gets the proceeds, the man effecting the sale taking 10 per cent. Another practice is to lease a boat to an alien who pays so much a month for it. In this case the shell is brought in and sold by the owner, the proceeds again going to the alien. Another way is for the alien to provide all the expense for gear, etc., the proceeds from the shell being divided between the European and the alien. Some people might contend that the system of leasing is justifiable and should benefit the industry, but it must be conceded that the conditions under which the aliens were allowed to come in were that they should work as divers in the obtaining of shell. They were not permitted to come into the State with a view to their participating in any of the proceeds from the pearlshell. A measure which aims at overcoming these difficulties should receive the endorsement of the House. There is a new provision with regard to a diver's tender, who also will be required to take out a license. The tender is the man who attends the diver, and the diver and his tender are the two men against whom the pearlers should be protected. The suggested limited dealer's license is a very good proposal. In the past we have had experience of unscrupulous buyers who refused to take out a license in the pearling area as required by the present Act. They were thus able to buy pearls at a reduced value and sell them to the jewellers south of the 27th parallel. Dealers now wishing to buy pearls in the State will take out a limited license, and it will be possible to trace the man from whom the pearls were purchased. Thus the association will be given a chance of tracing the sellers of pearls obtained illicitly and put on the market here. It would be a good thing

if this legislation could be extended throughout the Commonwealth. I do not suppose that we shall be able to overcome this trouble by passing an Act that will operate in Western Australia only. If the unscrupulous buyer of pearls finds that, under this legislation, his movements and transactions can be traced, he will probably take his pearls to Sydney or Melbourne and sell them there. If the Commonwealth would co-operate in this legislation, it would help in a great measure to preserve the industry for the people legitimately engaged in it. Under existing conditions it is very difficult for a new man to start in the industry. The industry does offer opportunities to make a very good living—a number of returned men have engaged in it—but pearlers find that the industry is passing into the hands of aliens and that they cannot stand up against the competition. They cannot compete against the alien who is able to secure the services of the principal divers. We have heard a good deal recently about pearl culture. There is nothing new about this; in fact, it has been going on for centuries. It is recorded that somewhere in the thirteenth century the Chinese were engaged in this particular industry. It has continued, I understand, up to the present time, a number of families on the rivers being engaged in the cultivation of pearls. Some hon. members will probably have seen the small Buddhas that are sold in the East. These represent cultivated pearls. A miniature image of Buddha is inserted in the shell, and it becomes coated with the exudation of the oyster.

Hon. P. Collier: What is wrong with cultivating pearls so long as the public know what they are buying?

Mr. DURACK: Our desire should be to preserve this very valuable industry for our people. The cultivation of pearls would be engaged in by none but Japanese, who have made it a science.

Hon. P. Collier: Why should not the poor have a chance of getting cheap pearls?

Mr. DURACK: If pearls were a necessity, I would agree; but they are not a necessity. They are a luxury, and the pearling industry is of great value to this State and therefore should be preserved. We have here a large proportion of the world's output of pearls and shell, and therefore we should safeguard the industry.

Hon. P. Collier: People have a perfect right to cultivate pearls and sell them as such.

Mr. DURACK: I do not think that is quite justified in this case, seeing that the cultivators of pearls would be almost wholly Japanese.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But you have been partial to Japanese in the past.

Mr. DURACK: The pearling industry is surrounded with a great deal of romance as well as historical fact. It is on record that 22 centuries ago pearls were paid in China by way of tax and tribute.

Hon. P. Collier: They are a necessary commodity then?

Mr. DURACK: I would not call them that.

Hon. T. Walker: Would you call them an injurious commodity?

Mr. DURACK: Pearls have been largely responsible for extending the boundaries of the white race. Indeed, the early settlement of the coast of Western Australia was due in great measure to the pearling industry. Many good properties now established in the North owe their financial origin to our pearling industry. To go back a little in history, it is on record that in 1680 pearls were cultivated by a Parisian jeweller. The matter formed the subject of some legislation. There was then a certain competition between Oriental pearls and Scottish pearls, and a law was enacted preventing jewellers from setting Scottish pearls with Oriental pearls. Many of the historical names of the British race are associated with pearls. Sir Walter Raleigh brought back from America about 5,000 pearls of wonderful evenness and roundness, which were regarded as of great value. Again history tells us that Sir Thomas Gresham, the wealthy London merchant of Queen Elizabeth's time, who came to the rescue of the English Government during a time of financial embarrassment, had an extremely valuable pearl ground down and drank it with wine to the health of Queen Elizabeth as a proof of the prodigality of his loyalty. We are told, too, that the conquests of Alexander the Great were inspired largely by the lure of pearls in the Orient. Julius Caesar is said to have been largely actuated in his conquest of Britain by the reports of valuable pearls to be found in the waters there. It is recorded also that Julius Caesar presented a pearl of great value to the mother of Brutus. These historical facts throw a glamour over the pearling industry. I hope hon. members will recognise the necessity for putting through the amendments proposed by the Bill. Though I do not think they will altogether do away with dummying, yet they will prove a great factor in tightening up the existing Act and thus preserving the industry for those who are entitled to engage in it. I have an amendment which I shall move during the Committee stage. I have referred it to the Crown Law Department, and I think it represents an omission from the Bill. I hope the measure will commend itself to he House.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, debate adjourned.

BILL—GERALDTON RACECOURSE.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. K. Maley—Greenough) [4.54]: In moving the second reading of this short Bill, I may say that it follows very closely the lines of the Broome Hill Racecourse Bill. It proposes to revest in the Crown Victoria Location 1229, now held under lease by the trustees of the Victoria District Turf Club,

in order that the land may be granted to those trustees as an estate in fee simple. Further, the Bill provides that the trustees may, with the approval of the Governor, sell the land to be so granted as an estate in fee simple, subject to the proceeds of sale being applied, to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands, to the improvement of Reserves 18098 and 16855. Then the measure provides that the Victoria District Agricultural Society may, with the approval of the Governor, lease portion of Reserve 16855 to the trustees of the Victoria District Turf Club for a term not exceeding 50 years, subject to such conditions as the Governor may think fit. The present Geraldton racecourse is three or four miles out of Geraldton, and the object of selling the site is that the trustees of the race club may establish a racecourse on a portion of the ground at present vested in the trustees of the agricultural society. The area in question is 54 acres. I do not think any member need fear that by carrying the Bill they will be ministering unduly to the racing proclivities of the people of Geraldton, a fear which the Leader of the Opposition expressed in behalf of the people of Broome Hill. The purpose of the measure is to concentrate in closer proximity to Geraldton both the agricultural show ground and the racecourse. The member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock), who has been in communication with the Lands Department in behalf of the turf club and the agricultural society, and who has been instrumental in getting this Bill put forward, will be able to explain any other aspect of the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [4.57]: I have but little to add to what has been stated by the Minister for Agriculture. The present racecourse and show grounds are a couple of miles apart, and in view of the finances of both the turf club and the agricultural society, it has not been possible to afford the services of a caretaker. If the racecourse and the show ground are concentrated as proposed by this Bill, it will be possible to engage a caretaker for the buildings, the capital value of which will exceed £1,000. The arrangement will be convenient to both parties; and the townspeople of Geraldton, and indeed all the residents of the district, will be better served if we allow the land to be given to the turf club as proposed. I do not think there should be objection to the Bill from any quarter, seeing that both bodies have requested that the land be granted and utilised in the manner indicated by the Bill.

Mr. Pickering: Have you any idea what the land will realise?

Mr. WILLCOCK: About £4 per acre; approximately £700.

Mr. Harrison: Which body will control the land—the turf club or the agricultural society?

Mr. WILLCOCK: The turf club. The need for the third clause of the Bill arises from the fact that otherwise the turf club will not be able to obtain sufficient ground for a racecourse within the show ground. Without the authority contained in Clause 3, it might be argued that the agricultural society have no right to lease this portion of their ground to the turf club.

Mr. Pickering: The expenditure will be made on the agricultural society's land?

Mr. WILLCOCK: Possibly. There is also a proposal to put in a railway siding between the agricultural society's ground and the site of the present racecourse. This will be of considerable benefit to both bodies. The siding can be used for unloading horses when race meetings are being held, and for unloading stock at the time of the agricultural show. At present horses and cattle and sheep are to be seen all scrambling together at the side of the train on agricultural show day. With this siding going to the back of the racecourse, it will be much more convenient and safer for the public, and as the expense is to be shared everyone concerned approves of the proposal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.0]: I am not going to oppose the second reading of the Bill; I merely wish to express surprise that such a request should have come from the town of Geraldton. Here we have a racecourse not very far from the town and we have an agricultural ground almost in the centre of the town.

Mr. Willcock: Three miles away.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I was at the National Show there, and I was there when the new ground was opened on the first occasion.

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes, that show ground was in the middle of the town at that time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: From what I have seen in the Press lately, the people of Geraldton appear to be ambitious as well as optimistic regarding the future. They are looking forward to the division of this State, and to Geraldton becoming the capital city of the suggested new northern State. In view of that, I consider it is necessary for the Government to retain all the land that they have.

Mr. Underwood: I do not like your chance about Geraldton being the capital, so cut that out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Geraldton people, I repeat, should do their utmost to retain all the land they possess in close proximity to the town. Perhaps they have become so pessimistic lately on account of not being able to see a possibility of their desires being carried into effect.

Mr. Willcock: Do not forget that the ground is three miles out of the city.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Even three miles will not be very far when Geraldton becomes the capital of the northern State. All the land owned by the Government should be retained for the purpose of providing the accommodation which may be required with the growth of the town. But, as I have said, it may be on account of lately induced pessim-

ism that they wish to sell the racecourse which is only a couple of miles out of the town.

Mr. Willcock: Seven miles out of the town.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Geraldton itself is a long and narrow town. We must bear in mind the possibilities of development in this great State.

Hon. P. Collier: But all the development will be in the South-West.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We shall not be contented with development in one part of the State only; we want to see the whole of the State developed. The Leader of the Opposition fails to realise that this State, in the opinion of some people, when it becomes divided into smaller States, will make greater progress than it has done in the past. I can only repeat that I am surprised at the pessimistic attitude adopted by the people of Geraldton with regard to this matter. Of course, if that is how they feel towards their town, it is their own look-out.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Albany) [5.10] in moving the second reading said: The Bill deals largely with the conditions under which oil licenses are held and the conditions which are to apply in the event of oil being discovered in payable quantities. It also contains a clause which deals with a question quite apart from the principles of the Bill, and that is the difficulty which has arisen with regard to mining on tailing leases. I have not at any time attempted to set myself up as an authority on oil prospecting, or the working of oil deposits, and I am not aware of anyone in the State who has had practical experience in such operations who could definitely say that he was sufficiently well acquainted with the conditions, other than perhaps by having read reports, or having read authorities on the subject, to be able to tell us anything very definite as to how we should proceed. I desire to ask hon. members to throw their minds back to the time when there were whispers of the possible discovery of oil in Western Australia. One or two small syndicates had been formed and they had, under an arrangement with my predecessors, obtained licenses to prospect for oil on Crown lands. As they proceeded they discovered that, in the event of success following their efforts, they would have no tenure, that they would be at the tender mercies, not so much of Parliament perhaps, but of the prejudices that might arise, or the difficulties that quite naturally would arise from such an event as the discovery of oil in payable quantities, which would mean so much to the State. We were urged, before proceeding too far, to provide by statute, and of course arising out of an Act of Parliament, by regulation, the method by which these people could prospect for oil. When I submitted the Bill on a previous occasion, to put the matter on a statutory basis, I had not an easy task. The matter was not easy from two special standpoints, one that neither I nor any member in the House had very complete knowledge of oil occurrence and prospecting and working. But I found that the greatest difficulty I had was having to contend with severe criticism in the direction that the Bill was not liberal enough.

