Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 6th September, 1928.

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

QUESTIONS (2)—TRANSPORT.

"Rutwayed" System.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Works: 1, As the "Rutwayed" light railway and roller body wagon system has proved a success in Trinchinopoly, India, will he cause inquiry to be made as to the suitability of this system to Western Australian transport conditions? 2, As Mr. Tymms, representing the system, will visit Western Australia in the near future, will he meet that gentleman and discuss its suitability to local conditions?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Following upon representations made by Messrs. Hunters on behalf of the inventor, Mr. H. W. Perry, full inquiry has been made. The reports available show that this method of transport is not suitable to Western Australian conditions. 2, In view of the information in the possession of the Department, no good purpose could be served by further discussing the matter with any representative.

Six-wheeled Vehicles.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has he information regarding the suitability of six-wheeled lorries or buses to Western Australian transport conditions? 2, If so, will he make it available to the House?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. The Commonwealth Government have appointed a committee to study mechanical transport. When the report of that committee is made available, a copy is to be supplied to each State Government. 2, Answered by 1.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY—PRESENTATION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that I waited upon His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-Reply, to which His Excellency has been pleased to deliver the following message to the Assembly:—

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament. (Sgd.) W. R. Campion, Governor.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1, Forests Act Amendment.

2, Profiteering Prevention.

3, Land Agents.

Introduced by the Premier.

BILL—KULJA EASTWARD RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: Authority for the construction of the line referred to in the Bill is being sought on the recommendation of the Railway Advisory Board. In their report, members of that board have pointed out to the Government that settlement has extended in the Mollerin district to about 36 miles north of the Wyalkatchem-Lake Brown railway, while in the newer districts, of Warkutting and Karloning, settlers have selected land 25 and 27 miles north of the line. In the opinion of the board, these distances represent a great handicap to farming operations there and they consider that if the settlers are to be successful, additional railway facilities must be provided. They point out that throughout their travels they were much impressed with the type of settler in the districts traversed and with the large quantity or work that had been carried out on the various holdings. The areas under crop ranged from 300 acres to about 1,700 acres, while a considerable area has been fallowed there. The Advisory Board report that the crops were uniformly good, particularly in the Mollerin and North

Bencubbin areas, where crops estimated at seven bags to the acre were not uncommon. They consider that what they saw furnished striking evidence of the fertility of the soil and the excellence of the season. The board recommend the construction of a line from the point "A" on the litho.—I have placed the plans on the Table of the House—to about five miles west of No. 1 rabbit-proof fence, and about 25 miles from the Lake Brown railway. They say that that line will serve about 896,000 acres, the whole of which has been closely classified by the Survey Department, and plans in that regard have been placed at the disposal of the board. Of this area about 241,630 acres have been alienated, or are in course of alienation, leaving about 654,370 acres available for new settlement. Of the area available for new settlement, according to the board's report, about 250,000 acres may be looked upon as good wheat growing land, ranging from rich salmon gum and gimlet country to large mallee, while the remaining 404,370 acres are classed as plain country, a good deal of which, probably one-third, can, as has been demonstrated on country already selected, be made to produce profitable crops of wheat. The board go further and say that the area examined is probably one of the best naturally watered districts in the wheat belt. They point out that there are numerous soaks and rock holes, whilst right throughout, there are many large granite outcrops that could be utilised for providing water supplies for the settlers. The members of the Advisory Board say that all the available evidence goes to show a sufficiency of rainfall. Allowing about 1,860 acres per holding, the unalienated land would provide for about 350 new settlers. When these become established, the board consider it would not be unreasonable to assume that an average of 500 acres per settler would be cropped each year, while, allowing that only one-quarter of the present alienated land would be under crop every year, the total area of about 250,000 acres would be cropped, which, with an average of 12 bushels to the acre, would result in a return of about 2,820,000 bushels of wheat per annum. The board say that, taking the existing settlement into consideration, with the possibility of placing an additional 350 settlers on the land, they are of the opinion that the area is well worth providing with railway facilities, and they recommend the extension of the Mollerin spur line eastward for a distance of about 62 miles, as shown in a red line on the litho. In investigating the proposal, the board came to the conclusion that the authorised terminus of the Mollerin spur line, lettered "A" on the litho, could be brought south with advantage to enable the eastward extension to pass immediately north of Mollerin Lake, and as the Act allows this deviation, they recommend that this course be adopted. They point out that no engineering difficulties will be encountered in the construction of the line. The line will be constructed on the ruling grade of one in 80, with minimum rates of curves of 20 chains. It is proposed to continue the existing type of construction undertaken in connection with the Ejanding Northwards railway, and 60lb. rails are to be used. Much of the country that will be served by the line proposed has been inspected by the members of the Migration and Development Commission, and we understand that they were very favourably impressed. The opening up of this area is part of the 3,500 farms scheme.

Mr. Thomson: That means you will get the money at one per cent.

The Premier: If it be approved.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This is amongst the items to be included. If it be approved the money will be forthcoming at a cheap rate.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Migration and Development Commission have to recommend it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. They have not done so yet. But they have inspected it, and we understand they are favourably disposed towards it. Our idea is to proceed with the building of this line immediately the authorised line now under construction is finished, so that the staff can go on with this work without coming away and having to return to the district. That is the reason why the Bill is introduced at this stage. On the evidence of the Railway Advisory Board we have concluded to build the line.

Mr. Stubbs: Have the Government satisfied themselves that the rainfall is all right?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, the Advisory Board are convinced that the rainfall is quite satisfactory. "All the available evidence goes to show a sufficiency of rainfall." Those are their own words. The Advisory Board are most enthusiastic about the district, and have declared that in their judgment it is one of the best watered in the wheat belt. It is on that report that the Government have

based their decision to build the line. And, as I have said, the reason for asking authority at this juncture is so that as soon as the present work is concluded the staff can go straight on with the work of this line, instead of coming away from the district and having to return. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—PEARLING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR GOLDFIELDS AND AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. J. Cunningham—Kalgoorlie) [4.47] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this Bill is to overcome a weakness which apparently occurs in the provision set forth in the Pearling Act, 1912-24 for the issue of ships' licenses to qualified persons. In Subsection 9 of Section 33 of the principal Act, the words "unqualified person" appear, and the expression means any person not qualified to hold a ship (pearling) license under the Act. A heavy penalty is provided should any unqualified person acquire or hold an interest in a ship. To understand the defect in the principal Act which this Bill seeks to remove, it is necessary to point out that by Section 16 of the Act the grant, transfer and renewal of licenses is discretionary, and subject to Ministerial control. It is also provided in Subsection 2 that every licensing officer shall obey and observe such directions as the Minister may give him regarding the granting, renewal, removal or transfer of license or of any particular license.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We don't want an Act at all. Let the Minister do the lot.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: We do want an Act. It is necessary that we have an Act to empower the Minister to put into operation the provisions under which licenses may be issued.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No fear! The Act does that.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: Without the Minister, the Act would be inoperative. So where it is necessary to have an Act, it is necessary also to have a Minister to put that Act into operation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We do not want too much of "the Minister" in the administering of Acts of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: Under the section I have referred to, directions have been issued to licensing officers which render it necessary, (a) that all applications for ship licenses from persons of Asiatic race, even though they may have held a license or licenses under the Pearl Shell Fishery Act, 1886, be referred for Ministerial approval; and (b) that no ship license be granted by the licensing officer to a person of Asiatic race who did not hold a license under the Pearl Shell Fishery Act, 1886. The proposed amendments in the Bill are put forward because of an adverse decision in a recent case at Broome against an Asiatic named Bramsa Maidin, a British subject who in 1927 was granted one ship license.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are reading this speech.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: If I am, which I do not admit, it is necessary just now because I want to bring under the notice of the House this case that recently occurred at Broome, which in itself renders an amendment of the Act necessary in order to put into effect the decisions of Parliament, or what were believed to be the decisions of Parliament, when the Act of 1912 was amended in 1924. I thought it would be beneficial to members if I referred to certain sections of the Pearling Act, because it would enable them to look up those sections for the purpose of making intelligent contributions to the discussion. Recently action was taken and a prosecution launched against this Asiatic, Bramsa Maidin, a British subject who held a ship license in 1927. This individual was not only desirous of carrying on his trade under one ship license, but he also desired, in contravention of the provisions of the Pearling Act, to carry on business in conjunction with another party who also held a ship license. The result was that a partnership was entered into, which was contrary to the provisions of the Pearling Act. Proceedings were taken against Bramsa Maidin, and the local magistrate gave his decision in favour of the defendant, although it was pointed out that this was a clear case of dummying and contrary to the provisions of the Pearling Act. The reason

