

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 3rd October, 1916.

Questions:	Retrenchment in State Departments	Page
Water meter rents	451	451
State Dairy, return	451	451
Railway Station, Woodanilling	452	452
Electoral enrolment	452	452
Privilege, Question or Return	453	453
Adjournment, Military Referendum	454	454
Bills:	Western Australian Day Funds (No. 1) withdrawn	455
Western Australian Day Funds (No. 2), 1A., 2A.	455	455
Electoral Districts, 2A.	456	456
Franchise, 2A.	456	456
Permanent Reserve, (No. 1) 2A.	459	459
Roman Catholic Church Property Acts Amendment, 2A.	470	470
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 2A, Com.	471	471
Special Lease (Lake Clifton), 2A.	472	472

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

QUESTION—RETRENCHMENT IN STATE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. MUNSIE, for Mr. O'Loughlen, asked the Premier: 1, Is the report in the *West Australian* of 27th September correct, wherein he denies that there has been retrenchment in the State departments? 2, Is it not a fact that since his Government took office 15 men were dismissed at the Wooroloo Sanatorium; 70 were dismissed from the pipe track; 20 from the implement works; and 20 from the water supply and house connections, in addition to the whole of the sleeper cutters at Donnybrook and Dwellingup? 3, If this is not retrenchment, will he explain what it is?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, A number of men have been put off from the services mentioned, owing to the completion of the work upon which they were engaged. This does not apply only to the period since the present Government took office, for in the case of the sewerage connections the number of hands employed was reduced by 55 between January and August last. 3, There is a wide difference between paying off hands because the work is finished and paying off hands merely for the sake of cutting down expenditure. The latter is

retrenchment and is due to the lack of money, not lack of work upon which money, if available, might profitably be expended.

QUESTION—WATER METER RENTS.

Mr. MUNSIE, for Mr. Green, asked the Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): 1, Is it true that no water meter rents are charged either in the metropolitan area or on the services at Midland Junction and Guildford? 2, If this is so, will he take into consideration the question of the abolition of this vexatious exaction on the household water supply services on the Eastern Goldfields?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, in accordance with the provisions of "The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909," meter rents are not charged for meters installed at private residences throughout the metropolitan area. 2, The late Minister refused to grant a similar request on account of the large annual deficit on operations of the Goldfields Water Supply Undertaking, and of the condition of the State finances generally, unless the communities concerned would agree to make up the amount by contributing, by way of increased water charges in other directions, an equivalent sum. The Government cannot see its way to depart from this ruling.

QUESTION—STATE DAIRY, RETURN.

Mr. ALLEN asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House a return showing the position of the State dairy—(a) capital account; (b) result of trading for each year; (c) result of trading from inception to 30th June, 1916; (d) all charges against concern; (e) price charged for milk sold?

The PREMIER replied: (a) £4,995 11s. 8d.; (b) 1913, profit £273 10s. 11d.; 1914, profit £24 12s. 2d.; 1915, loss £533 6s. 7d.; 1916, profit £70, 2s. 5d.; (c) net loss, £165 1s. 1d.; (d) apart from ordinary trading charges, interest, sinking fund, and depreciation—charges for work of lunacy patients at 10s. per week (cost of their maintenance), also charges assessed at £515 per annum, for the following services, viz.,

rental of farm and grazing lands, horse and dray hire, fuel, light and water (supplied from institution), departmental services, etc.; (e) 1s. 6d. per gallon, from inception to date (including period of drought in 1915, when ruling rates were much higher).

QUESTION—RAILWAY STATION, WOODANILLING.

Mr. THOMSON (for Mr. S. Stubbs) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware—(a) that the railway station at Woodanilling has been reduced to the condition of a siding by the removal of the station-master and his staff with all books and material; (b) that the residents of the district are consequently obliged to leave unguarded on the platform their produce and other parcels on the chance of their being picked up by the guards of passing trains, and so suffer very serious loss and inconvenience; (c) that recognising that the change was made in the interests of economy the residents of the district offered to defray the cost of maintaining a responsible railway official at the station with the duty of taking delivery of parcels on the part of the department for transmission by train, the arrangement to cover the period of the year when the trade in perishable produce is most important; (d) that the Commissioner of Railways has refused on any terms to appoint an officer with power to issue receipts for such parcels? 2, If so, what course does the Government intend to take in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, (a) yes; (b) they are brought into line with over 400 other sidings similarly situated on the system; (c) yes; (d) the Commissioner advises that the number of trained men capable of taking charge of a station has already been greatly reduced by enlistment, and owing to the exceptional falling off in the business generally, it has been found absolutely necessary to close all stations on lines where the train service has been reduced, and the length of the section can be increased. Woodanilling is one of about 20 which have been closed recently. There are more than 400 unattended sidings on the system: at about 30 of these, caretakers have been appointed, and Woodanil-

ling is included amongst these. These caretakers are paid a purely nominal amount; their principal duties are to accept orders for wagons, and keep an eye generally on parcels that may arrive at the station. The residents of Woodanilling are apparently not satisfied with this, although the arrangement is hoped to be only of a temporary nature, and they have offered to pay the salary of an officer for three months. Being short of trained men, the Commissioner has not been able to agree to their request. He informs me that he advised the hon. member for Wagin that, as the residents are prepared to pay for an officer, they can choose their own man to look after the goods, and the Commissioner will appoint him as caretaker to carry out our requirements, as previously mentioned, and they could make up to him any difference in salary if they desired to have the whole of his services employed in their interest. 2, This is a question of management of the railways which has been vested by Act in the Commissioner, and the Government does not propose to interfere.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL ENROL- MENT.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Attorney General: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a letter appearing in the *Westralian Worker* of the 22nd inst., by Mr. A. Discombes, addressed to the Chief Electoral Officer, and the reply thereto? 2, Will he make a definite statement to the House for the information of electors in outback districts as to what procedure they will have to adopt to ensure correct enrolment? 3, If so, when?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Yes. 2, The information required is contained in a circular letter of instructions issued to electoral registrars, dated 3rd July, 1914, which contains an opinion expressed by the Solicitor-General on the point raised, and which is as follows:—"Subject to a claimant being a natural born or naturalised subject, and an adult, the qualification for an Assembly vote is residence in the State for six months, and residence in the district for not less than one month immediately preceding the claim. Given these facts, an

elector is entitled to be enrolled; and to reject the claim of a person whose qualification is apparent cannot be justified. But if a claimant resides in a municipal district or townsite where the streets are named and the houses are numbered, these particulars must be stated. Where it is otherwise, only such particulars are required as, in the opinion of the registrar, are sufficient to enable the exact locality of the claimant's residence to be ascertained. The card requires the claimant's place of living (full postal address) to be given. Except where the streets are in fact named and the houses numbered, it is for the registrar, in his discretion, to determine whether the particulars are sufficient to enable the exact locality of the claimant's residence to be ascertained; and it would, in my opinion, be unreasonable, if not vexatious, to reject a claim if the particulars (however apparently meagre) are sufficient to enable the registrar to ascertain the one material fact as to whether the claimant resides within the boundaries of the district." The opinion in question shows clearly the procedure required to be adopted to ensure correct enrolment. 3, See answer No. 2.

PRIVILEGE—QUESTION OR RETURN.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [4.45]: On a question of privilege, I desire to draw attention to the question asked by the member for West Perth (Mr. Allen), and the reply given thereto by the Premier. While it may be urged that the question as asked is in order, I contend that the reply given by the Premier puts it out of order; because if an hon. member can ask a question of this nature it precludes other members from getting further details which they may desire to have. In this particular instance, had there been a motion for a return, or a motion that papers should be laid upon the Table of the House, I would have availed myself of the opportunity to ask for certain additional particulars. As it is, the Premier has given information which is limited to the scope of the question, without affording the House an opportunity of obtaining further information which should, in my opinion, be included in the reply, so that

the whole of the facts may be laid before the public at the same time. I raise the point because I consider that great care should be exercised as regards questions. Any hon. member is liable to ask a question on a particular phase of a subject, and in doing so to elicit a reply which will be absolutely misleading to the public. Again, a Minister may, in all honesty, give a misleading reply. The Minister may not know the exact position of the matter which is being brought under the notice of himself and the Chamber. If, instead of a question being asked, notice of motion for a return or for papers is given, then an hon. member knowing the full facts is afforded an opportunity of, if necessary, extending the scope of the motion so as to ensure that the full facts will go out to the public, should the Minister fail to perceive exactly what is required in order to give a complete answer. Therefore, although the question as asked is undoubtedly in order—

The Premier: What is it you take exception to?

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON: To the Premier's reply. He is replying to questions which are really not asked in the notice of question. The notice of question asks whether it is the intention of the Government to lay a return upon the Table. The particulars given by the Premier are limited, and by no means as full as I would have liked and would certainly have asked for had a notice of motion for a return been given, as I contend should have been done.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) [4.48]: The question asked me by the member for West Perth reads—

Is it the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House a return showing the position of the State dairy . . .