Mr. Underwood: The areas were a bit small.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Everybody at that time was of opinion that we could take any sort of risk in order to encourage people to prospect for oil.

Hon. P. Collier: The usual appeal on behalf of the boodler.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know about that, but the fact remains that practically the whole of the criticism of the measure came from a quarter that objected to any restriction being placed on prospecting, as it was considered that the freest possible license should be given to search for oil, and that to bring about the discovery and the benefit that would accrue to the State, we should take all sorts of risks. That was the phase of the question which appealed to most people when they were eager to get something, and when the prospects were not too bright. Of course, in the event of a discovery being made, and actual operations being commenced, and the value of such discovery becoming properly known and understood, we knew that the criticism would be in the opposite direction, that it would be not against Parliament so much as against the Minister, for having, with a knowledge of some of the facts as submitted to him by those who ought to know, given away so much. I do not suggest that anybody else would know so much about it as the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood). What he does not know is not worth worrying about. I suppose he knows the Alpha and Omega of this question, as of every other. I do not pit my knowledge against his, but I say that the Bill submitted on that occasion was criticised as being too restrictive rather than too generous.

Mr. Underwood: The administration has been at fault.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is always so when the hon. member is not part of it; when he is part of it, all is satisfactory. If ever the time comes when the hon. member can tell us of something which is right although he has no hand in it, I will say the millennium has arrived. The hon. member complains that the areas granted were too great. As a matter of fact I had nothing to guide me as to the size an area ought to be to encourage that capital so essential to prospecting for oil. I know there

are some who, like the member for Pilbara, can find anything at all without capital or any other assistance. One can discover mica without any capital at all. Oil is entirely different. As I have said, criticism at the time took the line that the areas ought not to be restricted, that we should not only encourage capital to come here to prospect over enormous areas but——

Mr. Durack: And it is a fact that the Anglo-Persian Company would not come in unless they got the whole State.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is quite true. Those who had a thorough knowledge of prospecting for oil in different parts of the world declined to take any interest in the oil prospecting of Western Australia unless we gave them the whole of the territory.

Mr. Harrison: Rather a large order.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was the order of the moment, and there were not a few people in the State, who, because of the uncertainty of the prospect and the large amount of expenditure entailed, not only before but also after the discovery of oil, believed that only a company of national standing could properly prospect the State for oil. I told the House then what the proposition was, and that I had taken the responsibility of notifying the Anglo-Persian Company that we were not prepared to hand over to them a monopoly of prospecting when others were entitled to consideration. So it will be seen that, in comparison with what was demanded by an experienced world-wide company, the areas actually granted were small. In the South-West, in proximity to railways, roads and other traffic facilities, areas had been granted prior to the passing of the Act, areas as large almost as those granted anywhere in the State outside the Kimberley areas.

Mr. Underwood: Outside of Kimberley there were areas of 29,000 square miles.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And the hon. member can have the lot for twopence. I declined to grant many applications for large areas outside of Kimberley because they were more accessible and more easily worked than were the Kimberley areas. If the hon. member desires any further information, let us consider the South-West Oil Exploration Company, in which Sir William Lathlain has shown so much interest. They have been prospecting continuously, not only by looking for surface indications, but by boring, and up to the moment they have spent a large sum of money without finding anything. They have learned only what to avoid. They have a territory extending from the Fitzgerald River across almost to the Leeuwin, a comparatively accessible portion of the State. The hon. member, too, when speaking on another motion, had a good deal to say about me in a personal way.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss that on this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: All right, I do not desire to do so because, seeing the source from which it came, I have not paid any attention to the criticism. I never ran away to a mica show for three months in order to qualify for a life pass over the railways and draw fees from my colleagues; whatever I may have done, I have not run away from my office and only signed for the cheque at the end of the month.

Mr. Underwood: That is pretty poor tripe.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But pretty true, all the same. This State has not been very closely surveyed geologically.

Hon. P. Collier: You mean in respect of oil.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, in respect of the occurrence of its rocks.

Hon. P. Collier: I thought it had nearly all been surveyed, except in the very far North.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The far North has been just as well surveyed geologically as most of the rest of the State. Generally speaking, we have obtained sufficient data to enable a geological map of the State to be produced and attached to the annual report of the Geological Department for 1918. That map disclosed that if the geologists of the world know anything about the oil occurrences, there are certain parts of the State which may be ruled out from territory where it is possible for oil to be discovered. The Geological Department and its officers have been severely criticised by those who have taken not so much interest in the discovery of oil as in the floatation of companies. Because the department have concluded from the nature of the rocks and from the prevailing conditions elsewhere where oil has been discovered, that it was not likely oil would be discovered in places being held by the vendors who are also company operators—because we were basing our opinion on the geological structure and concluded that the conditions were not favourable, we have been criticised and told that we were interfering where it was neither necessary nor desired. But that geological map, which is based largely on flying survey work, has disclosed sufficient to enable the department to come to certain definite conclusions. They could not say within a few miles how far the rock would continue, or that the place could be definitely marked on the map where oil possibilities would begin. Recently we had with us a noted oil geologist in Capt. De Hautpick, who made an inspection of a very small portion of the South-West. We granted to him, as to others, opportunity for obtaining any information he desired in respect of the geological structure of the State. From that he has copyrighted a map which sets out areas in which he says it is absolutely impossible to find oil. He may be right, he may be wrong. I know from the discussions I have had with the State Geologist that in one direction at all events, Capt. De Hautpick has not been as careful as he might have been. He refers to a part of Kimberley where the Durack Company is operating as being a place which can be ruled out of the possible oil area. Yet the rock in that area is dis-

tinctly similar to rock in other parts which Capt. De Hautpick has included in areas where the discovery of oil is quite possible. I mention this to show that while we talk about cutting up the whole of the State for the purpose of granting permits, while the territory may be large, as a matter of fact the part of our State which, as far as we know geologically lends itself to the occurrence of oil, is not very great. In fact there are parts about which we know nothing, of which we have not even flying geological surveys. We have left those areas vacant on the geological map. There are other parts respecting which I think we are entitled to say the chances of finding oil are so remote that it is useless to ask people to put up money for the prospecting of such areas. However, there are people who, without attempting to learn anything about our geological structure, have marked out on a map parts of such territory and applied for a license. I suppose they will be successful in raising sufficient money to enable them to get a cut out of it and probably do some little work in the hope that oil may be discovered. Unfortunately, these things are occurring even to-day. But no body will suggest that it is my duty as Minister to tell those people they have no chance whatever of getting oil, any more than it is my duty to point out where there may be possibilities of oil. The license only provides for the licensee to prospect upon the Crown lands and no other. In the South-West the areas may appear to cover a large territory but, in fact, they are very small.

Hon. P. Collier: When you say Crown lands, you mean also leasehold land?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. Lands in process of alienation or alienated altogether are not Crown lands. I asked for information regarding the areas of some of these licenses, and the area alienated or in process of alienation upon them, to find out over what territory the companies concerned would be permitted to prospect. I find in some cases almost the whole area has been alienated. There is one license comprising 1,456 square miles, of which 1,435 square miles are alienated or in process of alienation. There is little or nothing left for the people to prospect over.

Mr. Mann: Where is that?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It largely comprises the metropolitan area.

Mr. Underwood: Down in Albany?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is not there. I think it is No. 15H. No. 13H comprises 2,325 square miles, of which 1,719 are alienated or in process of alienation. No. 8H comprises 4,700 square miles, of which 2,300 are alienated or in process of alienation. The same sort of thing applies with regard to 11H. In the North the whole of the territory is Crown lands from the point of view of prospecting for oil.

Hon. P. Collier: In those cases where it is hoped that oil will be discovered the licensees have the whole area.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: When application was made the territory was open to anyone to apply for.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh, no.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I was not in the position to say when the amending Bill was introduced that oil would be discovered in the North-West. There was a difference of opinion at the time. The part of the State which was held to have been nearest to the discovery of the oil was down in the South-West at Bremer Bay.

Mr. Underwood: And it was contradicted by the Government Geologist.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The statements of the people concerned were contradicted by the Government Geologist, who was told he knew nothing about oil geology. They went on with their attempt to find oil. There are some people to-day who are waiting for the time when they hope to get the scalps of the officers of the Geological Department for the attitude they adopted on that occasion. They hope to prove that the officers were wrong, and when they do that they say there will be something doing.

Mr. Underwood: The stuff that was shown in the window was said to be mineral oil.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was declared to be that.

Mr. Underwood: But it was not proved to be mineral oil.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The people concerned declared that their method of testing was sufficient from their point of view to prove that it was mineral oil. There are people who are prepared to accept in a large measure the evidence then submitted as being evidence of mineral oil.

Hon. P. Collier: I do not think that is so. The Russian expert condemns the bore from which this supposed oil was taken, and whilst saying there is no oil there advises the company to go elsewhere.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is true. He has declared that the spot where they were boring was not likely to produce oil, and recommended boring elsewhere.

Hon. P. Collier: Who is right, the so-called field expert at Bremer Bay or the Russian expert? The Russian expert says there is no oil there.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As a layman I cannot decide between two experts, that is, if we accept both men as experts.

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Blatchford says there is no oil there.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We did not send either Mr. Blatchford or Mr. Wilson to Bremer Bay for any other purpose than to comply with the terms of the Act. The Act says if any person reports indications of oil, the discovery shall be reported on by the department in order that the interests of the State may be protected. We did not send an officer down there to tell the discoverers that they should bore here or bore there, or to give a geological report upon the features of the country. Our officer in this case said that the oil that had been found was not mineral

oil. He was not asked to make a geological survey of the territory, or to tell them what they were to do in order to discover oil. If we could do that sort of thing we would not need licenses or prospectors, or capital brought into the State for the purpose of finding oil. We would send our own men and the State would get the entire benefit of it.