given by the magistrate for his decision was that the defendant was the holder of a ship license, and was therefore a qualified person. That, in the opinion of the magistrate, was sufficient to enable the defendant to enter into a partnership with another party and so extend his business. But Parliament in 1924 had decided against such partnerships. When the Pearl Shell Fisheries Act of 1886 was amended in 1912, it was provided that all those persons who held ship licenses at that time, irrespective of their race, would be entitled to hold ship licenses under the provisions of the Pearling Act, but in no case were they to have more than one ship license each. As the result of the recent decision at Broome, it has been found necessary to bring down this amending Bill with a view to remedying the obvious weakness in the Act. Under the provisions of the Pearling Act, Asiatics and South Africans are precluded from holding ship licenses, save only those Asiatics and South Africans who held such licenses prior to the amending Act of 1912. The amendment in the Bill is for the purpose of blocking the illegal action of certain persons in dummying for other people. For instance, in the light of the decision given by the magistrate at Broome, it would be possible for an Asiatic holding one ship license to get into touch with some other person qualified to hold a ship license, and to enter into a partnership to finance that second person in his business, and so have the second party to dummy in his interests. That, certainly, was not the intention of Parliament when the Act was amended in 1924. Hence the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF COLLIE VALIDATION.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) (4.55) in moving the second reading said: This is one of those Bills that frequently come before the House, asking to have some action of doubtful legality by a local authority, duly legalised. It appears that for many years past, practically ever since the establishment of the municipality of Collie, that municipality have been trading under an incorrect name or names. They have carried on some of their business under the name or title of Mayor and Councillors of Collie; they have conducted other transactions under the title of Collie Municipal Council, while still further business has been done by them under the title of Municipality of Collie. Legally, the correct title of this body is the Municipal Council of Collie. Only seldom have they used their correct name. The Bill proposes to legalise the actions they have taken under a wrong name or title.

Hon. G. Taylor: Under an assumed name.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think there can be any doubt that the people doing business with the council knew with whom they were doing business, and did not mistake them for any other body or organisation. Also, I think the people of Collie knew quite well that it was their own mayor and councillors who were transacting their local business for them. Still, for some reason which is not clear, the municipality have used all those several titles I have enumerated. The Bill is merely to validate what has been done under those several titles. The House can rest assured that nothing wrong has been done, nothing that would need a validating Bill to cover up what would not stand the light of public examination. It was simply an error or series of errors, and the mayor and councillors did not know that the law made it compulsory for them to use the title of Municipal Council of Collie.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Colonel's lady and Bridget O'Grady are sisters under the skin.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This having been brought so forcibly to their notice, no doubt in future they will be careful to see that only their correct title is used. The Bill is solely to correct a mistake that has been occurring for years past, ever since the municipality was established. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.0]: It is quite a common occurrence for validating Bills to be brought before Parliament, but they are not always on all fours with this measure. Generally they are due to some municipal council or road board having done work or collected rates outside its own boundaries, believing at the time that the correct thing was being done. Consequently Bills have been introduced to vali-

date such acts. The Municipal Council of Collie seems to have acted in good faith with its ratepayers but has made a mistake, and this Bill is designed to rectify the error. I suppose the Minister is satisfied that no litigation is pending which this Bill will forestall.

The Minister for Works: There is none.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Then the Bill will not be opposed from this side of the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. Millington—Leederville) [5.4] in moving the second reading said: At present the conditions governing the sale of feeding stuffs are included in the Fertiliser and Feeding Stuffs Act. It is proposed to separate the legislation on the two different subjects, and we have already introduced a Bill to control fertilisers. Both the measures required to be modernised, and it was thought desirable that feeding stuffs should be included in a separate measure. An important stock food in this State is bran and pollard. Under the existing Act it is found desirable to deal with that food, and it is now recognised that there should be power to deal not only with bran and pollard but also with other stock foods as required. In support of the contention that changes are required I may mention that two years ago the necessity arose for bringing bran and pollard under the operation of the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act. The department, after considerable inquiry, proclaimed standards for bran and pollard, with fairly satisfactory results. In order to meet future requirements it is desired to obtain under this Bill power to deal with other commodities. It is also proposed that stock licks shall be brought under the operation of the measure. Though not recognised as foods, stock licks come within the class of commodities which should be controlled by legislation. The proposal is also in accordance with a resolution of the conference of Ministers of Agriculture held in Perth recently. The resolution read—

> That each State provide for the compulsory registration of proprietary stock licks, stipulating, as in the Fertilisers and Plant Foods Act, that a guarantee be given of the constituents comprising same.

Hon. G. Taylor: Have you decided upon any formula?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I shall explain that later. The inclusion of stock licks is important from the pastoral point of view. The idea of the Agricultural Conference was that stock licks should be regulated in order to protect users. It was considered that by having them properly designated, pastoralists could be advised as to the licks suitable for use in various districts.

Mr. Thomson: It is quite possible that something deleterious might creep into a stock lick.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I had an instance brought under my notice recently. In a certain district—the name of which I shall not mention—stock was found to be suffering from decayed bone. If a cow stumbled over a log or met with the slightest accident the animal's legs would be broken, revealing that the bones had decayed. That was due entirely to mineral deficiency in the natural pasture of the district.

Hon. G. Taylor: It was not limestone country, anyhow.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In every district there are mineral deficiencies in the pasture which are corrected by providing the necessary ingredients in stock licks, varying with different districts. The provision has become necessary because of comparatively recent advancement in the science of feeding stock. As a result of investigations it has been found that stock may seriously suffer as a result of mineral deficiencies, and that those deficiencies may be supplied by feeding certain materials to the stock.

Mr. Mann: Do the people in the district concerned know of that? Would it not be well to mention the name of the district?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The people of the district are well aware of the deficiency, and they do their best to correct it.

Hon. G. Taylor: I take it they have had the advice of the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, and have also had the benefit of their own experience. I admit the instance I have quoted is an extreme one, but wherever stock is held on natural pasture, even where the pasture appears to be good, there is a deficiency that must be made up by artificial means. Let me quote another instance illustrating the need for correcting such deficiencies. During the past year it was found in certain districts of the State that stock had developed an enormous appetite, and were dying as a result of eating rabbit carcases and chewing bones. It was thought at first that death was due to the poison from the rabbit carcases. Investigation by the veterinary staff, however, proved that death was due to an organism which was toxic in its character, and that the craving for the carcases and bones was due to a mineral deficiency of phosphate in the pasture upon which the stock was fed. By supplying the mineral deficiency by means of stock licks or hand feeding, the craving was overcome, the depraved appetite disappeared, and the stock no longer perished. That is a definite instance.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That knowledge is as old as the hills.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know that it is as old as the hills; it occurred last year.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The knowledge is.

Hon. G. Taylor: We knew the effect of that when I was a boy in New South Wales —cattle eating dogs for the reason you have indicated.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: As we had not the knowledge of either of the members who are interjecting, there was a disposition to believe the deaths to be due to the poison contained in the rabbit carcases.

Hon. G. Taylor: We saw them chewing at carcases before any rabbits at all were seen in New South Wales.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The work of the scientists who conducted the investigations connected with mineral deficiencies has been proceeded with, and means of compounding licks have been made available. Consequently a commercial demand for such licks has been created. In some instances the licks have been put on the market without due regard to the needs of the animals, and sold at rates altogether out of proportion to their value. The Bill will ensure that suitable licks are marketed, and also will afford means to estimate the value of the licks placed upon the market. It is considered that the time has arrived when stock raisers should be protected against such tactics. Furthermore, it is believed that if stock owners are to use the licks intelligently, as they should do, it is essential that they should know the principal ingredients. Hence the resolution of the Agricultural Conference already quoted by me. Provision is made in the Bill for stock licks to be dealt with in a manner similar to that in which fertiliser is dealt with at present, namely, that vendors of stock licks shall state of what the licks are composed. At present there is no necessity to do so. The same principle applies to other stock foods.

