

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 16th September, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Royal Perth Hospital, as to intermediate beds, charges, etc. ...	1125
Medical School, as to resumption of land	1125
Motions : Electricity Act, to disallow radio workers' regulations ...	1131
Electricity Act, to disallow cinematograph operators' regulations... ..	1132
Bills : Land Sales Control, Standing Orders suspension, 1r., 2r. ...	1125
2r., Com. point of order, report, 3r. ...	1137
Assembly's message ...	1151
Assembly's request for conference ...	1154
Conference managers' report ...	1154
Assembly's further message ...	1155
Interpretation Act Amendment, 3r. ...	1134
Marriage Act Amendment, 3r....	1134
Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r. ...	1134
Fisheries Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r. ...	1134
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment, as to re-com., 3r. ...	1134
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, Com., report ...	1135

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

QUESTIONS.

ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL.

As to Intermediate Beds, Charges, etc.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Honorary Minister for Agriculture:

(1) (a) What number of intermediate beds are provided in the wing of the new Royal Perth Hospital?

(b) How are they divided in rooms?

(2) What number of intermediate beds will be provided when the new hospital is completed?

(3) (a) What charges are to be made for the occupancy of these beds?

(b) How will they vary according to class of accommodation?

(4) (a) What is the estimated cost per bed in the Royal Perth Hospital?

(b) Does this include the cost of all hospital services divided per bed?

(c) Does it also include interest on the cost of the new building?

(5) Is it possible to provide a comparative figure with a private hospital such as the Mount Hospital, where the charge covers only accommodation and nursing?

(6) (a) Is a plan of the ultimate design of the Royal Perth Hospital and its surroundings available?

(b) If so, will the Minister lay same on the Table of the House?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) 39 beds.

(b) 1 room of 4 beds =	4
3 rooms of 3 beds =	9
7 rooms of 2 beds =	14
12 rooms of 1 bed =	12

(2) 72 beds.

(3) Charges have not yet been determined.

(4) (a) The cost per patient per day during the 12 months ended 30/6/1948 was 24s. 7d.

(b) Yes.

(c) No.

(5) No.

(6) No.

MEDICAL SCHOOL.

As to Resumption of Land.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Honorary Minister for Agriculture:

Has any decision been made regarding the resumption of land suggested by Professor McCallum in his report on the establishment of a medical school.

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:
No.

BILL—LAND SALES CONTROL.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [4.36]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Bill to be passed through all its stages at the one sitting.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [4.37]: I hope the Honorary Minister will give us time to have a look at the Bill if we agree to the motion. Probably he

would be agreeable to having it adjourned until after the tea suspension so that members can peruse it. If not, I must oppose the motion.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [4.38]: If the motion is carried, it does not necessarily mean to say that the Bill will be rushed through. I am willing to sit here until quite a late hour tonight if necessary. It is essential that the measure be passed by this House and sent to another place.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Is it essential that it be passed today?

The **HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: Yes, we want it passed today, and I see no reason why it should not be. I will give the House every opportunity to study the Bill; even to the extent, should it be necessary, of adjourning the House for two or three hours in addition to the tea suspension.

Question put and passed.

First Reading.

Bill received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: I apologise to the House for having to present the Bill at such a late hour. I mean by that, that the control now exercised by the Commonwealth finishes on Monday next. So, I admit, it does not give members very much time in which to consider the measure. But, as I have already said, I shall allow as much time today as is necessary for them to study the Bill in order that it may be passed.

There were reasons for the delay. I have been told that the officers concerned desired to get as much information as they could about what was being done in the Eastern States in connection with the transition of land powers from the Commonwealth to the States. I will tell the House later on what has been done there. Members know that after the Referendum the Commonwealth decided to relinquish control on sales of land and so it is neces-

sary that the control should be taken up by the States on the 20th September; that is next Monday. This Bill, if passed, will place on the statute book necessary legislation for the State to continue control.

Some time ago the Leader of the Opposition, when Premier, went to the Eastern States and while there he made representations to the Prime Minister that Western Australia was in a bad position regarding the base figure which was adopted on the 1942 valuation. At that time he got relief to the extent of a 15 per cent. increase on the base price and thus the base figure at present is the 1942 valuation plus 15 per cent. When the valuation was based on the 1942 figure, Western Australia in particular was dealt a very severe blow in regard to land values. Probably Western Australia was dealt a more severe blow than any other State with the exception of Queensland. Members will know that in 1942 there was a scare of Japanese bombing, and perhaps Japanese invasion, and land was practically unsaleable.

I know of one instance where people went from the city to the country—and there were many of them—and I know this instance quite well because the people came to my own home, which we divided into two. They let their house for the low sum of £2 5s. per week. Later on the court gave these people permission to charge £3 16s. a week for the same house. I mention that to show how the values of rents and everything else were depleted at that time, and Western Australia in particular was dealt a severe blow in that regard. Under the Bill the Government will allow considerable alleviation with respect to prices, and I will explain that later on.

The Bill aims to alleviate and decontrol just as much as is possible within reason. I do not think that the time has yet arrived when all controls of land should be removed but I am of the opinion, and the Government as a whole agrees, that although we do not want all controls removed, the time has come when a number of them can be done away with. When I say controls, I mean control over the price of land. Land sales have gone on almost to the same degree as before, but most of the prices have been on blackmarket values. I do not think it would be any exaggeration to say that 90 per cent. of the sales have been made at blackmarket prices.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How do they work it?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is worked very easily. I will give members an instance of what happened to me. I was mixed up unintentionally in what I think was a blackmarket sale. One of my constituents asked me to pick up a cheque at a certain place in Perth which was for the sale of a block of land. I went along to get the cheque and the man opened a safe and I could see a large number of notes. I am quite sure in my own mind that a certain amount of money, apart from those notes, was passed between the vendor and the purchaser. It is quite easily done and I cannot see how it could be stopped. I have been told that where a person goes along and buys a house for, say, £1,000, the vendor sells the key for, say, another £500, or the cat for £100 or something else like that. I am quite sure that there is not the slightest doubt that blackmarketing has been rampant over the years, even with the control of prices.

Hon. G. Fraser: You say 90 per cent. How do you estimate that?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am only making a guess.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: It might be 99 per cent.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is my guess, and my guess is as good as the hon. member's, but I am confident that blackmarketing has been going on in regard to the sale of land, particularly city land. I have discussed the matter with land valuers, and they have told me that that is the position. I know of another case in the country where a large property at Katanning was sold and a certain amount of blackmarket money passed between the vendor and the purchaser. I have been told of other instances and I think it is only logical under the circumstances. If we take the fixed price of a property valued in 1942 at £3 an acre, who is going to sell a property at the present time for that amount? We have only to consider the price of wheat, lambs, pigs, wool and everything else to realise that no-one would sell at that figure, except under exceptional circumstances. Of course, there may be times when people want to get out. So I believe that this Bill, with the lifting of control, will to a great extent obliterate

the blackmarket in land sales and the business will go through the authorised channels, which means that the Government will receive stamp duty. At present the Government is being deprived of stamp duty because of these blackmarket deals.

Hon. G. Fraser: How are you going to do that, when you have legislation similar to that operated by the Commonwealth?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not the same, and I will explain that later on.

Hon. G. Fraser: Are you going to have the same controller?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The control will be separate but the basis of valuation will be different. If the hon. member will have some patience, I will explain that later on when I come to it. This Bill will restore public confidence in the land business. I do not think that is only my opinion about what is going on in regard to blackmarketing, as members have only to ask anybody in the business. It is not going on only in connection with land but in many other directions as well.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Has the Bill been distributed yet?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is on your file.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope that when the Bill comes up for review next year it will not be necessary to ask Parliament to continue it, but I am honestly of the opinion that the legislation is required for at least 12 months. It may be that Parliament will be asked to continue it next year, but I hope not. It is proposed under the Bill to release control over vacant city, country town and suburban lots.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: The Bill does not provide for that, does it?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It will be done by regulation. Business premises will be entirely decontrolled. There again I want to make it quite clear that that means business premises where no dwelling is attached. Where a dwelling is attached to a business house it will have to be considered. Purely business premises and boarding houses will be completely decontrolled. The Government, however, will retain the right to exercise

control if necessary should the situation get out of hand. The Government does not desire to be placed in that position, and I certainly hope it will not be necessary to resume control to that extent. With regard to ordinary dwelling-houses, an increase of 15 per cent. will be allowed. The control price will be maintained in respect of that type of house at the basic figure fixed in 1942, plus 15 per cent., plus another 15 per cent.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is, 30 per cent.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It will be more than that; it will be 32½ per cent.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. It will be slightly more than double. I do not think that price will be excessive. I know that prices on that basis are paid today, with an extra 15 per cent. on the blackmarket. Farm lands will be on a similar basis to dwellings, and subject to the basic price of 1942, plus 15 per cent., plus another 15 per cent. Thus it will be seen that the Government intends to exercise a considerable amount of decontrol. It was suggested that the control with regard to farm lands should be dispensed with altogether, but the Government considers that a measure of control should be continued for a further 12 months respecting properties and areas of land that will be required for soldier settlement purposes. For that reason, 15 per cent. was considered quite enough in the uplift of prices.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Why do you make that statement, that that is quite sufficient? Is it in order that the Government may purchase properties more cheaply for soldier settlement purposes?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The soldiers have to be considered.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Quite so.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: And I remind the hon. member that this is for 12 months only. During that period, it is considered that all the properties required will have been bought for soldiers. I can inform the House that many people who have sold their farm properties are quite satisfied with the price received. That is borne out by the large number of holdings that have changed hands and been acquired by the Government. Some of the former owners felt

that the valuations might have been a little low, but were prepared to accept them because of the conditions under which they sold to the Government. Those transactions were on a cash basis; there was no time payment and no commission. Everything was done quickly. I will be candid and admit that some people have not been entirely satisfied but, generally speaking, they have been.

I will give the House information regarding the position in the Eastern States. In New South Wales, vacant areas, residential blocks and land required for industrial purposes have been exempted from control. The standard valuation for land sales has not yet been determined. In Victoria, the existing policy is to be maintained except that it is proposed to release vacant blocks, irrespective of their value, just as we propose to do here. In South Australia the legislation retains the 1942 values. I do not think South Australia suffered like we did. That State was in rather a protected position in 1942, and, as far as I can gather, land values there did not deteriorate to the extent that they did in this State. In Tasmania, they have taken over the Commonwealth conditions without any alterations whatever, and are continuing on that basis. As I have pointed out, Western Australia is acting similarly to New South Wales and Victoria, and controls will be maintained in respect of all sales with the exception of those affecting city, suburban and country town lots.