Mr. Mann: Mr. Blatchford is doing that now. His services have been loaned to a company.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He has been loaned to the company in question, and the company accept the responsibility of following his advice. From the point of view of the legality of the position he still remains the agent of the Minister, if he is required to act in that capacity. If we were certain that things were going to happen in the Kimberleys, all we would require to do would be to put the Act into operation and advise Mr. Blatchford at once that he was acting as agent for me, as Minister. The company would then have to obey the instructions passed on through him to preserve the State's interests in regard to oil discoveries. That is better than telling a company to go ahead and to find the money required, and for the State upon the discovery being made to send an officer up there, which would take several weeks. The arrangement made in connection with Mr. Blatchford represents a saving of cash, and gives the State an officer in the immediate vicinity to carry out any instructions that may be sent to him by the State Mining Engineer or the Government Geologist to protect the interests of the State.

Mr. Mann: Would it be wise to send an officer out with each company?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not necessarily. If any other company were, in the course of boring, to obtain the same definite indications that have been found on the Freney company's area, it would be necessary to have someone available for the purpose of proceeding to the spot. Until that point has been reached, there is no necessity for us to have a man there waiting for something to turn up and act if necessary. It is not likely we are going to pierce the earth's crust and obtain a gusher of oil without definite indications being first discovered in the process of boring, such as would enable us to take action before the stage of the gusher was reached. I have been somewhat severely criticised because persons have held areas and not complied with the terms of their license. It was definitely intended under the Act, and members understood that to be the intention, that if any person held a license and did not prospect it to the satisfaction of the Minister, and any other person brought that matter under the notice of the warden, the warden could hear sworn evidence upon the question and submit a recommendation to the Minister.

Mr. Underwood: That is not in the Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It may not be in the Act, but the intention was clear. It is in the Act that the evidence shall be submitted to the Minister.

Mr. Underwood: But not the recommendation.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, but recommendations have been submitted to me and I have acted upon them.

Mr. Underwood: But it is not so provided under the Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is an absurd attitude for the hon. member to take up. Although the Act does not provide for a recommendation from the warden, am I upon receipt of a recommendation from the warden to return it to him instead of acting upon it? The intention was clear. Surely the warden after hearing the evidence himself is in a better position to judge as to the position of the licensee, and the claimant for forfeiture, than the Minister would be on merely perusing the evidence. All doubts upon the question will, however, be removed by this Bill.

Mr. Underwood: You are amending the Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, in order to make it comply with the intention of Parliament, and with what has been operating hitherto. The warden sits on the case just as he sits in connection with any other mining case. I am not compelled, as Minister for Mines, to accept the recommendation of the warden for the forfeiture of a gold-mining lease, which may be a proved proposition. I can use my discretion in the matter, and accept or reject the recommendation. The same thing applies in regard to oil licenses. If the evidence discloses to the satisfaction of the warden that the terms of the Act are not complied with, and he recommends the forfeiture of the license, I would not withhold my approval, and have not done so. If the warden declares on the evidence that he is satisfied that the people concerned are doing all that is sufficient by way of prospecting to satisfy him, and recommends that the license be continued, I have usually accepted the recommendation. We are not placed as they are in America, and have not known oil structures. If that were so we would insist upon very different prospecting provisions. It would not be a question of providing that work to the satisfaction of the Minister should be performed, but we would specify the nature of the work that would have to be done, that the earth should be pierced to a certain extent, and that each year a certain amount of drilling should be done. In America they have favourable prospects of discovering oil. Here the case is totally different. Is it to be imagined that people are going to put money into a proposition of this nature to pierce the earth's crust in places where no geologist would dream of recommending any boring? That would be absurd, for on the face of it there would be no possibility of discovering oil. There is no wisdom in the Minister directing that satisfaction can only be given by the earth's

crust being pierced by means of a bore. Minute geological survey is the first thing that is required to be done and drilling will follow if the survey promises favourable results. In certain cases I have been satisfied that the licensees are making a reasonable endeavour to have a sound geological survey made with the intention of raising capital to bore at a later date. While there may be some discontented people, and in some cases the discontent may be justified, it cannot be said to be sufficient in all cases. Under the conditions prevailing to-day there may be some justification for saying that there is not sufficeint close prospecting work done upon some of the areas that are held.

Mr. Mann: It was stated in the House that some licensees were making arbitrary terms with prospectors, and in other cases refusing to give terms at all.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I believe that it would be impossible to introduce an Act dealing with a subject of such great importance as oil without numbers of people immediately showing some activity in the matter, and obtaining rights which they hoped to get some benefit out of. In more than one case propositions have been submitted along these lines, "I will withdraw my application for part of your territory for the sum of £1,000." That is nothing else but blackmail. I am not going to be a party to that sort of thing. Most complaints have arisen in connection with those territories for which the greatest amount of capital has been raised, and where the most work has been done.

Hon. P. Collier: There is one big area upon which no capital has been spent, and in connection with which the people are asking impossible terms.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know of it.

Hon. P. Collier: I will tell the Minister later on.

Mr. Underwood: I will tell you something, too.

Hon. P. Collier: They have sat down on a great principality in the North-West, and demanded thousands from those who have desired to prospect it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know of such a case.

Mr. Mann: Under such conditions has the Minister the right to cancel the license?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not if legitimate prospecting is being done by the people holding it.

Mr. Mann: But if they are doing nothing and will not allow others to do anything?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If they are doing nothing, and such evidence can be produced to the satisfaction of the warden, who in turn recommends the cancellation of the license, then the cancellation will follow. I have no intention of becoming a detective to go round the country to see whether everyone is working according to the statements made in the reports that are furnished to the department.

Mr. Underwood: How do you know they are doing the work?

Hon. P. Collier: I venture to suggest that the Minister has not read the monthly reports.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, I have not.

Hon. P. Collier: They are all the same and it shows that the same thing is going on month after month; they are always endeavouring to raise capital and not doing anything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I would ask the member for Boulder, who has been a Minister, if during the time he was Minister for Mines, he had no complaints about areas held up under the Mining Act and not being worked.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes; I did receive complaints.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course he did. I would ask him, did he say when he heard those complaints, "I have heard these rumours. I will go and see for myself."

Hon. P. Collier: Of course not.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It could not be expected that a Minister would adopt that attitude. He could not do so.

Hon. P. Collier: I am not blaming you for not reading the monthly reports which are very voluminous, but I say that a perusal of them will disclose what has been going on.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is different from the attitude taken up by the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood).

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do you not think you would make inquiries into these matters, if you read those reports?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have not had those matters brought under my notice officially.

Mr. Underwood interjected.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Pilbara has made a lot of statements.

Mr. Underwood: I spoke about the O'Connor case.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Pilbara is like the man who called "wolf" so often that no one took any notice of him. All cases that come under the notice of the department in which action has been taken, are referred to the warden and the warden makes a recommendation.

Mr. O'Loghlen: What the member for Pilbara said about Le Mesurier impressed me.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I know that that case went to the warden.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If a company sell portion of their lease, the lease should be cancelled because they did not prospect it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think the member for North-East Fremantle is wrong.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am not.

Mr. Chesson: A man's lease should be forfeited if it is not prospected.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Cue is like the member for Pilbara. They are both confusing prospecting for base metals with prospecting for oil. The two things are totally different.

Hon. P. Collier: On the reports, it would appear that only on two leases has any prospecting been done.

Mr. Mann: There are three.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, three in the North-West and one down south.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As to those two leases——

Mr. Underwood: As a matter of fact, there are five.

Hon. P. Collier: That is there are about five out of 38 on which work has been done.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There are two leases shown on the map which members can see for themselves and I do not suppose any member had any knowledge about them at all, until Canning opened up his stock route. Those leases are entirely different propositions. They would not appear to be worth a tuppeny dump situated as they are so far inland. Yet there was someone with courage enough to take up the propositions and equip a party to investigate the prospects. Do hon. members imagine for one moment that any one would be keen on providing the necessary capital to carry out geological investigation unless they had a large territory over which to work and where they would have a reasonable hope of finding oil?

Mr. O'Loghlen: How long was it worked?

Hon. P. Collier: With such an area, it would take a year to make a flying survey.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will admit that it is remote but not more remote than in some cases in Persia where it took seven years and the expenditure of over half a million of money to get oil. It is not all a bed of roses when prospecting for oil. Only during the last two or three months we have cancelled a number of these licensed areas. The moment a license is cancelled, the area is available for anyone else to take up. I do not know that anyone has taken up a lease and has sold it in the way suggested.

Mr. Chesson: They are held for a gamble.

Hon. P. Collier: Very few leases have been cancelled except quite recently.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We could not get anyone to hear the complaints.

Hon. P. Collier: There has been no time for anyone to do anything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, because a number of licenses have changed hands two or three times over and the men who have succeeded those about whom they have complained, have proceeded to do exactly what they have complained of others doing. They have sat down and waited for someone else to put in some capital.

Mr. Mann: Some have been taken up again?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, but those who have taken up the leases have simply done what they complained of others doing. They have waited while looking round for someone with capital, sometimes putting some of it into their own pockets. We have indications of the possibility of oil in the North which are extremely satisfactory, and I still hope that the work that has been done will lead to the discovery of something substantial. That, however, should not induce us to let people take up parts of the State where they might as well look for diamonds as for oil, the effect of this being that they can go on the market and endeavour to secure capital. It is suggested that if a licensee divides an area we should cancel the lease. That looks very well on the face of it, but if there is a possibility of discovering oil, it should be preferable to cut up the area into five or six parts so long as the conditions under which the transfer is made will assure the State that the area will be more closely prospected. Under such conditions, we will have more individuals or companies endeavouring to find money to carry out prospecting work, than if only one company were concerned in the larger area.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In some cases, the holders of the licenses are sitting down and will not let others operate who desire to prospect.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is not altogether true.

Mr. Mann: Do you not think you should have control over subletting?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We have that control to a certain extent. If the member for Perth had a large area of land and he realised it was preferable to himself and to the estate that he should allow someone else to work part of it, he should be allowed to do so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That would be proof that too much land was held by one man.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so. And parts have been sold at big figures.

Mr. Underwood: In one case, £25,000, including shares.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is the point I will come to, as to whether the Minister should have power to make provision that shares or other interests involved in the transfer from any person concerned in a license to prospect, shall be held in escrow as is the case in America. Hon. members will realise that it is preferable to have four companies raising capital and prospecting an area thoroughly, rather than one company making an effort to get funds to carry on the work over the one area.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is all right, but why should the holder of the lease be able to make money out of State property?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But they do not get money.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes. In one case they cut off a bit of their lease and got £2,500 for it. They are damned thieves who do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not altogether agree with the member for North-East Fremantle. If the holders of an area are prepared to allow other companies to take over part of their holding and thoroughly prospect the whole area, that course is preferable so long as no unfair advantage is taken of the men who are doing the work.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the point. That is what they are doing.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know that that is so.

Hon. P. Collier: I think it is a mistake that a man can get an area from the State by the payment of £5 and then sell part of that area for £2,500.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But what is the £5 paid for?

Mr. O'Loghlen: For the exclusive right to prospect.

Hon. P. Collier: And they have sold part of their right to prospect for over £1,000.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know that they have.