Mr. Mann: Then vendors will have to give away their formulae.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: To an extent, that will be necessary, but the principal manufacturers of stock licks do not object to it. Immediately after the Agricultural Conference carried its motion, I received letters from two of the recognised firms stating that they approved of the proposal. As a matter of fact it is the practice of firms in Melbourne to register stock licks A. and B. and give the formulae. Take the case I referred to. Several pastoralists came to the Agricultural Department for advice, and mentioned the districts they came from and the difficulties they were having with their stock. They expected the department to advise them as to what lick was suitable for that district and their particular kind of stock. If the various stock licks were registered and the formulae disclosed, the departmental experts would have an opportunity of advising people as to the best stock licks to use. This would be of advantage to stock-raisers. The manufacturers of licks, which are simple compositions, have no objection to this. They have actually approved of the proposal contained in the Bill. The measure also provides for three methods by which the purchaser may be acquainted with the composition of licks. The standards may be prescribed with which certain foods must comply. Under the Act the standards for bran and pollard have been proclaimed, and based on the result of actual investigation. The proposed standards for bran and pollard are slightly different, and are somewhat more liberal than those which have been in existence during the past 12

months. This is the result of experience gained since the standards were first proclaimed. It has been somewhat difficult to determine satisfactorily what the standards should reasonably be for bran and pollard. These are by-products of wheat, and are not the main products of the milling industry.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If they are the products of wheat, that is all you need.

Hon. G. Taylor: But it should be specified.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Complaints have been made that bran and pollard containing impurities have been sold in certain districts. Deputations upon that point have waited on me on several occasions. One large user of bran and pollard said he had been for some time buying cocky chaff, or waste, from one of the mills, at a cheap rate, but that his supply had subsequently been cut off. He was assured that the cocky chaff was being ground up and mixed with the bran and pollard.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why did he not go to the Northam mill? It would have been all right there.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No one suggests that those who adopt such practices should be protected.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The buyer should be protected.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The standard with which bran and pollard should comply is attached to the schedule to the Bill. It is more liberal than the one previously prescribed. No objection would be raised by any firm or person carrying on the milling industry in a legitimate manner to a minimum standard being fixed for bran and pollard. The schedule provides the means whereby this can be done.

Mr. Thomson: How does the schedule compare with the schedules in the Eastern States?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The responsibility for prescribing a standard was placed on the advisers of the Agricultural Department. They say it is a most difficult question, and a big responsibility to thrust upon them. They did, however, prescribe standards, and these to a certain extent have had the desired effect.

Mr. Thomson: Bran is imported from the Eastern States. That would have to be sold to the same standard.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The selling is controlled. No one is allowed to sell bran and pollard under the standard. Any agent who sold the commodity below the standard would be held responsible for so doing.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If you said these things must be the product of the grain, that would be enough.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The standard set up is a reasonable one, and is not impossible of achievement. The hon. member will see the percentages laid down. The Bill will insure the sale of a reasonably pure product. The standard is not likely to create a disability against any manufacturer. Provided the product is bran and pollard there will be no difficulty. The Bill will prevent the mixing of impurities with these products. If the standard were made too severe, and we attempted to prescribe too high a standard of purity, it would mean that the price would go up. Reason must be shown in fixing the standard. I assure members that the standards are more liberal than those previously fixed. They must be convinced that the only object of the Bill is to ensure a reasonably pure product. In regard to stock licks the vendor may indicate to the purchaser the composition of the food by giving him an invoiced certificate setting out in detail the parts of which such food is composed. This is the main provision of the Imperial Foodstuffs Act.

Mr. Teesdale: There are no stock-lick manufacturers in this State.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Stock licks are sold here.

Mr. Teesdale: They are coming from South Australia. Some will be made here directly.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think so.

Mr. Teesdale: I guarantee that.

Mr. Thomson: You are getting a cheap advertisement.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If stock lick manufacturers begin producing here, they will doubtless be anxious to conform to the requirements of this Bill. We shall also be able to ensure that stock licks that are sold are what they purport to be, but this will protect the genuine manufacturer.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We generally set out to regard all people with enterprise as thieves.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the case of standardised foods, the seller has the opportunity of registering the com-

position with the Department of Agriculture. It was anticipated that this provision would be largely availed of in connection with stock licks. It is the practice in the Eastern States. In Melbourne the compositions of two distinct stock licks are registered with the Agricultural Department. Provision for putting this into operation is contained in the Bill. One portion of the measure deals with the fixing of standards according to the schedule set out for bran and pollard, and the other provides the method whereby the products shall be tested. It is necessary that there should be these distinct provisions. At the end of the provision for testing the standard of pollard, it will be noticed that a certain sieve has to be used. I understand that is a silk sieve. A different result would be obtained by using a metal sieve. It is necessary to have a specified method of applying a test. That is all set out in the schedule.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Are you going to have inspectors all over the State taking samples?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. As was the case in the Fertilisers Bill, we place the responsibility on the vendors to sell the quality they purport to be selling. If they do not, they risk prosecution.

Mr. Thomson: The products may be sent out in good order and condition, but may be adulterated by a dealer.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am aware of that difficulty. If a retailer sells bran and pollard below the standard, he will be proceeded against, unless he can prove that he received an inferior article in the first place, in which case the responsibility would rest with the original vendor. Anyone who is selling these products will have to secure himself. Now that feeding stuffs have been made the subject of a separate Bill, the only matters we now consider require attention are those I have referred to, namely, bran and pollard and stock licks. Provision is made for other stock foods that may be put on the market. It was considered necessary that they should be subject to the regulations and the standards prescribed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Will that mean an army of 40,000 inspectors?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. The Bill is a necessary one. This and the Fertilisers Bill will take the place of the original Fertilisers and Foodstuffs Act. It will straighten things out and keep the two matters entirely separate. It will also be of value to our stock-raisers and business people who deal in these commodities. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—FERTILISERS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 4th September; Mr. Panton in the Chair, the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 19—Sale of Fertiliser not in conformity with standard (partly considered):

Mr. THOMSON: Progress was reported in order that the Minister might have an opportunity to clarify the position. Section 12 of the Act defines the offence, and Section 30 gives power for the making of regulations prescribing a unit value of minimum quality without which a fertiliser is not registered. Section 37 makes it an offence to sell a fertiliser that is under the prescribed standard. The Minister said it was not the department's intention to fix a unit value of minimum quality subject to which a fertiliser would be registered. The parent Act, however, provides for that.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Clause 19 of the Bill takes the place of Section 12 of the Act. It is true that certain standards are required. Under the Act it is an offence to sell as bone dust or bone fertiliser something that does not consist wholly of bone. Under this Bill, if an attempt were made to register as bone dust, for instance, something which was not in fact bone dust, registration would be refused. In effect, the definition clause provides for that. Again, the value of basic slag lies in its being finely ground, as otherwise the fertiliser contained in it is not released. The department would not permit basic slag to be registered unless ground to a fine consistency. Even if a formula of basic slag was registered, and the basic slag supplied was not of that fineness, its sale would not be permitted. As regards superphosphate, the term "standard" is hardly right. The proper word is "minimum." If the department

prescribed that superphosphate sold in this State must contain 22 per cent. of phosphoric acid, that would be wrong. In the past a minimum has been prescribed.

Mr. Thomson: That is all we want.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I believe the old regulations insisted on 18.3 per cent. of phosphoric acid. The standards have not been fixed as the result of action taken by the department, but presumably as the result of experience. Superphosphate is used so largely because the manufacturers endeavour to conform to the requirements of those who use it. Probably there are variations in the superphosphates made here. It has become a recognised practice in Western Australia not to manufacture superphosphate other than that of the recognised standards.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The farmer is not an ass; he will insist on getting what he wants.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Is it necessary to prescribe any standard except a minimum? If it is found necessary, it can be done. The power is here.

Mr. Thomson: You said that was not the intention under the Bill. So long as you say there is power for the department to refuse to register any brand of fertiliser not considered satisfactory, that is all I want.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The department have that power. It has rarely been necessary to use it.