And then he proceeds to set out the particulars he wants. I have given those particulars. Instead of furnishing a return, I reply "No" to the first part of the question. I say, "Here are the particulars"; and I give them just as they are enumerated in the notice of question. I fail to understand what is the objection of the leader of the Opposition. The answer to the question does not tie his hands.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: The answer is absolutely unfair.

The PREMIER: Unfair? Nonsense. The hon. member himself when in office has followed exactly the same course on many occasions. Many questions have been answered in exactly the same way by the hon. member's Government.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: Whether that is so or not, I say it is wrong.

The PREMIER: I cannot for the life of me see how the leader of the Opposition is going to object to an hon. member's getting information. The leader of the Opposition can get all the information he wants.

Mr. Angwin: No secrecy.

The PREMIER: There is no secrecy whatever attached to these things.

Mr. Underwood: We have had too much of the hush policy in the past.

The PREMIER: I do not want secrecy. I want to publish the facts.

Mr. Angwin: The dairy is all right, anyhow.

The PREMIER: I have given the information.

Mr. Angwin: What is it going to cost to save the lives of the children?

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford—in reply) [4.51]: The point I desire to raise is whether, in view of the Premier's reply, the question of the member for West Perth should not have taken the form of notice of motion for a return, so that other members could add to the motion if they thought it desirable in the interests of the public, extending the scope of the notice so as to ensure that the whole of the details should go out to the public. I fully admit that the question as asked is in order, but I contend that the reply given by the Premier has placed the question out of order, bringing it within the category of motions for returns. I raise the point so that, in future, questions of this description may take their proper form of motions for returns.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.52]: The leader of the Opposition admits that the question is in order, and the reply given is no concern of mine. The reply is a matter between the Minister and the hon. member who asks the question. The member for West Perth (Mr. Allen) asked—

Is it the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House a return showing the position of the State dairy...

The answer to that question will be yes or no; but the Premier has given fuller information. Of that I can take no notice. The matter is one for the Premier himself. It is usual, however, in matters of this kind for hon. members desiring such information to move for a return. Questions asking for statistical returns, or for such detailed information as requires the compiling of official records, should take the form of a motion for a return. I must admit that the question is in order. It is a matter for the Premier himself how he shall reply to the question.

ADJOURNMENT—MILITARY REFERENDUM.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [4.56]: I move—

That the House at its rising on Thursday next, 5th October, do adjourn until Tuesday, 31st October, in order to give hon. members an opportunity of participating in the Referendum Campaign.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [4.57]: I have no intention of opposing this motion, but I would have liked the Premier, in moving it, to give the House an assurance that, as far as lies in his power, he will see that freedom of speech is ensured in connection with this campaign. To my mind, it is deplorable that in a country like Australia, where we boast of our freedom, a stage has been reached—and this applies to Western Australia as well as to other parts of the Commonwealth—when a section of the public, an organised section evidently, will not permit both sides of the question to be laid before the people.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Have you not experienced that in former times?

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. This is a big national question and the very fact of its being so important as to call for its submission to the people by way of referendum necessitates the laying of both sides before the public. Advocates on either side should

have opportunities of addressing public meetings.

Mr. Taylor: There is only one side to it, and that is conscription.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON: That is matter of opinion. There are people who hold a different view. I would like the Premier to give an assurance that the State Government, so far as they are concerned, will do all that lies in their power to guarantee freedom of speech to all, whether for conscription or against conscription, addressing public meetings.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex—in reply) [4.59]: By way of reply to the leader of the Opposition, I may draw attention to a series of questions asked of me by the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) at the last sitting of the House. One question asked by that hon. member was—

As this great subject will have to be submitted to a referendum of the people of Australia on the 28th October, will he (the Premier) endeavour to prevent a repetition of these disgraceful methods, by granting adequate police protection to those who desire to hold public meetings to ventilate this question, so that both sides may be presented to the people?

My reply was—

The State police will do all that is possible to maintain order at public meetings. I reaffirm that statement. The present Government are at all times prepared to maintain law and order at any public meeting. I may say that I myself have had experience of public meetings at which the police have failed in their duty under this head. On several occasions I have had bitter experience of failure on the part of the police to preserve law and order at public meetings. So far as our power goes, we shall certainly see that the police do keep law and order at all public meetings.

Question put and passed.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DAY FUNDS (No. 1).

Withdrawn.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [5.0]: It is my intention to sub-

stitute another Bill for the one which was introduced by the late Government, and I therefore move—

That the Western Australian Day Funds Bill be withdrawn with the view of the introduction of a fresh Bill.

Question passed.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN DAY FUNDS (No. 2).

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) having obtained leave, introduced a Bill to declare the purposes to which the funds raised by the movement known as "The Western Australian Day for the sick and wounded" may be lawfully applied, which was read a first time.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [5.2] in moving the second reading said: I desire to explain that the only alteration is contained in the middle paragraph of Clause 2, which extends the power of the provisional committee at any time to pay such portion of its funds as it may desire to the War Council of Western Australia to be expended by such council for any purpose previously mentioned in the Bill. The original Bill was introduced by Mr. Scaddan when we first met, and it was introduced in accordance with a promise which he gave on behalf of his Government to the committee of the Western Australia Day Fund. The following is a brief outline of the circumstances which have given rise to the necessity for the introduction of the measure. At the time the appeal for Western Australia Day was first made there was considerable confusion as to the particular objects to which the money would be applied. The feeling of the public, apparently, was that the moneys should be applied for the benefit of soldiers returned sick or wounded to this State. At a conference between the secretary of the Red Cross and the executive of the Western Australia Day Fund it was decided that the moneys raised by the fund should be handed over to the Red Cross Society for disbursement, and there was a certain resolution submitted at that conference and it was embodied in the

circular issued broadcast dated 10th July, 1915. That circular bears the signatures of the president, vice-president, chairman of Executive Committee, and honorary secretary of the Western Australia Day Committee, and of the honorary secretary of the Red Cross Society. It is not a very long circular and I propose to read it to the House. It is as follows:—

In accordance with the resolution carried at the meeting held in Government House on the 18th June all the money collected on or in anticipation of Western Australia Day will, in the first instance, be paid over to the honorary treasurer of the executive committee of the Western Australia Day for the sick and wounded, Mr. C. E. Harrison, Viking House, William-street, Perth, whose duty it will be, on the closing of the accounts to hand over the money received to the honorary treasurer of the Western Australian branch of the Red Cross Society (Mr. A. D. Rankine). The money so received will be applied by the Red Cross Society in a manner consistent with the basis upon which subscriptions are sought, and the public may rest assured that the sick and wounded returning to our shores will be considered fully before funds are despatched overseas. No stipulation is to be made that the whole of the Red Cross Society's funds in Western Australia shall be retained in Western Australia, in view of the fact that the majority of the Western Australian sick and wounded are in hospitals in Egypt, Malta, and England, deriving benefit from the Red Cross funds in those centres; it is obvious that if such a stipulation were made the majority of our brave soldiers would not participate and this, we are certain, would not represent the general wish of the community.

That was the circular broadly laying down the agreement come to with regard to these funds. Then the Red Cross Society in the ordinary course made application to the court for the utilisation of some of the funds, in other words, they wanted to remit a certain sum of money, £10,000, in the first instance, to headquarters in Melbourne in order that it might be transmitted to the hospitals referred to in the circular for the

benefit of our soldiers. The circular which I have read has been recognised by the courts as the trust deed under which the Western Australia Day Fund must be administered. They obtained the permission of the court on the 30th December last, and again on the 20th March of the present year to remit money to headquarters. Legal opinion was sought as to whether the moneys raised by the Western Australia Day movement and paid over to the society in accordance with the resolution I have read, could be applied outside the scope of the constitution of the Red Cross Society, and it was found that the moneys could not be so applied. The report in connection with the Western Australia Day Fund reads—

On the advice of the society's legal advisers it was found that this money could not be applied unless within the constitution of the Red Cross Society. It was felt that when this money was collected from the public it was intended that it should be applied in any way for the benefit of returned sick and wounded soldiers, and steps were taken to make the fund available for this purpose. Negotiations with the late Premier (Mr. John Scaddan) who has throughout extended the kindest sympathy and support to the society, resulted in a promise by the Government to introduce a Bill into Parliament to give the Society permission to expend the Western Australia Day Fund on any object for the benefit of sick and wounded soldiers. An indemnity by the Government to the society to this end, pending the passing of the Act, has been received.

The constitution of the Red Cross Society sets out the objects to which Red Cross moneys may be applied. In brief these are—

(a) To supply hospitals, ambulances, vehicles, clothing, comforts, etc., for the sick and wounded in time of war, and to generally supplement the hospitals, medical stores, and equipment for the medical services of the army and navy. (b) To contribute aid to the sick and wounded, irrespective of nationality, even though the British forces are not engaged.

