

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 30th October, 1928..

	PAGE
Question: Workers' compensation, referees	1449
Motion: Standing Orders	1449
Bills: Lunacy Act Amendment, 3A.	1450
Water Boards Act Amendment, 1A.	1453
Proletarian Prevention, 1A.	1453
Fertilisers, Assembly's message	1453
Group Settlement Act Amendment, 2A.	1453
Abattoirs Act Amendment, Assembly's request	1460
for Conference	1460
Conference Manager's report	1460
Railways Discontinuance, Assembly's message	1460
Forests Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1460

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

QUESTION—WORKERS COMPENSATION, REFEREES.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN (for Hon. A. J. H. Saw) asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have the Government appointed any legally qualified medical practitioners to be medical referees, or members of a medical board, as provided by Section 15 of the Workers Compensation Act, 1924? 2, If not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes, medical referees have been appointed in the following districts:—Albany, Beverley, Bridgetown, Boulder, Broome, Bunbury, Busselton, Carnarvon, Collie, Cue, Derby, East Kirrup, Donnybrook, Esperance, Fremantle, Geraldton, Gnowangerup, Greenbushes, Narrogin, Kalgoorlie, Katanning, Kellerberrin, Marble Bar, Meekering, Midland Junction, Moora, Mornington, Nannup, Northam, Northampton, Perth, Pingelly, Pinjarra, Port Hedland, Southern Cross, Tambellup, Wagin, Wickepin. Numerous medical boards have been appointed, the members comprising the board being recommended by the registrar under the Act and approved by the Minister when the occasion arose for submission of a claim to a medical board. 2, Answered by No. 1.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS.

As to regulations, prayers, etc.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [4.36]: I move—

That the Standing Orders Committee be requested to consider the desirability of submitting new standing orders to enable a select

committee to be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into, and reporting on, any regulation laid on the Table of the House, and to consider, and report as to, any other amendments to the standing orders that may be deemed desirable.

It is some three years since the standing orders of this House were reviewed and I understand that the revised copies are almost out of print. It is about time the standing orders were again revised. Most members are not thoroughly conversant with the standing orders, and when I say that, perhaps I am speaking for myself. When I entered this Chamber the then President, Sir Edward Wittenoom, handed me a book containing the standing orders and said, "Take this and read, mark and learn it thoroughly." I said it was rather complicated and rather much to commit to memory, and that the best way to overcome the difficulty would be that whenever I broke one of the standing orders, I should be pulled up. Then I would know the rule in future.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That has frequently occurred.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I have already broken one or two of the standing orders—not too many—and I have been pulled up. I now know those rules and I avoid breaking them a second time. That is what I told the then President of the Council. When regulations are laid on the Table of the House, there is a certain period in which a member may move for their disallowance. When such a motion is tabled many members speak, and often they are not conversant with the facts of the case. If such regulations were referred to a select committee for investigation, I think the effect would be beneficial. The select committee could inquire into and report as to how the regulations were likely to affect the people most interested. At present we are proceeding somewhat blindly and do not know exactly where we are. There is one matter under the standing orders that has me perplexed. Chapter XVI. deals with the previous question, which is covered by standing orders Nos. 138-143. It seems that the previous question can be moved only when the House is discussing a Bill on the second reading. In Chapter XX., however, I find that a motion for the previous question shall not be moved in Committee. It seems to me anomalous that that should appear under Chapter XX. Either it should be omitted or placed under the chapter deal-

ing with the previous question, so that if the previous question were moved in Committee, it could be put just as it is now put on the second reading. Some three years ago I moved in this House a motion for an alteration of the prayers. At that time I picked on our President, Hon. J. W. Kirwan, and Dr. Saw to consider the question.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They picked on you.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: But they were picking from a long distance; they did not come to close range or they would have got their gruel. Mr. Kirwan seemed to think that to interfere with the prayers was rather too delicate a question for him, and Dr. Saw considered that the old traditions should be adhered to. He was averse to departing from any of the customs observed in this Chamber. I do not know how that attitude would apply in the medical profession to which he belongs. The old sawbones of fifty years ago would be of little use nowadays at a delicate operation. They used to take a man's arms off with a circular or crosscut saw, but to-day they have a much better method. When I moved to have the prayers revised, I did so because they seemed to be too long and quite out of date. Some members will not enter the Chamber for prayers because they say, "The President will read the long prayer to-day; we will attend on the day he reads the short one." On one day we have a long prayer; on the next day a short prayer. I suggest that the prayer read in the Assembly is very much better. It runs—

Almighty God, we humbly beseech Thee to vouchsafe Thy special blessing upon this Parliament now assembled and that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all our consultations for the advancement of Thy glory and the true welfare of the people of Australia.

I do not like the word "consultations"; it reminds me too much of Tattersall's sweeps. The Commonwealth Parliament has a prayer that I think the committee could take into consideration. It reads—

Almighty God, we humbly beseech Thee to vouchsafe Thy special blessing upon this Parliament, and that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper the work of Thy servants for the advancement of Thy glory and the true welfare of the people of Australia.

That is quite long enough for a prayer; we do not want lengthy prayers because the Almighty will hear us if we utter only a few words, as did the dying thief on the cross.

He spoke only two or three words and Christ said, "This day shalt thou dwell with Me in Paradise." I think we could dispense with the Lord's Prayer, owing to its grammar, or use it with only two or three words of introductory prayer.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is only the prayers of the righteous that availeth much.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Yes. That is about all I wish to say on the motion. I hope an inquiry will be made as suggested, in order that various matters that to me appear anomalous may be considered. I am quite sure that no member of this Chamber knows the standing orders from A to Z, because, if he did, he would be afraid to speak or look sideways at any member in the House, provided he lived up to the standing orders. He would be in somewhat the same position as the young man who was trying to live up to the manners and tones of good society—always putting his foot in it. I hope an inquiry will be made on the lines I have indicated.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 4.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Bran, pollard, and other stock foods:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have an amendment on the Notice Paper. Since the Bill was last before the Chamber I discussed Clause 4 with the Solicitor General, and he considers that the simplest way of dealing with the matter would be to strike out of paragraph (d) of Subclause 2 the words "expose for sale, or have in his possession for sale," as I previously suggested. If the Chief Secretary would agree to that, it

would save the need for the proviso in my amendment.