Hon. P. Collier: Freney got £2,500 for a small area.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not in cash.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, in cash. It is in their balance sheet.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The company took up the area and did the preliminary prospecting work. They sold their advices thus obtained for £2,500.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Is it not possible that the man who prospected got those advices first?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is possible that he may have got the information first, but I have pointed out that these areas were available for anyone to take up. There was no exclusive right. A certain amount of farming out is permissible so long as it does not retard the closer prospecting of the areas.

Mr. Chesson: That is an admission that the leases were too big in the first place.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not deny that if we had had as much information at the start as we have now, such large areas would not have been granted. When there was talk about oil in the North-West, some said that they would give the State away so long as we got oil. Now there is some prospect of oil being discovered, does the member for Cue say we should cut down these rights and take them away from these people because prospecting has led to some results? He cannot suggest that, but if he does so, I will not agree to do it.

Hon. P. Collier: When an individual is not carrying out the terms of his lease and he is asking thousands for a portion of his rights, I would talk to him.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But is that so?

Hon. P. Collier: I am not talking about Freney.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know of those cases. Should there be any such cases, it is a matter for the warden to attend to and he will make his recommendations.

Mr. Chesson: Are those inquiries always held in public?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Mr. Underwood: Where?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Those who are interested in the matter know very well where they are held.

Mr. Underwood: It is a fair question! Where is the inquiry held?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know. All I know is that the warden holds the inquiries.

Mr. Underwood: You hear a North-West case in Perth!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Does the member for Pilbara suggest that where there is a complaint regarding a lease held close to the boundaries of the Northern Territory, we should go there and inquire about the complaint?

Mr. Underwood: What about Marble Bar?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It does not make any difference. The inquiries are held at a place that suits the convenience of those who are raising the question. That is the proper place to deal with such a matter. It is human nature that when someone succeeds in discovering or doing anything, others want to participate in the results as well. The fact remains that respecting the licenses, those people who have complained and have succeeded in getting licenses taken away, have simply continued doing what they have complained of others doing. If hon. members look at the newspapers they will find complaints regarding these people who are doing what they complained of others doing.

Mr. Lambert: You can get persons in St. George's-terrace who would not put a penny into anything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) knows how much he could expect people to put into his manganese proposition if he wanted to dispose of it to-morrow.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a different proposition altogether.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: When I was North, the people at Derby said they did not think it was a fair thing that Freney should have got so much country. I told them that they had had an opportunity to take up an area but they said they did not know as much as Freney did. I told them I could not help that. Is it to be expected that I should take notice of all the tittle tattle that one hears?

Hon. P. Collier: That is rather a poor argument, to say that because a man gets in first, he should cut up the country.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: For what purpose? The money that Freney got has been put back into the company and is available for prospecting purposes.

Hon. P. Collier: It may be.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is in the balance sheet. I have the balance sheet here.

Hon. P. Collier: So have I.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It has not been collared by any individual. In the event of oil being discovered on that part of their territory, they would have a share in the company but the capital obtained has been put into the books of the company.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not additional money for prospecting.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is no loss, either. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) talked of a swindle.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not a swindle but it is outrageous profiteering and should not be done with the sanction of the State.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Perhaps the hon. member can tell us how to introduce the capital to prospect for oil.

Hon. P. Collier: They are hawking these big areas and have not found a bob.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member has stated what he knows is not correct.

Hon. P. Collier: There are the facts and I can show you. It is an outrage and I hope the House will stop it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill is in the possession of the House and the House can do as it likes with it, but I object to the hon. member saying that my statement is not founded on fact.

Hon. P. Collier: What statement?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The statement of their not having found a bob of capital.

Hon. P. Collier: I was not referring to the Freney Company.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member was discussing the Freney Company.

Hon. P. Collier: I was referring to some company. Others are holding up the country without having found anything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Some of those who were loudest in their complaints previously are doing no different now. I do not know of anyone who has in his grip the capital necessary for the purpose of prospecting any of these territories.

Hon. P. Collier: I know of a company that have spent no money and have refused thousands of pounds for the right to prospect a small area.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member should get in someone who is interested and get the other party out.

Hon. P. Collier: It has been held for the last six months and should have been forfeited.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Who is it?

Hon. P. Collier: Read the report and you will see.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I anticipated what would happen when the Bill was originally before the House. Members were crying out for additional privileges for these people.

Mr. O'Loghlen: A few.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I had to put up a strenuous fight to retain the restrictions which exist to-day.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I do not think there was anyone here.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the hon. member reads "Hansard" he will find that pronounced views were expressed against being able to do anything. Members argued about the indirect benefit which would result to the State and claimed that that warranted us in doing anything. No doubt every hour and every day bring us nearer to a discovery, but from the point of view of definite prospects we are no nearer, with the exception of the Kimberley Company and probably the Okes-Durack Company, than we were then. How do members imagine that we can get people to find hundreds of thousands of pounds to prospect for oil unless they can get something which offers a promise of their getting their money back? People do not invest money in these things for fun.

Hon. P. Collier: There are people prepared to put up thousands of pounds but they are not allowed. The country is held up.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have heard the same story from one individual. He was very pronounced in his statement that if he could get a certain territory he would be able to obtain £25,000 or £30,000 on the following day. He got the territory but he has not found 30s. of capital. The Leader of the Opposition knows that men frequently go before the warden's court with the story that, if a certain man is put out, the applicant will be able to get the money, and that the money does not eventuate. The applicant obtains the lease and then begins hawking it around. There is one area into which a man got members of Parliament to put their money. He said he knew where oil was oozing out of the ground and that, if he could get this territory, everything would be all right. He has got that territory to-day but he has not raised 5s. yet. He is hawking it around Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: He carried out his undertaking. Sufficient money was raised to test it and it was tested, and so the object was served. It proved to be not there.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is not so.

Hon. P. Collier: I am referring to the one on the Trans. line.

Mr. Lambert: Do not refer to that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There were others as well. The history will doubtless be written some day and members will learn the intrigue of the last 12 months. I think members will agree that I have tried to remove myself from any partiality towards any of the people who may be prospecting. I have been abused because on every occasion when the evidence has been entirely against a proposition I have made known the reports of departmental officers who were entitled to speak. Some of my friends have a fair amount of money at stake in these propositions, and it would give me great pleasure if I could honestly say they were on good propositions.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You said something about Mt. Monger and got trimmed up for it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, I said the surface prospects were satisfactory and favourable. When I get a geological report which declares there are no indications and that the whole proposition is a fake, and make a statement to that effect, I am abused. Why should I keep such a report in the pigeon-holes of the department?

I have given fair consideration to the different companies.

Hon. P. Collier: You are only abused by the person trying to put up the ramp.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Such persons do not go in ones or twos, but in droves.

Hon. P. Collier: Quite a number of them engaged the same geologist and he reported without ever leaving Perth.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I know that men have been engaged to make geological reports on some of the areas held and, when these reports have been unfavourable, they have never seen the light of day. Every report yet published dealing with any of these areas held under license has been favourable. There has always been enough in it to make a layman feel that he was justified in investing his money. When the reports have been unfavourable, however, they have not seen the light of day. We must get capital into the prospecting for oil. It is an entirely different proposition from prospecting for gold or base metals. Since the Act was passed companies have been formed with a nominal capital aggregating £549,000, and quite a fair percentage of that has been actual cash for prospecting operations. If the Leader of the Opposition looks at the balance sheet of the Freney Comany, he will find it is not a simple proposition to proceed with the prospecting after the first indications gained from a flying survey. It cannot be done for a few shillings. There are 10 companies whose nominal capital aggregates £549,000 and they do not include the syndicates. If we have not discovered very much, we have introduced a certain amount of capital, and a good percentage from the Eastern States which has been spent on this work. The Australian Petroleum Development Company, the South-Western Oil and Shale Company, the W.A. Oil Exploration Company, the Kimberley Petroleum Company, the Kimberley Oil Options, the Locke Oil Development Syndicate, Ltd., the Okes-Durack Kimberley Oil Company, the Leeuwin Oil Prospecting Company, Ltd., the Central Oil Prospecting Syndicate, Ltd., and the Freney Kimberley Oil Company, Ltd., with one or two exceptions, have raised fair sums of money with a view to prospecting in different parts of the State. Those who have spent money so far, with one or two exceptions, have not got anything more in the way of favourable prospects, but those people are entitled to some consideration. They are entitled to a fair opportunity to prospect on a basis entirely different from ordinary prospecting, in order that the territory might be properly overlooked. When the Act was passed, the intention of Parliament was that the warden should hear these cases and not merely submit the evidence but give a decision.

Hon. P. Collier: It was definitely intended that he should make a report; it would be stupid otherwise.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We have acted on that, but the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) has the impression that I have been deciding these matters by perusing the evidence. Anyhow I have introduced an amendment to provide that the warden shall report as in every other mining proposition. There is not much point in the amendment except that it makes clear that the warden must make a recommendation on the sworn evidence given in the court.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: At the tea adjournment I was about to mention a provision of the Bill dealing with the extent of the right to prospect. The original measure does not make it clear that Crown lands include some alienated lands. In connection with some titles it is stipulated that the alienation shall be to a depth of only 100 or 200 feet. At a greater depth, therefore, the land remains Crown land. It was not intended, however, that rights granted under a permit to prospect for oil should extend to land below the surface. The present Bill, therefore, makes that point very clear. Most holders of licenses have agreed that such was the original intention, but others have not yet signified their concurrence. Still, the holder of a license is not able to enter on land in fee simple without first making an arrangement with the owner. Further, the Bill provides that the warden, after hearing evidence and submitting it to the Minister, shall make a report and recommendation thereon. Then it is provided that in the event of any holder of a license boring on more than one lease and simultaneously striking oil at more than one point, he shall, subject to such leases not being within the same basin, be entitled to separate reward areas. In the event of the holder of the Bremer Bay license, for instance, striking oil there, and simultaneously striking oil by boring operations at Narnalup, it would be every evident that the oil find at each place came from an entirely separate basin. In that case the holder would be granted reward claims in respect of each area. Each basin stands by itself so far as the reward claims are concerned. In order to get over the difficulty mentioned by the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) at an earlier period of this session, we provide with regard to persons casually prospecting for oil and making a discovery which gives indications—which is the most that can be expected. Such a person on reporting to the Minister shall be entitled to receive a reward for his discovery. It is of course quite possible for a boundary rider or any other person employed on a station or a farm to discover indications eventually leading to the location of an oil basin. It is not desirable that information of such a nature should be kept secret, since in some cases it would mean that the discovery made by the individual casually prospecting would not be rediscovered by the company perhaps for many years, and perhaps not at all. Accordingly the Bill proposes the insertion of the follow-

ing new section in the Mining Act Amendment Act, 1920:—

> 22 (a). In the event of oil or an indication of the presence of oil being discovered within an area the subject of a license under this part of this Act by a person other than the licensee or a servant or agent of the licensee, and on such discovery being reported to the Minister, the Minister may in his discretion grant to such discoverer a reward not to exceed one-half of the royalty payable by and received from a lessee of the area on which the discovery was made, during a period not exceeding five years. Provided that in such case the lessee shall recoup the Minister on demand one-half of the amount paid from time to time by way of reward to such discoverer. Provided also that such discretion shall not be exercised if an agreement in lieu thereof is made between the licensee and the discoverer.