From this it will be noted that the objects on which, by the constitution, the Society were empowered to expend Western Aus-

tralia Day Fund moneys were very restricted in comparison with the general idea in the public mind when the money was contributed as to how it should be applied. For example, the constitution of the Red Cross Society does not permit of the society making temporary advances by way of amelioration to soldiers, and this was undoubtedly one of the objects for which the Western Australia Day Fund was raised. The Red Cross Society felt that to administer the funds in the directions for which they were collected, it would be necessary for power to be obtained to make disbursements outside the scope of the constitution and the assistance of the Government was invoked to this end. The late Government gave the society an indemnity pending the passing of the necessary legislation enabling them to spend the Western Australia Day moneys in any way for the benefit, assistance or advancement of soldiers, whether discharged or undischarged, returned sick or wounded to Western Australia, and also of soldiers, whether discharged or undischarged, who may be prevented from leaving the State by reason of injury, incapacity or sickness suffered whilst on service. The Bill before the House will give the society the necessary legislative authority, as covered by the indemnity already given by the late Government. This Bill gives power which will permit the society to expend Western Australia Day Fund moneys upon sick and wounded sailors in addition to soldiers, and it will also enable the Fund Committee to make payments from that fund to other bodies which have been appointed and upon which the Day Fund may be lawfully expended, and to avoid the necessity of keeping separate accounts of any moneys so paid by the Red Cross Society to any committee or body. Provision is made in the Bill to provide that the receipt given by any such committee or body to the society shall be a complete discharge to the society as payment made by them under the trusts of the Western Australia Day Fund. I would like to point out the position of the Fund as it is shown in the balance sheet. The total contributions to date, including interest, amount to £68,844. There has been paid away £18,399, including two sums totalling £15,000. The court gave permission in De-

cember last for the payment of £10,000, and in March of the present year £5,000 was paid to headquarters in Melbourne in accordance with the order of the court, for the purpose of assisting military hospitals in Egypt, Malta, England and elsewhere. The balance in hand is £50,445, and I think when I explain that the Bill is the outcome of the negotiations between the late Government and the two societies concerned, the Western Australia Day Fund Committee and the Red Cross Society, together with the War Council—

Mr. Walker: Not the War Council.

The PREMIER: I do not know that the War Council was actually consulted.

Mr. Walker: The negotiations were principally with the Red Cross Society.

The PREMIER: When I point this out I do not think it requires any further explanation on my part. Hon. members will agree that the Bill should be passed as soon as possible. The paragraph relating to the War Council, which has been added to this new Bill, is the middle paragraph in Clause 2, which makes it lawful to pay moneys to the War Council to be expended by them for the purpose for which the money is authorised.

Mr. Walker: The difficulty is that it stops there. You get a receipt and lose the run of the funds.

The PREMIER: The War Council are not likely to lose the run of the funds. They wish to utilise some of the funds for the amelioration of returned soldiers, and the committee of the Red Cross Society are in favour of that course. Therefore, I do not see how we can offer any opposition to the project. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [5.17]: I have no desire to move the adjournment of the debate, because such an action might be misunderstood. However, I ask the Premier not to go on with the Committee stage this evening, but to allow us time for further consideration of the measure. It is true, as the Premier has pointed out, that an understanding was arrived at between the Red Cross Society and the Western Australian Day Fund committee, and certain pay-

ments were made by the Western Australian Day Fund committee which it was considered were outside their scope. Those payments were really made through the Red Cross Society. When they realised the difficulty the Red Cross Society approached the Government with the object of getting an indemnity, so that they would be free from any claims as to the expenditure of the fund. That was done, and an undertaking was given, in accordance with which the late Government introduced the Bill that has been withdrawn to-day. But there is a marked difference between the two Bills. We are now asked to go beyond the indemnity which was given. That indemnity was purely a matter between the Western Australian Day Fund committee and the Red Cross Society. The War Council did not come into it at all. Hon. members should realise this difference between the two Bills. It is all very well for the Premier to say that because the War Council, the Red Cross Society, and the Western Australian Day Fund committee are in agreement we should not quarrel; but I think we have a big responsibility upon us, inasmuch as this money was collected on the distinct understanding that it would be expended by the Red Cross Society for our own sick and wounded soldiers. There is just a danger—I do not say that it will happen—that this money may go into the Repatriation Fund. There should not be any over-lapping between the two funds. I am proud to see that the Federal Government are going to impose taxation with a view to putting millions into the Repatriation Fund, a course which should have been adopted long ago. If credit for this is due to any outside body, it is to the anti-conscriptionists, who have forced the hands of the Government in this respect. However, I have no desire to raise a discussion on the question of conscription. I merely wish to point out that there is a danger in extending the powers of this committee in a manner which will enable them, not only to pay over this fund to the Red Cross Society, but to go farther and include the War Council in the distribution so that the War Council might extend their functions. If this be done it is just possible that some of the money may be diverted into

channels not anticipated when the public subscribed it. Therefore, as representatives of the people generally, it is our duty to see that the funds so liberally subscribed by the public shall be expended in the manner intended by the subscribers. I ask that the Committee stage be postponed in order to afford opportunity for investigation.

Mr. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.21]: There should be no fear in regard to the provisions in the Bill. On several occasions it has been brought under the notice of the Western Australian Patriotic Fund committee that many of our soldiers after discharge and while awaiting their deferred pay have found themselves destitute and have appealed to the War Council, which to them appeared to be the proper body from whom to expect assistance. But the War Council have no funds at all, and the money raised for the Western Australian Day Fund could not be applied to these men once they were discharged. It was seen to be necessary that someone should render assistance to these men, and the question was taken up by the Western Australian Patriotic Fund committee. I maintain that this is the clear duty of the War Council. The trouble in regard to this fund is that it was never intended that the whole of the money should be handed over to the Red Cross Society. Any money so handed over, of course, had to be administered in accordance with the constitution of the society. When there are lawyers on a committee they generally put some difficulties in the way, and so it proved in this instance, there being lawyers on the executive. Immediately the War Council asked for assistance for the soldiers the legal minds got to work and found a bar to acceding to the request. But for this, the money would have been put to the purpose for which it was raised. The War Council are working under an Act of Parliament. They are the recognised authority; no funds can be raised without their consent, and there is no room for doubt that their administration of these funds would be beneficial to many men between the time of their discharge and their securing of employment.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: Then it is going into the Repatriation Fund?

Mr. ANGWIN: No. No member of the War Council would agree to putting any of this money into the Repatriation Fund. That is a separate fund managed by trustees with head-quarters in Melbourne. The War Council of Western Australia have to apply to Melbourne before spending any of that fund. Incidentally I think there should be a few more workers on the War Council.

The Premier: They are all workers, a most industrious body.

Mr. ANGWIN: You know what I mean by "worker." In view of this, there might be a little jealousy in regard to the question, but I think provision should be made to empower the War Council to receive something from the Western Australia Day Fund for the amelioration of the condition of our soldiers.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora) [5.26]: The clause referred to by the Premier requires a little more explanation. Both the Premier and the member for North-East Fremantle say the money will not go into the Repatriation Fund, but the fact remains that there is nothing to prevent it from being so used.

The Premier: What is it given for? The object is to be stated.

Mr. FOLEY: The objects are embodied in the first part of Clause 2. Even if the clause is rigidly adhered to, there will still be a chance of the money going into the Repatriation Fund; but in my opinion the War Council have no desire to render much assistance to any but the Repatriation Fund, and in this they are being strongly backed up by the Federal Government. According to Press reports the Federal Government have said that everything is to be made subservient to the Repatriation Fund. In my opinion, that fund should be a direct charge on every person in the Commonwealth. I am not against the repatriation of our soldiers, but I object to any slipshod method of employing moneys contributed for any other purpose. The Premier has given us an assurance that it is not desired to let this money go into the Repatriation Fund, but we have no guarantee that the War Council will not take a different view.

The Premier: It is for the Red Cross Society, and not the War Council, to determine.

The Red Cross Society can make their own stipulations.

Mr. FOLEY: If I were sure of that, I would be content to let it go, but it is provided that it shall be lawful for them to do these things. It does not say for any specific purpose at all. But in the event of the War Council—

Mr. Willmott: "As previously mentioned."

Mr. FOLEY: Is the reference to the Repatriation Fund contained in the first portion of that clause?

Mr. Willmott: Of course it is.

Mr. FOLEY: There is no evidence of it there. And, as I have said, my opinion is that in recent times the War Council has shown no desire to encourage any other form of subscription than for the purpose of the repatriation of soldiers.

Mr. Willmott: You are referring now to repatriation permanently; this Bill refers to repatriation temporarily only.

Mr. FOLEY: But, according to my reading of this measure, they may say that any assistance which they wish to give to the Repatriation Fund is temporary in nature only, and is to be backed up by something permanent whenever something permanent is done. But who is to do that permanent something? By some it is said the Federal Government will do it; others, again, are saying that it is to be done by voluntary subscription, while yet others assert it will be by direct taxation. I think it would be well if we could arrive at something definite on the point as to how the permanent repatriation of soldiers is to be effected, and until that is known we shall not get very much further ahead. For that reason I should have liked to see the second reading of this Bill postponed, in order that hon. members might have had an opportunity of ascertaining what really is meant. It is scarcely fair to the House that this measure should be rushed through, nor is it fair to those people who have subscribed this money. I do not accuse the Premier of wishing to rush this Bill through, but I certainly do think that the House should have had more time to examine it, so as to ascertain what the Bill really means. Each member who has spoken up till now has given a different opinion, and I

think we should have unanimity on this point before we start with the consideration of the Bill at all.