I believe that the community generally and the workers in particular, have suffered as a result of the control exercised during the past few years. I know of instances where workers and others put their savings into vacant land but, when they came to sell their blocks, could not get what they paid for them. In fact, the Government itself was in that position. For one reason or another, land had to be sold, and the Government had to accept a price lower than that which it paid.

Hon. A. Thomson: The State Housing Commission was in that position.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. The Commission acquired land much below its real value. I admit that, and I agree that it does not seem right. It seems to me a great pity that it was so, particularly where land was resumed. I took up a case on be-

half of a woman who had paid £200 for a large block of land. It was resumed for certain purposes and the deal led to a long argument. It took me a long time to get the lady her £200, but I did so eventually by, practically speaking, sitting on the doorstep of the people concerned. In my opinion, with the lessening of control the demand for land will increase. I do not think that the amount of money involved will change to any great extent, because I think the value is there all the time. On the other hand, the Government will collect stamp duty that was not payable before because, under the changed conditions, everything will be above-board.

After 12 months, it is proposed to review this legislation and, if necessary, effect adjustments to meet the circumstances prevailing at that time. We do not propose to set up any new department, but will use that in existence now. It will be taken over as it stands, and the officers will be paid by the State for work done. They will also be paid for work that they will continue to transact on behalf of the Commonwealth with regard to valuations for taxation purposes. The administration of the department will be under the control of the State Minister. We are fortunate in being able to retain the services of permanent officers who are well versed in matters affecting land sales. What they do not know about land valuations is not worth knowing, and we will benefit from that standpoint.

Under the Bill, it is proposed to set up an advisory panel to advise the Government and the controller on land valuation matters. There is also the appeal board to which any person unsatisfied with his treatment can make representations. I do not think there is anything more I can tell the House at this stage. I trust the Bill will be agreed to, so that everything will be in order by next Monday, when control will be relinquished by the Commonwealth Government. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till after the tea suspension.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why not pass the second reading?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have been unable to read the Bill.

Hon. L. Craig: We could proceed with other business in the meantime.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We shall know something about the Bill if we have an opportunity to peruse it. There is a sheaf of amendments.

Hon. H. K. Watson: If Sir Charles Latham is willing to withdraw his amendment I am prepared to speak to the Bill.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member has evidently perused it, because he has prepared many amendments to it. However, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [5.1]: I share the regret expressed by the Minister at the extremely brief opportunity this House appears to be afforded to consider the Bill, which, it seems, we are expected to pass almost with the speed of jet propulsion. I find myself in much the same position as has been expressed by Sir Charles Latham. I would have preferred to have much more time to consider the Bill and its implications. Even if the Bill is not passed today and even though the Commonwealth regulations expire at midnight on Monday next, I suggest that, if the Bill is not passed today, but on Tuesday next, the consequences would be negligible. The earth would still continue to revolve on its axis in its orbit round the sun.

The substance of the Bill, as I understand it, is that no land may be transferred without the consent of the controller, and that the controller, in giving or withholding his consent, will have regard to the question as to whether, in his opinion, the price at which the property is being sold is its fair value as at the 10th February, 1942. Whichever way one looks at this question of control, whether it be viewed from the standpoint of business premises, vacant lands, farms or private homes, it definitely inflicts injustice.

Take a simple illustration, the ease of a worker living at Midland Junction and owning his own home. He finds himself transferred to Fremantle. It is inconvenient to travel the whole distance each day and consequently he decides to sell his house at Midland Junction and build a house at Fremantle. Assume his house at Midland Junction cost him, pre-war, £1,000, it would be

worth today £1,800. It would cost him £1,800 to build the same type of house today. He says, "I will sell my Midland Junction home and build another at Fremantle of the same dimensions." He finds, however, that although it costs him £1,800 to build a house at Fremantle of the same size, he is compelled to sell his house at Midland Junction for £1,000. In other words, he is compelled to make a virtual gift of £800 to some lucky purchaser.

To me, control does seem wrong in principle. I suggest that whatever merit the control may have over the sales of homes or farm lands—having regard in the case of farm lands to the relationship of commodity prices to capital values—there is no ground at all for control over the sale of vacant lands, business premises or mining tenements. The average business man—and what I say now applies also to the average company—seeking either a city property, a factory or a business establishment, is well able to protect himself and to see that he gets 20s. in the pound value for every £1 he spends. He does not require any protection at all.

On the question of the value of mining tenements, hon. members who represent Goldfields constituencies can speak with much more authority than I. It requires no special brilliance to realise the utter impossibility of a clerk, sitting in his office in the Taxation Department in Barrack-street, assessing the 1942 value of a mining tenement or of a part thereof, whether it be a goldmining lease or a prospecting area for asbestos or felspar or any other mineral. The Minister has informed us that, although vacant land and business premises are controlled under the Bill in its present form, they will, by regulation, which I understand is to be introduced on Monday, be excluded from the Bill. I find it difficult to follow the logic of legislation of this description. If vacant land and building premises are to be excluded from control, then Parliament should write into the Bill the exclusions which are to be made, particularly if they are not exclusions which are to be made in the dim distant future but which we are assured will be made on Monday morning. As I have said, the proper place to declare the exemptions, in my opinion, is in the Bill.

Here is another angle: Assume the Bill is passed in its present form and that the

regulation is brought down on Monday morning to exempt vacant land and business premises, it is conceivable that after the regulation has been tabled in both Houses of Parliament, it may be disallowed by another place. If that were so, this House would have lost all opportunity of rectifying the matter. The Minister has made reference to what has been done in the other States, or some of them. I have studied carefully the South Australian Act dealing with land sales control. It was assented to on the 5th August, 1948, some five weeks ago and it followed the same principles for decontrol to which the Minister has adverted; that is, in South Australia, it is not intended to continue the control over vacant land or over building premises. That exemption, however, is included in the South Australian Act itself. There is really no good reason why we should not follow that example in our legislation.

The task of the controller—or indeed of any other person—in this year of grace, 1948, arriving at or expressing an opinion on what was the fair value of any property in 1942, and not only in 1942 but on the 10th February of that year, is, if not impossible, an exceedingly difficult one. I should like to give the House one or two illustrations of how control has worked in recent years under Commonwealth administration. A case came under my notice of a residence in West Perth which was to be sold for £3,000. Two approved valuers valued the property at £2,850, but the controller of land sales refused to agree to the sale at a price greater than £2,200. Another case is that of a city property just over the William-street bridge. The sale price was £7,000. The valuation of the approved valuer was £6,900, but the price on which the controller insisted was £5,000—£5,000 as against a sale price of £7,000! A competent and approved valuer valued the property as at the 10th February, 1942, at £6,900.

In connection with these values, I think it worth while to remember that when the approved valuer makes his valuation, he inspects the property and may spend half a day, a day or two days making a thorough and complete personal investigation of the property for the purpose of compiling his detailed report. But the Treasury official who vetoes that valuation does not leave his

office. He simply sits at his desk and, from such information as he may have in his office, makes an arbitrary valuation which over-rides that of the competent valuer who has personally inspected the premises. I therefore feel that any aggrieved applicant should have the right of appeal from the valuation of the controller to the advisory committee which it is proposed to set up under the measure. I think provision for the advisory committee and appeal to it should be made expressly in the legislation.

Steps should be taken to see that the advisory committee is a much more representative and practical body than the more or less departmental committee that was set up under the Commonwealth regulations, and that which, if I understood the Minister's remarks correctly, is proposed to be set up under this measure. I am not sure whether the Minister contemplates an advisory committee consisting largely of departmental men, but I sincerely hope he does not. I feel that Clause 12 should be struck out as it seems calculated to encourage the growth of that obnoxious person, the agent provocateur. When the Bill is in the Committee stage I feel we could assist the Government's desire in the matter—it would certainly be more in accord with parliamentary practice and the rights of this House—by amending the measure in the manner I have indicated.

I have circulated among members a list of amendments, based largely on the South Australian Act, and I trust the Honorary Minister will see his way clear to accept them. They relate to the inclusion in the Bill of provision for the exemption of vacant land, business properties and mining tenements; provision for a right of appeal, for the safeguarding of the composition of the committee and the deletion of Clause 12, together with one or two minor amendments that I believe the Honorary Minister will readily accept. I support the second reading of the Bill, but trust we will have opportunity of making these amendments that in my opinion are necessary and desirable.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

I do not wish to speak on a Bill that I have not examined.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think it would be preferable if members who desire to do so, would speak on the Bill now.

Hon. G. Fraser: We are all in the same boat.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If it is the wish of the House that the debate be adjourned until after tea, I am agreeable to that course being followed, though I would prefer any member who is prepared to do so to speak now.

Motion (adjournment) put and passed.

MOTION—ELECTRICITY ACT.

To Disallow Radio Workers' Regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. A. L. Loton:—

That Regulations Nos. 113, 117, 118, 119, 123, 124, 129, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139 and 142 made under the Electricity Act 1945, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 25th March, 1948, and laid on the Table of the House on the 27th July, 1948, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.22]: I believe these regulations would create difficulties and considerable inconvenience in country areas. In many districts there are men who do radio work, and some of them are almost expert at it, but if they had to pass the radio workers' examination before being allowed to continue in their trade, I am afraid they would not qualify. As time goes on there are more and more radio sets in country areas. The regulations, of course, refer to any kind of radio set, electric or otherwise. Under them, a radio worker who did not pass the examination could not interfere even with a battery set. The regulations go beyond the requirements of the State Electricity Commission for the protection of people from a safety point of view. For that reason I feel bound to vote for their disallowance.

I am not so concerned about the metropolitan area as about country districts. If it is desirable to apply the regulations to the metropolitan area, that could be done, and country districts could be exempted. However, I feel that even for the metropolitan area these regulations are too drastic.