The Chief Secretary: I am opposed to that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In that case I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Sub-clause 3:—"Provided that a person shall not be convicted of an offence under paragraph (d) of Subsection (2) hereof if he proves that the bran, pollard, or other prescribed food so sold or exposed or in possession for sale as aforesaid has been purchased with a written warranty or invoice certificate from a person in this State, and that he had no reason to believe at the time when he did or committed any such acts that the bran, pollard, or prescribed food was not in conformity with said regulations."

The need for the proviso prompted itself when Clause 7 was being dealt with, as that clause also has a proviso dealing with the matter. It is easy for a merchant to have on his premises bran which is apparently for sale, but which he has not had the opportunity of examining. The buyer is fully safeguarded, because he will examine the bran; further, if a merchant sells an article not in accordance with standard he is liable to a penalty. But to make a man liable as he would be under paragraph (d) of Sub-clause 2 of Clause 4 is wrong.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I offer no opposition to the amendment. I agree that some such amendment is necessary. If it is passed, there is no need at all for any alteration of paragraph (d). The amendment protects the innocent seller so long as he can show that he has purchased the stuff with a warranty that it is the genuine article.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: In one respect the amendment does not go far enough. The main object is to provide against inferior quality of bran and pollard entering the State. There has been very little trouble indeed, and there is not likely to be trouble, with regard to bran and pollard manufactured in Western Australia. There has, however, been trouble with some of the bran and pollard from the Eastern States. As a rule those articles are imported when there is a scarcity of the local by-products and prices here become high, with the result that buyers have to look outside Western Australia. It often happens that a good deal of foreign matter is contained in the Eastern States articles, giving rise to much dissatisfaction among dairymen and horse-owners. The weak spot in the amendment is that it

protects only in respect of goods bought in Western Australia, and not goods bought outside it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That point is covered by Clause 7.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: There should be a certificate of warranty from the seller, whether he be a person in this State or in any other State. However, if Mr. Nicholson says the point is covered by Clause 7, I am satisfied.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I moved the amendment having regard to the proviso at the end of Clause 7. I do not know why the words "in this State" were inserted.

The Chief Secretary: Because we could not proceed against a person in another State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No; our courts would not have jurisdiction. Anyone could send goods from the other States without paying any regard to standards imposed here, and there would be no means by which the authorities could reach such a person.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: In that case the measure would become a farce.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The merchant would have to put the goods in some other place than his place of business if they did not answer the warranty subject to which such goods may be sold. Hardship might be caused, and a prosecution might ensue. If Mr. Stephenson cares to move the excision of the words "in this State" I shall be quite agreeable, but possibly the Chief Secretary may object.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: If the amendment is carried, I am not sure that it would be of much use to pass the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The amendment will not do any harm.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The merchant is to be free from conviction if he produces the warranty referred to. Now, if he adulterated the imported article himself after purchase, and then produced a certificate stating the article to be free from adulteration at the time he purchased it, the amendment would prevent his conviction.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Hamersley is taking a rather extreme view of the position. If goods come into a merchant's possession, he sells them on warranty. Then if an inspector discovers that they are not in accordance with the warranty, an inquiry will be made. That inquiry may reveal that the person who sold the goods originally, sold them in perfect condition, and that if they were adulterated, they were adulterated

after they had left the original seller's possession. Mr. Hamersley is seeking to protect the man who sells originally on a wrong standard or certificate of warranty.

Hon. V. Hamersley: No.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The argument of the hon. member would apply with probably greater force in the case of goods that might be sold under warranty to a merchant, who receives those goods in bulk and who would not have time to examine them. If, on examination, the merchant found they were not in accordance with the standard or certificate given, he would have his rights against the seller of those goods. If an inspector entered the premises, the merchant would be able to show his warranty and thus disclose that he had been duped by an unscrupulous person.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Even if he adulterated them himself?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The evidence would be gone into by the inspector and it would be found that when the goods left the possession of the seller they were in accordance with the warranty given, and if adulterated, they must have been adulterated after they left the seller's possession. There must be protection of the nature suggested by the amendment which is on the lines of the proviso to Clause 7.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I agree with Mr. Nicholson. If the innocent seller produced his warranty, the department would take action against the person who sold the adulterated foodstuffs. If it was proved that Smith sold the adulterated foodstuffs, action would be taken against him. I placed the amendment before Mr. Sutton who, in reply, addressed the following minute to the Minister for Agriculture:—

I have seen the Solicitor General and pointed out that if the words "exposed for sale or have in his possession for sale"—

Mr. Sutton is referring there to a previous amendment.

—are deleted, it would handicap the administration of the Bill should it be passed. This has been proved by our experience with the Fertiliser Bill, where some dealers have endeavoured to evade the provisions of the Act by stating that fertiliser obviously intended for sale was not for sale, and but for a similar provision in this Bill, it would have been very difficult to obtain samples for examination and also evidence as to whether the dealer was guilty of an offence. In the case of the administration of the proposed Bill, it is believed that the difficulties would be increased. Because of this phase of the question, the Solicitor General has decided to suggest that the words referred to be not deleted and that

he incorporate the amendment already submitted to you. This amendment will protect the seller as by the proviso in Clause 7.

Hon. H. STEWART: The amendment is entirely unnecessary. Clause 4 provides that any person who sells bran or pollard not in accordance with the standard prescribed will be guilty of an offence. Bran and pollard are stock foods. Clause 7 provides that any person who sells any article for use as food for stock—and the paragraphs set out what shall be required—shall also be guilty of an offence. Clause 7 generally covers Clause 4.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No, my amendment is to paragraph (d) of Clause 4.