Mr. WILLMOTT (Nelson) [5.32]: As a member of the War Council, I can assure the hon. member that he need not have the slightest fear of any desire on the part of members of the War Council to draw any of this money into the Repatriation Fund, or to use it for the purposes of the permanent repatriation of soldiers.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: But that could be done under this Bill.

Mr. WILLMOTT: I do not think so. As has already been pointed out by the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Angwin), the War Council has found itself in the past in the position of not having any funds to draw upon when required for some specific purpose. The position was discussed by the council and it was resolved that it would be beneficial to adopt a policy of placing all contributions into one concern, and having a certain portion of the fund thus established allocated to the purposes of the War Council. Those funds could then be used for certain necessary purposes, even though those purposes were not covered by the ordinary functions of the Council. The War Council has not the least desire to put this money into the Repatriation Fund, for the reason that, if it were done, the War Council would directly lose control of the money, as the control would then vest in the central committee in Melbourne.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: Nobody suggested the War Council had any desire to do that, but that it would be possible for it to be done under this Bill. Another point raised by hon. members is that the money was not raised for repatriation purposes, that while there was a connecting link between Western Australia Day and the Red Cross Society, there is no connecting link with the War Council—this Bill is making that link now.

Mr. Thomson: What was the money collected for?

Mr. WILLMOTT: For the Red Cross. As I have already explained, the War Council from time to time found itself without funds; and the suggestion contained in the Bill came from the Red Cross representa-

tives on the War Council. I can assure hon. members they may disabuse their minds of the idea that the War Council has any wish to use this money for the repatriation of soldiers.

Mr. Carpenter interjected.

Mr. WILLMOTT: There have been many things we would have liked to do; but we have not a farthing with which to keep men going, even for a time. Members of the council have even done that out of their own funds.

Mr. Foley: But the Patriotic Fund gives a certain amount to the dependents of soldiers.

Mr. WILLMOTT: Yes, to the dependents, but not to the man himself. That is the very point. Many of the men come back here and find themselves stranded. Here is the case of one returned soldier, which will illustrate. He was put on board a boat for Australia and his kit was supposed to have been put on board also. Whether or not it was nobody can say, but on arrival at Fremantle it was found that his kit was not there. In that kit were the papers upon which he would be entitled to draw his pay. When he landed, naturally he wanted his pay; but he was told that he could not be given his money until the necessary papers were produced, or until the office had certain evidence of his identity. That unfortunate man was in the position of not being able to draw a single penny.

Mr. Foley: But do you not think the duty of assisting such men should devolve on the whole of the people of Australia, instead of on one section only?

Mr. WILLMOTT: Since that, I happen to know that similar cases have occurred. It is all very well while the men are coming back in ones and twos, but when soldiers begin to return in large numbers, this will become a very difficult problem. That is an aspect of the question which should appeal to the House. It is astonishing how many little things of this nature crop up day by day, matters which do not come under the heading of repatriation, in respect of which the War Council has no fund at the present time to draw upon. Members may rest assured that the War Council will utilise this money for temporary relief purposes only.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: The Repatriation Committee has other funds.

Mr. WILLMOTT: If the hon. member were on the War Council, he would, I am sure, be one of the last to suggest that the council wishes to use these funds except in the way I have explained.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: I do not say they are anxious to, but that they have the power to under this Bill. I say we are going beyond the purposes for which this money was subscribed.

Mr. WILLMOTT: I think the House will find that this money will be used by the War Council for the very purpose for which it was subscribed.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna) [5.39]: I well remember the occasion on which this collection was made, and the object for which it was made. The true purpose of the collection was to afford succour, help—charity if you like—to our own returned Australian soldiers. But when the money had been collected, the biggest part of it—I might almost say the whole of it—was claimed on behalf of one organisation, the Red Cross. Everybody subscribing had been told they were contributing towards Red Cross purposes, but they were also told that they were contributing towards helping our own people. Pounds upon pounds were collected on the ground that it was a contribution for the assistance of our own people. But the moment that the whole of the money was put into the Red Cross Society's funds it became immediately earmarked for those specific purposes contained within the charter of that organisation. That money cannot be utilised for any purpose outside those strictly defined in the Red Cross Society's charter. Therefore, the bulk of that money, in fact the whole of it, instead of being distributed among Australians in Egypt or in France, would be forwarded to the London head-quarters of the society and distributed there as thought to be best. Appeals have had to be made to our Courts for permission to divert that money. More than one appeal has been necessary for permission to utilise the money for purposes other than assistance to our own citizen soldiers, who have volunteered for the ser-

vice of the Empire. An indemnity even was required, so that the House will see it was no mere quibble of the law. Everyone knows that any organisation working under a charter is compelled to keep within the four corners of the charter.

Mr. Willmott: And rightly so.

Mr. WALKER: I agree that it is rightly so. Even the local representative of the Red Cross Society, if anxious to help our sufferers, is bound by the terms of incorporation of the Red Cross Society. After consultation with the Government, a Bill was sought to give power to the representatives of the Red Cross Society to divert the money for other charitable purposes. That Bill was brought down, but not passed. It was reintroduced by the late Government; but now comes an alteration. At first glance it appears wise to allow funds contributed by the local people for the purpose of assisting local people to be controlled by a local body in touch with returned and departing soldiers. But I want to know what power even the War Council has to constitute itself a charitable organisation, for the purpose of relieving any necessity which may be brought to its notice. The War Council is to take up a sort of voluntary work with apparently no responsibility or supervision. Whilst I have every confidence in that council, I should like to know who is going to be responsible for seeing that that money is properly, wisely, and judiciously distributed; and also who has authorised the War Council to assume this responsibility. The moment the Red Cross Society's representative attaches his signature and obtains a receipt in respect of funds handed to the War Council, all responsibility ends.

Mr. Willmott: So far as the Red Cross Society is concerned.

Mr. WALKER: And also so far as the subscribers are concerned. The War Council may properly distribute those funds; but I would point out that the hon. member himself raised a question in the course of his speech which shows that he also had some doubt as to the wisdom of putting this responsibility on the War Council. He told us that there have been cases of returned soldiers who could not produce the papers necessary for the satisfaction of local officers

to entitle them to receive payments. They could not produce their pay books, they could not establish their identity.

Mr. Willmott: They could establish their identity.

Mr. WALKER: I will go further and say that there have been those who could not prove their identity when they came back on account of their papers coming after them, and could not show what were the proper payments or that they were making proper claims. Whose responsibility is that? It is not that of the War Council or the Red Cross Society, nor is it that of any charitable organisation. There is something short-sighted in the manner of dealing with these claims, or there certainly was at the commencement, when our first lot returned. The machinery was not completed for properly dealing with these people, and great hardships occurred at times.

Mr. Gardiner: The Patriotic Fund finds a deal of difficulty itself in dealing with the matter.

Mr. WALKER: There is no question about that. Here we have a Patriotic Fund, the War Council, and the Red Cross, and what I am afraid of is that ultimately we shall be unable to fix the responsibility on anybody, when any single section is not dealing adequately with our returned soldiers.

Mr. Foley: Let us have direct taxation; that would settle it.

Mr. WALKER: What is needed is a fund provided by the Commonwealth to meet emergencies of this kind, and administered officially and strictly, and with sympathy. If it is left to somebody merely moving when the position is desperate and notice brought, and then perhaps the matter going from one organisation to another and from one door to another, there is going to be a great deal more dissatisfaction than already exists. I submit that it is a solemn responsibility devolving upon the Commonwealth Government to see that adequate means are provided that no soldier is thrown upon the street or has to seek some charitable organisation in order to obtain relief upon his return.

Mr. Allen: Hear, hear!

Mr. WALKER: That is the position.

Mr. Foley: It is a position which is not being manifested at the present time.

Mr. WALKER: It is not being sufficiently impressed—

Mr. Foley: And all the talk that is going on will not do any good, we want something to prevent it.

Mr. WALKER: It is not being sufficiently impressed upon the Federal authorities. I shall object to vote for the clause as it stands. It is too indefinite and too vague, and the money might be diverted from its proper purposes. I have not one word to say against those zealous members of the committee who are giving their work so unselfishly for the good of the country and for the benefit particularly of the soldiers who have returned, but they are all, I think, limited in their knowledge and the time that they can bestow upon the matter, and they may not always be the constituents of that council. Others may come in. Amongst other things provided in the first portion of Clause 2 is "the advancement of the soldiers." On the question of the advancement of the soldiers, repatriation might well be considered as included. The fund might be technically and correctly applied to that purpose. Until there is some amendment, which we shall have to consider in Committee, I should not feel inclined to give my consent to the passing of that clause and to its becoming a part of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [5.50] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to make provision for the better representation of the people of Western Australia in Parliament.