I have formed that opinion from representations made to me by various people who have been engaged in the industry. Many of the men in the country, to whom I have referred, have been doing this work for years. If a person chooses such a man to do radio repair work, that is his affair, and it is not the business even of a member of Parliament to interfere. I know of very few cases where such men have done a bad job or have displeased the owner of the set. In my home town there is a man who has been doing this work for many years.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: For how long?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: For about ten years.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Then he would easily pass the examination.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He would have no trouble in passing the test.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Until we peruse some of the examination papers, we do not know what difficulties will be involved in passing the test.

Hon. G. Fraser: Have the people you refer to ever tried to pass such an examination?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: If the regulations become law hundreds of people in the rural areas will have to send their radio sets to Perth for repairs and we, who live in the country, do not desire regimentation of that kind. Unless the regulations are considerably modified, I will oppose them. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

MOTION—ELECTRICITY ACT.

To Disallow Cinematograph Operators' Regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. Sir Charles Latham:—

That Regulations Nos. 71, 80, 86 and 104 made under the Electricity Act, 1945, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 25th March, 1948, and laid on the Table of the House on the 27th July, 1948, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.27]: I am surprised that Sir Charles Latham should

have moved for the disallowance of these regulations. After the startling things he told the House the other night, I made inquiries and found that all his arguments were based on very insecure foundations. There is a real danger attached to amateurs or unskilled and inexperienced people doing work in connection with cinematographs. I have been supplied by a firm of underwriters with a list that clearly indicates the hazards of fire in the operating box. Other firms may have additional records. The statement supplied to me reads—

In view of the fact that the Film Renters' Association insists on their films being handled by licensed operators, it is with some satisfaction that we note that the damage for 14 fires has been confined to a cost of less than £160. Had not skilled operators been in charge it is felt that the number of and damage by fires would have been greater, with the possibility of additional loss of buildings, and even life.

Hon. W. R. Hall: They would be pretty well insured.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Of course they would be insured. The statement continues—

Total Claims for Fires £159 10s. 6d.

Date of Mishap	Cause.	Amount of Claim. £ s. d.
28/1/1944	Film broke and jammed in machine.	6 15 10
18/3/1944	Double break	12 1 6
29/7/1944	Fire occurred in the gate and penetrated to the magazine.	12 19 2

That is in the machine room and the total damage was £12 19s. 2d. The list goes on—

		£ s. d.
7/9/1944	Film caught fire.	11 10 9
15/9/1944	Film broke.	8 12 9
13/9/1944	Film touched exciter lamp.	7 12 4
Total (1944)		59 12 4

If the operators in charge had not been experienced and licensed, there would have been greater damage.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I guarantee they were not experienced licensed operators at that time.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The claims list also shows the following:—

10/2/1945	Join parted in projection gate.	10	10	0
26/3/1945	Joint in film snapped, lodged in gate.	10	19	1
12/4/1945	Film broke at projection head.	8	6	8
9/9/1945	Electric light exploded and set fire to the King film.	16	13	1
7/12/1945	Film broke	3	12	4
Total (1945)		50	1	2
11/1/1946	During re-threading, end of film touched cooling plate.	18	9	9
Total (1946)		18	9	9
3/8/1947	Fire occurred at changeover.	9	12	2
Total (1947)		9	12	2

Hon. W. R. Hall: They got out of it lightly.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I just want to point out that skilled men were looking after the machine.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The damage might not have occurred if a man who had not passed his examination had been in charge.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I just want to point list is as follows:—

		£	s.	d.
19/6/1948	As reel was removed from lower magazine end of film brushed the auxiliary motor rheostat.	21	15	1

I do not see how these regulations can be lightly cast aside on the figures and occurrences I have quoted, nor why members should agree to a set of circumstances that would be detrimental to the men operating these machines.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have you got a table of premiums from the insurance company?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That has nothing to do with the argument. The point is that the premiums would perhaps be three or four times as high as any ordinary risk.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You do not know; that is only supposition!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is not supposition. It is a fact. Sir Charles Latham made some sarcastic remarks regarding the

regulations yesterday evening in connection with having to obtain a plumber to fit a washer on a tap.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Is that not so?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There is a common-sense reason for all those regulations. It is that all the people who cannot do these jobs are obliged to call in plumbers to do the skilled work, and they are entitled to receive labour and services from men who are properly qualified to carry out the work. Sir Charles Latham and Mr. Thomson put up some strong arguments why everyone should be allowed to do such work.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They have been doing it for 32 years.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is most surprising to me to see, particularly in country areas, the bad work done in hotels by alleged plumbers, which not only burdened the owners with additional cost but also inconvenienced the tenants and everyone else concerned.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is a reflection on the Licensing Court.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Most likely the person who did the job was not licensed at all.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Licensing Court should see that such work is performed to its satisfaction.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: How could it do that?

Hon. A. Thomson: Why do you say the work was done wrongly if the court did not see the jobs done?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We would not expect the Licensing Court to travel all over the country looking at such work.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why make a charge? You are giving an illustration.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am giving an illustration of the jobs I have seen and which would be a disgrace to a poor class plumber.

Hon. W. R. Hall: What has this got to do with cinematograph machines?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the hon. member to speak to the motion.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am speaking now of the value of the regulations. I challenge any member of this House effectively to dispute the value of any one of these regulations. They are reasonable, and our first

consideration should be the protection of the public. That is the main object. The people are entitled to be protected whether they are in a picture theatre in the country or in the metropolis. The authorities have every right to promulgate these regulations, which will be just not only to theatre patrons but also to the proprietors and film operators.

Hon. A. Thomson: What has the Health Department been doing all this time?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The hon. member would still object no matter which department framed the regulations. He is a skilled craftsman himself, and I am surprised at his putting up arguments against these regulations. They are designed so that it is not necessary for anyone to be trained, but in order that one can learn anything at any time.

Hon. A. Thomson: You are making a close preserve.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: An examination of the regulations destroys that argument. Everything is fairly balanced, and all sections of industry and the community will obtain knowledge from them. For that reason I cannot understand why any objection should be raised. Such a course is not fair to the State Electricity Commission. It is desirable that Western Australia should work in fair comparison with conditions in the Eastern States. We want every authority to work in unison and co-operate with each other. It will be impossible for them to do that unless we have regulations comparable with those in the Eastern States. Our workmen are as competent as any other workmen in Australia. We should make the conditions as uniform as possible so that if tradesmen leave Western Australia any one of them can take up a position in another State, do an efficient job and be a credit to Western Australia. That cannot be so unless a solid system for ensuring the safety of the people working in the industry is implemented.

Hon. A. Thomson: The average Western Australian tradesman will hold his own with any worker in Australia.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am glad to hear that remark, but he will not be able to hold his own unless he is properly trained as a carpenter, a cinematograph operator, or as

any other tradesman. I hope members will review their attitude to the disallowing of these regulations, give the Electricity Commission a fair deal and support the Government in its endeavour to place this industry on a competent footing. I disagree with the motion before the House.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Interpretation Act Amendment.
- 2, Marriage Act Amendment.
- 3, Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 4, Fisheries Act Amendment (Continuance).

Transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT.

Order of the Day read for the third reading of the Bill.

As to Recommittal.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 14.

The PRESIDENT: Under the Standing Orders it is necessary for the hon. member to give notice of his intention to move for recommitment and he has not done so.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, Mr. President, I merely desired to delete a clause.

Third Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [5.41]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.42]: I would like the Honorary Minister to explain Clause 14. The clause may operate satisfactorily in a very closely settled area, such as the metropolitan area, but in Western Australia, with its great distances, there may be justices of the peace, with no training, who act as coroners in outlying parts. I think it is too big a responsibility to place on the shoulders of such men.

Some important thing may happen which, in the opinion of an acting coroner, might appear quite unimportant, but an experienced coroner and a trained legal man would consider, without hesitation, that a public inquiry was necessary. Therefore, in the interests of the people in the country areas I think this clause places too big a responsibility upon untrained men. I have no objection to its application with respect to the metropolitan area where we have qualified coroners, but in the country, and particularly in the North-West and on the Goldfields, it is a heavy responsibility to place on an acting coroner.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [5.45]: I am not in a position to give the explanation desired by Mr. Gray. The point has been raised on very short notice, and I do not profess to know all the reasons for including the various clauses in the Bill. I suggest that the hon. member have the matter taken up in another place and obtain an explanation there. Since hearing Mr. Gray, it does appear that we shall be casting a big responsibility upon an acting coroner.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 5D:

The **HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: Last evening there was some room for doubt as to whether food contained in a package of less than 28 lb. would require a certificate and whether it might escape the control exercised over larger packages. The Department of Agriculture would not allow an open go on feeding stuffs that happened to be in smaller packages. When the food is manufactured, it is supplied to the retailer, who may sell it in packages varying from 1 lb. to 28 lb. or more. In view of the close scrutiny which would have been exercised

at the factory and elsewhere, further compliance with the provisions of the Act by the retailer is unnecessary. The original legislation was passed in 1928 and there are now four amending Acts, so that to follow the effect of the various provisions is difficult.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That is why I object to these Bills being put through in one sitting.

The **HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: When I moved the second reading, I asked members to consult their constituents about the amendments. The Act provides that any person who sells any manufactured food for stock that does not consist of the material set out in the application for registration or is not in accordance with the chemical analysis or with the standard prescribed, shall be guilty of an offence. No matter in what quantity these foods are sent out, they are subject to these requirements at some stage or other. An inspector may even take samples from any vehicle. The manufacturer is required to supply considerable detail, and the amendment merely means that a retailer shall not have to supply similar information. All possible safeguards have been provided.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I agree with the Honorary Minister that, when the requirements have been complied with by the wholesaler, similar information should not be required of the retailer. However, flour is put up by millers in 25 lb., 50 lb. and 150 lb. bags and if a manufacturer desired to evade the provisions of the Act, all he would have to do would be to pack his commodity in 25 lb. bags, or something less than 28 lb.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: If it were sent out in 3 lb. bags, it would have to be registered as containing certain ingredients.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The manufacturer is required to supply food of the nature, substance and quality set out and show the percentage of nutritive or other ingredients, but, under the amendment, we propose that that provision shall not apply to any package if the net weight does not exceed 28 lb. Therefore, if it is under 28 lb., all those conditions are set aside. The intention doubtless is to avoid the necessity for retailers' having to supply certificates and warranties, which intention

was quite sound, but I consider that if a manufacturer put up food in 25 lb. bags, he could evade the provisions of the Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Act provides that no food may be distributed unless it is properly controlled and complies with the conditions mentioned. Application has to be made for registration and the fact of using packages containing less than 28 lb. would not exempt the manufacturer. That section is a sufficient safeguard for every bit of food that goes out of the manufacturer's place. I think that must surely satisfy Mr. Gray. No foodstuff, whether it reaches the consumer in a ton lot or in a 3 lb. lot, can escape that provision.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The Minister read Section 4. If he had perused Subsection (3) of Section 5C, he would find that it reads, "The provisions of this section shall not extend or apply to any package when the net weight of the contents does not exceed twenty-eight pounds." That sets aside everything the Minister has read. I know the intention is clear; but anybody can set up business in this State and manufacture stock foodstuffs, put them up in 28 lb. bags, and so be excluded from the provisions of the Act. I do not know what is the interpretation of the word "section." Perhaps it should read "subsection."