Hon. H. STEWART: I claim that Clause 4 which deals with bran and pollard is covered by the general Clause 7, which contains a proviso similar to the one the hon. member seeks to add to Clause 4. Subclause 2 of Clause 4 simply provides that the Governor may make regulations. Those regulations must be approved by this House. Thus, the exposing for sale or being in possession are not dealt with. Subclause 3 sets out that any person who acts in contravention of any regulation or fails to comply with the regulation, shall be guilty of an offence. Mr. Nicholson is now seeking to add a proviso which declares that a person shall not be guilty of breaking regulations that are not in force. Those regulations can be dealt with when they are before the House.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	12

Majority against 5

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. Sir W. F. Lathlain	Hon. H. Stewart
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Bill again reported without further amendment.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Water Boards Act Amendment.

2, Profiteering Prevention.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—FERTILISERS.*Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

BILL—GROUP SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.20]:

By this Bill we understand we have arrived at another stage in the vexed question of group settlement. In a good deal of criticism levelled against this scheme, two fundamental factors, under which the scheme was instituted, have been lost sight of. The first is that it would be a means of establishing in Australia a number of migrants, who would be trained to work under agricultural conditions. Many of these men were taken from occupations in the old land that were far removed from agriculture. The whole of their training and their lives were entirely remote from the conditions under which they were to live in Western Australia. We have to recognise that this scheme has at any rate, achieved its purpose in that many of the men who are to-day living in Western Australia may not have been living so happily had they remained in the old land. They have been trained now to live and to battle in Western Australia, and I have no doubt will give a good account of themselves in the history of the State. The other object associated with the scheme was that it would be the means of providing for Western Australia the production of commodities for which we have been paying too high a price on our importations from the Eastern States.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We have paid a big price for those objects.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The increase in production of our dairy products, especially in relation to butter, shows that this object, too, is being achieved. As Mr. Holmes has

said, we have arrived at the position when we have to calculate whether we have paid too big a price for achieving these objects. This Bill discloses a state of affairs that requires investigation. Figures were given in another place by the Minister for Lands who showed the large expenditure already incurred of £5,500,000.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Without including the expenditure on the Peel Estate.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Minister explained that his figures included only the settlement of block charges, and not the expenditure on drainage, roads, etc. It has been pointed out that one of the members of the board, who will deal with the important question of adjusting the charges on the groups, would have to be a member of the Agricultural Bank, because that bank would have the responsibility of carrying on the settlers. I should like to have an indication from the Minister as to how the other two positions on the board will be filled. We should be given that information, for it would show exactly what idea was in the minds of the Government in making the appointments. I know from past experience that it would be wise to get this, because it would remove any impression that political considerations were entering into the matter.

The Honorary Minister: What considerations?

Hon. H. SEDDON: The suggestion might be made that political considerations would weigh in the making of these appointments. I should like to refer to the figures given by the Leader of the Opposition when he criticised the measure. He pointed out that the expenditure up to the end of 1924 was £1,053,000. When Mr. Angwin made a statement in the House in 1925, the expenditure was £2,557,218 on 2,334 group holdings. The Minister for Lands said the expenditure on group holdings was £5,523,000, so that there has been an expenditure since his administration of £2,900,000. The point that requires investigation is the one raised by Mr. Holmes. He pointed out that the expenditure or the charges against the various groups should be made plain. It should be indicated how that expenditure is made up. I understand that interest has been charged against group settlements and that the interest has been compounded. We can well understand that these charges might by this

action be raised to considerable dimensions. If the bare cost of developing the holdings were assessed, it is possible the sum involved might come within the scope of being handled by the settler. A point arises in connection with the writing down of the holdings that calls to mind other aspects of the State's finances. I think the present is a fitting opportunity to deal with that. We have to recognise that there has been placed on the shoulders of the taxpayers a constantly increasing burden for which we have no assets, and which may represent liabilities on the State for the maintenance of those national works that have been acquired by this expenditure. May I instance the expenditure from loan money on the Fremantle dock, £220,000, and the loan money that was sunk in the State smelters, £138,967. The Wyndham Meat Works involves an expenditure from loan of £500,000. On page 4 of the 1927 report of the Industries Assistance Board a writing-off is shown of £328,535, and on page 8 of the 1927 report of the Agricultural Department a writing-off is shown of £191,242. We know that within the last few years a deficit has been funded of some £6,000,000. The total amount of loan money which I contend has been entirely lost to the taxpayers is £7,378,000. If we add to that the money we expect to write off under this Bill, we may be inclined to ask how much more load is to be placed on the taxpayers, for which they have no tangible assets, and which will remain upon their shoulders until the loans have been repaid. If, on the £7,378,000 I have referred to, we allow interest at the rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., we get an annual charge of £405,000 for interest alone, and of £36,000 for sinking fund, a total of £442,000 in round figures. When we remember that in addition the Government have budgeted this for a deficit of £94,000, we are justified in asking how soon the finances are to be taken firmly in hand and placed on a sounder basis. We cannot contemplate as satisfactory the progress of Western Australia when these tremendous losses are being incurred, and we are justified in asking that the Treasurer should budget to balance his revenue and expenditure. The conditions associated with the Financial Agreement make that more imperative than ever. This Bill will deal definitely with the question of writing off loan expenditure. This is only another step in the retrogres-

sion of the State's finances, and demands immediate attention. The question of writing off the capital value of these group settlements should not be left to a board. It should be brought before Parliament each year so that not only members but the taxpayers at large may see exactly what losses have been incurred. I intend to be guided in my attitude towards the Bill by the concluding remarks of the Minister.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West): [5.27]: Next to the Bill which authorised the establishment of the group settlement scheme, I look upon this as the most important in connection with the scheme that has yet come before Parliament. It is now proposed to alter the machinery of the original Act and to substitute a provision for the appointment of a board of three members. This will have the effect of making a very important alteration in the existing state of affairs. The present proposal is to empower a board to fix the amount chargeable against each location. If we have regard to the amendment set out on the Notice Paper in the name of the Chief Secretary, the board will be able to fix the amount chargeable at so much below the actual expenditure as in their discretion they may think fit. That would give the board very wide powers, but I think, in the circumstances, there is justification for that course being adopted. I realise some information should be given to Parliament as to how much it is proposed to write off, but I feel convinced it will be absolutely necessary to write off quite a large amount in order that the settlers may have a fair chance to succeed. In the original stages of the Group Settlement Scheme the settlers were promised that at a certain stage, which it was then thought would be within a year or two, they would be given particulars of costs, and assessments of locations would be made. By that means the settlers were given to understand that they would know how they were getting along and what chance of success there was ahead of them. A good many applications have been made to the Government, or to the department, for information as to costs, but in practically every instance the requests met with a refusal. It has always seemed to those who have watched group settlement matters closely, rather extraordinary that the question of costs has not been ascertainable. With the exception of one or two