Mr. Thomson: I am not suggesting anything different. Safeguards are wanted as regards imported fertilisers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In the case of bone dust a standard is necessary. The article must be bone dust. It would be fraudulent misrepresentation to sell bone dust containing any admixture. Such a bone dust would not be registered. In the main, however, it is not necessary to prescribe standards.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: So long as we see that the people get what the manufacturers purport to sell, we shall have done all that is necessary. The farmer will look after himself. He does not want all this pettifogging interference and added cost which result from legislation such as we have been indulging in lately. Every farmer in the country knows what he wants in the way of superphosphate. Hundreds of tons of superphosphate are sold to every ton of most other kinds of fertiliser. If the farmer buys potato manure, the invoice must set out what he is getting. The department would be acting ridiculously in setting up standards. People should be free. and should be told to protect themselves as far as possible. I agree they cannot do so now in the case of phosphates, but as regards many other fertilisers they can. We want to give them sufficient protection, and no more. If we lead them to believe that we are going to make the dealer honest by Act of Parliament, we shall be deceiving them.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: With reference to the question raised by the member for Katanning, the clause is rather misleading. The Minister says he is not setting up any standards.

The Minister for Agriculture: In certain cases, yes. I referred to certain fertilisers specified in Section 12 of the original Act.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: That bone dust shall be made of bone?

The Minister for Agriculture: Also fertilisers the value of which depends on fineness of grain.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The prescribing of standards takes place only under Section 12 of the parent Act. If there is an offence against Clause 19 of the Bill, the offender will be liable to prosecution, but not under any other conditions, because the clause contains the words "if the fertiliser so sold is not in conformity with the standard and differs therefrom otherwise than in the manner and to the extent allowed by the regulations." I presume the clause will deal with any fertiliser that is manufactured. The manufacturers will stamp on the case or the bag what it is and will have to sell it as whatever is indicated.

The Minister for Agriculture: There are certain fertilisers that cannot be registered unless they conform to the standard.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 20, 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Powers of inspector:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—"This section does not apply to premises where fertilisers are in progress of manufacture, and are not kept for sale or sold."

The intention is that the clause shall not apply to a factory; a factory is to be ex-

empt, and the object of the amendment is to make the position definite.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not see the necessity for the amendment. Until the product is branded, the legislation will not touch it. It must first be branded and be prepared for sale before it can be regarded as the completed article. A certificate must also be given before it can be put on the market. In the process of manufacture, the product would not be offered for sale. The amendment will also have the effect of making it impossible to secure a conviction. A man might say, "I am not putting it on the market yet," and it would be necessary to wait until it was in a store and ready for sale before it could be said it was on the market. The object of the Bill is to deal with fertilisers after they are offered for sale. In the process of manufacture, it cannot be said that an article is ready for sale. It is not so ready until it is branded. There should not be any desire to handicap a manufacturer. Moreover, we want to guard against those wide awake gentlemen who, by the sharpness of their intellect, impose upon some people. The amendment is wholly unnecessary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know that the amendment is vital. In a factory where the fertiliser was in process of manufacture, there would be an enormous quantity, and it would be a fair thing to sample it there.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That would be ridiculous.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause is far-reaching and the manufacturer should be secured during the process of manufacture. The amendment merely prevents an inspector from entering premises where fertilisers are in process of manufacture.

Hon. G. Taylor: You would not have a man as an inspector who would be foolish enough to interfere with an article while it was being manufactured.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The amendment is superfluous.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: As I said before, it is not vital and it will not matter if it is not added.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Procedure on taking sample:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I notice that the sample is to be thoroughly mixed and analysed. Every bag of superphosphate should be properly and evenly mixed.

The Minister for Agriculture: To get a really good sample, you would have to take a sample from each bag. Thus you would get an average sample.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is said that there is 22 per cent. phosphoric acid in the fertiliser, so that if you take any part of a ton, every pound should contain its proportion of phosphoric acid. Is it proposed to take samples out of 20 bags? There might be five dud bags and 15 good, and the latter would bring the lot up to the required standard. That is what we want to avoid.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: When fertiliser is mixed, it is supposed to have the same constituents throughout, and if a big parcel is sampled, a fair average of the constituent parts should be obtained. I do not see how we could expect to get that result if a sample were taken from one bag only.

The Minister for Agriculture: You know something about sampling!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I know too much about it to think that is possible. No sensible manufacturer would contemplate taking the risk of sending out a couple of dud bags in a 100-bag lot. He would be scared of what might happen.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 25 to 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Unfit for sampling:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that the sample shall not be drawn from less than five packages, unless the total quantity from which the sample is taken is contained in less than five packages, in which case the sample shall be drawn from each package."

The principle underlying sampling is that we shall spread the sample over as big a bulk as possible. The more one takes, the more he is likely to arrive at the proper value of the article. A sample taken here and another there, would not be sufficient to provide a guarantee.

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

Clauses 29, 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Tampering with samples:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The clause is important. I do not know how the Minister can suggest he will be able to catch anyone,

unless it be through check samples. Although it will be difficult, I recognise the necessity for a stringent clause. Has the Minister gone into this question with his expert officers?

The Minister for Agriculture: I can assure the hon. member the clause will help.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 32 to 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Exemption of employer from penalty on conviction of actual offender:

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The member for West Perth raised a question of the advisability of the person who sold the fertiliser being brought in. At the time I said it was reasonable that we should proceed against the person who committed the offence. The last three lines of the clause support my statement. Those lines are, "The said analyst, inspector or officer shall proceed against the person whom he believes to be the actual offender, without first proceeding against the said dealer." There may be extreme difficulty experienced in some instances, but the portion of the clause I have quoted indicates that the person who innocently sells fertiliser that is below the required standard, will not be prosecuted and that action will be taken against the person actually responsible for the offence. The clause seeks to place the responsibility upon the real offender.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 37—Regulations:

Mr. DAVY: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (g) be struck out.

The provision I desire to excise from the clause provides the Governor with power to make regulations to prescribe standards for fertilisers. The Minister has emphasised over and over again that it is not the intention to indicate to manufacturers or dealers what shall be the constituent parts of fertilisers. The object of the measure is to place farmers in the position of knowing exactly what they are buyng, and to punish people who sell fertilisers that are not in accordance with the declared contents of the fertiliser purported to be sold. I submit that that is sufficient. The average farmer is an intelligent man, and if the Agricultural Department tell him what type of fertiliser he should use, and also make provision enabling him to tell what are the constituents comprising that particular fertiliser, that should be enough. If farmers require more protection than that, they ought to expect the State to sow their crops for them, put in their fertiliser, and take their crops off too! Should the amendment be agreed to, Clause 19 will have to be altered. In fact, that clause could be deleted because if no power is given to prescribe standards for fertilisers, it cannot be an offence to sell fertilisers of a description not in conformity with the standards specified.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is necessary to retain the power to prescribe standards. It is true that the main object of the Bill is to place upon the manufacturer or the vendor responsibility of delivering goods in accordance with the standards registered. The advice I have received is that there will be little need to set up standards. In fact, that term is not used in connection with the majority of fertilisers, but it is respecting some. For instance, bone dust registered under the old Act had to be in conformity with the standard prescribed. Bone dust that contained anything else was not allowed to be sold as "bone dust." The standard will have to be prescribed for that fertiliser.

Mr. Davy: Why?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Because bone dust is dealt with in the interpretation clause and it will be necessary to have a regulation dealing with that article. It will also be necessary in connection with basic slag, the beneficial effects of which depend upon the article being finely ground.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. It has been found that when a new fertiliser is put on the market and its value to the farmer is not always commensurate with the price, it is necessary to fix a standard. To-day the farmers realise the value of superphosphate, and so perhaps it is not necessary to fix a standard for that manure; but when, 20 years or more ago, superphosphate was first brought on the market farmers were not familiar with it, and so it was necessary to prescribe a standard. This is so whenever new manures, with which the farmers are unfamiliar, are put on to the market. It would be a great mistake to remove from the department this power to fix a standard, for it may be re-

quired at any time in order to protect the farmer.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Already we have discussed at considerable length the question of fixing a standard by the department. I think it is rather a dangerous provision. What we have to do is to see that the seller supplies fertiliser in accordance with the invoice and with the registration at the department. The Minister has already told us that we shall be able to examine the register if we wish to do so. But the real safeguard for the farmer is in the invoice, which must set out the contents of the fertiliser.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is, when the fertiliser is known.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But under the Bill no fertiliser can be sold unless its contents are stated on the invoice. The Minister's inspectors are there to see that the fertiliser is of the standard set up. Every fertiliser must be registered before it can be sold.