The casual prospector making a discovery therefore has two methods available to him. He may report to the Minister, and then, in the event of oil being discovered following on his indication, he may receive the reward of one-half the royalty payable during the first five years; or he may enter into an arrangement with the company outside this provision. The provision, however, entitles him to some reward for having reported the indication. As the licensee benefits as well as the State by such a report being made, in the event of payable oil resulting, the Bill proposes that an extra amount of royalty shall be recovered from him for the first five years. If the amount of royalty payable was five per cent., the discoverer would be entitled to receive 2½ per cent. But the additional amount paid to him would be recovered from the licensee, and the State would actually lose less than one-half. The reward royalty would be made up as between the licensee and the State.

Mr. Pickering: Each would pay 1¼ per cent.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That would really be the loss to the State.

Mr. McCallum: What if the company and the discoverer worked in collusion?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no compulsion on the Minister. That possibility was mentioned to me when I discussed the matter with the departmental officials. Therefore the matter is discretionary on the part of the Minister. If there was any evidence whatever of collusion between the licensee and the original discoverer, the Minister would not pay the half royalty. On the other hand, it will readily be admitted that a station hand might make a discovery, as I believe actually happened in the case of the Durack Oil Company. The first indication there, I understand, was discovered by a boundary rider.

Mr. Durack: But can the discoverer sit down on his discovery for perhaps ten years whilst the company are operating?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No. In the event of a casual discovery being made, the casual discoverer, in order to obtain a reward, must report to the Minister. The Minister can then have the indication examined by the departmental officers. In the event of their considering the indications satisfactory, the Minister can then call upon the company to prospect the indications immediately. The prospecting done by the company must be to the satisfaction of the Minister. In the event of the indication given by the casual prospector leading to the discovery of oil, which it might do within a very short period, then the casual prospector would be entitled to receive half the royalty during the first five years.

Mr. Mann: And if the company failed to prospect as directed by the Minister?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then the license would be forfeited.

Mr. Willcock: Just for that particular area?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, or even the whole of the company's licenses could be forfeited.

Mr. Willcock: But if the company were prospecting satisfactorily elsewhere?

Mr. Durack: Assume that the indication is within an area of 40 miles.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would be a matter for the discretion of the Minister. The Minister must be in a position to decide whether there is any collusion, whether the casual prospector is not taking advantage of a discovery previously made by the company or its employees, and thus endeavouring to secure an undeserved reward.

Mr. McCallum: According to the wording of the clause, the company would not pay the 1¼ per cent. extra.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. The clause says—

> Provided that in such case the lessee shall recoup the Minister on demand one-half of the amount paid from time to time by way of reward to such discoverer.

Mr. McCallum: You want to make that quite clear.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is quite clear. I hope to encourage those who are casually looking for other features and who may have some knowledge of localities where indications exist and who may thus secure what they are entitled to receive, namely, some reward for their discovery.

Mr. Chesson: The royalty covers only a period of five years.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Mr. Chesson: Before they get the oil five years may pass.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is not a question of five years immediately following or subsequent to the discovery; it is for the first five years of royalty paid by the company; it is the first five years of the payment of royalty, and half of that royalty goes to the discoverer. It is not five years subsequent to the discovery. There is a good deal of concern displayed by the licensees prospecting

for oil, and particularly those who are reaching the stage where there are satisfactory indications, about the payment of the royalty being fixed by regulation. I have looked up the practice in most parts of the world, and I find that there is taken from the fortunate discoverer of oil 5 per cent. of the value of the oil discovered, either in cash or in kind. There is an alteration in the Bill which hon. members should know about. In the existing Act there is provision that the discoverer of oil may mark out, after he has found oil in payable quantities, a reward area of 640 acres, and that he may take two additional areas of 48 acres each. Then anyone else may peg out 48-acre leases on a similar basis. That is objectionable from more than one standpoint, because of the confusion that may arise in the pegging. When pegging may commence is very uncertain because of the conditions under which oil leases are claimed. If on the discovery of oil a report is made and the Government Geologist fixes what he considers to be an area in which the basin is likely to exist, then, when that is fixed, boring is continued to the exclusion of anyone else until oil is discovered in payable quantities. Then they are called upon within 30 days or any extended period, to peg out their 640 acres and the two 48-acre blocks. It is impossible for anyone to be able to decide just when the period would arrive when they would peg out those claims. The parent company could easily arrange with anyone else to come in until the 30 days were up. Then they might, on the 28th day, get a lot of dummies in to peg out the whole of the basin. That would be undesirable, and what I intend to do is to provide in Clause 7 that, as soon as a discovery is made, we shall proclaim a reservation of what the Government Geologist thinks is the oil basin. From then onward anyone will be allowed to prospect without the special permission of the Minister, but it is only intended to grant permission to prospect for other than oil. With that reservation, when the discoverer has selected 640 acres plus the two 48-acre blocks, the Government may afterwards allot 640-acre leases and submit them to auction and obtain a premium according to the market value of the adjoining oil leases, and when operations are actually taking place, extract 5 per cent. royalty. That is what is being done now in America.

Hon. P. Collier: By that method the Government would probably get more revenue, but it would not prevent the original prospector getting the whole basin.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: He would have to get it then in public competition.

Hon. P. Collier: But by virtue of the fact that he had struck oil, he would be able to raise unlimited capital, and out-bid anyone else.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If he can raise unlimited capital for the purpose of working the adjoining leases, it will be possible for anyone else to do likewise. The result will be that in competition in order to get an oil area, the State will receive what it is entitled to, namely, a fairly good premium, according to the prospects as disclosed by the discovery. The Leader of the Opposition will agree that that is preferable to permitting the dummying of the leases. The British Government have about three-fifths control, and they have not found too much of the money. The State may do likewise. After all, the key of the whole position from the State point of view is in the existing Act, which is very frequently overlooked. In Section 22 of the Act of 1920 it is provided—

> The Governor shall have the right of pre-emption of all oil produced by the lessee from any land held under a mineral oil lease or by any owner of land from land alienated by the Crown without the reservation of mineral oil, and of all products of such oil, and in the event of the exercise of this power the lessee shall do all things reasonably in his power to facilitate the delivery of the oil or products in accordance with the directions of the Governor. The price to be paid for the oil or products, shall, if the price is not agreed upon, be fixed by arbitration.

We have control. We can pre-empt the whole of it if we feel so disposed, but while that is not the definite purpose, it will be admitted that the State is entitled, after the discoverer has obtained what we have already declared to be a sufficient reward, to do as it feels disposed with the balance of the basin, that is, either to auction it or work it, and make arrangements with the parent company if thought fit. The only other provision in the Bill is the extension of the rights of the lessee to the residues of oil. The clause reads—

> The exclusive right conferred on a licensee under this part of the Act to bore and search for mineral oil, and on a lessee to bore and search for and obtain mineral oil shall extend to bitumen, glance pitch, asphaltum and other residues or derivatives of petroleum within the area of the license or lease.

The purpose of that is to prevent what might easily arise from the discovery of asphaltum or what may be accepted as indications of the presence of mineral oil, and what might operate to the detriment of those making the discovery, and prevent what is a common practice in other parts of the world of using means to do what is known as off-set the discovery. We do not want that; we want those making the discovery to get what we consider is a fair reward. At the same time, the State must be properly protected by royalty as well as by the right to dispose of the balance of the area, or to work it. The final clause of the Bill deals with tailings leases. The reason for this is very apparent to mining members. At the present time there are a number of leases granted to enable mine owners to deposit their tailings as a protection against confiscation of their property, which might easily arise if they had no protection. Someone might peg out an area and take that which they made no effort to obtain. That of course would not be fair to the owner of the tailings. For years past we have granted these leases. We have dis-

covered recently that the tailings lessees are in actual possession of the whole territory within their four pegs and that even for mining purposes they can exclude everyone else.

Mr. Mann: Do they pay rent?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A nominal rent only. The lessees are actually in possession of shafts and other facilities where mining operations may take place and they can exclude others from going on those leases.

Mr. Chesson: The Belle Vue and Mt. Sir Samuel, for instance.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was never intended that that state of affairs should exist. We propose to make provision, and it is to be retrospective provision, as follows—

> Every lease granted under the principal Act as a tailings lease shall be held under and subject to Division 3 of Part V. of the principal Act relating to mining on authorised holdings, and a tailings lease shall be deemed to be an authorised holding for the purposes of that Division.
>
> The lessee of any mining lease for mining below the surface of the area comprised in a talings lease, and any person lawfully claiming under him, may, with the approval of the warden and subject to the payment of such compensation, if any, and to such conditions as the warden may think fit to allow or impose, make use of the mining shafts, if any, on the tailings lease.
>
> The Governor may resume from a tailings lease such rights as may have been conferred thereby on the lessee beyond the surface rights, and such other rights as are necessary for and incidental to the use and enjoyment of the demised area as a tailings lease so far as the resumption may be necessary to give effect to this section.
>
> This section shall apply to tailing leases granted before or after the commencement of this Act.

The object is to continue to protect the property, but we do not propose to hold up the whole of the area from mining operations. So in future the property, that is, the tailings, will be protected, but the balance of the area will be available for mining operations, subject to conditions to be imposed by the warden. It is impossible to lay down hard and fast what should be the maximum area. I have advised the department that it is my intention to considerably restrict the area in order to compel closer prospecting; but at this stage it would be impossible to say what the restricted area shall be in any given part of the State. In the Northern Territory the areas, we know, are very small. But there is there no prospecting work to be compared to the prospecting in Western Australia. That is due to the fact that while they have those small areas they cannot raise the capital so essential to the work.

Mr. Durack: Only by amalgamating the areas have they succeeded in raising capital.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is of no value, for it leaves them in much the same position as they were. Two years ago I stood almost alone in the preservation of State interests in respect of prospecting for oil. There was then a strong demand to encourage prospecting, almost to the extent of giving away our birthright. I adopted what was considered by many to be the proper attitude when I said it was too valuable a birthright for us to give away. The prospecting right exists only up to the discovery of oil. From the taking of the oil we get royalty. Up to that point, therefore, we ought not to extract from the holder of a license undue fees, because he is not then obtaining anything. But immediately he gets oil we begin to take from him a percentage of what he is getting.