isolated instances, of which I have heard, such information has never been given. The Minister for Lands stated recently that the total expenditure on the group settlements had been £7,838,000, or without the cost of drainage and railways, which, I submit, has benefited quite a lot of people over a large area, £5,523,000. The difference between those two amounts cannot be altogether charged up against group settlement because that expenditure has had, and will continue to have for all time, a very marked effect on the fortunes of many people settled in the localities affected. For instance, the construction of the Margaret River railway was promised years before group settlement was ever thought of, and the people in that district worked in anticipation of the railway being built. That line serves a number of old-established settlers as well as group settlers. The same applies to the question of drainage, which has had, and will continue to have, a marked effect, particularly in some areas in the Sussex electorate, more especially in the area around Busselton. The drainage that has been carried out there will improve the value of the properties of old settlers to a large extent. That drainage scheme, except in a few minor instances, has proved the most successful I know of. When the detailed costs are being totted up against group settlements, these factors might well be borne in mind. I do not want to go over the story of the enormous waste of money that has taken place in connection with the Group Settlement Scheme. We realise it as a fact, but we say that the high costs should not be debited so much against the groups as against the faulty administration of the Government. I would point out that the Government, and not the settlers, are most to blame for the waste of money that has taken place. Those who have watched the development of the scheme have noted plainly the policy of drift that has been permitted for years past; it has led to the serious position in which the settlers on the one hand, and the Government on the other, now find themselves. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, quoted average costs on certain locations, and these ranged from £2,654 on Group 54 to £3,459 on Group 53. I would have appreciated more some details as to how those costs were arrived at. No matter how I have figured it out, I have not been able to discover that any more than 50 or 60 per cent. of the amount suggested has been actually spent on group locations.

Hon. H. Seddon: What about interest charges?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am coming to that point. The balance, I take it, represents interest compounded. The position is that, while a group settler is handed a bill showing that the charge against his location is anything up to £3,000, he will turn round and defy anyone to show that more than half any such amount has been actually spent on his property. Naturally, the group settlers complain that they are being mulet because of mal-administration over which they have had no control. I am looking at the position for a moment from the group settlers' point of view, and I submit that they are in their present position largely through no fault of their own. Mr. Holmes made some reference to interest charges and to the fact that the scheme had been financed out of Loan Funds. Mr. Seddon followed suit a few minutes ago. I understand that quite a fair proportion of the loan money that was borrowed for the purpose of the Group Settlement Scheme was obtained at 1 per cent. interest. I also understand that the settlers are being charged interest at a rate of anything from $5\frac{1}{4}$ to 6 per cent. With other members, I want to know where the balance goes. Are the Government making a profit of 4 per cent. or more on this money? Are they piling up the cost of the Group Settlement Scheme on a $5\frac{1}{4}$ or 6 per cent. interest basis, whereas the money cost them 1 per cent. only? If that is the position, then I consider it little less than a scandal, and the sooner the true position is made public the better.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They are doing that to reduce their interest bill and still affect their deficit.

Hon. W. J. MANN: And at the same time they are adding to the cost of group settlement.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Which is to be written off.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes.

Hon. E. H. Harris: To show how clever they are!

Hon. W. J. MANN: The present position is causing the group settlers some alarm and they are asking themselves whether it is worth while going on. I hope the Minister will make the position quite clear. We have heard a lot in this House regarding the results of the deliberations of select committees, and the thought

passed through my mind that if the statements that have been made are correct, if there is the discrepancy I have indicated between the interest charged and the interest paid on money utilised in financing the scheme, and if the money has been used in the way suggested, the appointment of a select committee to go into the question might not be amiss. It might throw a little light on the subject.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would the Government take any notice of such a select committee?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps in the light of findings that might be arrived at by some such select committee, they might do so. To come back to the provisions of the Bill, I hope the Government will realise that, in order to inspire confidence in the group settlers themselves, every precaution should be taken to see that they get a fair deal in the assessments that are about to be made. My first idea in connection with the assessments was not for the appointment of a board such as is proposed. For some years I advocated the creation of three advisory boards; one for the Peel estate, which is quite a different proposition from that of the Busselton-Margaret River-Augusta areas, or of the Manjimup-Pemberton-Denmark areas, for which the other two boards would be appointed. I suggested years ago that the Government should do away with some of the field supervisors and other officers and appoint a highly qualified advisory board in each of the districts to take over a good deal of their work, to spend their whole time in their respective areas, and to concentrate on the solution of their particular problems. That suggestion was never taken up and ultimately the Government adopted the principle of appointing one advisory board, with the result that the present board was created. The members of that board are doing their best to cope with the task entrusted to them. The fact is, however, that the area over which they have to work is so extensive and the number of locations they are concerned with are so great, that it is no wonder some settlers say they have never seen the members of the board. The time of the board is largely taken up with the troubles of some malcontents with the result that the good men, because they do not make any noise, are not often seen by the members of the Group Settlement Advisory Board, and those set-

tlers are left to jog along in the same old way. My idea of dealing with the assessments is that the Government should cut up the group areas into halves, and appoint another advisory board, letting them get together and base their assessments on the knowledge they gleaned. I want to warn the Government that this is going to be a very long job. These assessments, if made properly, are not going to be made in less than a couple of years. There are now nearly 1,800 locations, and our knowledge of boards of this description leads us to believe that they will leave their hotel at about 9 o'clock in the morning, motor out to a location, have a look at it, perhaps lunch in the bush, and will be home again by 5.30 p.m. for dinner.