The Minister for Agriculture: But if the formula were misleading in regard to the actual contents?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It cannot be misleading, because the contents have to be stated. Once the fertiliser is registered, it must be sold according to the registration.

The Minister for Agriculture: This power is contained in the existing Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But we are altering that Act considerably, and I do not see that the power is necessary in the Bill, for probably it was never used under the old Act.

The Minister for Agriculture: Oh yes, it was.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is a dangerous power to concede. If the seller has to state clearly in his invoice what it is he is selling, that is far more than we do in respect of foodstuffs.

Mr. Thomson: We have the Pure Foods Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but we do not analyse any ordinary foods, unless they happen to be sold in tins. Ministers have a great desire to protect people by Act of Parliament; and because there are a few unscrupulous persons in trade, we are asked to legislate on the assumption that all are unscrupulous. Already we are providing sufficient safeguards in the Bill. All that is necessary is to see that the farmer gets the fertiliser he wants. I do not think any fertiliser company will be prepared to take much risk of prosecution.

Mr. THOMSON: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. While we do not desire to cast reflections on those in business, it is essential that the department should have power to fix a unit value for any manure that may be manufactured in this State or, alternatively, imported into this State. The department should have the right to say that unless the component parts of a fertiliser comply with the unit value, the company will not be permitted to sell it as a registered brand of fertiliser. The power is embodied in the parent Act, which has been in force since 1904. There have been instances where it was considered necessary to protect the users of fertilisers, and it is only just that we should continue the power under which action was taken. It is essential that we should have some form of protection.

Mr. Davy: I thought you were a free-trader.

Mr. THOMSON: Our Pure Foods Act prescribes that certain articles of food shall be of a given standard of quality. Surely in view of the fact that fertiliser plays so important a part in the operations of the farmer, every precaution should be taken to see that the fertilisers are of satisfactory standard. It would be criminal to take away from the department the power to prescribe that standard.

Mr. STUBBS: If the paragraph will have the effect of protecting producers against unscrupulous dealers, I shall support it. Fifteen or 20 years ago we could buy superphosphate for a little over £4 a ton. Another manure commonly known as basic slag was imported from the Continent and sold at £2 10s. a ton on rail Fremantle. A shipping representative at Fremantle then offered settlers in my district a large quantity of fertiliser, which he said was equal or superior to basic slag, at 12s. 6d. per ton cheaper, but it turned out to be rubbish. The results were so disappointing that we complained, and the reply received was that the wet season probably accounted for the lack of success. Unless better reasons are advanced, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. DAVY: The arguments advanced against the amendment do not appear to have any relevancy. A person who desires

to sell fertiliser has to register it, and in doing so has to set forth accurately its constituents. We have a Department of Agriculture to advise farmers of the constituents of the fertiliser they should use. If the farmers desire anything more than to be told what ought to be in the manure and what is in the manure, they are not the men I take them to be. It is pretty arrogant to claim that the department should be the sole judge of the chemical constituents of the fertilisers to be used.

Mr. Stubbs: Have not the Government experts had the experience?

Mr. DAVY: Such experts are essentially conservative and resent any new idea unless it is driven into them.

Mr. Lindsay: Quite correct.

Mr. Mann: The paragraph will really tie the hands of the farmer.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, and dictate as to the constituents of the fertilisers to be used.

Mr. Thomson: What an absurd argument!

Mr. DAVY: That is an easy statement to make.

Hon. G. Taylor: But difficult to prove.

Mr. DAVY: Taken in conjunction with the other powers in the Bill, the paragraph would enable the Minister to control absolutely the fertilisation of all crops in the State. If the farmers desire to hand over their independence to a Government department, they are not the type of men who have made a success of the wheat belt.

Mr. LINDSAY: I agree with the member for West Perth: there is no need for the paragraph. There is nothing wrong with basic slag, referred to by the member for Wagin, if used on the right class of soil. Not long ago the Director of Agriculture advocated the use of not more than 45 lbs. of superphosphate per acre, on the ground that a larger quantity would burn the crops, and the Professor of Agriculture supported that view, but the farmers decided from practical experience that a much larger quantity was required.

Mr. Stubbs: I have seen it burn crops to nothing.

Mr. LINDSAY: No man has ever seen a crop burnt with superphosphate, no matter how much was used. It is sufficient to insist that the manufacturer lodges his formula with the department and that the department polices it to ensure that it is kept up to standard. Then farmers will do the rest, and buy the manures that suit them.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I want to know how, in the absence of power to prescribe standards, the two cases I have mentioned can be dealt with. Bone dust may be put on the market as conforming to requirements and may not actually come up to the standard.

Mr. Davy: The vendor must say what is in it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Not only are there such things as constituent parts of fertiliser, but there is the manner in which it must be manufactured to make those parts available. The member for Wagin referred to Thomas's phosphate. In the case of that fertiliser, unless a prescribed percentage of it is so prepared that it will pass through a sieve of a certain sized mesh, it will not conform to the standard. Unless superphosphate is ground sufficiently fine to pass through the prescribed size mesh, its constituent parts are not available. A percentage of basic slag is frequently useless because it is ground too coarsely.

Mr. Davy: The fineness of the grinding might be made a part of the registration.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: People may buy basic slag only to find that the fertilising constituents are not available. The practice of ensuring that the fertiliser must pass through a certain kind of mesh must be continued. Superphosphate manufactured overseas was of greater value than the local article, but there was difficulty in getting it through the drills. There is no doubt that the departmental officers have advanced with the times; they are by no means hidebound.

Mr. Lindsay: They have gained their experience from the farmers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They now say that between 75 and 150 lbs. of super may be used in the fertilisation of a crop. They would not dream of asking the Minister to prescribe unnecessary regulations. They must, however, have power to meet an emergency. It was a long time before even the farmers realised the value of fertilisers, but they now know what they are buying. It is not intended to ask that a standard for superphosphate should be fixed. In the absence of power to prescribe regulations, it is almost impossible to ensure that superphosphate, even though it contains all the necessary ingredients, can be put to

full use. I am of the opinion that basic slag has been a failure.

Mr. Davy: You now want to dictate to manufacturers what kind of fertiliser they shall put on the market. You have repudiated the idea that you could dictate to anyone.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Unless we can prescribe the method by which the superphosphate must be prepared, the formula will be misleading. I am dealing now with Thomas's phosphate. Other kinds of fertiliser may come on the market that will require to be prepared in such a way that the constituent parts may be available. A certain percentage of the fertiliser, for instance, must be soluble in water. It is necessary, in order to regulate the supply of fertilisers, that the power contained in the Bill shall be given.

Mr. THOMSON: I must thank the member for West Perth for his anxiety to protect the interests of the farmer. It is time someone in that part of the House took up the cudgels on his behalf. I did not suggest for a moment that the farmers had no intelligence, and I defy the hon. member to prove that I said the departmental officers should tell farmers what kind of manure they should use. I am amazed at the arguments that have been put forward. Apparently the member for West Perth does not mind what kind of rubbish is put on the market. No one is to have any right to dictate to the fraudulent manufacturer, and the department must accept the registration of his product. He says further that the farmer will have the opportunity of deciding what fertiliser to use. Of course that is so. But the hon. member points out that the farmer, perhaps 500 or 600 miles from Perth, will be able to journey to the capital city and inspect the register.

Mr. Mann: Would he have no other means of getting the information?

Mr. THOMSON: Of course he could write to the department and get the formula. I have no desire to empower the department to compel the farmer, or the orchardist, to use any particular fertiliser. For 24 years this very provision has been in force, and no member can show that the farming community has been compelled to use any particular kind of manure. The department should have power to prescribe the minimum unit value for which registration will be granted.