Hon. P. Collier: But in the meantime he is extracting fees from others.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The same thing occurs in gold mining. On the discovery of indications of a gold-bearing reef, it is palmed off on to the public for anything up to £50,000. That money is not available for prospecting the territory, but goes to somebody else. That sort of thing cannot be prevented. It is to be found in every walk of life. There are workers in possession of workers' homes who are clamouring to have the leasehold converted into freehold in order that they might palm it off on to somebody else at an enhanced price. I do not want hon. members to believe that it is a simple matter to impose such conditions as will be satisfactory to the State and yet not seriously retard prospecting for oil. Until such time as oil is actually discovered we have to depend in large measure on the investing public to find the necessary money. We must give them some encouragement. After the discovery of oil we should begin to get for the State some recompense for the taking of what is really a national asset. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—NAVIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. S. Sampson—Swan) [8.7] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is very short. The inspection and survey of floating boilers and machinery, apart from those on ocean-going vessels, were included in the provisions of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1904. In 1910 it was decided by the Government to transfer the control from the Inspection of Machinery Department to the Harbour and Light Department, which has since been carrying out the surveys and charging fees under the provisions of the Inspection of Machinery Act. Last session, however, that Act was replaced by a new Machinery Act, and probably owing to the fact that the Inspection of Machinery Department was not handling floating boilers, no provision for them was made in the new Act. In consequence of this omission, since the commencement of the Inspection of Machinery Act of

1921 there has been no statutory authority for the fees charged in this connection by the Harbour and Light Department. The Bill is designed to supply the required legislative authority.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Is it retrospective?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I take it the work is being carried out but, as I say, there is no statutory authority for the collection of fees. I move--

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8.10]: The Bill looks innocent, but I do not think there is any necessity for it. All the boats mentioned in the Bill are provided for in the Boat Licensing Act. Therefore the Bill will mean dual control, with additional fees for inspection. It would be much better to consolidate it with the Boat Licensing Act, which was passed in 1878 and has been amended several times. The provisions of that Act cover all those contained in the Bill. Section 6 of the Boat Licensing Act provides that the boat licensing board may grant licenses to boats, vessels, or steamers to carry passengers and goods. That was amended in 1906. It provides further that the board may license vessels to ply for hire and inspect such boats, vessels, or steamers, surveying the hull, tackle, gear, boilers, engine, etc., and charge the owners fees for such examination, and may refuse a license because of any of several things, including unsound boilers. The license fees to be charged under that Act range from 10s. to £2, and the survey fees from one guinea to two guineas. So the boat licensing board has full power to inspect and charge fees for inspection. If the Bill be passed, it will mean that the Navigation Act also will apply, and so we shall have the boat licensing board issuing instructions for certain surveys, and may also have the chief harbour master issuing further instructions for surveys. The boat licensing board issue a license for 12 months, but the Navigation Act provides that the examination may take place twice a year, at times appointed by the Chief Harbour Master. It means that small craft plying in the river will have to be placed in exactly the same position as large ocean-going boats. There should be some safeguard for seeing that small boats plying on the river or in the harbour are perfectly safe, but I maintain that the legislation already existing provides sufficient safeguard in that respect.

The Colonial Secretary: The Navigation Act is silent in respect of this kind of craft.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Boat Licensing Act provides for that. Clause 6 of the 1878 Act provides everything given here under the Navigation Act. There is no doubt this is purely a Bill to obtain additional fees.

Mr. Underwood: That is right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The licensing board has been doing everything it can to keep the fees as high as possible in connection with these small craft. There are very few small craft now plying for passenger hire on the river. It does not pay them to do so. The Harbour and Light Department has been continually increasing the charge upon these small boats in respect of jetty dues on the river and in other directions. The position is reached to-day wherein the small craft find it difficult to make a living. Their season extends only between Christmas and Easter; that is the best time of the year for them. The owners find great difficulty in making a payable proposition out of the running of their boats. Last year it was found necessary, owing to the increased charges, to put up the fares to the general public who use these craft. I object to dual control being instituted merely for the sake of obtaining additional fees. This Bill provides that every boat has to be approved of under the Navigation Act, and that there must be an inspection at least twice a year. That means an additional expense. It provides for the payment of fees in addition to the inspection for the issuing of certificates under the Navigation Act. It also provides for the dual fees to be paid and issued again under the Boat Licensing Act, which means doubling the amount of charges imposed upon the owners of these boats without any corresponding advantage either to them or to the people who use them. Nothing can be gained by including these small craft under the Navigation Act. The Minister has put forward no good reason why this should be so. He said that the engines and boilers are already inspected under the Machinery Act. I read Section 6 under the Boat Licensing Act which provides that they can be inspected under that Act. The charges are provided for there.

The Colonial Secretary: When the Bill was brought down last session no reference was made to this particular subject.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When the Navigation Bill was introduced in 1904—I think you, Mr. Speaker, introduced it—the legislation in existence at the time provided all that was necessary for the examination of these small craft. I refer to the Boat Licensing Act. The Government of the day, therefore, did not think it necessary to introduce anything into the Navigation Act to provide for dual inspection when one alone was necessary. We should encourage, rather than discourage, these small craft to trade on the river. A lot of people who cannot afford to own boats obtain a deal of pleasure out of the trips they make up and down the Swan River. We should not put on unnecessary charges which the boat owners have to pass on to the public which, in turn, will limit the pleasure they get by these means. In Fremantle, where most of these boats are running, the control of licensing is under the Harbour Trust. The trust is also gazetted as a licensing board for the Swan

River. I know that the inspection of these boats is performed with extreme care, to see that they are only licensed for the number of passengers they are fit to carry and that the boats themselves are perfectly safe for the passengers. An officer of the trust inspects these boats every year before renewing the license, and this should meet all the requirements. There has been a continual increase in charges with the result that today very few boats are plying for hire on the river. I admit there are other places outside Fremantle, but very few boats are engaged in those places. The Bill does not apply to sailing boats. There have been many complaints about these.

The Colonial Secretary: Nor to rowing boats.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only to motor and steam boats.

Mr. Underwood: Some boats are already provided for.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and other craft are provided for under the Navigation Act. The legislation we already have meets all requirements. This is purely a revenue Bill, though the revenue is small. The Minister said so in his speech. We, therefore, should not interfere with the existing Acts. If a person runs a plank out into the river in order that he may reach a small rowing boat without wetting his feet he has to pay £5 a year for doing so.

Mr. Pickering: And for that he has the privilege of calling it a jetty.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many people get a small boat in order that they may catch fish to assist them in keeping down the cost of living, but this high fee naturally prevents them from doing so.

Mr. Underwood: There is no recreation equal to boating.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know whether the fee is enforced, but it was imposed by regulation last year.

The Minister for Agriculture: If we do not charge something the whole foreshore will be lined with planks.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not at all. When it becomes a nuisance then is the time to speak. Anyone travelling from Perth to Fremantle will find very few jetties. The same charge is imposed whether it be a plank jetty, or a jetty in fact. I mention this to show the grasping actions of the Government in their endeavour to increase the revenue.

The Colonial Secretary: You said the license fee charged was very small.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But that is going to be duplicated under the Bill. According to the Navigation Act, for issuing a certificate, where the tonnage of a steamship does not exceed 50 tons, the fee is £2 per annum. Where it exceeds 50 it is £4 per annum, where it exceeds 100 it is £6, and where it exceeds 300 tons it is £1 for every additional 300 tons. This is independent of the survey costs. I have shown that there is a duplication of fees, and that is all the Bill was introduced for. I hope it will not be passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [8.27]: I support the remarks of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). Almost every piece of legislation that comes before us contains some system of taxation. If there is anything that should be encouraged it is boating. It should not be discouraged by taxation. Of all the morally and physically healthy sports or recreations that the public can engage in boating on the river is the best.

Mr. J. Thomson: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is a matter of opinion. If we are going to tax, let us tax something to which everyone contributes. If we are going to tax boating, we should tax cricket, football, lawn tennis——

Hon. P. Collier: Bowls.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes.

Mr. Mann: We tax football now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: That is so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Which way?

Mr. Mann: There is the amusement tax.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We do not tax on that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The people who go to see football are taxed. Those who play football or tennis do not pay, but apparently those who go on the river will have to do so. I trust the Bill will not be carried. We spoke last session of the care of boats on the river, and of seeing that they were properly looked after. We were speaking last session of sailing boats. The Government have paid no attention whatever to that aspect. They seem to be after means of collecting taxation in doing this work. When it comes to motor boats, however, there is a chance of getting extra taxation. It does not seem to me to mean anything else, and where they can get a few people affected they attempt to get more taxation.

The Colonial Secretary: No, that is not the position.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Before the Government get more taxation from these directions, they will have to exercise more economy in their departments.

The Colonial Secretary: There is no power under the Act to deal with this.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for North-East Fremantle has clearly put before the House what control there really is. I administered this Act at one time and I know that there is power. This is simply a Bill to place the control under another Act so that more taxation may be secured.

On motion by Mr. Mullany, debate adjourned.

BILL—DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT.

Second reading.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.32]: I approach with very much diffidence the dis-

cussion of any measure that emanates from the Ministerial benches.

The Minister for Agriculture: Does that worry you?

Mr. PICKERING: Since my criticism of a measure recently and the advocacy of the Government interests by the Leader of the Opposition and the able lieutenant and sub-lieutenant, the members for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin), and for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), respectively, attention has been drawn to my attitude. I offered some criticism on that occasion of a measure emanating from the Ministerial bench and it seems to me that whatever criticism I may make regarding legislation from that quarter, must be tantamount to a motion of no confidence.

Mr. McCallum: Hear, hear!

Mr. PICKERING: Be it so or not, I am not at a loss to understand whether the privilege of being a member of the Country Party in this Chamber means that one is to have any rights at all here. I was returned to this House as member for the Sussex electorate and the present is not the first time I have had the honour to be returned in that capacity. I take it that, in the circumstances, I have the confidence of my constituents in any actions I may take in this Chamber. I resent the gross interference with my duties by the Leader of the Opposition and members sitting behind him.

Hon. P. Collier: I have not spoken! I am not objecting to you speaking!

Mr. PICKERING: I object to the attitude of the Press in interfering with members who speak in this House. I regard it as an unwarranted interference with my responsibility as a member of this Chamber.

Hon. P. Collier: Chastise the Press if you like, but why drag me in? I have not said a word.

Mr. PICKERING: You said a great many words on the last occasion.

The Minister for Agriculture: Well, let's get back to the Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: While members have a right to express their opinions on the floor of the House, I think they are entitled to protection against the Press from these unwarranted attacks.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Press should not intimidate.

Mr. PICKERING: It was a gross attack on the privileges of a member of Parliament that was outlined in the leading article appearing in the "West Australian."

Hon. P. Collier: Bring him before the bar of the House.

Mr. PICKERING: I contend it is not the province of the Press to attack and intimidate members of this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member making an explanation?

Mr. PICKERING: I am making a personal explanation regarding a certain article which appeared in the Press and which I am entitled to resent, inasmuch as I have certain obligations to my electors which I certainly intend to fulfil.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They blamed you when they should not have done so in this instance. It was your party.

Mr. PICKERING: When the Press abuses and threatens that unless I come to heel in this Chamber in keeping with their thoughts and desires, I think it is only proper that I should resent any remarks emanating from such a source. I think it is only right that some protection should be afforded to members from such an unwarranted attack.