Member: Or about 4 o'clock.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It has been suggested they will be back at 4 o'clock, but I believe the field officers do rather better work than merely being on duty from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. If the board are going to make any kind of an inspection of these properties, they will be fairly fortunate if they do much more than three or four per day; and if we take out Sundays and holidays and the few times the board will want to come up to Perth for a week, it will be seen that it is going to be a very long job.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Surely there are more than 1,800 locations.

Hon. W. J. MANN: There were 2,300, but many of them have been linked up, with the result that they are now reduced to 1,800.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That is outside the Peel Estate?

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, I understand that includes the Peel Estate. I have given my original idea for assessing these groups, but further consideration and some little talks with group settlers have caused me to alter my opinion and I now believe the present proposal will be more satisfactory to the group settlers; because it will bring in a board quite untrammelled by any previous convictions regarding group property valuations, and in addition the board may ignore all knowledge of any little friction that may have occurred between the board or the field officers and the settlers. Naturally, in a huge scheme of this description there are periods when the group settlers and the authorities clash. Both consider they are right. If subsequently anything happens that the settler feels to be against him, he sometimes gets the idea that he has been

victimised. Again, if the authorities insist that he shall do certain things quite against his wisdom and knowledge and he does not do them to their satisfaction, the board may think he is not doing as he should. So I think the bringing in of a new and untrammelled tribunal to make these assessments is best after all. Respecting these valuations, there is a number of aspects to be taken into consideration, and for obvious reasons I think it quite fair that they should be mentioned here. Some of the settlers have expended on their locations quite a reasonable amount of their own money. Many of them have gone on with the idea of making a home and making good. They have had a little financial resource, and they have not hesitated to spend a fair amount with the idea of bringing their places into profit as soon as possible. To the same end others have put in a good deal of spare time effort. They have not bothered about the ordinary working hours, the recognised 8 o'clock to 5 o'clock per day.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Has that been the recognised time?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, from the very inception that was the recognised time for working on the group settlements. On many of the groups the Saturday work finished at 12 noon. That was the authorities' scheme, and the settler is not to blame for it. Again, the idea of a lot of the settlers was that instead of taking each Saturday half-day, they should take a full day every alternate Saturday.

The Chief Secretary: Will the hon. member say it was not the men who fixed those hours?

Hon. W. J. MANN: It was not the men: that was the scheme handed to them.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And you say that was the original scheme.

Hon. W. J. MANN: When first they went down to the groups, the settlers had to work 48 hours per week. That is perfectly correct. They were paid for 48 hours per week.

The Honorary Minister: But that was the minimum. There was in addition the work done to establish their farms.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, that was for the purpose of establishing their farms. They were encouraged to do spare time work.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Were their spare time hours recorded?

Hon. W. J. MANN: No. Certain circulars were sent out to the settlers saying they were expected to put in certain

spare time as well. But the actual time they worked and for which they were paid was 48 hours per week.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It was the team work that they did in 48 hours.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes. Provided the settler is not working on contract, the foreman expects him to be at work at 8 a.m., and if he sees him coming home at a quarter past 5 p.m. it is accepted as about right. Contracts came in, and the great majority of the settlers did a lot of spare time effort. Moreover, a number of them spent their own capital. Many of the men did not scruple to call in the aid of their families and worked, not only daylight hours but night hours also, pulling their logs together for the burn-up, and that sort of thing. Also they worked on Saturday afternoons and frequently on Sundays. Those men by their industry have built up better places than have the men who simply sat back and made a job of it. I want to be sure that in these assessments those industrious men are not going to be mulcted by reason of their energy. If that should happen, I can see quite an exodus from the groups of the very men we want to keep, the men that have made their holdings financial propositions fast becoming worth while. They are the men largely responsible for the great increase in the cream being accepted at various butter factories and, consequently, for the increase in the butter production of the State. I want an assurance that whoever constitutes the board shall have it made clear to them that there must be no mass production principle in the making of the assessments, no sitting in an office and taking the graphs coloured red—"This is what the Government have done and this is what the man himself has done." I do not want any other method than the method of going on to the property, seeing the man, taking the personal equation into consideration, together with the work done on the place, and valuing the location from a purely commercial standpoint. We had the principle of mass production in the early stages of the scheme. The idea was to punch the settlers all out of the one mould. We now know that was impossible, owing to the differences in temperament and climate, and what-not. I want to stress the contention that fair recognition must be given to active industrious men in the making of their assessments, as against the

men who have sat down and done nothing more than they were compelled to do. The man honestly endeavouring to make good should be carefully safeguarded in the determining of these assessments. I will support the Bill.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.56]: I do not rise to pose as an authority on group settlement for I know very little, hardly anything, about it. But I do realise fully that we are bound to make some reduction in the amount of money we have spent on the scheme, and that in handing over the locations to the men, we must reduce the amounts due on them. When the idea of group settlement was first mooted I was opposed to it. But I gave, as I always do give, to Sir James Mitchell, very great credit for his originality in starting the scheme, and in getting into touch with the British Government and directing their attention to the development of Western Australia by that method. To my mind the method by which it was attempted to develop the country was altogether wrong. For those men, aptly described by Mr. Seddon as men who came from London, never used to bush life or to Australian conditions, were taken down and asked to work under overseers on those group settlements, put to what was regarded as the hardest work in Western Australia.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The first thousand men on the group settlements were not migrants at all, but were approved men from our own State.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am speaking of the migrants. When those men were put in those immense forests, naturally their hearts went down into their boots. My idea was that the Government should have cleared a space on each area so that those migrants could have gone to work and produced something in the early stages of their new career. There are always men ready to take clearing contracts at a far cheaper rate than that at which it could be done by newly arrived migrants on the group settlements. I did not lose sight of the fact that the idea of getting them to do the clearing was to familiarise them to Western Australian conditions, both as to clearing and climate. That was the reason given for getting the migrants to do the clearing rather