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That deals with labels and descriptions. The foodstuff cannot get out of the manufacturer's hands unless it passes through the barrage I indicated.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: What is the meaning of "section"? I take it that the subsection applies to the whole of Section 4.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I cannot agree. I have read out the section, and I think there is every safeguard.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If the product is put up in 28 lb. bags, all that the Minister has told us is set aside.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I do not agree.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Then perhaps the word "subsection" should be used.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What are you quoting?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Section 4 of the amending Act deals with Section 5A of the principal Act; and I have been referring to Section 5C, Subsection (3) of the amending Act.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That deals with labels.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It does not. I am not going to argue the matter any further. I have drawn the attention of the Minister to the fact that if anybody wishes to evade the Act, he can do so.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I take it the matter has been referred to the Crown Law Department; but there is a possibility, as Sir Charles has stated, of the Act being evaded. I would not suggest that millers would do that, because their reputation is too high, but there is an opportunity for unscrupulous people to start a business and sell a lot of stuff before being brought to justice. This measure would not meet the emergency. We have more lawyers in both Houses of Parliament today than we have ever had previously in our history, and they should try to introduce a better system of drafting Bills.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Consolidating them.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Not only consolidating them, but drafting them plainly. I will never forget the bread legislation that was introduced here. The union, the master bakers and I put up proposals; but when the Bill was drafted we could not recognise them. On the other hand, a man with average intelligence is quite able to understand Bills drafted in South Australia, and I believe the English laws are equally clear. I guarantee that if this Act is ever challenged in a court, it will not prove effective.

Should a man who is a crook decide to manufacture these products, it might take a month to catch up with him and bring him to court. Then we would find that this legislation would give him a legal way out, and a subsequent amending Bill would be found necessary. Why not insert a clause in the Bill applying to retailers only? That might be more satisfactory. We and everybody else would understand it. I am certain that the Department of Agriculture has the right idea; and if there is any weakness in the Bill, it is due to careless drafting.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I had a long talk with officers of the department and they are satisfied that the whole business is so tied up that the provisions of the Act cannot be evaded. There may be something in the contention of Sir Charles Latham that the word "sub-section" should appear instead of "section." I would have no objection to the alteration.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—LAND SALES CONTROL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [7.32]: I support the second reading of the Bill because I know it is necessary. But at the same time I protest, with other members, against such a measure being brought down and the Government's expecting it to be passed in one night. It is of no use offering the excuse that there was not time, because ever since we met early in July it was expected that such legislation would have to be passed in order to carry on the regulations that were being abandoned by the Commonwealth Government. I cannot see that there is any reasonable excuse for introducing it at such a late hour.

We cannot have good legislation under these conditions. I am grateful to the Honorary Minister for giving us an opportunity to sit down quietly and study the Bill, and the amendments which are to be moved when it reaches the Committee stage. We are at a disadvantage, however, inasmuch as I cannot find in the House the Commonwealth regulations which have controlled the sale of land. It is essential that we should have some knowledge of the conditions now prevailing.

Hon. L. Craig: Mr. Watson's amendments will more or less put it right.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They come from South Australia. They may never have been in the Commonwealth regu-

lations. I do not know. The Minister for Lands gave me a copy of some regulations, but they had nothing whatever to do with this measure. The Honorary Minister, when introducing the Bill, said that a terrific amount of blackmarketing has been going on. I suppose there will be blackmarkets, and my advice to him, if he wants to stop them, is to drop the Bill. We cannot have blackmarketing if there is no legislation to fix prices.

I am perfectly satisfied that there is no necessity to push the Bill through tonight. I would like to have a fortnight's or a month's grace in which to see what effect there would be without it. I cannot believe that a man who desires to purchase a property will pay anything in excess of its value. When the legislation was first introduced by the Commonwealth Government, it was for two purposes, one of which was to prevent people from investing in land so as to make the money available for war purposes.

Hon. A. Thomson: That was the main reason.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes. The second was to prevent the price of land going up through people investing their money in it and so increasing the amounts paid. That was a minor reason. I remember the Prime Minister at the time making the statement that he was going to prevent people, who were not subscribing to the loans, putting their money into other concerns. For that reason he almost prohibited the purchase of property, and investments by way of shares, etc. Members know that was the origin of the legislation. We have had two years since the war finished, and land values today are totally different from what they were in 1942. Land values vary according to the price of the commodity produced—I am talking of agricultural and pastoral lands. Therefore, with all due respect to a hard and fast valuation, I contend that land prices will rise if the earning capacity of the land increases.

In 1939 and 1942—and probably from 1928 onwards—the value of agricultural and pastoral lands dropped considerably because their earning capacity was much reduced. If we bear that in mind we shall get some idea of why the legislation was introduced. There is not the same necessity today for this measure, because the Commonwealth Government is getting more money than it

requires, by way of loans. If I were permitted, I would curb some of its borrowing powers because it is taking money from the citizens of Australia, by means of taxation, which should cover all the expenditure necessary. There may come a time when money will be required for developmental purposes and it will have to be borrowed. We should not encourage the Government in that way. I cannot believe that the speculator or investor—I would not call a man a speculator who purchases land—would be prepared to pay more than a reasonable value.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: What about other people who have money lying idle and do not want to put it into a loan? Do not you think they would be extravagant in the price they would pay?

Hon. R. M. Forrest: It would not make any difference if they were.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not think so. There may be a few, but from my experience the values have been assessed at a remarkably low figure. I do not know whether Mr. Hunter will be continued in his position, but he has been fairly reasonable in deciding values. I pointed out to him that in 1942 wheat lands had very little value because no-one wanted to put money into them with wheat at 1s. 6d. to 2s. a bushel. It would be wrong to say that at that time the land was at a standard value.

His argument was that probate had been granted in respect of an estate in 1939 where the value of a property was remarkably low. I pointed out that we could not sell wheat farms in 1939, because no-one wanted them. People did not have the money to purchase them, or any encouragement to buy because of the low price of the commodities produced. I am looking to the future. I think we should keep some control, and that is why I shall support the second reading. If we pass the legislation, and the members of the public know it is on the statute book, and that some punishment will be inflicted if they put an excessive price on land—

Hon. G. Fraser: Who would determine that?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The controller.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: He would not have any authority.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, he would. We have many statutes—the Criminal Code is one—which punish, and so act as deterrents. It is necessary to have this measure, and a controller. He may be the present taxation officer. There are some amendments to be moved by Mr. Watson, and I think they will vastly improve the Bill. I agree with him that it is difficult for a person to understand the position on the following Monday when we make a fixed determination in a Bill. The regulations could not come out until after the Bill was assented to. Immediately the Bill is assented to, we can alter those conditions. We should be consistent. While we say that no land shall be sold or leased without the consent of the controller, we provide, by the regulations, that land can be sold or leased if it is a town block.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We should not have this sort of thing in a Bill which is to become an Act. Regulations are not available to the public as are Acts of Parliament. A person goes to the Government Printer and purchases an Act in good faith, but he forgets that there might be six or seven different lots of regulations containing the same power as the Act.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Do you not think members of the general public will soon find out?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: They do not. It is amazing how ignorant they are.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: The land agents will soon let them know.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I agree. I do not believe that we should encourage people who are rudely described—I do not endorse the remark—as parasites. After all, the Minister can transfer his land without any aid. He knows how to fill in a form, etc.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: But they are there, and always will be.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes. If one reads the Bible, one finds they were in existence then.

Hon. H. K. Watson: They serve a useful purpose.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, and so do lawyers. The main purpose they serve is to try to interpret pieces of legislation similar to what we have here. The Minister will assist me to interpret these clauses, because he has knowledge which I have not. I hope we shall get back to the simple method of drafting laws. If we look at the old English Acts, we find we can understand them because they are clearly set out. But we cannot interpret some of the phraseology here.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I agree with you there.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am going to assist the Honorary Minister to get the Bill through, but I hope we shall relax controls as quickly as possible. If the Bill comes up again next year, and I am here, the Minister will not get my support, unless we are, unfortunately, again in the throes of international trouble.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do not say that!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We do not know what is ahead of us. Then, of course, we will have to reconsider our views, but if things are going along normally, I hope the Government will not ask this House to pass any more of this restrictive legislation.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [7.45]: I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House. I agree with what Sir Charles Latham said with regard to the obstacles we meet and the lack of opportunity to study Bills of this nature. That is not the fault of the Leader of the House as he is here to do a job, and we have to put up with things as they are, but I hope that this will be the last Bill which will be pushed through in this manner. Of course, those who support the Labour movement are in a happy position as regards this legislation because it was introduced by a Labour Government in the first place. Those who supported the "No" campaign at the referendum must feel uncomfortable at the hasty way in which the State Government has pushed through similar legislation and copied almost word for word the Commonwealth Labour Government's enactments. The control of land sales, particularly over the last two years, has been a great hindrance and loss to many ex-Servicemen. I do not agree with the Minis-