Mr. Lutey: Bring it before the House.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who is the offender?

Mr. PICKERING: I suppose it is the leader writer of the "West Australian." I want it to be known that I resent any interference with my privileges as a member of this Chamber.

Mr. McCallum: The Leader of the Opposition will have to look out.

Mr. PICKERING: The Bill is an important one. It is not quite new to this House. It has been suggested on many occasions before. When the Stallions Bill was before this Chamber, I was anxious that this aspect should also be included in that measure. The Bill is to bring our dairy industry into a proper condition to return the utmost profits to those engaged in the business of dairying. If we are to do any good in connection with the dairy industry, it is essential that proper attention shall be given to the production of the highest and most profitable type of cattle Western Australia can produce. It is impossible for the State to fulfil its dairy cattle requirements from outside sources. The demand upon the Eastern States to supply the requirements we anticipate during the next few years will be very great indeed. I think the only way we can do it is to get to work in earnest in endeavouring to breed that type of cattle it is desirable we should have. It is not an easy thing to accomplish at the present time because until now there has not been that general due regard to the development of the right type of dairy cow that should have been seen all along. We have a great deal of prejudice to overcome among the cattle breeders of the State, more particularly in those districts which are interested in dairy cattle. The Minister gave several illustrations to show the results following in the wake of such a policy in America. He quoted some very illuminating instances as to how results had been obtained in those areas and the difference prior to carying out dairy breeding along the lines advocated in this Bill. We need not go so far as America and Denmark to get such results. We have in our midst some capable men like Mr. Padbury and Mr. Goyder who have shown that they are capable of successfully breeding the best type of cattle for the dairying industry. This has been demonstrated not only in Western Australia but elsewhere, because Mr. Padbury has taken prizes at the Sydney and

Melbourne Royal Shows. That is a tribute to the possibilities ahead of Western Australia, and the results achieved by these two gentlemen have been remarkable indeed. To-day some of the dairy herds of Western Australia will compare favourably with those in the Eastern States. During my recent trip through the East I passed through much of the best dairy country along the northern rivers of New South Wales. I was struck by the very few pure bred dairy herds that I saw there. It may be that the type of dairy cattle they go in for is not the pure breed, but to my mind if we are to encourage the herds best suited for certain districts, it will go a long way towards increasing the interest taken by the different farmers in the dairy herd. There is nothing that appeals to a farmer more than pure breeding, whether it be in cattle, horses, or any other type of stock. If we can bring pure bred cattle into the industry, we will get the best results in the milk pails and that is the success which the measure contemplates. The Bill will not come into operation immediately, and I trust its provisions will be carried out with the greatest tact. I hope the officers who will be entrusted with the administration of the measure will use tact to the utmost of their ability so as to educate the farmers as to the advantages to the State and the desirability of giving effect at the earliest possible date to the improvements suggested in the Bill. I have had much experience among dairy farmers in the South-West. The greatest difficulty has been in regard to the type of bull allowed to come into the various districts throughout the South-West. It is absolutely essential that some restriction should be placed on this aspect as soon as possible. Herd testing and other means which will weed out the indifferent types should be taken into consideration at the same time. If we only deal with the bull and neglect the cow we are not likely to achieve the results one should anticipate under the Bill. The sooner we deal with this aspect, the sooner we will get those payable propositions in our dairy farms we are anxious to see. In my opinion, the farmer has been largely to blame in connection with the state of dairy farming to-day. It is not a question of getting a cow to give the best result, but of getting the cow in milk. That seems to have been the general aim of farmers and unless some system is brought into vogue to improve this condition, we are not going to make the dairying industry as popular as we should wish. It is only by showing considerable desire to protect and improve the industry that we will make it more popular and more remunerative. Unless we take steps to make the industry popular, those large areas which we intend to devote to dairying through the group settlement system, will prove to be failures. The greatest care will have to be exercised to assure pastures and crops so that the farmers will not have to start off under conditions which will make dairy farming disastrous. That will be the result which must follow by starting dairying on unimproved properties unless some safeguards are provided as I suggest. This Bill, like other measures to come before the House, does seem to impose a certain form of taxation. I sent a copy of the measure to my agricultural society and desired them to offer any comment on clauses which threatened to affect them unduly. One of their suggestions is that consideration be given to defining as early as possible the area over which the Bill is to operate. Some announcement should be made to allay the anxiety which exists.

The Minister for Agriculture: Practically to the South-West division.

Mr. PICKERING: Another clause which requires to be altered is that stipulating the age of the bull. The age of six months is too young. It is almost impossible for any farmer to say at six months how an animal is likely to turn out. I consider it absolutely necessary that the age should be increased to nine months. This should not be considered a measure to impose additional taxation. The object of the Bill should be to encourage the development of a higher grade of stock. If the fee were made 5s. that would be adequate and in the case of the loss of a certificate surely 2s. 6d. should be sufficient to replace it. There are several small matters which can be considered in Committee. I commend the Minister for bringing forward the Bill and I trust he will consider favourably any minor alterations which may be suggested in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Munsie in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Act to apply only within prescribed areas:

Mr. PICKERING: The Minister should give an assurance as to the prescribed area in which the measure is to apply.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The prescribed area will be decided from time to time, but generally speaking, it will be the South-West division. This division extends from the mouth of the Murchison River north of Geraldton to Esperance.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Bulls to be registered:

Hon. M. F. TROY: The success of this measure will depend upon the capacity of the inspectors and I doubt whether there are in the department any inspectors capable of determining suitable bulls to be registered. How does the Minister propose to overcome this objection? Is it proposed to use the Bill merely as a means of imposing additional taxation, creating further difficulties and leav-

ing the producer at the mercy of an incompetent inspector? If it is proposed to introduce from the Eastern States men who know the business, it will be a good thing for Western Australia. If the administration is to be left to the present officers, no good will result, but settlers will be further handicapped.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am surprised that the hon. member should be under the impression that we have not competent officers in the department.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I said for this work.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill is for the purpose of registration and in the main the chief dairy expert will be available for the work. As the owner has the right of appeal to the Minister, any dispute regarding the fitness of an animal would be referred to a board to be composed of probably the Chief Inspector of Stock, an authority on the standard of cattle and a competent breeder. This provides the necessary safeguard.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

> That in Subclause 2 the word "six" be struck out and "nine" inserted in lieu.

The age of nine months is considered by men of experience to be more satisfactory.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the amendment. A further extension will necessitate delay in the use of the knife, but a scrubby youngster of six months and not too well fed might well be allowed to go to nine months before being operated on.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This provision deals only with registration. The hon. member is under the impression that there is some danger if the age of six months is retained.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do not appreciate the point.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, I do.

Mr. DURACK: I support the amendment. It is hard to know what an animal aged six months will eventually arrive at. In most cases we extend the period to 12 months.

Mr. BROUN: The member for North-East Fremantle missed the point. The question is one of registration, but the inspector may refuse to register a bull at six months, when perhaps it would be a scrubby animal. Seeing the animal at nine months, however, the inspector might readily agree to register it.

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

Clause 6—Method of registration:

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

> That the word "ten" be struck out, and "five" inserted in lieu.

This will reduce the annual registration fee from 10s. to 5s.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In some instances the registration might cost the Government several pounds, not a few shillings. No officer is going to register an animal without first seeing it. Five shillings would not cover the cost of printing and issuing the certificate, without any inspection whatever.

The Minister for Agriculture: This is an annual registration.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: So are all the other registrations annual.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: During the term of a bull's life £6 or £7 might be paid in registration fees. This provision has been taken from the South Australian Act. However, many of our farmers are not so well established as the South Australian farmers, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BROUN: I hope the amendment will be carried. The fee will be payable for perhaps 10 years, and there will be no occasion for inspection after the first registration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No matter what disease the bull might suffer from afterwards?

Mr. BROUN: Where farmers are very much scattered, every three or four of them will need a bull. It would impose a hardship to require payment of a fee of 10s. annually for a bull used for only a few cows.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If this is such a great hardship on the owners of a bull, why have any fee at all? I do not think our legislation contains any registration fee as low as 10s.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Annually?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, annually. To impose a fee of 5s. for the registration is ridiculous.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The objection of the member for North-East Fremantle would be well founded if this were not a recurring expense. The people who produce stock have a dozen and one annual charges to meet. They are charged on almost every commodity that they produce. The trouble is these continual charges which are made periodically. But my chief objection is that no matter what the charge in this instance may be, the administration will not be competent. If every few farmers in this country have a bull, a very large number of inspectors will be required to go round the country; and I do not think we have sufficient competent officers of that class in the service. I say this without casting any reflection whatever. Our men simply have not had the opportunity of acquiring the necessary training, because we have not had the dairy herds. Even in our dairying districts the cattle are poor and scaggy.

The Minister for Agriculture: There are a lot of scraggy cattle in the East.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Very few. The Minister does not know much about it. In the East they have been breeding up for 30 years.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We got a very poor lot of cattle over from the East at one time.

Hon. M. F. TROY: We sent such a competent person over to buy! My objection is

that I do not think we can get the men. The Minister may talk of experts, but there are other experts we have going round giving advice, piffling advice such as no man of ordinary experience would accept. If the Government had competent inspectors, then the person owning a bull could well afford to pay £3 or £4 for the certificate, because the certificate would be a hall mark showing that he had a good animal, and he could sell his stock at good prices. Let the Government get the inspectors first, and then we will not mind paying any reasonable registration fee.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not a question so much of aristocracy of breeding in connection with this Bill, but a question of getting bulls from high production strain. It is not a question of pedigree altogether. The matter can be checked by herd testing from time to time. Some of the purest bred animals will probably not prove to be as good as scions from dams of high milk-production strain. Seeing that we carry out these experiments by consistent herd testing, there is no reason to fear that our inspectors will not be competent.

Mr. Harrison: If a breeder of pedigreed stock of various kinds has to pay a registration fee, he should not be required to pay an additional fee for stock of any other particular line. He should not be penalised in this way.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Surely a breeder of pedigreed stock will not object to paying 5s. for registration when a farmer will have to pay the same fee.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 the word "five" be struck out and "two shillings and sixpence" inserted in lieu.

A sum of 2s. 6d. should be sufficient for the issuing of duplicate certificates.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a good deal of work involved in issuing duplicate certificates and 5s. is not too much to charge. Members may have seen the advertisement in the "Primary Producer" for a "Merino Shorthorn bull calf. For particulars apply Stock Department, Westralian Farmers." A sum of 5s. would not be too much for looking up the registration of such an animal.

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

Clause 7—Registration to be renewed annually:

Mr. BROUN: What is the meaning of this proviso?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If a registration is effected within three weeks of the 1st January the owner of the stock shall be deemed to have effected registration on the 1st January.