Mr. Mann: Suppose the farmer desires a particular manure, knowing that it will give good results?

Mr. THOMSON: That is for the farmer to prove.

Mr. Mann: But he cannot prove it.

Mr. THOMSON: I hope the clause will pass as printed.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Until to-night the Minister has maintained that he does not desire the department to set up a standard of fertiliser, that being the function of the manufacturer, who guarantees to supply in conformity with the specification furnished to the department, failing which he will be liable to punishment. But now, according to the Minister, the department are to prescribe the formula. Under paragraph (g) the department may prescribe standards for fertilisers. I agree with the member for West Perth that departments are naturally conservative and disposed to adhere to what exists. It has been shown that nowadays the agricultural experts advise our farmers to use fertiliser in quantities against which they warned them years ago. The Bill proposes that experts shall be allowed to determine how fertilisers may be manufactured. The arguments of the member for Katanning really support the excision of the clause. All that is needed is to ensure that the fertiliser which the farmer buys shall be up to specification. Farmers are sensible enough to know the best fertiliser to give good results..

Mr. DAVY: Personally I have always distrusted deeply the conferring of arbitrary powers on the Government, or really the departmental heads, as this clause proposes.

The Minister for Agriculture: Eventually it means Parliament.

Mr. DAVY: No.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, because every regulation has to be laid before Parliament.

Mr. DAVY: I wonder whether the hon. member is prepared to accept responsibility for all regulations laid on the Table of this House.

The Minister for Agriculture: The clause is a safeguard.

Mr. DAVY: To whom?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with regulations; we are dealing with the clause.

Mr. DAVY: Pardon me, Sir; we are dealing with a proposal to give to the Government power to make regulations.

The CHAIRMAN: Not all sorts of regulations. I hope the hon. member will not get away from that.

Mr. DAVY: If my proposal for excision is not carried, the department will be able to prescribe, for example, "Everything called fertiliser shall contain 32 per cent. of superphosphate and 13 per cent. of bone dust," or something to that effect—the member for Coolgardie could furnish the precise phraseology. Indeed, they could lay down exactly what any brand of fertiliser shall contain. Such a power, if exercised, would be a burden to the Minister and might be used arbitrarily and unfairly towards manufacturers and vendors, besides seriously cramping the style of the farmers. It is difficult to understand why the leader of the Country Party should be so anxious to have the farmer dry-nursed in regard to use of fertilisers. The power sought is neither necessary nor expedient.

Mr. MANN: There is evidence that the departmental officers themselves are not sure what strength of manures farmers should use. In connection with the experimental farm recently opened east of Southern Cross, certain plots of ground are allotted to testing what quantity of superphosphate should be used with various kinds of wheat, in order to ascertain the best method of growing wheat in the district. Near Merredin one sees scores of plots which are being utilised towards the same end. That is the means by which our Agricultural Department have been endeavouring for years to ascertain the best methods of wheat growing. Throughout the wheat belt one finds what is called wodgil country. When the belt was settled, that country was believed to be suitable for wheat growing in the same way as salmon gum and gimlet, but time has shown that wodgil country will not grow wheat, though it will grow oats and other cereals. It is possible that a manure will be discovered enabling wodgil land to be used for wheat growing. Then, unless the departmental officers are satisfied that the manure will enable wodgil land to grow wheat, the discoverer of it will not be permitted to put it on the market, even if he has proved its value to the satisfaction of the farmers.

Mr. Thomson: Do you think that if he had demonstrated to the farmers that the fertiliser would grow wheat, they would decline to use it? If so, you are hard up for an argument.

Mr. MANN: Every member is hard up except the member for Katanning, who overflows with intelligence and brains. Everything he puts up is right, in his own opinion. Getting away from the hon. member's interjection, I would point out that the departmental officers are not always right. That fact was demonstrated by the member for Toodyay when he referred to the quantity of superphosphate that the officials advised for use in his district. I do not know why the Minister objects to the amendment because his attitude is against his own argument.

Mr. STUBBS: I cannot understand the arguments advanced against paragraph (g).

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not our fault!

Mr. STUBBS: The Minister indicated that this measure is the outcome of the recent conference of Ministers of Agriculture from all parts of Australia, and the object is to protect the agriculturist from unscrupulous dealers in what those people are pleased to call "manures." According to the remarks of the members for West Perth and Perth it seems to me that the inference to be drawn is that the departmental officials are mugs and do not know their game. I take it that anyone occupying the position of Minister for Agriculture will avail himself of the best advice at his disposal. At the University we have a Chair of Agriculture and a Chair of Chemistry. I am positive that the present Minister, and others who follow him, will be guided by the expert advice obtainable from departmental officials and from University professors. While I agree that what may be a suitable fertiliser for the electorate represented by the member for Toodyay may not be best for the "farming district" represented by the member for Perth, the argument put up is that the farmers will teach the Director of Agriculture and other expert officers their business. I am aware that what applies to one district may not apply to other parts of the State, but I join issue with the member for Toodyay when he says that a farmer can put as much superphosphate on his land as he likes, and it will not burn his crop. If the hon. member makes that statement in all seriousness, then he does not know what he is talking about! I have seen rich land where 1 cwt. of superphosphate was put in compared with a neighbour's property that comprised land of an equal quality but which had been treated with only 50lbs. of super

The yield on the former was not nearly half as good as the one obtained on the second block!

Mr. Lindsay: That is no fault of the super.

Mr. STUBBS: I know what I am talking about. I have not represented an agricultural district for 17 years and not learned my business. I hope the paragraph will not be deleted.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I support the amendment. It would be a serious matter if we allowed the clause to be passed intact. It will give away too much power and already there is too much government by regulation. I disagree with the member for Wagin, for I know farmers who object to this sort of thing and prefer to mix their own fertilisers, from which they get 10 times better results.

Mr. Thomson: Will that be prevented if we agree to the paragraph?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It will to this extent, that the hon. member said in effect that he would allow the experts of the department—

Mr. Thomson: I did not say that.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: In effect, the hon. member said he would allow the experts of the department to say that farmers in a certain district should use such and such a fertiliser only.

Mr. Thomson: I am glad you said, "in effect."

Mr. J. H. SMITH: That is what the hon. member meant.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must deal with the clause.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: We have to remember that these regulations will probably be issued in January and Parliament will not be able to review them until July. It is too dangerous, and the amendment should be agreed to.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	18
Majority against	8

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Mann	Mr. North
Sir James Mitchell	(*Teller.*)
Mr. J. H. Smith	

NOES.

Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Miss Holman	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Marshall	(*Teller.*)
Mr. McCallum	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Maley	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Troy
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. W. D. Johnson

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 38-40—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 4th September. Mr. Panton in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 13, which deals with objections and notices having effect in relation to new rolls.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Inspection of rolls:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I presume it will be possible to procure copies of the rolls under this arrangement just as we can under our existing conditions.

The Minister for Justice: Yes. That is covered by paragraph (b).

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Addition of names to roll:

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That after "form," in line one of Subclause 2, the following be inserted:—"Such claim form to be a joint claim card."

My object is that the Electoral Department of Western Australia shall not lose its control over the claim cards that will be submitted. It is true that under the proposal of the Minister the claim cards will be filled

in before the Federal officers in the various electorates. But they will continue to be the property of the Federal Electoral Department. If the card were perforated and signed in duplicate, one half could be filed in the Federal Department and the other half in our own department. I cannot see any insuperable difficulty about having such a joint claim card. We are bound to have a certain amount of dual control. Our own electoral officer will have power to examine the cards, but it would be better if he were given duplicate cards. The amendment will retain the identity of our own Electoral Department, and at the same time will provide the desired facilities for the electors.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have no objection to the amendment. The claim card will be a joint one, and there is no objection to providing for that in the Bill, although it is quite unnecessary, since the card will be similar to the form prescribed in South Australia and Victoria, which is a joint claim card. I have here a specimen of that card.

Mr. Thomson: But I want more than is on that card. I want a perforated card.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member cannot set out in the Bill a detailed description of his proposed card.