ter that there has been as much black-marketing as he stated.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You are wrong there.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There has been a great assistance to many people. Mr. Wat-big majority of people in this country are honest. Scores of young ex-Servicemen have had the opportunity of buying land on the blackmarket and have refused to do so. Because of their refusal, they have lost good opportunities of obtaining blocks. The Minister's statement that vacant lots in town, suburban and country town areas would be removed from control, will be of great assistance of many people. Mr. Watson proposes to move a number of amendments to the Bill and we shall have to take them as they come. Personally, I prefer to stick to the original Bill because we have not the time to investigate properly these amendments.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Would you not like to see it improved?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, if it is possible. But there is no mistake about the harm that would result if the Government dropped control of land sales altogether. We have the example of the United States of America to guide us. This Bill provides that the control of land can be reasserted if necessary. That is a very wise precaution because we must guard against the evils of inflation which could be brought about in the event of over-spending. I reluctantly support the Bill as it stands and if Mr. Watson can put up a good case when moving his amendments I may assist him, if it will improve the Bill. I support the second reading.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [7.50]: I do not want to delay the passage of the Bill through the House, but I do hope members will endeavour to assist the Honorary Minister. He has a most difficult job with the Chief Secretary away and up to date has made a splendid effort.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is a matter of to help the Honorary Minister and not to hinder him. The Government is also to be congratulated and commiserated with for having to get this sort of legislation through by Monday.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It has had months to get it ready.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is a matter of opinion. The Government has other things to do besides this. The measure is not a difficult one to understand, and we all know what it is about. I have read it through since the tea adjournment.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Perhaps you understand some of it.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think I understand most of it, and I am entirely in agreement with the Government with regard to the proposals contained in the Bill. It will have an extraordinary effect. The legislation will bring more land on to the market and make it available to people who wish to build, instead of sending them out to new suburbs where there are no roads or transport. It will make land available that is within easy reach of transport in the suburbs around Perth. The number of blocks available on the blackmarket are limited and that in itself has had the effect of making the illicit price higher than it would be under normal conditions. The honest people who own land will have nothing to do with the blackmarket business, but they will not sell at the fixed price. Consequently a lot of land is held up and there are hundreds of blocks owned by people who would sell them—but not at the present price.

People who are anxious to buy land and who are prepared to go on the blackmarket for it, have a very limited selection and the price is much higher than if the market were free. So, the ostensible lifting of the price of land will not increase the price at all because there will be more land available at a lower selling price than is being paid for it today, and the Bill will do a lot of good in that regard. The lifting of the price of agricultural land by 15 per cent. will not make this class of land readily available, but there may be a little more of it put on the market. I am in a quandary as to what my outlook is as regards agricultural land. The Rural Reconstruction Commission, in one of its reports, stresses strongly that the Government should not release control over the sale of agricultural land, and the reason given is that before the depression land had reached very high prices.

Hon. L. A. Logan: Too high.

Hon. L. CRAIG: In New Zealand the price reached £150 per acre and in New South Wales it was over £100 per acre for good dairying land. When the depression came, the people who had bought this land at the exorbitant price and had borrowed money to do it—that was the tragedy of it—were left in an awkward position. On some farms in New Zealand there were as many as 13 mortgages and when the price of the product fell, the value of the land fell as well. No. 13 mortgagee was protecting No. 12; No. 12 was protecting No. 11, and so on. The owner of the farm had no equity in it at all. In those days a very great percentage of agricultural land was purchased and a large proportion of the purchase money was borrowed from Crown instrumentalities. The purchase of that land at a high price and the dropping of values, caused meetings to be held all over the country and approaches were made to the Government to pay subsidies on the commodities produced because the men could not make a living, due a great deal to the excessive price that had been paid for the land.

Now that land products are such an exorbitant price, it is unreasonable to expect people who have developed the land and own the freehold, to accept such a low price for it, especially when there are others waiting to pay a higher price for it—perhaps at a price of may be two or three times the present fixed valuation. I would not sell my land for more than twice what would be allowed by the Sub-Treasury. Pastoral properties today are changing hands. I know some of them and the revenue in the first year is often nearly as much as the purchase price.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That is true.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Many places are sold under those conditions today, so it is hard to say what the value of a pastoral property really is. It is utterly foolish for a man in Perth to endeavour to fix a price on a pastoral property, because it varies with the seasons. Places are changing hands today that have been unsaleable for years. I know of a place that was sold the other day for under £20,000, and it had a debt of £120,000 on it. The owners have been trying to sell it for years. They sold it, wiped off the debt, and the revenue from that place this year was over £18,000.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: That is gross revenue, of course.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, but with a net revenue of £12,000 or £14,000. This has been a good season and high prices have prevailed, but what the value of the land will be in two years' time I do not know. It may not be worth the £20,000 then because there may be a drought and all the sheep may die. The value really is in the sheep. At the present time they are cutting up to £3 worth of wool but the value of the stock on the place may be gone in two years.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That is the point.

Hon. L. CRAIG: So, how can we determine an arbitrary value for places of that kind? It is utterly impossible. It is like backing a racehorse. We cannot limit the odds on a horse. I believe we could de-control all land for building purposes in urban areas. I have had some extraordinary experiences during the last year or so of genuine buyers for homes at, say, £1,200 or £1,300—not big places—and the controller has cut the price down to, say, £1,100. The vendor has then been unwilling to sell and the purchaser—in some cases a soldier—has been forced to go to the Housing Commission and apply under one of its schemes for a house and that same type of house has cost him, with land, about £1,600.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And more.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. I am trying to be modest about it. This man has probably been forced to build in a locality which did not suit him, away from his friends, and so on. It is unreasonable to expect people who own houses and who do not have to sell, to take the controlled price when the cost of a new house is so much more—and we know it is not being done.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Of course it is not.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I could tell the House of a dozen cases. Trustees cannot do anything except sell at the controlled price. They are decent, honest people. I know of a case where the estate had to be sold and the money distributed. The trustee was compelled to sell the house and the beneficiaries agreed to sell it to one of their number. That enabled the trustee to sell the

house, with the consent of all the beneficiaries, at the controlled price. The purchaser has offered the place at £1,000 more than the price he paid for it. If the sale goes through at that price, the resultant money will be divided between the beneficiaries. That is what is happening all the time. I believe it would be quite safe to release all land that is purchased for building purposes and also residential houses as well. Under the Bill it is not proposed to do that, but I do not intend to endeavour to secure an amendment along those lines.

I regard the measure as a genuine effort on the part of the Government gradually to release control. I have perused the suggested amendments and they are mostly all right. They are not really controversial and will only embody in the Bill much of what will be done under the regulations. There is one provision included in it about which I am not very keen. I refer to the one setting out that an approved valuer must be one who has had 10 years' continuous service as a valuer.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is absurd.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think it is not reasonable. The effect would be that an older man would be employed who might not be as good as a younger person with up-to-date experience in valuing. I cannot see why it should be not sufficient to say that the valuer should be one approved by the controller. However, that is a matter we can consider in Committee. I hope members will not mess about with the Bill by trying to insert a whole lot of amendments.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Subclause (15) of Clause 10 gets over your point regarding valuers.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That may be so. I have not had time to study the Bill very closely and I do not like provisos. I have got into trouble about them before today.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: And you will get into trouble about them again.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Possibly I am not so learned in such matters as is the hon. member.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I am learning still.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I hope the House will pass the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Mr. PRESIDENT: What is the motion? When is the debate to be adjourned to?

Hon. G. FRASER: Till the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and negatived.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [8.5]: I make no apologies for having moved the adjournment of the debate. Every member who rises to participate in the discussion on the Bill will have the same complaint to make, which is that we have not had time to look into the contents of the Bill or study its provisions in conjunction with the amendments in order to see where we stand. It is impossible at this stage to deal with the Bill properly.

Hon. A. Thomson: No-one can do justice to it or understand it as he should.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is why I wanted the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. L. Craig: But it is not a difficult Bill to understand.

Hon. G. FRASER: We should not be stampeded into passing legislation of this description. There is no necessity for such a procedure. I blame the Government to a large extent for the Bill coming before us at this late stage. If the measure had been put higher up on the notice paper of another place, we could have had it before us days ago, with ample opportunity to consider and discuss it. As it is, at this hour on the last sitting day of the week we are asked to deal with the legislation.

I find that one of its worst features is that which gave me cause for complaint regarding an earlier Bill. Most of the matters that will be dealt with are not referred to in the Bill but will be provided for in regulations that we have not seen. I do not say that even if we did have an opportunity to peruse the regulations, we would have a clear understanding of them; but at least we would have been able to get some idea of their purport.

Referring now to the general provisions of the Bill as I understand them from a cursory glance, I should say they deal with the control of land values and certain decontrols. The Bill, however, says nothing of that description. We have to accept the

word of the Minister that the intention is to do all that by regulations. The Bill merely gives certain powers so that no-one will be able to purchase land without the written consent of the controller. We understand that decontrols and other phases will be dealt with by way of regulations. I think it is quite a new departure in asking the House to pass a Bill that sets out certain things that must be done and then they may be undone by way of regulations. That is not right.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: How will that be done by regulations?

Hon. G. FRASER: Nothing can be done without the consent of the controller, but we understand the regulations will override that provision. The Bill does not indicate how those powers will be given to the controller but it is to be done by way of regulations, which is a wrong procedure. As I understand the Bill and according to the statement by the Minister, one of the main objects of the Bill is to remove controls from the sale of land in metropolitan, suburban and country towns.

In some instances that might be quite satisfactory but I am not so happy about the application of that provision to the West Province. In that area it has been almost impossible for many years to purchase a reasonably good block of land for building purposes. In many instances people have been trying for years to secure blocks and I can imagine what will happen there when the lid is lifted off these prices. I realise that members will view such a provision from the standpoint of how it will affect their respective areas.

Hon. L. Craig: The Housing Commission has been able to buy land very well in your district.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Commission did not buy it; the land was resumed.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes. There was a striking instance recently when a local authority in the Fremantle district desired to sell a number of blocks for the non-payment of rates to the road board concerned. The Housing Commission stepped in and practically commandeered most of those blocks.

Hon. L. Craig: Then the board got something for the land whereas formerly it was getting nothing.

Hon. G. FRASER: At any rate, the Housing Commission took most of the blocks. The original advertisement in "The West Australian" covered one and a half pages; but after the Housing Commission had taken what it wanted, the blocks still for sale covered only one-quarter of a page in that paper.

Hon. L. Craig: The Commission paid for the land.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig: Otherwise the local authority would not have got anything.

Hon. G. FRASER: But in our area the people are land hungry, and many of them desired to purchase the blocks.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The owners could not have thought much of the blocks, otherwise they would have paid the rates.