Mr. BROUN: If I register a bull in December I am given no grace, and I have to pay another fee for registering again in January.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Appeals from refusal of registration:

Mr. BROUN. I move an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

Why should an appellant have to pay £3 to the department because some inspector may have refused to accept an animal for registration and an appeal becomes necessary? The owner may be put to a good deal of expense because of the action of the inspector, and it costs the department nothing to hear an appeal.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Some appeals may necessitate the board travelling a long distance in order to see the animal in question. It is, therefore, necessary to impose a fee as well as to prevent frivolous appeals.

Mr. Broun: If you are going to send the board out in the case of every appeal, it will cost the country a fortune. The inspector has already seen the animal, and the board has only to hear the evidence of both sides.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The board must go to the animal. If it is considered that the fee is too high, I am prepared to make a reduction.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fee will prevent frivolous appeals. The board can decide as to whether the fee shall be returned in full or in part. If the fee is returned in too many cases the Minister will require to know why the inspector has not been more careful.

The Minister for Agriculture: Subclause 3 only provides that the fee shall not exceed £3.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In some cases, £3 may not be sufficient.

Mr. Broun: In some cases, the cost of the inspection by the board will be more than £3, so why the necessity for the board to go there, as they will already have seen the beast?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In most cases, it will really be a question for an expert decision on a matter of fact, rather than an expression of opinion.

Mr. Pickering: It may be possible to get expert cattle breeders in the district.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would be better to use those people if they were available. If the Minister knew that in a certain district there were people who were reliable, he would take their advice rather than go to the expense of sending the board to that district. Some provision should be made for a fee so as to prevent frivolous appeals.

Mr. PICKERING: We should take into consideration the next subclause which provides for the payment of expenses. It is evident that not only will the fee of £3 be taken, but a further amount which rests entirely with the board. I intend to move an amendment that the word "three" be struck out so as to substitute a fee of up to £2.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Subclause 3 provides that the fee shall not

exceed £3. It may be fixed by way of regulation at any sum from 1s. upwards. The amendment suggested by the member for Sussex is simply a quibble. The retention of the fee of up to £3 is warranted. The Government would not deal harshly in a matter of this kind, particularly where it concerns the promotion of an industry in which the owners of stock for the most part will be too poor to provide the fees.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I suggest that the member for Beverley's amendment should be withdrawn and another substituted to provide for the return of the fee if the appeal be upheld.

Mr. Broun: That would cover what I seek to achieve.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Provision should be made for the fee so as to stop frivolous appeals.

Mr. Broun: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment——

That the following words be added to the sub-clause:—"The fee to be returned to the appellant if the appeal be upheld by the board."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

That sub-clause 4 be struck out.

In view of the amendment secured by the member for North-East Fremantle the subclause is unnecessary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The last amendment makes the first portion of Subclause 4 superfluous and in the circumstances I do not wish to retain the remainder of the sub-clause.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. HARRISON: Sub-clause 5, which provides for the destruction of the bull, is too drastic.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The owner has an alternative.

Mr. HARRISON: It does not say so here.

The Minister for Agriculture: The owner's own common sense should tell him such is the case. It should suggest to him that he should put in the knife, before someone puts in the bullet.

Mr. HARRISON: I do not see why the animal should be destroyed. The subclause is superfluous and ridiculous. I will move an amendment to strike out all words after "order the" in the third line, with a view to inserting other words. All we need provide is that the bull shall be castrated.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have an amendment to move before that. I move an amendment—

That in line three "court" be struck out with a view to inserting "board."

Mr. LATHAM: I think the word "court" should be retained. It is the court that imposes a penalty and convicts an offender. It is the board to which an appeal is made against the decision not to register a bull.

Mr. BROUN: The Minister's amendment should be agreed to. An opportunity should be given to the farmer to deal with the bull as suggested by the member for Avon or to kill the animal to dispose of the meat, which is quite palatable when the bull is young.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for York is right in his contention. The inspector examines the animal and decides whether it shall be registered or not. The owner has the power to appeal to the board on the question of registration only. If under Clause 5 a person is convicted of keeping an unregistered bull, he is guilty of an offence for which the penalty is £20. The only body that can impose that penalty is the court, and Sub-clause 5 refers only to those who have been convicted by the court. The amendment should not be agreed to. Registration can be refused until after the appeal is heard.

Mr. Harrison: Then it cannot come under Section 5.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, after refusal the owner is convicted under Section 5.

Mr. Broun: This is coming the double on him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN. And he deserves it. If he has refused, the court may order the animal, not to be destroyed in fact, but to be destroyed as a bull.

Mr. BROUN: In this clause "destroyed" means anything. Why not insert the word "castration" instead of "destroyed"?

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing that yet. The amendment is to strike out "court" with a view to inserting "board."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause is perfectly clear. The board may order the bull to be destroyed, but if in the meantime the animal has been emasculated it is no longer a bull.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is to delete the word "court."

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment, for it knocks all sense out of the clause. If a person has refused to carry out the decision of the board, he is liable under Section 5 to be brought before the justices. If the amendment be carried, the case will have to be referred back to the board. Why not permit the court to issue instructions for the animal to be destroyed?

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

Ayes	15
Noes	13
Majority for	2

Ayes.	
Mr. Broun	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Carter	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Denton	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Durack	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Mullany	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Pickering	Mr. Davies
Mr. Piesse	(*Teller.*)

Noes.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Heron	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Lutey	(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That "board" be inserted.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Minister will explain what he means by the amendment. There is in the Bill no provision for any board but an appeal board, and I have never heard of an appeal board having authority to destroy.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: By "board" I refer to the appeal board. If on review there is found to be anything wrong with the amendment, I will have it amended in another place. In the meantime I think the board is the proper authority to be vested with this power.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. BROUN: I move an amendment—

That "destroyed" in lines 3 and 5 be struck out and "emasculated" inserted in lieu.

Destroyed means anything. It is all very well to say the animal is destroyed as a bull, but the owner would have no claim against an inspector who destroyed the animal in fact by shooting it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not propose to oppose the amendment, because I rather think the draftsman has been side-stepping the word "emasculation."

Mr. Latham: Better leave "destroyed" if you would protect yourself.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The wording of the clause can be interpreted to mean exactly what is meant by the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Minister will not agree to the amendment. If a bull be five or six years of age there is great risk in emasculating it. I want to know if the board is to be charged up with the cost of the animal. The word "destroyed" is the correct one, for it will relieve the department or the board of all responsibility.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I like the clause as it stands. We might if necessary add as a proviso, "Unless within a fortnight the bull has been emasculated." We ought not to leave the interpretation of the clause to mere inference. Let us state exactly what we mean. It might be necessary to extend the time, because the operation is a ticklish one. If the animal happened to die, there should be no responsibility on the department.

Mr. HARRISON: After the measure has been in operation for two years, the department may claim the right to refuse to register certain animals. Such animals should not be destroyed. They should be converted into oxen.

Mr. BROUN: I hope the amendment will be accepted. I am quite willing to agree to the addition of the words "at the owner's expense" if it is thought that the expense should be borne by the owner. Good meat should not be wasted by destroying these animals. I was surprised to hear the statements of the member for York. In skilful hands there is no danger in performing these operations on beasts 10 years of age; only a duffer would kill a beast.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Clause 13 provides that no action can be taken with out the consent of the Minister.

Mr. Broun: There is no appeal to the Minister on the question of destroying an animal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think the clause is fairly clear.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why should the responsibility of having the animal emasculated be placed on the inspector?

Mr. Broun: The Government can order a veterinary surgeon to do it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why should the Government take the responsibility?

Mr. Harrison: They are taking the onus of refusing registration.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, in the interests of the dairying industry. Does the member for Avon think these animals should be kept irrespective of their fitness?

Mr. Latham: Registration might be refused because an animal is tubercular.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the words "at the owner's expense" be added to the clause.

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

Clause 12—Evidence:

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, clause consequentially amended by striking out of line 3 the word "six" and inserting "nine."

Clauses 13, 14, 15, and Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Scaddan—Albany) [10.13] in moving the second reading said: This Bill has reached us

from another place and is very brief though to an extent very important. The Light and Air Act was passed in 1902 and consists of five sections. The purpose of the present Bill is to amend the section which makes provision for the access of light or air which at present is limited to a period of 21 years. The proposal is to make the extension in perpetuity subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. The position is that in all cities there frequently arises necessity in connection with the construction of a large or extensive building to obtain from an adjoining owner sufficient easement to enable light and air to be provided for the building to be constructed. In our Light and Air Act we have limited such easements to 21 years, the underlying object of the limitation being to safeguard the interests of any centre where building operations are likely to be on an extensive scale. However, it has been found that at present the restriction is likely to affect building operations. This Bill merely proposes that light and air easements in perpetuity may be granted subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council, so that each application will be dealt with on its merits. The case that we have in mind at the moment is an insurance company who propose to build on an area of land in St. George's-terrace adjacent to Sandover & Co.'s building. The company have arranged to obtain from Sandovers the right of access for light and air from a portion of Sandover's property at the side of such building and well removed from the frontage. The company have also arranged to obtain an access for light and air at the rear. The object is to prevent the construction of any future building abutting on their premises so as to shut out light and air either on the side or at the rear. The only purpose of the restriction of 21 years is to avoid the granting of such easements as would interfere permanently with frontage construction. I think members will agree that light and air should be provided for all buildings. The present conditions are such that unless a perpetual easement is granted in this instance, the building operations will not proceed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would prevent any person on that land from putting up a similar building.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No. The easement is granted only for the purpose of light and air, and not for the purpose of construction. If Sandover's were to build on their property, that light and air shaft, as it might be termed, would be a light and air shaft for their building exactly as for the building now about to be constructed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But it would be Sandover's ground.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, because the insurance company have purchased the easement over the land, and are actually in possession. The result of the proposal, if carried out, will be a permanent light and air easement at the side of the new building, as well as a light and air easement at the rear. The people who have purchased this particular portion of Sandover's property, a very small portion, cannot build on it, because they have purchased only under the provisions of the Light and Air Act.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Should not this have been a private Bill?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think so. The Light and Air Act is a public Act, and the only purpose of the Bill is to permit of its operation being extended in perpetuity in certain cases.

Hon. P. Collier: Although you are giving that case as an illustration, the extension would apply generally?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It certainly can apply generally. If another case arose, an application could be made to the Governor-in-Council to apply the Act in perpetuity.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why should not this application be made to the Perth City Council?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Government deal with building legislation. The insurance company could purchase the whole of Sandover's property, and then make no provision for light and air unless they so desired. In order to give permanent light and air to their structure, they have purchased a light and air easement under the Light and Air Act which is already in operation. This Bill, if passed, will give them that easement permanently instead of for 21 years only. This is really to all intents and purposes a case of the issue of a new title in respect of a particular piece of ground for a definite and distinct purpose, for which purpose, and no other, the piece of ground can be used. It is really an encumbrance on Sandover's title under the Light and Air Act. The only purpose of the restriction under the Light and Air Act to 21 years is to prevent such an interference as would destroy appearances and eventually might retard the progress of a locality. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.