Mr. Mann: Is not the new Federal card a duplicate card?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not know. I have no objection to the amendment. Actually, the card will be a joint card, amendment or no amendment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the amendment represents what the hon. member desires. What he wants is a duplicate card, so that our electoral officers can check the Federal enrolment. But if we are going that far, we ought to oppose the amalgamation altogether. After the Bill is passed, nothing that our officials can do will in any way influence the Federal Electoral Department. For instance, we cannot get on our roll any elector who will not be on the Federal roll. So, after all, there cannot be the check the hon. member desires to have. I notice that our own Act contains a provision similar to this clause. It seems to me there will be some overlapping. Evidently, in drafting the Bill the Minister and his officers have not been sufficiently careful.

The Minister for Justice: Yes, we have.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is plain that we shall have to maintain our registrars in their office, so we shall not be saving very much after all. For instance, our Legislative Council rolls will have to be kept by our own officials.

The Minister for Justice: And there will be lots of other work for them to do.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I am as anxious as anybody to have the enrolment of our electors made as easy as possible. But whilst favouring the joint roll, I should like to see some protection for our own department. It seems to me our officers are going to be mere office boys to the officers of the Federal Electoral Department. I cannot see why there should not be a joint card in duplicate, so that each Electoral Department, State and Federal, can have its own copy.

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

Clause 18—Claim for enrolment or transfer of enrolment:

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in line one of Subclause 2 "one" be struck out, and "three" inserted in lieu.

That will bring the provision into conformity with an amendment, of which I have given notice, to be considered on a later clause. We provide in the Bill that if an elector coming from the Eastern States resides in Western Australia for three months, he shall then be entitled to enrolment and to a vote for the electorate in which he is living. If that principle is sound in respect of people from the Eastern States, we can with confidence make the same provision for an elector who has removed from one division to another. It will not disfranchise an elector, but it will simplify the working of the joint rolls. It will prevent any suggestion of the happenings that we say occurred at the last election. A man working on the roads or on a railway is in the district for only the duration of the job and moves on as the work progresses.

The Minister for Justice: A man might not be three months in any one electorate.

Mr. THOMSON: If he was enrolled in Perth and his work took him to Katanning, Albany and Narrogin, he might be in three electorates in three months, but he would be domiciled in Perth.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I support the amendment, which the Minister should welcome. Many statements were made about enrolments at the last election, and the amendment would place the Minister above suspicion.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the amendment would place the Minister above suspicion, I would vote for it, but I do not think it would. A man might not be three months in any one electorate and, if he was three months absent from his own electorate, he would lose his vote. Residence for three months must precede enrolment, but absence for three months would mean his disfranchisement.

The Minister for Justice: That is so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It should be possible to allow men employed on temporary work for the Government to remain on the roll.

Mr. Thomson: That is my objective.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is obviously wrong that temporary residents of a district should decide the representation. That undoubtedly occurred at Greenough and the residents of the district were disfranchised.

Hon. G. Taylor: A number at any rate.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A majority of them. The residents themselves would have made a different decision.

The Minister for Justice: Perhaps.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The number of road workers was more than sufficient to decide the contest.

The Minister for Justice: A number of the men had been miners living in the district for years and had been given work in the hope that mining would subsequently provide employment for them again.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They happened to be in Perth when they were sent to Greenough.

Mr. Thomson: My amendment would protect such men.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the men are in a district for a month, they will be entitled to enrolment, but the amendment stipulates three months. It would be better to arrange that men on Government work of a temporary kind should remain on the roll for the district from which they proceeded to the work.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Suppose those men were in the district for four months.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If their homes were in Perth and they were employed on temporary work for the Government at Albany, they would remain on the roll for Perth. In many instances the amendment would operate adversely. There are two classes of people to be considered—the people who go to a district meaning to make their homes there, and the people sent there to do temporary work.

The Minister for Justice: I should not like to decide to which class they belonged.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am referring to men engaged on temporary jobs for the Government. Men would be better treated if they were allowed to be enrolled for the district in which they lived. They would have a special interest in that district and no interest in the district where they were temporarily employed. It has been suggested that the amendment would place the Minister above suspicion.

The Minister for Justice: No one would place me under suspicion, surely.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We know what happened just before the last election. If we could make it impossible for such things to happen again, it would be wise to do so, but I fancy we would be doing more harm than good by accepting the three months. We should be careful before we alter the period because, although the three months would carry some advantage, it would certainly carry some disadvantage also.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not think the Minister was quite right in suggesting that the amendment would disfranchise some men following casual work. I am not aware that the Bill will amend the nomad provision.

The Minister for Justice: You know how few people took advantage of that provision.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not know.

The Minister for Justice: I think there were 200 throughout the State.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If a general labourer, domiciled in Kalgoorlie, took work on railway construction at Bunbury, and was there for a period up to three months, his name would remain on the Kalgoorlie roll under the nomad provision. The three months qualification would make roll-stuffing much more difficult. I do not suggest that anything in that way has been done. A person would remain on the roll where he had been domiciled for three months. When he had been four months away from his electorate he would

be eligible to go upon the other roll if the amendment of the member for Katanning was carried. I see no harm in such a provision. The man who had been living in his own electorate for some time would know more about its requirements than one who had been there only for a short time. Nowadays, Nationalists vote for Nationalist candidates wherever they are, and Labour supporters vote for Labour candidates wherever they are. People do not consider so much the requirements of a district, if they hold strong party views, as they do the political faith of the candidates. No doubt the provision for three months residence would prevent any such thing as roll stuffing. Ours are machine politics, and the country is suffering accordingly.

Mr. Lindsay: The amendment is a two-edged sword.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If a man is away for three months, his name can still be retained on the roll under the nomad provision.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I think the amendment will favour those who have no fixed place of abode. On the occasion of the last elections men made false statements in order that they might get on the roll at the last moment, fearing that they would not otherwise be allowed to vote at all. Casual labourers travel extensively about the State, and if they were not away from Perth for more than three months they would still be allowed to vote for their home electorate.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If a man lives in a district only for a month he cannot have any interest in its welfare. It is surprising how much people do move about in this State.

The Minister for Justice: It is on record that there were 1,300 changes in the names on the Canning rolls during the last few months.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The amendment may be an improvement in certain directions, but will be disadvantageous in others.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: My objection to the amendment is that it will destroy the purpose of the Bill. The Federal law provides that an elector must notify the Commonwealth Electoral Office if he has been away from his electorate for a month. Failing notification he may be fined. I do not know why Western Australia, of all the States, should be different in a matter of this kind. Almost everywhere in Australia people are compelled by the State laws to alter their names from one roll to the other if they have been in a new district for a month. It is no use discussing this Bill if the amendment is carried.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: This is a way in which to defeat it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. It is impossible to have different qualifications for such a large number of electors. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, this amendment will affect hundreds of people. I have already by interjection indicated the changes that have recently occured in the Canning electorate. Many of the 1,300 could get on the electoral roll within a month, but they would have to wait another two months in order to get on the State roll. Allowing for delays involved in the issue of writs and so forth, a man would have to be four or five months in an electorate before he could vote at a State election. We are doing and shall be doing a great deal in the way of land settlement; and if three or four hundred people go on the land to remain there, so far as they know, for the rest of their lives, are they to be debarred from voting in their own electorate because of this amendment?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We sent far more men out in the past, and they had to wait.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: They had to wait only a month. The carrying of the amendment would render the Bill useless. Having affirmed the principle of joint rolls by passing the second reading, the Chamber should not now, so to speak, murder the Bill.

Mr. THOMSON: According to the Minister, the carrying of the amendment would destroy uniformity. Why should we be compelled to accept a proposal of the Federal Government if we do not consider it to be in the interests of Western Australia? The existing Act provides that a man from the Eastern States, before he can be placed on our Assembly roll, must reside in Western Australia continuously for six months. The Minister proposes to reduce that period to three months. Why, in his desire to secure uniformity, does he not reduce the period to one month?

The Minister for Justice: I am prepared to do that.

Mr. THOMSON: But the hon. gentleman will not get my support for it.

The Minister for Justice: I am aware of that.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister said it would be a hardship to keep an elector for three months on the roll of an electorate from which he had removed. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that 200 out of 300 new settlers on an agricultural area came from the Eastern States; they would have to reside in the district for six months before being permitted to vote.