Mr. Carpenter: Quite necessary.

The Premier: Yes, quite necessary.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: A Royal Commission free from party influence is appointed in the Bill itself, to consist of a judge of the Supreme Court, the Surveyor General, and the Chief Electoral Officer. The Royal Commission will divide the State

into 50 electoral districts. That will be its duty. That portion of the State now comprised in the Kimberley, the Roebourne, the Pilbara, and the Gascoyne districts (with some modifications of boundaries as the Commissioners may think fit) will be divided into four districts as at present. The quota will not apply. As regards the area now comprised within the remaining 46 districts, the Commissioners will allot a certain number of districts to each of three areas, namely, firstly, the metropolitan area; secondly, the goldfields central area; and thirdly, the agricultural-mining area. Hon. members will see the boundaries of these areas in the schedule.

Mr. Carpenter: It sounds like a wedding.

Mr. Taylor: Where is community of interest there?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As a general principle, one vote one value is theoretically good, and absolutely good when all conditions of life and environment are equal. It, however, can only satisfactorily apply in closely settled districts, and where community of interest exists. Western Australia has a scattered population in the country, and it cannot be said that there is community of interest between the agricultural districts and the goldfields, or between the goldfields and the closely settled industrial population of the metropolitan area.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: That is a strange argument.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Bill provides for two distinct classes of quotas. The first is what I may term a "uniform quota." That is for the purpose of calculating the number of districts into which each area will be divided. Such quota is ascertained by dividing by 46—being the number of districts to be provided for—the aggregate of the following three figures, namely, firstly, the total enrolment in the agricultural-mining area; secondly, the total enrolment in the metropolitan area reduced by two-fifths; and thirdly, the total enrolment in the goldfields central area reduced by one quarter; and the quotient thus obtained becomes the "uniform quota" for the above-mentioned purposes, approximately, I may say on present figures, 3,000 electors.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: That is in the goldfields central.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Would you give us an illustration, a comparison?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will give the hon. member an illustration later. That is the first class. The other class of quotas is required for the purpose of delineating the districts within each area, and these quotas are arrived at by dividing the total actual enrolment, that is the whole of the electors of each area, by the number of districts allotted to that area, there being thus obtained an average or quota of enrolments which will form the basis for the redistribution in each area. Take the metropolitan area. The present number of enrolments there is 70,838 electors. The number of districts apparently will be 14, and the quota 5,060. But although the quota is taken as the basis for such division, the Commissioners may allow a margin not to exceed two-fifths, 20 per cent., more or less, and shall give consideration to the following:— firstly, community of interests—

Mr. W. D. Johnson: That is community of interest in the districts as divided by the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly. Secondly, means of communication; thirdly, physical features; and fourthly, the existing boundaries. The Commissioners will report to the Attorney General, who shall lay the report on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament, and a Bill will then be introduced for the redistribution of seats in accordance therewith. The Bill will provide for the readjustment of provinces. The seats of existing members of the Assembly and Council remain unaffected until a dissolution of the Assembly or the periodical vacation of seats in the Council. There is also provided for a redistribution from time to time on the resolution of the Assembly, or if any biennial election enrolments for five districts falls short of or exceeds the quota. The basis of the 1913 Bill, as of this Bill, is the quota and its fixing. The 20 per cent. increase or decrease of which I have spoken does not affect the principle, and is merely incidental. The 1913 Bill was a centralisation measure at the expense of the goldfields and of the country districts, from which it took no less than eight seats, which eight seats it automatically gave to the metropolitan area. This Bill names the Royal Com-

missioners—an appointment by Parliament—whilst the 1913 Bill gave the appointment to the Government of the day.

Mr. Bolton: This is the same thing, is it not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

Mr. Bolton: You are going to appoint the commissioners under the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When the 1913 Bill was before the Assembly, the then Premier, Mr. Scaddan, said—

I do not know how this distribution is going to pan out.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: How could he know?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I therefore now wish to show how that Bill would have panned out, and to explain to members of this House the difference between the provisions of the 1913 Bill and those of this Bill.

Mr. Bolton: Will you tell us how this Bill will pan out? It is only fair.

Mr. Taylor: After the elections he will.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The 1913 Bill exempted from its general provisions the four electorates I have mentioned—Kimberley, Pilbara, Roebourne, and Gascoyne; and the area now covered by those districts was, under that Bill, to be divided into three districts, leaving 47 for the balance of the State to be constructed by the commissioners on an even quota of enrolment. The Legislative Council restored the four Northern districts, of which action the Assembly later approved. The 1913 Bill would have centred 40 per cent. of the whole of the Assembly representation in the metropolitan area, by raising the number of metropolitan districts from 12 to 20. This Bill on present day enrolments and on present boundaries will work out—and now I am answering the question of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Bolton)—at 14 districts for the metropolitan area, representing an increase of two. The 1913 Bill would have reduced the representation in the Assembly of the present 13 goldfields districts from 26 per cent. to 16 per cent., reducing the number of goldfields districts by five, from 13 to eight; while this Bill reduces goldfields representation by four districts calculated on the present enrolment.

Mr. Foley: Those are not your own figures.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: These are the departmental figures of the actual enrolment, and are indisputable. The point is that in the Assembly debate on the previous Bill no one took the trouble to analyse the measure.

Mr. Taylor: Where were the Opposition?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Premier had said he did not know how the measure would pan out.

Mr. Bolton: We will analyse this measure.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member may do so to his heart's content. Continuing my analysis of the 1913 Bill, I have to point out that it would have reduced the representation of the present 21 country districts to 19. The 1916 Bill exempts from its general provisions the four Northern districts of Kimberley, Pilbara, Roebourne, and Gascoyne; but the boundaries of those districts may be readjusted by the commissioners into the same number of districts, namely four. That leaves 46 districts for the remainder of the State. The 1916 Bill provides quotas on a sliding scale, based upon the present figures of enrolment, and working out approximately as follows:—Quota for the metropolitan areas 5,000, for the central goldfields areas 4,000, and for the argicultural-mining areas 3,000.

Mr. Foley: Working it out on your own sliding scale, do you think the 3,000 and the 5,000 fair?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Most certainly. The Bill reduces the metropolitan representation. Hon. members opposite would have centralised the whole government in Perth. Calculated on the present enrolment, the 1916 Bill would increase the representation of the metropolitan area by raising the number of districts from 12 to 14. Calculated on the same enrolment, the same Bill would increase the representation of the country or argicultural districts by raising their number from 21 to 23, an increase of two.

Mr. Foley: That just means that you take some seats from the goldfields and spread them over the other portions of the State.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am giving the effect of the Bill calculated on the

present enrolments, which would reduce the representation of the goldfields districts in the Assembly from 13 to nine, a reduction of four districts as against the five districts which were cut out by the 1913 Bill. At the same time, this measure leaves the Golden Mile with its present four members untouched.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: Why do not you follow your figures up? You gave us the quotas for metropolitan, agricultural, and mining.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am coming to the other figures. In order to enable hon. members more fully to comprehend the provisions of this Bill, I have had prepared by the Electoral Registrar four returns, which I have laid before hon. members for their consideration. I now refer hon. members to No. 1 return, which shows the quota calculated on the present enrolment in the existing districts. The first column mentions metropolitan, central goldfields, and agricultural-mining; the next column states the number of districts at the present day, being 12 for the metropolitan, four for the central goldfields, nine for mining districts, and 21 for agricultural and ports. The enrolments are given in the third column, and to-day's quota is given in the last column. On looking at No. 2 table hon. members will find that the quota is calculated on the present enrolment of the proposed new districts. I myself have added to that table two columns, one on either side, which I will give to hon. members; and they can add those columns, which I think useful, to the table, for their own information. Taking the table as it stands, it gives again the various areas or districts. The first column of figures shows the number of new districts there will be in each area. The next column gives the enrolments, which are as before. The last column gives the quota in each district. If hon. members will look, for instance, at "metropolitan 5,060" they will see where I get my 5,000 from. On looking at "central goldfields 3,845" they will see how I arrived at 4,000. On referring to "agricultural-mining (combined) 2,925" they will see where I got my figure of 3,000. I suggest hon. members should mark on the side of this table 5,000, 4,000, and 3,000; and they will then follow my argument. I suggest