than having it done by contract. It was my idea to have portion of the land cleared by contract. If a man had a holding of 100 acres, 25 acres of it would be cleared in order that he might be able to get some return from it straight away. Only recently it has been pointed out to us that clearing is the hardest work in Western Australia. In the course of a debate here the other day we were told it was most difficult to get an Australian or European to undertake clearing, and great exception was taken to the fact that nearly all such work was being done by people from the south of France and by Italians. If our own men will not tackle that class of work, how can we expect men from England, without experience of such heart-breaking thickets and forests, to do it satisfactorily? My suggestion was no new idea because, in 1890 or 1891—that was long before there was any idea of group settlement—I wrote a letter to the Press suggesting that the Government should clear areas and add the cost of the clearing to the annual price, giving the settlers 20 or 30 years to pay for it. It is nearly 40 years since I offered that suggestion. That would have been the system to adopt for group settlement. To my mind, Western Australia should never have had anything to do with the finding of money for group settlement. To find the money for that purpose was an undertaking far beyond our means. When the then Premier, Sir James Mitchell, went to London, the proposal he should have submitted to the Home authorities, was, "We will make you a present of the land; you find the money and put your migrants on the land and, after a time, when they are doing well, you can charge them so much." Instead of our finding the money, the Home authorities should have found it, while the Commonwealth Government might have paid the interest. Under the conditions existing when I had that idea in mind, Western Australia would have received an extra 25s. per head for every migrant who came here under the scheme, and in the circumstances the State might have undertaken the supervision of the work.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is exactly what Sir James Mitchell was advised to do.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have not taken any prominent part in the discussion on group settlement. I realised it was going to be a very expensive experi-

ment. The report submitted by Mr. Holmes and his fellow Commissioners showed that the particular portion of group settlement into which they inquired was a failure. Therefore, I felt justified in continuing reluctantly to cherish the ideas on which I thought group settlement should have been based in order that it might be made a success. I now realise that we must make a reduction in the capital costs so that the group settlers will have a capitalisation on which it will be possible for them to pay interest and carry on. Unless I hear anything during the subsequent discussion that leads me to adopt a different view, I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Would you allow three men to write off millions of money without any control?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Perhaps we shall discuss that question at the Committee stage.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [6.3]: I do not intend to give a long dissertation on this Bill. The measure, by its brevity, speaks for itself. As I understand the question, several millions of money have been expended on group settlement—

Hon. J. Ewing: Some of it on railways.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Still, the money has been expended on the group settlement scheme. That expenditure has been authorised by Parliament. Already too much has been said by way of criticism of the scheme, and too little notice has been taken of the criticism, so I shall not add any further comment on the failure or success of group settlement. Every session it has been stressed that the State was proceeding on wrong lines in spending millions of money as it was doing. The previous Government were responsible and the present Government were responsible, in my opinion, for the lavish expenditure of money on group settlement. Now we have a board inquiring into group settlement and making recommendations as to the mistakes or successes of past administrations. This Bill has been introduced to give that board power—

Hon. J. Ewing: No, another board.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, to give another board power to write down probably a million of money without any reference whatever to Parliament. In the writing down of some of that lavish expenditure,

Parliament is to be ignored. I do not know much about companies, but I think it is a general rule for company directors to tell the shareholders by how much the capital is to be written down or what is to be done. Often the shareholders have no alternative to accepting the recommendations of the directors, but they have a chance to consider the decisions of the directors in the writing down of a company's capital. With the passing of this measure, however, Parliament will have no say at all. We shall not be asked even to express a pious opinion. Such a thing should not be sanctioned and I hope it will not be. If it is, let the board now doing the work continue to do it. The existing board is a fairly competent one. I know two of its members and I am satisfied they possess a good deal of horse sense. The question is, "Are they going to make the necessary inquiry and recommend what amount shall be written down? If not, why are they acting to-day?" If they are going to recommend some other tribunal to do the job, it will be a waste of money. If that is not the proposal, I should like to know what the new board is to do.

Hon. W. J. Mann: To assist the settlers financially and otherwise.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then we are going to constitute another body to say whether some of the capital should be written off. Where is that body going to get its information and how?

Hon. W. J. Mann: By investigation on the properties.

Hon. J. CORNELL: By records in the office?

Hon. W. J. Mann: And by inspection.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then the new board will have to traverse some of the ground that the present board has covered. If there is going to be any writing down without reference to Parliament I would much prefer that the present board clean up the business and recommend what should be done; otherwise we shall have another body stepping in and probably bringing down recommendations totally the reverse of those of the board at present investigating group settlement. My point is that the Bill should be amended in Committee to provide that whatever capital is to be written off shall be written off on the recommendation of the board with the approval of Parliament. If

the board is a competent one—and I think the present board is—to make recommendations, why should any other board be constituted? If the board recommends that a certain amount should be written off to make the scheme a success, I do not think there will be much cavil on the part of Parliament. But we would have this safeguard, that we would not be instituting the pernicious system of Parliament voting money and then empowering an independent body to write it off without the approval of Parliament. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, but I am strongly of opinion that whatever the board recommends should be subject to the approval of Parliament. If it is necessary for Parliament to appropriate money for group settlement, it should be equally necessary, when it comes to writing off millions, for Parliament to have that safeguard, even if no criticism whatever is offered by Parliament. We are in danger of introducing the pernicious system of one body voting money and an independent body determining what shall be written off.

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

BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Request for Conference.

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting the Council to grant a conference on the amendment insisted on by the Council, and intimating that the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That a message be transmitted to the Assembly agreeing to a conference as requested; that the conference be held in the President's room at 7.30 p.m., and that the Council be represented by the Hon. J. J. Holmes, Hon. H. A. Stephenson and the mover.

Question put and passed.

BILL—RAILWAYS DISCONTINUANCE.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the amendments made by the Council.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 8.30 p.m.

BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.

Conference Managers' Report.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson) [8.30]: I desire to report that the Managers appointed by this House met the Assembly Managers in conference and failed to come to an agreement.

BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it disagreed to the amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Delete and substitute the following in lieu thereof: "2. Section 41 of the principal Act shall, as from the first day of July, 1928, continue in force as amended by the Forests Act Amendment Acts, 1924 and 1927, and this Act until the thirtieth day of June, 1929, and no longer."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the Council's amendment is that there is already in the sandalwood reforestation fund an amount more than sufficient to meet the requirements for the present financial year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment made by the Council be not insisted upon.