Hon. G. FRASER: The land I refer to comprised blocks in the Applecross, Canning Bridge and Palmyra areas. If one endeavoured to buy a block in any of those places, one would find it almost impossible to do so. I do not blame the Housing Commission for stepping in and purchasing so many of the blocks but to my knowledge many people proposed to attend the sale with the object of purchasing them. I can quite imagine how the price of land in the areas I have mentioned will jump up when the lid is lifted.

If any member were to go to the North Fremantle area with a view to ascertaining the number of building blocks available, he would find it impossible to get one. Despite that, many people are looking for blocks there. I can certainly imagine how land values will jump up when there is de-control. I have heard many tales about sales at blackmarket prices but I have not come across anyone actually connected with such business transactions. I have handled many land sales but have not yet come across instances of blackmarketing.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You would not know what was happening between the vendor and the buyer.

Hon. G. FRASER: As I mentioned before, I have heard a lot of tales and I believe there is quite a lot of truth in them—but I keep good company! I have a complaint to make against the department with regard to the sale of properties over which there will still be control. I hope some

effort will be made in the near future to deal with the phase I shall mention. Members may not regard it as a matter of major importance but it costs people money. The usual procedure is for the vendor and the purchaser to submit to the controller on the approved forms the signed contract together with the valuer's certificate, when the application is made for the sale.

No notice is ever taken of the valuer's certificate, which would cost anything from £2 2s. to £5 5s. The controller may advise the parties that the sale can go through for perhaps £50 or £100 less. The parties can protest against the decision and by the payment of another £4 4s. or £5 5s. can have an independent valuation made. The effect of that is to more than double the cost of the valuations. I think it quite unnecessary to insist upon the production of the original valuer's certificate and I hope that in future that requirement will not be mandatory. All that should be necessary to submit with the application is the signed transfer. On the other hand the practice is to ignore that original valuer's certificate and insist upon another.

Why put the parties to the double expense in connection with valuations? In dealing with sales of vacant land, there is no insistence upon the lodging of a valuer's certificate with the application for sale. I can see no necessity for the certificate in the first instance if it is not required in the second. I hope the Minister will look into this matter with a view to seeing that at least that expense may be avoided. Apart from those two phases, there is nothing more I wish to say on the second reading. We shall probably have a lively time when the Bill reaches Committee and we are considering the various amendments which will be moved. I hope, with Mr. Gray and one or two other members, that the Bill will pass substantially as it has reached us. In the circumstances, the best thing we can do is to agree to it. I support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [8.16]: Naturally, I am highly gratified at the reception of the Bill. I admit justification for the criticism, but I do not think I am unreasonable in my haste to have the Bill passed. Consideration will now be given to the various

amendments of which notice has been given. It is unfortunate, of course, that we have so short a space of time in which to deal with them. I hope we shall do our best to return the Bill to another place as quickly as possible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Administration:

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (2) the following words and parentheses be added: "(of whom not more than one shall be a member of the Public Service)."

During the course of the second reading of the Bill I explained how, under the Commonwealth regulations, committees appeared to consist largely of civil servants. I consider it necessary that the membership of this advisory committee should consist primarily of men with business experience.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment. Parliament should not restrict the Minister's choice. In any case, why only one member of the Public Service? Why not two? They may be highly qualified.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They may not be.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We have civil servants with much experience in valuing land. It may be desirable to appoint one of these.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not agree with the Minister's contention. My experience of civil servants is that they are apt to get into a groove. The members of this advisory committee should be practical business men with experience in making valuations. I support the amendment.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am surprised that Mr. Watson does not trust even his own Minister to make suitable appointments to the advisory committee. I am supposed to be an opponent of the Government; nevertheless, I am quite prepared to give the Minister that power. I have enough

confidence in him to know he will do the right thing.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I hope you will maintain that confidence.

Hon. G. FRASER: We do not know how many persons will be appointed to this advisory committee.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Minister should appoint men with outside experience and a better knowledge of values.

Hon. G. FRASER: The Minister would appoint experienced and capable public servants.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Are you maintaining that there are no men with brains outside the Public Service?

Hon. G. FRASER: I did not infer that. It is possible there may not be a suitable civil servant, but the Minister's discretion should not be fettered.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The amendment is not complimentary to the Minister. I cannot support it, as I think we should not tie the hands of the Minister in this way.

Hon. H. HEARN: I support the amendment. It is my opinion that the public are tired of control by civil servants, such as we have had during the war. The amendment seeks to limit the number of civil servants who may be appointed to the advisory committee to one. My view is that we should bring into the picture men who have had business experience and so introduce a breath of free and fresh enterprise.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: It is desirable that the majority of the advisory committee should be independent and competent men. I point out that the Government is taking over, practically *holus bolus*, the existing Commonwealth system. It may be that the Government contemplates also taking over the existing appeal board. Those who have had experience of that board know its worth and how its value has been dissipated. It is practically a board of civil servants, one of whom is the chairman. It is not a question of our endeavouring to restrict the Minister in his selection; it is a question of Parliament writing into the Bill what it desires.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The principal ground for opposing the measure is the restriction on the Minister's selection of persons to be appointed to the advisory committee. I am

not suggesting that the Minister would appoint two or three public servants, or even one. The matter should, however, be left to the Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: I point out to Mr. Watson that, as the clause now stands, the Minister may not appoint any advisory committee at all, so that the position from Mr. Watson's point of view would then be worse.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I am quite unimpressed by Mr. Fraser's remarks. I wonder what he would say if the Bill contained a provision that was inserted in another Bill within recent memory. That Bill was amended to include the words, "one of whom shall be nominated by the State Executive of the Australian Labour Party."

Hon. G. Fraser: It would be an improvement on this.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The amendment is a reflection on the Civil Service. There are in government departments men with excellent qualifications, and it would be a mistake to limit the Minister's selection from the Civil Service to one man. I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not content to leave it to be insinuated that because I vote in favour of the amendment, I am casting a slur on members of the Civil Service, as it has been suggested would be the case. For years past we have grown used to legislation devised to control almost everything, but we have now reached the stage where a reversal of that process must take place. I think Mr. Watson's intention is to make it clear by his amendment that this Committee believes that a process of decontrol should be implemented. I believe the idea of decontrol will come more readily to those who have not been associated with control legislation in the past than to those who for years have been familiar with it. I will vote for the amendment but not with any idea of casting a slur on those who have given such good service in the past.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot follow Dr. Hislop's logic and I do not know that a few civil servants being on the advisory committee would have anything to do with decontrol. The Government desires to bring about decontrol when it thinks that can be done. I do not believe that the intention

in Subclause (3) is to load the advisory committee with civil servants. The Committee should not restrict the choice of the Minister in this matter.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	9

Majority for	1
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. J. Loton	Hon. H. Tuckey

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed: the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Appointment of staff:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Under this clause, the Minister could have all the civil servants he desired placed at his disposal. I do not think he has anything to fear in that regard..

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Certain land transactions forbidden:

Point of Order.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I desire your ruling, Mr. Chairman. Some time back I asked that very long clauses such as this should be broken up so that members could follow them intelligently. This clause covers 3½ pages. I would refer you to Standing Order 117, which states—

The President may order a complicated question to be divided.

I draw your attention to that power of the President. Standing Order 187 states—

In Committee the preamble shall stand postponed without question put, and the clauses and schedules shall be read in their order separately by the Chairman, beginning with the first clause—

That looks as if the Standing Orders state that, if necessary, the Chairman shall read

each clause completely, and sometimes that has been the custom. Standing Order 190 states—

In reading the clauses of a Bill it shall be sufficient to read the numbers and marginal notes only, unless otherwise ordered.

The Chairman: The hon. member has referred me to Standing Order 117, which has no relation to the matter now before the Committee. I shall certainly, wherever necessary, refer to the separate subclauses. That will be necessary, because Mr. Watson will be submitting a number of amendments, which will be dealt with as they are moved.

Committee Resumed.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) of Sub-clause (2) after the word "land," the words and parentheses "(other than country land)" be inserted.

The marginal note to the clause reads, "Certain land transactions forbidden. Cf. Commonwealth Regulation 6." In looking over Commonwealth Regulation 6, I find it is not fully incorporated in the Bill. In the Commonwealth regulation, there appears the wording "other than country land." With that insertion the clause will be identical with Section 6 of the Commonwealth Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On this short notice I do not profess to know whether this amendment is right or wrong, and I am not prepared to accept it. I do not blame the hon. member for moving it without notice because it just could not be helped. I would suggest that he get his colleagues in another place to put it in the Bill when it returns there.

Hon. G. FRASER: As I mentioned when moving the amendment the marginal note indicates that the clause is supposed to be a repetition of Commonwealth regulation No. 6.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Not supposed to be; there is an indication as to where it came from.

Hon. G. FRASER: Exactly. The regulation has been included in the Bill with a small portion deleted. I think it is an oversight because it occurs both in paragraphs (a) and (b) in the relevant Commonwealth regulation. The words "other than country land" appear in both those paragraphs. As

this clause is supposed to be a replica of the provision in the Commonwealth regulation, I merely wanted to make it conform in that respect.

Hon. A. Thomson: Does not this apply to all lands whether country or town?

Hon. G. FRASER: That is what appears in the Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: We are not supposed to be copying the Commonwealth regulations.

Hon. G. FRASER: Not supposed to be copying them! What is the Bill, if we are not supposed to be copying those regulations?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It is a new regulation.

Hon. G. FRASER: We are taking over all the Commonwealth regulations.

Hon. W. J. Mann: I do not think the difference matters very much.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (a) of Sub-clause (2) after the word "lease," the following words be added: "or being a lease of land the term of which exceeds three years and in respect of which a fair rental has been determined by a court under the Increases of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939-1948."

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

Ayes	11
Noes	8

Majority for .. 3

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. H. Heard	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. A. L. Loton	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. R. Hall
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (g) of Sub-clause (2) after the word "forty-two" the words "or to which consent was given under the Commonwealth regulations" be inserted.