also that hon. members insert a column in front of the first figure column, and call it "present number of members." I suggest hon. members should fill in there, "Metropolitan 12, central goldfields four, mining nine, agriculture and ports 21; total 46." Hon. members will then have a complete schedule dealing with the present enrolment, as contrasted with the new one. Return 3 gives a calculation, based upon present enrolment, of the approximate number of districts to which each area as defined in this measure would be entitled. The first column again mentions the area; the second the actual enrolment; the third the figures for calculation purposes under Clause 4 (a) of the Bill; and the fourth column the number of districts. Taking metropolitan, the actual enrolment is 70,838, less two-fifths 42,502, and the number of districts 14.38, or, as figured out in a further column, 14. Central goldfields figures work out at 3.90, which I phrase, as of course the commissioners would, four. The total of agricultural-mining, 27.72, is in effect 28. Thus the total of 46 is arrived at. The last return gives the subdivision proposal of the late Government on the basis of the present enrolment. If hon. members wish it, I can supply a schedule of the 1913 enrolment. There are, of course, slight differences in the figures; but I am here applying the 1913 Bill to the present day figures. Hon. members on doing so will find that in the metropolitan area, with 70,000 electors, they have 19.80 members, which is to say 20 members, under the 1913 Bill, as against the existing number of 12. I suggest hon. members add a new column here also, calling it "present time." That new column will show metropolitan 12, central goldfields four, mining nine, agriculture and ports 21. I would suggest a further column headed "new Bill," which column would show metropolitan 14, central goldfields four, other mining districts five, agriculture and ports 23. Thus hon. members have the whole of the information for which they have been asking.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: I hope you are going to circulate those figures.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Hon. members have them.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: But you have made certain additions here.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I suggested hon. members should make those.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: You ought to supply those to members. Could you not do that just in type-written form?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If hon. members opposite had only listened for a few moments, they could have written those figures down. Type-written forms showing those figures are quite unnecessary.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: If the figures are worth quoting, they are worth putting into your return.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have given hon. members the figures, and hon. members can deal with them as they please. I have other information here available for hon. members in respect of questions they may wish to ask, as to total enrolment for any individual district, or the like. I do not think it would serve any purpose to put that information before hon. members at the present moment, but I shall be prepared to give it. Hon. members now have the information I consider necessary for intelligent consideration of the measure, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [6.16]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

The Premier: No. Why should the business of the House be hung up like that?

Mr. Bolton: Say the Committee stage next week.

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON: With the permission of the House, I wish to point out that if the debate is resumed on Thursday next it cannot be completed on that day. The House will adjourn on Thursday for two or three weeks, and then we shall have had only half the debate. After one or two members have spoken, the debate will be adjourned for two or three weeks. If consideration of the measure is postponed until Tuesday next, it will go over the adjournment.

The Premier: This is only a Commission Bill. It is not a Redistribution of Seats Bill.

Mr. Bolton: But it gives the commissioners certain powers.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): The debate will finish on Thursday all right.

Motion (adjournment) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	17

Majority against .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Mullany	(Teller.)
Mr. Munsie	

NOES.

Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. George	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Harrison	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Male
Mr. Lefroy	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.23 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion for the adjournment of the debate can now be taken. When the House rose at 6.15 the motion for the adjournment of the debate until next Tuesday was defeated.

On motion by Mr. Bolton, debate adjourned.

BILL—FRANCHISE.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [7.33] in moving the second reading said: The object of this measure is to preserve the franchise of the members of His Majesty's forces and is practically the same Bill as that suggested by the late Government. There is, however, an addition to the end of it, and two clauses have been remodelled, but the principle is the same. Under the existing law, that is, the Electoral Act of 1907, an elector must be enrolled in the district in which

he lives and can only vote so long as he continues to live in the district for which he is enrolled, with the exception that if he changes his place of living and an election is held before he transfers his name to another roll within three months after he ceases to live in the district for which he is enrolled, he may nevertheless vote for that district. The Bill before the House which deals with the franchise of electors on service, that is, soldiers, provides that such an elector on service with His Majesty's forces shall be deemed during such service to continue to live in the district for which he was enrolled at the commencement of such service.

Mr. Bolton: Whether he is abroad or not?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No matter where he is.

Mr. Walker: Is being in camp regarded as being on active service?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. The Bill also provides that a person on service not enrolled may be enrolled for the district in which he lived immediately before the commencement of service. In dealing with the question of the Legislative Council franchise, the household qualification of a Council elector is preserved if the elector continues his tenancy of the house, though he need not continue to live in it. The chief electoral officer can insert the names of any person which may have been omitted, and preserve their franchise. The last portion of the Bill provides that an asterisk or a star is to be placed against the name of an elector who has joined the forces, the object being for the convenience of electoral and returning officers who may thus be able to see at a glance which of the electors are on service and not in the district at the moment.

Mr. Walker: Have you made any provision for them to vote?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

Mr. Walker: Then what is the good of keeping the names on the roll if they cannot vote?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is impossible to make adequate provision for the votes of soldiers to be taken in war-time.

I think it is undesirable that such provision should be made in regard to men who are engaged at the Front. The object of the Bill is to continue the names of those engaged on active service on the roll. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) [7.38]: As the Attorney General has pointed out, the Bill is practically the same as that which was prepared by the previous Government. I candidly admit that it will be of very little practical use, but I think it is only right that the names of those who go on active service should as far as possible be retained on the roll. There is only one point to which I would draw attention, and it is that we limit the proposal to those entitled to enrolment at the time of enlistment. We must, however, bear in mind that there are a lot of juniors who become entitled to the franchise while on active service by reason of them attaining their majority. In other words, a lot of soldiers have left, and are still leaving the State, before they are 21 years of age, and we should make provision for cases of this description. The Attorney General will realise that the Bill, while preserving the franchise of the electors on service, does nothing for the other members of the forces to whom I have referred. The measure might be broadened so that those who leave the country before they are 21 years of age may be enrolled while they are on active service.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle) [7.40]: I understand that the object of the Bill is simply to legalise what has been the practice in the Electoral Department. I well remember when the first batch of soldiers went away, the Electoral Department at once began to remove from the rolls the names of soldiers who had been residing in the districts for which they had been enrolled in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The result was that men who had gone away to serve their country, and who in the ordinary course of events returned either sick or wounded, or after having completed their work, found that their names had been struck off the roll. Complaints were made about

that action, and I believe the then Attorney General issued instructions to the Chief Electoral Officer that the names of all soldiers who were known to have gone away as members of the forces on active service were to be retained on the rolls. I take it it is intended by the Bill before the House to legalise that action. As Clause 2 reads it appears to make it mandatory that the names shall remain on the roll even though a soldier himself may not desire to have it on the roll of a particular constituency. A great number of soldiers who have returned have not gone back to the constituency from which they came. Some have gone to Albany, some have remained in Perth, while others may be in the Base Hospital at Fremantle, and these men may not have any intention of returning to their old electorates. What I want to be sure about is that they will be given the right to have their names transferred. I take it that the Bill cannot deprive them of the right to transfer, a right which they already enjoy, though Clause 2 sets out that the name "shall" remain on the roll for which the particular person may have been originally enrolled.

Mr. BOLTON (South Fremantle) [7.45]: Whilst it seems, on the face of it, very necessary, the Bill is somewhat dangerous. Not only is there the soldier at the Front to be provided for, but there are others on duty within the State who have been transferred from their own districts. These men are just as much on active service as those in the firing line, yet the Bill will not permit them to transfer from one electoral roll to another. Moreover, the provision for placing an asterisk against the name of the man on active service, suggests to me that such a man must remain on his original roll. I say he should have the right to transfer while on active service. The object of the Bill is to preserve the franchise of the man on active service. But, in a way, it disfranchises him. The name of the soldier on active service is retained on the roll originally claimed for, and no provision is made for his transferring his name to the roll of an electorate within which he may be residing for 12 months or more. Therefore, it will be seen that the man on active service has not the same right as a civilian. I think the point should be safeguarded.

The Attorney General: We might as well tear up the Bill as adopt your suggestion.

Mr. BOLTON: Then the Bill is a very dangerous one indeed. Under the Bill the man on active service is the only man to be restricted in his franchise. Any other elector who has moved from one electorate to another can claim to be enrolled for his new electorate.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): But the man on active service cannot be said to have changed his place of residence.

Mr. BOLTON: There are cases in which men on active service have been transferred from one electorate to another indefinitely, one might almost say permanently. The sergeant in charge of the base hospital at Fremantle has been in charge of that institution ever since its inauguration.

The Attorney General: That is very different from the case of a man who is there only temporarily.

Mr. BOLTON: Technically, the sergeant is there only temporarily. Hundreds who have joined the forces are still in this State, stationed in districts other than those for which they are enrolled; and they are likely to remain there. These men should have the right to transfer from one electorate to another. After all, a man cannot be on more than one roll. The very transference is effected by the Electoral Department removing the name from the original roll and adding it to the new roll. I cannot see why the Bill should be torn up merely because we say that the man on active service should have the same right as any other elector. Although the Bill appears to be very necessary, yet, as a matter of fact, it is distinctly dangerous. No Parliament has the right to say to a man, "You must continue to be enrolled for a certain district, because you originally enrolled for that district." The soldier should have all the privileges of the ordinary elector. This is all I ask.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna) [7.50]: I fully endorse the remarks of the hon. member. The late Government had the desire to preserve the franchise to every soldier going on active service. It meant something more than having the names of men on active service printed on the rolls with an asterisk appended. It meant that they should be

able to exercise their franchise. As the hon. member has pointed out, if the Bill does anything at all it limits the rights of men on active service. It limits their power to change their electorates, because they are to be deemed to continue to live in the electorates for which they were enrolled at the time of their enlistment. And it deprives them of the power to vote. There may be occasions when they could vote, but no provision is made to extend to them the right to vote wherever they may be. In other States such a right is given to seamen, and something similar should be done for our soldiers. But there is a greater danger still in putting a distinguishing mark against the name of a man on active service. It will be a sure guarantee that such men are non-voters.