This amendment was carried by a majority of only one vote, and I hope that upon reconsideration by the Committee I will meet with better success on this occasion. As members are aware, ever since 1924 the sum of £5,000 per annum has been placed in a fund for the purpose of the regrowth of sandalwood. There is now a balance of £7,000 in that fund and on an average only £3,000 per annum has been spent. The money is not needed for the propagation of sandalwood, nor for reforestation purposes, for on the 30th June, 1927, there was £115,000 in the reforestation fund and the year ended with £117,000 in that fund, or an increase of £2,000. There is only £5,000 involved in the amendment. It is a paltry amount, but still I could do very much with that if it were placed at my disposal for the

opening of schools. With that £5,000 I could open and finance for 12 months 15 schools. During the last two years the Education vote has increased by £73,000. I will not say that I have exercised strict economy, because in the Education Department strict economy is not called for. But at all events I have taken every precaution to see that the money has not been wasted. I made provision to open schools wherever they were justified by the attendance and, as I say, during the last two years there has been an increase of £73,000 in the vote. Besides that, we are spending £40,000 in dealing with miners' phthisis cases. Also there are losses on the agricultural railways being constructed. That is inevitable in the early stages of such enterprises, and those losses have to be made up in every legitimate way. We have also to find this year £226,000 additional interest and sinking fund on works approved by Parliament. And I may say the revenue is not increasing proportionately. Last year the income taxation was £64,000 less than the estimate, and £22,000 less than in the previous year. There is no control over that situation. The country is prosperous, yet the amount received in income tax has fallen away. I bring these facts before the Committee so that they may be weighed in the reconsideration of the Council's amendment.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Although the Chief Secretary has made out a very good case from the Treasurer's standpoint, I do not think he has quite appreciated the position regarding the regeneration of sandalwood. As he pointed out, £3,000 per annum has been spent in regeneration work. But those experiments have simply disclosed the great difficulty associated with regeneration. Again, that work has been practically confined to the goldfields area. It is quite evident from the history of sandalwood in Western Australia that sandalwood grows practically all over the State and seems to flourish best in jam country. Since we have to discover some means of successful regeneration, I suggest that we should extend our operations and try out new areas, not only goldfields areas, but farming areas and coastal areas and if possible even the northern areas, where different classes of sandalwood obtain. It is from that standpoint I would have the Committee approach this question. I feel that this work of sandalwood regeneration demands the services of

an economic specialist who should devote his time entirely to the experiments, trying out the sandalwood nuts not only in their natural condition but also, as suggested by the visiting forestry experts, in the way of determining how the germination proceeds under controlled conditions. Frequently important results can be obtained by experimental work, especially when dealing with seeds of very low germination ratio. The £3,000 annually devoted to this work could well be increased to the full amount of £5,000. And we have to recognise that in the future the amount of leeway in respect of sandalwood production will have to be made up by finding very much larger areas than we have been experimenting with in the past. The experimental work should be distributed over a far wider area, and when the experiments have demonstrated a satisfactory means by which sandalwood can be grown, our production of the wood should be greatly increased. The amount of £5,000, if not immediately required for regeneration work, would still be available to the Government in the form of a trust fund, and they could utilise it as they have used other loan moneys. Then, when required, it would be available for the purpose of the regeneration of sandalwood. For those reasons I hope the Council will insist upon the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: For the information of members I wish to say that since the second reading debate on this question I have discovered that Mr. Heath, the superintendent of King's Park, some years ago planted some sandalwood. He had no jam trees in the park, but he had the ordinary tuart, red gum and white gum for the sandalwood to thrive on if the sandalwood wanted a host at all. Mr. Heath tells me that sandalwood does not require a host, and will grow without one. He grew sandalwood without a host at long distances from any other trees. Unfortunately, fires came and burned out all the sandalwood trees except one, which is existing to-day and doing well, apparently without the assistance of any host. After the debate here the other day I asked the Conservator of Forests to let me have some sandalwood nuts and also some seed of the jam wood. He did so and Mr. Heath has now planted both the nuts and the seed in King's Park, in different positions and under different conditions. A free experiment will thus be conducted for

the benefit of the country. Several hundreds of sandalwood nuts have been planted in the park, and I am advised there is every probability of germination taking place.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: If there was a measure I thought was a really good one, it is that which provided for a special fund being set aside for sandalwood reforestation. Everything possible should be done to foster this wonderful and valuable plant. Apparently the money that was set aside for this purpose has been used in other directions of less value to the State. I know where many thousands of young trees are struggling for existence, but if they were properly cared for I have no doubt they would grow into valuable trees. It is criminal that the money set aside for this work should be used for something else.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is it definitely settled that sandalwood must have a host?

The Chief Secretary: Yes.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have seen a locality where all the timber but the sandalwood had died, or been killed. Unfortunately, the stock had access to that area. Many of the sandalwood trees died, but I do not know whether that was due to interference by the stock or to the ravages of insects. Sandalwood undoubtedly thrives well in thickets, because it is not interfered with by stock and it is not alone the subject of attacks by insects.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: This business of reforestation of sandalwood is being overdone. The Conservator has more money to spend than he can utilise. We should, therefore, have the money spent in other directions. It would be wise not to insist on our amendment. The matter will be discussed again next year.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I hope the Committee will insist upon its amendment. People will then be able to say whether they shall go back to the provisions of the original Act whereby three-fifths of the revenue must be devoted to the reforestation fund, or whether they wish the present procedure to be followed. It would be a good thing to move the Chairman out of the Chair, in which case the reforestation fund would benefit to the extent of £3,000.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I have for years been connected with the sandalwood industry, and I know that the tree does not require a host. It is said that sandalwood