This is really a drafting alteration. This is one clause which I think members will find is a Chinese copy of the Commonwealth regulation. We have to remember that whilst the Commonwealth regulations were brought in in February, 1942, since then many leases have been granted but they have already been approved by the Commonwealth controller. Therefore there is no good reason why, when we have exempted leases of this nature entered into before February, 1942, we should not also exempt leases which have since been granted and to which consent has been given under the Commonwealth regulations.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On the same ground as I opposed the other amendment, I oppose this one.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is not necessary, is it?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (2) the following new paragraphs be added:—

(h) any transaction affecting premises used solely as a factory, workshop, office, warehouse or shop or used solely for any other industrial or commercial purpose not being a farm, grazing area, orchard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary;

(i) any transaction affecting licensed premises (including registered clubs) within the meaning of the Licensing Act, 1911-1947;

(j) any transaction affecting vacant land and not being a farm, grazing area, orchard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary or part thereof;

(k) any transaction affecting any share, interest or right in a mining tenement under the Mining Act, 1904-1937, or any Act amending that Act.

The amendment is designed to insert in the Bill that which the Minister has assured us would be done by regulation, namely, the exemption of vacant land and all business premises. The amendment also provides for the exemption of any transaction affecting any share, interest or right in a mining tenement.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment. No other State except South Australia has adopted a similar provision. It should be

left to the Government to do by regulation what is considered right, and this power is proposed under Clause 14.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: All that the amendment will do will be to insert in the measure what the Minister says may be done by regulation.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: But how could we take any of them out?

Hon. H. K. Watson: Bring down an amending Bill.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We should bear in mind that the Victorian Act will expire at the end of this year so that there will be no control there after that unless further legislation is introduced. Tasmania has not yet passed its legislation and meanwhile the Commonwealth regulations will continue to apply there.

Hon. G. FRASER: If we accept the amendment, we might as well scrap the Bill because this is about the only provision left that will give control. If members consider that control should be eliminated, they should vote against the Bill. To insert such an amendment will be to make a farce of the measure; in fact, so little will be left that it will be a mere skeleton. If South Australia has made a mistake, there is no reason why we should follow its example.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	7
Majority for	5

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. J. G. Hislop (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. W. R. Hall	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) of Subclause (7), all the words after the word "forty-two" in line 5 be struck out.

If the Minister feels that this is not necessary, I will not press the amendment; but I consider it covers what appears to be a drafting mistake. This subclause has been taken from Federal Regulation No. 11, except that the Federal regulation refers to the Valuer General. We have not a Valuer General in this State. Under the Commonwealth regulation the Valuer General was given certain duties. In this case the draftsman has substituted the Commissioner of Taxation for the Valuer General.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment. The Commissioner of Taxation is a State valuer and an applicant under this provision would have an alternative means of securing a valuation if he were not satisfied with that of the controller.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not think Mr. Watson should press this amendment. If it is necessary to have a valuation by the Commissioner of Taxation, it must be the last one and not one made some years ago.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I am not pressing the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We are providing that the valuer may be the Commissioner of Taxation; and if we retain this provision all we are saying is that if the valuation of the Commissioner of Taxation is taken, it shall be the last valuation. The provision should not be deleted.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That new subclauses be inserted after Subclause (10) as follows:—

(11) If the Controller is not prepared to consent to a proposed transaction on the ground that he does not approve of the price or consideration agreed on between the parties, he shall notify the applicant of that fact and of the price or consideration of which he is prepared to approve.

(12) If an applicant is not satisfied with the price or consideration so notified by the Controller he may request that the transaction be referred to the Advisory Committee and the transaction shall be referred accordingly by the Controller. Thereupon the Advisory Committee shall determine the value of the land or subject matter of the transaction as at the tenth day of February, One thousand nine hundred and forty-two, and in deciding whether to consent to a transaction the Controller shall assume that the value determined by the Advisory Committee was the correct value as at

the tenth day of February, One thousand nine hundred and forty-two.

The substance of the amendment is that if the controller is not prepared to consent to a proposed transaction, he shall inform the applicant accordingly and indicate the price of which he is prepared to approve; and that if the applicant is not satisfied with the price indicated to him by the controller as the price at which he will be permitted to sell, he shall have the right to appeal to the advisory committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is the second worst amendment moved tonight. It is proposed to take away power from the controller to fix prices and give it to the advisory committee, which is very wrong indeed. The function of the advisory committee will not be to fix prices. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Hon. G. FRASER: I, too, hope the amendment will be rejected. If it is agreed to, the controller will not fix the price but the advisory body will do so. The controller will be in the hands of the advisory committee, which is a most ridiculous proposition. It was suggested in connection with a previous Bill of this kind that there would be uniform legislation throughout the Commonwealth; but can anybody tell me that any other State in the Commonwealth will have a measure like ours when we have finished with it? One of the aims of the secretariat to be set up in Sydney is to ensure uniformity between the States. Now we find that this Chamber is doing what was forecast: It is tearing the Bill asunder so that it will not be similar to any Bill in any other State.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I agree with the first of the new subclauses; but to put in place of the controller an advisory committee whose number is not defined and whose personnel will change from time to time, and to give that body the power to override the controller and the Minister in determining prices, would be to wreck the measure.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Like Mr. Craig, I support the first part of the amendment; but I think that if the second part were agreed to, the advisory committee would not be appointed because the Minister would not take the risk of handing over power to such a body.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: May I suggest, Sir, that we confine the decision of the Committee to the first part of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: If that is the hon. member's wish, we will break the amendment into two parts. The question is that new Subclause (11) moved by the hon. member be agreed to.

Amendment (to inset new Subclause (11)) put and passed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: In view of what has been said by various members, I will not press the second part of the amendment. But I would impress upon the Minister the desirability of having a competent independent body to which there would be a right of appeal by any aggrieved applicant. Otherwise I can assure the Minister he will have a busy time dealing with appeals under the Act, the general control of which will be under his supervision.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: At present there is a board of appeal, and I have no doubt the Government will have such a board.

Hon. H. K. Watson: But not that one I hope!

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not saying it will be that board, but I do not know why the hon. member objects to it.

Hon. H. K. Watson: It is the result of five years' experience!

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not prepared to speak for the Government; but I do not know why Mr. Watson cannot trust the Government to set up a reasonable appeal board. There is a very fine body of men on the existing board, to whom no exception can be taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member intend to move his new Subclause (12)?

Hon. H. K. Watson: No.

Hon. L. CRAIG: In Subclause (14), paragraph (b) there is a reference to "approved valuer" meaning a person who has had not less than 10 years' continuous experience as a valuer and who is approved by the controller as a valuer for the purposes of the Act. It seems to me that the controller should be able to select a man competent to value. A man may not have

had 10 years' experience but he may be modern and up to date in valuation work. There are excellent young men of 35 who know values very well, though they have not had the experience called for here. I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 to 3 of paragraph (b) of Subclause (14) the words "who has had not less than 10 years' continuous experience as a valuer and" be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not propose to oppose the amendment because I believe the position is already safeguarded. I do not want to restrict the controller any more than I desired to restrict the Minister. No doubt there will be opposition to the amendment if members want to be consistent in restricting certain people. The controller would not approve of a valuer unless he were qualified. To say the valuer must have ten years' experience is restricting the controller's choice.

Hon. G. FRASER: I support the amendment and in doing so I am not being inconsistent because the person appointed will have had to pass an examination before being made a valuer.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I have never heard of that before.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is correct.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No. The Supreme Court has the right to appoint valuers.

Hon. G. FRASER: A man does not simply apply to the Supreme Court and be appointed a valuer.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Yes, he does.

Hon. G. FRASER: He has to obtain a certificate, so it is on all fours with passing an examination.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I can only think this provision was included to prevent a person from being a valuer for the purpose of dealing with one estate. I think the suggestion made by the Minister safeguards the position and that Clause 15 (a) covers it. I remind Mr. Fraser that a person of good reputation, with a certificate from someone who knows him, stating he is of good character, and has a knowledge of land values, can obtain from the Supreme Court authority to be a land valuer.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am wondering why the word "Minister" in the Act from which this Bill was taken, was altered to read "Controller." I think it would be better for the Minister to have the right of approving of a valuer. I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of paragraph (b) of Subclause (14) the word "Controller" be struck out and the word "Minister" inserted in lieu.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR time to look at the Bill with the object of letting the Chamber know what amendments they desired to move. I object to amendments being sprung at a second's notice. I believe the controller would know better than the Minister who would be qualified to act as a valuer, unless the Minister happened to be in the business. I can see no reason for the amendment.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think this amendment should not be agreed to. It is not fair to the Minister to have this responsibility placed upon him. Politics comes into this a little.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am prepared to accept the Minister's explanation. I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That the definition of "land" in Subclause (14) be struck out.

This is really consequential following the amendment exempting mining tenements from the provisions of the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have to admit I have not had much time study the amendment, but a mining tenement could well include land on which houses were built. For that reason I ask members to reject the amendment. I think it is dangerous.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: In the event of the sale of a mining tenement, it is nearly always because of the ore content, the machinery value, or the prospective mineral value, and not for any buildings that may be on it. Goldmining leases could well be excluded.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not agree with that. It is possible that mining leases could be

valued and sold for what is on them in the shape of houses.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I believe Mr. Watson's wishes in this regard are covered by a previous amendment. If there were a genuine sale of a mining lease for the purpose of developing the ore, it would be covered, whereas if it were for the purpose of buying any houses erected on the mining tenement then, perhaps, the controller could exercise his powers.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I merely moved this as a consequential amendment. If the Honorary Minister feels it is not necessary, I will not press it. I ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Another consequential amendment I have—and I do feel that this is necessary—is to provide that a workshop, office, shop, warehouse or other business premises, shall not cease to qualify as business premises simply because there happen to be thereon a caretaker's quarters. I move an amendment—

That a new subclause be added as follows:—

"(16) Where the only residential premises on any land used as a factory, workshop, office, shop, warehouse, or for any industrial or commercial purpose are occupied by a caretaker of the land or buildings thereon, the existence on the land of those premises shall not exclude the land from the category of land used solely as a factory, workshop, office, shop or warehouse or solely for any other industrial or commercial purpose as the case may be."

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not going to oppose this amendment. It was not the intention of the framers of the Bill to include such premises.