The Attorney General: No, they may be here.

Mr. WALKER: It may lead to impersonation.

The Attorney General: The object of the provision is to avoid that very thing.

Mr. WALKER: It will give the cue to any who may have such practices in mind. It seems to have been a common practice in all old-time elections, and certainly, if there were any seeking a chance to impersonate, this would be a good hint to them. The Bill goes too far in proposing to mark on the roll the names of these absent electors singling them out as distinct from others. Many men have returned unfit for active service at the Front, notwithstanding which their services are still availed of locally, and they are daily at work in our camps. Those men will not be back in their own electorates, perhaps, until after the war, if indeed they ever choose to go there again. And, in the meantime, they cannot change their electorates and vote in those districts in which circumstances compel them to make their homes for the time being. Thus the Bill, instead of being of benefit to the soldiers, is a mere farce, simply enabling them to have their names printed on the rolls with an asterisk. The measure which the late Government intended to bring in would have given soldiers the full right to exercise the franchise, if they so desired. In effect we already have the power to keep them on the roll and grant them all civil rights, but to put it be-

yond all cavil the late Government intended to bring in a Bill expressly preserving those rights. No sacrifice of any right should fall upon the men on active service because of their patriotic zeal in our defence. This Bill means to the soldiers merely an ornamental publication of their names, of no value to them or to the country.

Mr. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.57]: There can be no doubt that the electoral rights of men on active service will be curtailed by the Bill. Many of those men are married and, on their enlisting, their wives moved into other districts, with a view to making their homes there, at least until such time as their husbands should return.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): These soldiers' wives can transfer.

Mr. ANGWIN: But no provision is made for the soldier's transfer. We will have the soldier voting in one electorate and his wife voting in another. I can readily believe that the desire of the Attorney General is to give the soldier full voting power; but the Bill will not effect that. The soldier is to be tied to the district for which he is enrolled, and he is not to have the same privileges as are enjoyed by all other electors. During the period of the war, and for six months after, he will not be able to transfer from one district to another. All that we ask is that he shall have the same opportunity of transferring his name from one to another roll, just as the civilian is permitted to do. An elector must reside in a district for one month before he is entitled to transfer his name. I hope the Attorney General will give consideration to that aspect of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (No. 1).

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [8.2] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to authorise the granting of a mineral lease of portion of Reserve A7537. This Bill is introduced in order to allow of a portion of

a class A reserve, now set apart in the Darling Ranges as a national park, being granted by way of lease for mining for molybdenite. I may say that this Bill came down from the late Government and is now brought forward without any alteration whatever. As members know, Section 8 of the Permanent Reserves Act, 1899, provides that the Governor may declare a reserve, and that after such reserve has been classified as a class A reserve it shall forever remain dedicated for the purposes for which it was declared until it is otherwise provided by an Act of Parliament, in which the lands dealt with must be specifically mentioned. That is the reason for the introduction of this Bill. The lease for these lands was applied for in 1914 by Messrs. Gull Bros. and Edwards. A Bill was prepared authorising a lease of part of the reserve, but was not brought forward in 1914 or 1915, owing, I am given to understand, to pressure of Parliamentary business. The only reason for urgency in this matter at the present time is in view of the demand for molybdenite and the high price that mineral is bringing. Molybdenite is widely distributed throughout Western Australia, but attempts to mine it have been made on only a small scale at Leonora, Mullewa, Southern Cross, and one or two other centres. The greater part of the world's supply of molybdenite comes from Australia, and the Commonwealth Government are to-day buying up the mineral at a fixed price of £452 per ton for 90 per cent. molybdenite. Ore attaining a less percentage down to eight per cent. is saleable, but at lower prices. The principal use of the metal is in the making of a special grade of steel. It is also used in connection with dye works, porcelain, and chemical industries. It is also stated to have considerable value as a preservative, and also in the making of cordite. The question is whether this portion of our national park might be operated on for the mining of this mineral. There appears to me to be no reason why mining operations on that part of the national park applied for should not be carried on under conditions which will protect the surface and ensure that there is no injury to the appearance of the park.

Mr. Underwood: Have you any evidence that there is molybdenite there?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand that there is such evidence, and the hon. member may be assured that we will have evidence before any lease is granted. The land applied for is situated one and a half miles north-east from the Swan View railway station, in the direction of the tunnel, and cannot therefore in any way spoil the appearance of the park. If there is any possibility of successful mining for molybdenite there I think it is now our duty to do what we can to develop it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Hudson debate adjourned.

BILL—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH PROPERTY ACTS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [8.8] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to further amend the Acts relating to the property of the Roman Catholic Church, and is mainly required because the Roman Catholic Diocese of Perth has been created an Arch-diocese. The church authorities also desire to have power to sell, mortgage, or lease their lands. The Bill provides further that the consent of the advisers constituted under the Roman Catholic Church Property Act, 1911, shall be obtained, and that the provisions of Section 7 of the Roman Catholic Lands Act, 1911, shall apply, that is to say, that where lands are acquired from the Crown the consent of the Governor-in-Council must be obtained before a lease or mortgage may be effected. Another clause of the Bill deals with the validation of certain transactions not strictly in form, owing to the fact that the archbishopric has been for some time in operation. Consequently, operations which have been proceeding in connection with the sale or other dealings in land are not in a proper sense in order and must be validated by a Bill of this description. If hon. members desire information as to the powers of the Roman

Catholic Church in respect to its lands, I would refer them to Section 5 of the Act of 1895—

With the consent of the Governor-in-Council, the said Bishop and his successors in office may sell any lands granted by the Crown as aforesaid to him or his predecessors in such office, or that may hereafter be so granted to him or his successors.

There is therefore power to mortgage, but it is desired to overcome the limitation in that section that moneys raised by way of mortgage under the Act of 1895 must be expended in buildings or in otherwise improving the land comprised in the security. It is felt that if money has to be raised for building purposes this limitation is hampering to the authorities. If members will turn to Section 5 of the Roman Catholic Church Property Act, 1911, it will be seen that—

The said Bishop and his successors in office shall not have any power to sell, lease, mortgage, encumber, or otherwise dispose of any real or leasehold property so vested in him and his successors as aforesaid without the consent in writing of two persons, who shall be styled the "Advisers" and shall be appointed as hereinafter provided.

In the Bill now before the House it is provided that the consent of these advisers shall be obtained. I do not think that there is any further information I can give, except to say that I think, after having examined it, that it is a proper Bill, and that the powers asked for are such as might be properly granted to the Roman Catholic Church to deal with its property. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. W. D. Johnson debate adjourned.

BILL—ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [8.15] in moving the second reading said: This is a very small amendment to the Adoption of Children Act of

1896, but though small, it is very important. In a word, the Bill provides for the alteration in the Act of one word or so. The Adoption of Children Act of 1896 provides in Section 3 for the adoption of a child in the prescribed form, by a married woman alone, with the written consent of her husband. Subsection 3 provides that a married woman who, in the opinion of the judge, is at least 18 years older than the child may adopt that child. A case cropped up in which a widow desired to adopt a child but could not do so under the Act. Strictly speaking, a widow is not a married woman, and in order to get over the difficulty, which hon. members will recognise, for a widow in a general way is rather a suitable person to adopt a child, the words are inserted, such as are provided under the Bill, "unmarried woman or a widow." Then there is a further amendment of the principal Act provided for, and this has to do with Section 4. It provides in the Act that a married man alone, with the written consent of his wife, may adopt a male child by permission of the judge, as in the prescribed form. Again, there is no provision made for a widower, so that the amendment in the clause of the Bill is really consequential on the other. In other words, the Bill provides in one clause for the widow and in the other for a widower. Furthermore, Section 3, Subsection 4 of the Act contains the words "a married man who in the opinion of the judge." Hon. members can see that this is a mistake, and, therefore, the word "married" is struck out and the word "unmarried" is put in. That is the only alteration to the principal Act, and is made for the purpose of making it clear that a widow can adopt a child on the same conditions as a married woman or a spinster. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [8.18]: I think the Bill might be passed. The amendments asked for are required because of the wording of the Act. It seems to me that cases could arise when unmarried people could adopt children with advantage to the children. We have to bear in mind, of course, that these adoptions are always considered by a judge. I am of opinion, therefore, that there is no danger whatever

to the child, and that, in some cases, such facilities will be of advantage to the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Mr. MUNSIE: Will the Honorary Minister tell me whether the clause, if agreed to, will prohibit a married woman from adopting a child?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: If the amendment is passed the section of the Act concerned will then read, "An unmarried woman, or widow."

Mr. Hudson: A married woman alone could adopt a child with the consent of her husband?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: That still remains.