The Minister for Justice: A man from the Eastern States would have to put in a month or two here before he got a block of land.

Mr. THOMSON: But people from the Eastern States come here to buy farms. The Minister does not suggest that a hardship is inflicted in such cases as regards the State electoral qualification, although one month's residence qualifies for Federal enrolment. Similarly it may be argued that no hardship is inflicted on the Western Australian elector removing to another electorate. The principle for which I am contending is already embodied in Section 17 of the Act of 1907. My desire is not to disfranchise any elector, but we should prevent the possibility of the recurrence of things stated to have been done at a previous election.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The provision as to three months which is in the principal Act was inserted by the framers of the Act, who also decided that between nomination day and election day a period of 30 days might elapse. If a man left his electorate and a writ was issued, he would not have the opportunity to get on another roll. Two months might elapse before he would have the chance of getting another enrolment.

Mr. Thomson: But if he could not get on a roll, he could not be struck off a roll.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Of course he could.

Mr. Thomson: Then let us amend the law so as to remedy that.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: A man can be struck off the roll if he is away from an electorate for a month.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He should be.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. No one can get on the roll for 14 days prior to the issue of writs. A total delay of eight weeks may intervene, and so for a period of three months the man's right to vote in his original electorate is preserved. Experience shows that 50,000 or 60,000 persons may change electorates in Western Australia, whereas the number of people coming here from the Eastern States would be only 200 or 300. Unless those who come from the Eastern States to Western Australia are officers on transfer, my experience is that they do not know for two or three months where they will reside permanently. In the meantime the period will have elapsed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19 to 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Time for altering rolls:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The clause fixes the closing time for the reception of claims at 6 p.m.

Mr. Griffiths: Not midnight!

The Minister for Justice: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know why claims were received up to midnight before. Such a thing was not formerly done in this State.

The Minister for Justice: What was done last time was not, in my opinion, desirable, and we are making sure of it this time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think midday would be better than 6 p.m. Why do the Government give power to the divisional returning officer or Chief Electoral Officer to depart from the closing time of 6 p.m.?

The Minister for Justice: There may be times when the necessity will arise. They would not be ordinary cases.

Mr. Thomson: A similar provision is in the Federal Act.

The Minister for Justice: The officers will not tamper with the rolls unless there is an excellent reason.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But what could be such a reason?

The Minister for Justice: A mistake may be made and, if so, it will have to be dealt with, and proved to the satisfaction of the highest electoral officer in the State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not prepared to agree to the clause as it stands. I can see no reason why the officers mentioned should have power to extend the time.

The Minister for Justice. It will be merely to correct mistakes. We do not propose that any subordinate officer shall have this right, but only the highest electoral officer in the land.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The second paragraph says that, except by direction of the divisional returning officer or Chief Electoral Officer, as the case requires, no name shall be removed from the roll pursuant to a notification of transfer of enrolment from the registrar after 6 o'clock in the afternoon of the day of the issue of a writ for an election, and before the close of the poll at the election.

The Minister for Justice: No name will be removed from a roll on transfer unless the principal electoral officer is satisfied.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is quite obvious that if the name of a man is to be taken off one roll by transfer, it must go on to another roll. There can be no transfer unless both things happen. It is a fresh enrolment.

The Minister for Justice: No, the name is merely taken off one roll.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But that action can only follow upon notice of a transfer of enrolment. The Minister should have the clause altered, because it may be made to apply to a great number of electors in an electorate. Surely it must be obvious that a transfer cannot be made without adding to another roll!

The Minister for Justice: The clause says nothing about adding to, but merely about removing from, a roll. It does not say that the name will be added to another roll.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It must be quite obvious that a transfer of enrolment means taking a name from one roll and placing it on another.

The Minister for Justice: Not at all.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then it is beyond me! I do not see any necessity for such a special provision.

Mr. Thomson: Perhaps it is so that a future Minister cannot keep the offices open until midnight.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 23 to 29—agreed to.

Clause 30—Names on roll may be objected to:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: In the parent Act, it was provided that each objection had to be accompanied by a deposit of half-a-crown. The proviso to the clause increases that sum to 5s. Has the Minister any valid reason for increasing the amount?

The Minister for Justice: It brings the clause into conformity with the Federal Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That ought not to make any difference to our Act.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I should think half-a-crown would more than cover the cost of any inquiry into an objection against an enrolment. The increased amount would not deter a wealthy man from lodging objections, but it might prevent working men from taking exception to enrolments that they knew were wrong. For years we have had trouble regarding objections taken to enrolments. In order to test the feeling of the Committee I move an amendment—

That in line four the words "five shillings" be struck out.

If the amendment be agreed to, I shall move to substitute the words "two shillings and sixpence" in lieu of those struck out.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I am not very particular about the amendment. The clause is framed to conform to the Commonwealth Act, under which 5s. has to be lodged with each objection. I know that is not a good reason, but we must consider the whole purpose of the Bill. The deposit is forfeited only if the objection is regarded as frivolous.

Hon. G. Taylor: The point is that the man who desires to object to enrolments may not have sufficient money to deposit 5s. with each objection.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member knows quite well from actual experience that individuals do not trouble to take any such action; political organisations on either side generally take action, and they have sufficient funds to provide the necessary deposit.

Mr. Davy: Why double the cost of objection?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We are doubling, not the cost of objection, but the penalty that may be inflicted on people lodging frivolous complaints.

The Minister for Health: It is a pity it is not £5 instead of 5s.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The cost is nothing, if the objection is upheld.

Mr. Davy: But the objector has to put up the money.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The money is quickly returned to him. I do not think many individual people are concerned about others being improperly on the roll.

Mr. Davy: It should be made as cheap as possible to object.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: But not so cheap that people can put up frivolous complaints without risking much money.

Hon. G. Taylor: If a man puts up a frivolous objection, let him be fined some substantial amount.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We do not wish to do that. In my own experience not very long ago, a lot of frivolous objections were put up with the object of removing people from the roll. That occurred in the Central Province elections a couple of years ago. A brother of the member for Cue was objected to.

The Minister for Health: And he could not get down here in time to meet the objection.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: And so he was struck off the roll.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was a property qualification for the Legislative Council. It would not have helped the election, even had he got here.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: But if he could have got down he would have been able to show that the objection was raised through lack of information. However, there is no vital principle concerned in this question before us, and I am not greatly opposed to the amendment. Still people who are prepared to make frivolous objections to names remaining on the roll should not be studied to the extent of 2s. 6d. The 5s. deposit will be returned to the objector as soon as his objection is upheld.

Mr. Davy: But he has to put up that 5s.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: What a terrible injury that is! Why should not a man put up 5s. for a week?

Mr. Davy: It might be, not 5s. but £500.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is not done by individuals. One individual may want to get some other individual off the roll if he thinks he is not entitled to be on it, but whenever a number of objections are lodged it is done by some political organisation with plenty of money for that purpose.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not think 5s. is sufficient if the objection is frivolous.

Mr. Withers: In football circles the lodging of a protest means £1.

Mr. Davy: But this is a wholesale matter.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Only once has it been done in a wholesale manner. Normally, not more than 20 objections in any electorate are lodged. The position is that the Federal Government have a certain procedure in regard to the qualification, and we are falling into line with them.

Mr. Davy: But we are not handing over to the Federal Government, so why alter this provision?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Merely to get uniformity. Most of these objections will be taken under the Federal Act. If a man is struck off the Federal roll, he will be struck off the State roll also, and vice versa. However, I am not very particular about the amount. If it will give any satisfaction to hon. members, I will accept the amendment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not wish to see any name taken off the roll if it ought to remain, and likewise I do not wish to see any name on the roll if it should not be there. Six hundred names were taken off the roll at the last election, and if it had been necessary to raise objection to all those names under the Act, a considerable deposit would have been necessary.

The Minister for Mines: But that would not have meant anything to you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The point is that I would not have got it refunded by the present Government. However, the Minister has agreed to retain the charge of half-a-crown.

Amendment put and declared negatived.

Hon. G. Taylor: I think we had better have a division.

The CHAIRMAN: The "noes" were distinctly in the majority. Does the hon. member desire a division?

Hon. G. Taylor: No.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 31 to 38, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.