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

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Excess consideration may be recovered:

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I do not intend to press the amendment standing in my name, but I protest against a clause of this nature appearing in the Bill because it is virtually an invitation to a man who is a party to an unlawful action to enter into that unlawful action with a view to making a profit. If there is to be a penalty at all, it should be paid to the Crown.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am glad that Mr. Watson will not insist on the amendment.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 to 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Delegation of powers under Act:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I consider it is a ridiculous state of affairs where a man's state of mind should be taken into account. He may be a temperamental person and a condition such as that should not be considered. I think we should strike out the words "or state of mind" in line 3 of Subclause (3) but first in line 3 of Subclause (3) after the word "opinion" the word "or" should be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the words "or state of mind" should first be struck out because, if the word "or" is inserted and the second amendment is lost, it would require a further amendment to strike out the word "or." If the hon. member will move to strike out the words "or state of mind," his present amendment will be consequential.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I move an amendment—
That in line 3 of Subclause (3) the words "or state of mind" be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not going to object to the amendment, as I do not think it makes any difference to the Bill. I agree it does not sound sensible to have the words included.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That in lines 5 and 6 of Subclause (3) the words "or state of mind" be struck out.

The same reasons apply to the striking out of these words as to my previous amendment, except that one is a controller and the other is a delegate.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think the right thing to do is to strike out Subclause (3) altogether. Subclause (1) already gives power to delegate authority. I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not had a chance thoroughly to examine it, but I think the amendment as moved by Mr. Baxter should satisfy everybody.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is duplicating what you already have in the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think we should leave it as amended. I think the Bill has been sufficiently mutilated already, although I admit it does improve it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not agree with Sir Charles Latham, and I think the clause should stand as amended.

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

Ayes	3
Noes	15
Majority against ..	12

AYES.

Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. A. Thomson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. H. Hearn	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived; the clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 25, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

The PRESIDENT: It will be necessary to suspend the sitting while the Bill is being prepared for the third reading.

Sitting suspended from 10.0 to 11 p.m.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

Sitting suspended from 11.2 p.m. to 12.2 a.m.

Assembly's Message.

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

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 3, Subclause (2)—Add after the word "knowledge" in line 11 on page 2 the words and parentheses: "(of whom not more than one shall be a member of the Public Service)".

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

It is undesirable to limit the choice; it may happen that two members of the Public Service may be specially qualified to act on the committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

I have already given my reasons and I do not intend to elaborate on them. It is undesirable to limit the choice of appointments to the advisory committee. There is nothing to say that the Minister will appoint two public servants, but he should have the right to do so if he thinks it desirable.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: After having heard the reasons advanced, I trust that the Committee will insist on its amendment.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	5
Noes	10
				—
Majority against		..		5
				—

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	(Teller.)
Hon. A. L. Loton	

PAIR.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson

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

No. 2. Clause 10, Subclause (2), paragraph (a), page 4—After the word "lease" in line 9 add the following words: "or being a lease of land the term of which exceeds

three years and in respect of which a fair rental has been determined by a court under the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, 1939-1948."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This is not necessary as if the rent has been fixed previously by a fair rents court the consent of the controller should follow automatically.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

If the rent has already been fixed by the Fair Rents Court, the consent of the controller should be given automatically. The controller will be subject to the Minister in this State, whereas previously he was subject to the Minister at Canberra. I hope the Committee will not insist on this amendment.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I agree that the consent of the controller should be given automatically if the rent has been fixed by the court, but there is no provision to that effect in the Bill and in practice it has been found not to be so. I trust the Committee will insist on the amendment.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 3. Clause 10, Subclause (2), paragraph (g), page 4—After the word "forty-two" in line 29, insert the words: "or to which consent was given under the Commonwealth regulations."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This is already covered by Clause 23.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

This is already covered by Clause 23, and I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I can see nothing in Clause 23 to cover the proposed amendment and I hope the Committee will insist on it.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 4. Clause 10, Subclause (2), paragraph (g), page 4—Add after paragraph (g) new paragraphs to stand as follows:—

(h) any transaction affecting premises used solely as a factory, workshop, office, warehouse or shop, or used solely for any other industrial or commercial purpose not being a farm, grazing area, orchard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary;

(i) any transaction affecting licensed premises (including registered clubs) within the meaning of the Licensing Act, 1911-1947;

(j) any transaction affecting vacant land and not being a farm, grazing area, orchard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary or part thereof;

(k) any transaction affecting any share, interest or right in a mining tenement under the Mining Act, 1904-1937, or any Act amending that Act.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

None of the States except South Australia has accepted these items in its legislation. These are matters as to which the Minister and Government must be left to act under the powers given by Clause 14 of the Bill. If the amendment is adopted a control could not be reimposed without an amending Act of Parliament.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

I trust that the Committee will not insist upon this amendment for the reasons stated by the Assembly, and also for reasons which I mentioned when previously opposing the proposition. There has been an attempt to pass uniform legislation throughout Australia and four States have adopted it on similar lines to this, although South Australia did not do so.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I disagree with the Minister's view and the Assembly's reasons. These are matters which, in my opinion, should be written into the Bill, and I trust the Committee will insist upon the amendment.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 5. Clause 10, page 6—Add the following subclause to stand as Subclause (11):—

If the Controller is not prepared to consent to a proposed transaction on the ground that he does not approve of the price or consideration agreed on between the parties, he shall notify the applicant of that fact and of the price or consideration of which he is prepared to approve.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This is now the usual practice. In any case, it is a matter of procedure which can be effected by direction of the Minister.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

My reasons are the same as those given by the Legislative Assembly. The proposed new subclause is a matter of procedure and can be effected by direction of the Minister. I do not think the amendment is necessary.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The reasons advanced by the Legislative Assembly for the amendment not being insisted on were fully considered by this Committee when the Bill was previously before us but, notwithstanding the reasons advanced, members in their wisdom felt that the fact should be stated in the Bill. I trust that the Committee will insist upon its amendment.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 6. Clause 10, Subclause (14) paragraph (b)—Delete the words "has had not less than ten years' continuous experience as a valuer and."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This is in the Commonwealth regulations and is designed to secure an authoritative valuation.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be insisted on.

I can see no use at all for it in the clause as the requirements will be well covered.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am rather surprised that the members of the Assembly are champions of old age and do not consider that anybody is competent unless he has had ten years' experience. I am sure some members of this and another place would disagree if we insisted that no man was competent as a member of Parliament unless he had had ten years' experience as a member.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 7. Clause 10, page 7.—Add a new subclause after Subclause (15) to stand as Subclause (16) as follows:—

Where the only residential premises on any land used as a factory, workshop, office,

shop, warehouse, or for any industrial or commercial purpose are occupied by a caretaker of the land or buildings thereon, the existence on the land of those premises shall not exclude the land from the category of land used solely as a factory, workshop, office, shop or warehouse or solely for any other industrial or commercial purpose as the case may be.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This is consequential on amendment No. 4 with which the Assembly has disagreed.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope that this amendment will not be insisted on for the reason stated by the Legislative Assembly. I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: This is an amendment consequential upon an earlier one on which we insisted. Therefore, I think we should insist on this amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am surprised that the Minister has adopted the attitude that he has.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I have given my reason.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have reasons too, and they were submitted when the amendment was made. I would therefore like the Honorary Minister to agree to some of these amendments.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I have.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: One.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Yes, to date.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 8. Clause 17, Subclause (3), page 11—Delete the words "or state of mind" where they appear in lines 10, 12 and 13. (The word "or" is consequentially inserted before the word "belief" in lines 10 and 12).

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

The phrase "state of mind" is taken from the Commonwealth Act and refers to the controller or his deputy being "satisfied" as in some cases the Act requires. (E.g., see page 8, line 3 of the Bill.)

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope the House will insist on this amendment. I move—

That the amendment be insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment insisted on.

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

Sitting suspended from 12.35 to 1.28 a.m.

Assembly's Request for Conference.

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Council, and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the managers for the Council be Hon. E. H. Gray, Hon. H. K. Watson and the mover.

Hon. H. HEARN: I ask for a ballot.

Ballot taken.

The ballot resulted in the following members being appointed as managers for the Council:—The Honorary Minister for Agriculture, Hon. H. K. Watson and Hon. Sir Charles Latham.

Hon. G. FRASER: It has never previously happened in the history of this House, since I have been here, that a Labour member has not been appointed to a conference.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the conference be held forthwith in the President's room.

Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 1.37 to 5.47 a.m.

Conference Managers' Report.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have to report that the conference managers met on the Bill and reached the following agreement:—

Amendment No. 1.—Clause 3, Subclause (2):

(a) After the word "of" in line 10 on page 2 there shall be inserted the word "five."

- (b) After the word "knowledge" in line 11 on page 2 there shall be added the words "not more than two of whom shall be members of the Public Service."

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 16th September, 1948.

Amendment No. 2 shall be withdrawn.
Amendment No. 3 shall be accepted.
Amendment No. 4 shall be withdrawn.
Amendment No. 5 shall be withdrawn.
Amendment No. 6 shall be accepted.
Amendment No. 7 shall be withdrawn.
Amendment No. 8 shall be withdrawn.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

Assembly's Further Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the conference managers' report.

House adjourned at 5.57 a.m. (Friday).

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Albany regional development, as to report of committee	1155
Housing, as to damage to Commonwealth-State rental homes	1158
Railways, as to construction of Meltham station	1156
Divorce, as to five years separation qualification	1156
Pilfering, as to happenings in Middle Swan electorate	1156
Bills : State Housing Act Amendment, 2r.	1157
Builders' Registration Act Amendment, 2r.	1159
Western Australian Marine, 2r.	1161
Northampton Lands Resumption, 2r.	1164
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), 2r.	1165
Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance), 2r.	1166
Interpretation Act Amendment, 1r.	1175
Marriage Act Amendment, 1r.	1175
Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, Act 1r.	1175
Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance), 1r.	1175
Fisheries Act Amendment, (continuance) 1r.	1175
Hospitals Act Amendment, Com.	1175
New Tractors, Motor Vehicles, and Fencing Materials Control, Com.	1178
Railway (Brown Hill Loop, Kalgoorlie-Gnamballa Lake) Discontinuance, 2r., Com., report	1182
Land Sales Control, Council's amendments	1188
Council's message, Assembly's request for conference	1187
Council's further message	1189
As to conference and Council managers : Privilege, as to non-representation of Labour Party	1189
Conference managers' report, Council's message	1191

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

QUESTIONS.

ALBANY REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

As to report of Committee.

Mr. NALDER asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has the Albany Regional Development Committee furnished a report?

(2) If so, has Cabinet considered the report, and what are the recommendations of Cabinet towards any of the proposals?