Mr. Hudson: There is no provision for a married woman adopting a child with the consent of her husband.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: She may adopt the child with the consent of the judge.

Mr. TAYLOR: I gather that Section 3, Subsection 2 of the Act, which this Bill intends to amend, makes provision for a married woman adopting a child.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Subsection 2 provides for a married woman adopting a child. Subsection 3 is then struck out and the present clause inserted providing for unmarried women, or widows.

Mr. Taylor: That is clear.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—SPECIAL LEASE (LAKE CLIFTON).

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [8.25]: in moving the second reading said: This is a very important Bill, and one which, I think, will appeal to hon. members, not only those represent-

ing the agricultural community, but those who are interested in the welfare of the country generally. By the development of the lime deposits at Lake Clifton we should be able to assist in the development of the South-West portion of this State. The land in Western Australia, it is well known, is more particularly deficient in lime, and any proposition which has been brought forward to enable the agriculturist to fertilise his land with lime will be of benefit, not only to him, but to Western Australia. The Bill provides for the granting of a lease under the Land Act, 1898, of Lake Clifton reserve, and Reserve 998 in the South-West division of the State, and to authorise the construction of a railway from Waroona to the said reserve. Lake Clifton is a lagoon of some 15 or 16 miles in length by about three-quarters of a mile in width, lying to the westward of Waroona on the Bunbury railway line and parallel with the sea coast. It is strange that it remains for us to discover this wonderful deposit at Lake Clifton after Western Australia has been settled for so many years. Its discovery is due to the researches of one of the settlers there some few years ago, who discovered that this wonderful deposit at Lake Clifton was simply a huge body of lime, lying in such a form that would be very easy of adaptation to the soil of this country, and lime in such a form that, when dried, would pass through a drill with ease. The deposit is found all over the surface of the lake and is about 12 feet in depth. Any measure that will provide for the working of this wonderful deposit must be of great benefit to the country. This Bill will enable a provisional agreement, entered into by the late Minister for Lands (Mr. W. D. Johnson) with Mr. John Henry Johnson, for a special lease to be granted for the bed and banks of Lake Clifton and a reserve of about 60 acres alongside the lease where operations will be carried on, to be granted. The late Minister took a very keen interest in this, and I am sure he will welcome the introduction of this measure before the House. In my opinion, the agreement was well thought out, well protecting the interests of the State without harassing the operations of the lessee. The agreement will be found in the schedule to the Bill. It provides, first of all, for a rental of £200 per

annum payable half-yearly, and for a deposit of £1,000. The term of the lease is 42 years, which I think hon. members will agree is necessary in order to induce a lessee to bring forward a considerable amount of capital for the development of the lime deposit. Without some lengthy tenure he could not be expected to do that. The agreement further provides that the lessee shall construct a railway from Waroona to Lake Clifton. The railway is to be built under the supervision of the Engineer-in-Chief, or of such officer as he may appoint for the purpose. The lessee will be compelled to work the railway, and to carry freight and passengers at such rates as the Minister for Railways may approve, but not less than the rates in force upon the railways of the Western Australian Government. A similar provision, I believe, appears in the contract between the Western Australian Government and the Midland Railway Company, this proposed agreement being much on the same lines. The railway from Waroona to the lake should in itself prove of great benefit to this State. There is, I understand, a considerable area of good swamp land around the lake, and also other land suitable for settlement along the route of the railway. All this country would be opened up. Further, I am informed there is near the lake a fairly large tuart forest, which the railway would render available. The railway is to be kept in good repair. The lime to be obtained must not be less than 50 tons per day, and its price is fixed at not more than 10s. for unscreened lime and not more than 12s. for screened lime, delivered, not at the lake, but at Waroona. Further, the agreement provides that the Government may, if they so desire, purchase the railway at any time on the basis of the original cost of the railway.

Mr. W. D. Johnson: At actual cost, less depreciation.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. If the price cannot be agreed upon, the matter must go to arbitration. At the same time, as the work of construction is to be carried out under the supervision of the Engineer-in-Chief, it will be necessary for that officer to ascertain the cost accurately while the construction of the railway is in progress. Thus there will be data as to cost available in the future. I have now stated the main

provisions of the Bill, but I should like to say a few words regarding the lime deposit, which appears to me unique in the history of this country. As I see the deposit—and the late Minister for Lands has also seen it—it strikes me as marvellous that so huge a quantity of lime should exist in such a form. The lime consists of minute particles, which can be seen almost with the naked eye, though, of course, more plainly visible with the microscope. It is almost as fine as flour. Shells have partly formed the deposit, and the lime from the surrounding country, which is all of limestone character, has come in solution into this lake and entered into the shell deposit, thus forming this marvellous supply. Careful inquiry has been made in the matter. It might be said, of course, that if any individual cares to run the risk of investing his money in Western Australia, we should let him do so. I do not think it is a wise thing to let anyone do so without previous inquiry, because, if people are encouraged to invest in an undertaking of this kind here and if they fail in the enterprise, it only goes against the interests of the country. Geological experts have investigated this lime deposit, which has also been inquired into by the experts of the Agricultural Department; and one and all are unanimous in affirming the great value of the deposit and the great benefit its development will confer on the agricultural community of the South-West and also of the eastern districts. The prices of the lime, 10s. for unscreened and 12s. for screened delivered at Waroona, are low. Rail freight on lime, as we know, is also low; the expense of hauling a ton of lime 100 miles is comparatively slight. My own opinion is that the unscreened lime will do all that is necessary. From what I have seen of it, the unscreened lime will run through a drill even more readily than the superphosphate farmers are in the habit of using. Mr. Saint Smith, who is a geologist of this State's Geological Department, has reported on the Lake Clifton lime deposit as follows:—

The lime occurs in the form of a very white, loose material, forming the bed and shores of the lake. Trials of the depth of the deposit were made by me with a pole across the centre of the lake at frequent intervals, from which it is certain that a

minimum average depth of 13 feet 6 inches of the material is present. The lime is for the most part quite impalpable, and has been produced by an accumulation of tiny gasteropod shells, exfoliated shells, shell fragments, and chemically precipitated lime, the last mentioned substance forming apparently the bulk of the deposit. Associated with this material are numerous diatoms.

Doubtless hon. members who are experts on this subject will later inform the House what diatoms are. Mr. Simpson, the State Mineralogist and Analyst, has reported on this lime deposit as follows:—

The variety of the lime in the sample is not calcite, which is that found in almost all limestones, but "aragonite." This is of importance in connection with the utilisation of this material as a fertiliser, since aragonite is known to be more susceptible to the attack of rain water and ground water than calcite. The minute size of the particles of aragonite will ensure a maximum activity in the soil.

These reports go to show that the Lake Clifton lime deposit is of wonderful quality, equal to anything of the kind that we have had. The Bill is before hon. members; I commit it to their careful consideration; and I am sure that all who are interested in the development of this State will assist in passing the measure through the House.

Mr. Angwin: The lessee intends to put up cement works as well.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. I had intended to mention that the lessee also purposes utilising the lime in conjunction with marl, which is found in the vicinity of the lake, to make cement. Indeed, I think the cement is what the lessee expects to make his money out of, because there is a great demand for cement throughout Australia. Moreover, when normal times return, as I hope they will before long, that cement may be exported to all parts of the world.

Mr. Angwin: Cement is 25s. a cask now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Anything which will assist in that direction will be an advantage to the State. I believe that the gentleman primarily interested in this undertaking is one likely to carry it through, a gentleman of good repute, a gentleman who, having resided on the gold-

fields for many years is, I understand, well known to many members of this House. I believe he is in a position, as a business man, to carry the project through. I trust the House will look favourably upon this Bill, in which, I know, the late Minister for Lands, the present leader of the Opposition, is keenly interested. I am sure the hon. member will assist in passing the measure through the House. That having been done, and the measure having received the endorsement of another place, I hope the lessee will as soon as possible enter upon this important work. When his railway has been built and the lime begins to arrive in Waroona, one of the greatest services ever rendered to our South-West will have resulted from the passing of this measure. I again commend the Bill to the House, and trust that with the assistance of hon. members it will soon become law. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. W. D. Johnson debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 4th October, 1916.

	Page
Questions: Midland Railway time table	476
German or alien subjects	476
Wheat Harvests and Marketing scheme	476
Markets and Refrigerating Works, Perth	476
Justices Appointments, confidential letters	478
Printed paper, Electoral Districts Bill	478
Bills: Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 3a.	478
Postponement of Debts Act Amendment, 1a.	478
Special Lease (Stirling Estate), 1a.	477
Permanent Reserves (No. 2), 1a.	477
Wheat Marketing, 1a.	477
Sale of Liquor Regulation, 2a.	509
Motions: Railway Irregularities, case of H. McLeod, to inquire	477
Flat rate for chaff	486
National Cabinet during War Time	490
Freezing Works, Wyndham, Nevanas Contract, to inquire by Royal Commission	494
Returns: Yandanooka Estate Operations	491
Fruit Industry, particulars	507

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