takes a hundred years to mature. By the time the trees which have been planted come to maturity, the Chinese may have changed their religion and no longer have any wooden gods before whom to burn sandalwood. These trees will grow anywhere, on hills or in valleys, on clay or rocky ridges. They do not require anything else beside them to promote growth.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Some interesting experiments in the regeneration of sandalwood were tried at Mysore some time ago. Two of these were carried out without hosts. In each case only a small percentage of the plants survived in the first year, and died out altogether in the second year. I have seen the roots of the host as well of the sandalwood tree, and noted how the latter obtain nourishment from the former.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You should have put them into the Museum.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The roots grow practically side by side. The sandalwood root has a kind of bulge, which digs into the root of the host plant and so absorbs nourishment. Eventually, I understand, the host root dies. Mr. Brown says he has seen sandalwood trees growing entirely apart from hosts. That fact will be of great importance to the Forests Department if the hon. member can substantiate it, because he will show the plant growing apart from parasitism, and such a plant can readily be made the parent of other plants, which will have the same characteristic. To demonstrate that it is not a parasite, the root growth of the plant will have to be opened up. It is a recognised principle of plant breeding that a sport, such as this, can be made the basis of breeding new species. The large number of host plants on the goldfields are being eaten out, and no work is being done towards their regeneration. Sandalwood regeneration requires the regeneration of the mulga and other plants which are sandalwood hosts. There is an enormous field to be covered by a trained scientific investigator. Further, sandalwood oil is largely obtained from sandalwood roots. The solving of the sandalwood regeneration problem would mean that people requiring sandalwood oil for medicinal purposes would be able to extract it from the root growth. The supply of sandalwood oil, one of the most valuable of medicines, is rapidly decreasing. More-

over, there are no indications of a synthetic substitute.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Seddon in his first speech this evening said that money should be spent on the regeneration of sandalwood in various districts of Western Australia. When replying to speeches made on the second reading, I stated that that was impracticable, as all the country suitable for sandalwood had been taken up. Such country is either excellent grazing or good agricultural land. The Conservator of Forests has reported that he has made investigations without finding vacant country suitable for the purpose. Sandalwood will not grow on sandplain. The Conservator has also stated, in effect, that he intends to go slow during the next 12 months, exercising a general supervision. As to sandalwood for oil extraction purposes, the best country for that, he states, is in the North-West; but he thinks it far better to carry out experiments on the Eastern Goldfields, as they would be far less costly there. If they proved successful, he would attempt further experiments in the North-West. Mr. Hamersley said that the money set aside for sandalwood replanting has not been utilised, but has been taken for other purposes. That is not so. The amendment agreed to by this Chamber in 1924 provided that the money should be used for sandalwood regeneration. An amount of £7,000 is now available. The amendment here in question is to operate only for 12 months. About 30 years ago, during Sir John Forrest's Premiership, experiments were conducted in the replanting of sandalwood; and I remember that my district was overlooked in the expenditure while, as usual, the south was given every consideration. Sandalwood plantations on the Eastern Goldfields are not, so far, a failure, and I hope they will prove successful.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Forests Act contains no provision that royalty from jarrah shall be applied to reforestation of jarrah, or royalty from sandalwood to reforestation of sandalwood. Since 1924 the House has generously granted the Government about £25,000 for replanting sandalwood. The Chief Secretary knows, and possibly the Conservator of Forests does not realise, that throughout the rock catchment areas in jam country there are protected spots admirably suited for experi-

ments in planting sandalwood. Jam wood is an excellent host. Many of these places are to be found in my province, and doubtless in other provinces as well. Such places are really splendid experimental plots. How much can be done with £5,000 by day labour? The Conservator could use all the Government reserves which are scattered every few miles throughout the agricultural areas.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	9

A tie 0

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, the question passes in the negative.

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair. I cannot debate such a motion, but I do not want the Bill to go back to the Assembly in its present form.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	10

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Ewing
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 30th October, 1928.

	PAGE
Questions: Synthetic drinks	1464
Drainage, South-West	1464
Select Committee, Land Agents Bill, extension of time	1464
Bills: Water Boards Act Amendment, 3R.	1464
Profiteering Prevention, 3R.	1464
Fertilisers, Council's amendments	1464
Railways Discontinuance, Council's amendments	1466
Abattoirs Act Amendment, Council's Message, request for Conference	1468
Electoral Districts Act Amendment, 2R.	1468
Lunacy Act Amendment, 1R.	1473
Jury Act Amendment, Com.	1473
Abattoirs Act Amendment, Council's further Message	1474
Abattoirs Act Amendment, Conference Managers' report	1474
Jury Act Amendment, Com. Report	1474
Quarry Railway Extension, 2R.	1478
Annual Estimates: Vote Discussed—Public Works and Buildings	1480

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

QUESTION—SYNTHETIC DRINKS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Health: 1, Is the sale of synthetic drinks in Western Australia illegal? 2, If so, is it incumbent upon the vendor to display an efficient notice or statement indicating the constituents of the liquid?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, No. 2, Any drinks which are made from synthetic essences or extracts must be labelled "Imitation," and sold as such. This is quite a simple matter when the drinks are sold in bottles, but it is most difficult to regulate in connection with drinks sold over the counter, as it does not appear to be practicable to require the glasses to be labelled. The vendor is not required to display a notice indicating the constituents of the drink.

QUESTION—DRAINAGE, SOUTH-WEST.

Mr. WITHERS asked the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: 1, Has any comprehensive scheme of drainage for the South-West from Pinjarra to Bunbury been completed; if so, when will it be put into operation? 2, Is the present drainage in the Harvey-Brunswick area a part of a comprehensive scheme?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, Not yet. This must follow a full investigation of the land. It cannot precede it. 2, It may be so assumed, but cannot be definitely stated until the comprehensive scheme is designed.

LAND AGENTS BILL.—SELECT COMMITTEE.

On motion by Mr. Lindsay, the time for bringing up the report was extended for two weeks.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Water Boards Act Amendment.

2, Profiteering Prevention.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FERTILISERS.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 11 amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair: the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Delete the definition of "financial year."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is desired in this case that the year should commence on the 1st November. This is more convenient for all concerned. That would also be the best period in which to register fertilisers. Most of the other amendments are consequential upon the first one.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It does not matter what the date is.