

preting laws when we have to look up half a dozen Acts of Parliament which deal with practically the same subject. The question under review is dealt with in the State Children Act and I would suggest that the Minister in charge of the Bill withdraw the clause from the Bill and bring it forward as an amendment to the State Children Act at some other stage. The clause brings a child under the supervision and correction of a court. Therefore it should properly be included in the State Children Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am afraid we cannot do what is suggested by the hon. member in the direction of amending the State Children Act, because we have already to-day disposed of the measure dealing with an amendment to that statute.

Hon. T. Walker: It can stand over.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I admit it is one of those matters which, although it has a bearing on the educational system, should be dealt with in an amendment of the State Children Act. Under the circumstances I have no objection to the clause being deleted.

Clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—ANGLO-PERSIAN OIL COY., LTD. (PRIVATE).

Council's Amendment.

Returned from the Council with an amendment which was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Foley in the Chair; Hon. W. C. Angwin in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Third proviso, after the word "or" in line 2, insert "construction of necessary work and":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The effect of the amendment is that the specifications and plans of the works shall be submitted to the Minister for his approval, in just the same way as it is provided shall be done in connection with the pipes which are to be laid in the streets. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

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

House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 4th December, 1919.

	PAGE
Questions: Land Settlement, Manjimup ...	1964
Public Servants and Politics ...	1964
Mining, Yampi Sound ...	1964
Parliamentary Allowances Amendment Bill ...	1965
Sitting Hour ...	1965
Bills: Industries Assistance Act Amendment, report, 3R. ...	1965
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, report, 3R. ...	1965
Prices Regulation, Assembly's message, report, 3R. ...	1965
Roads Closure, 2R., etc. ...	1965
Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act Amendment, 2R., etc. ...	1966
Anglo-Persian Oil Co., Ltd. (Private), Assembly's message. ...	1974
Zoological Gardens Act Amendment, 1R. ...	1974
Traffic, Governor's Amendment ...	1974
Public Education Acts Amendment, Assembly's Amendment ...	1974
Loan, £3,339,000, 2R., etc. ...	1974
Land Act Amendment, 1R. ...	1981
Presbyterian Church Act Amendment, 1R. ...	1981
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Assembly's message ...	1981
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, Assembly's message ...	1981
Ajana-Geraldine Railway, 2R., etc. ...	1981
Sand Drift, 2R., etc. ...	1983
Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall Railway Extension, 2R., etc. ...	1984
Wickepin Racecourse, 2R., etc. ...	1985
Adjournment, special ...	1985

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

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, MANJIMUP.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister for Education: 1, To which item or items does the sum of £1,744, furnished as an answer to Question 7 in return relating to land at Manjimup, refer? 2, If this sum does not include the cost of surveying and subdividing the land referred to in above return, will he give the cost in connection with such surveying and subdividing?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, To item No. 6. 2, About £2,230.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVANTS AND POLITICS.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it a fact that the attitude or public utterances of members of the Public Service on political or public questions are recorded on their personal files? 2, If so, does this apply to all members of the Public Service?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—MINING, YAMPI SOUND.

Hon. G. J. G. W. MILES (without notice) asked the Minister for Education: Will the

Minister have the report of the State Mining Engineer on Yampi Sound published as soon as possible?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: I will bring the matter under the notice of the Minister for Mines.

QUESTION—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT BILL.

Hon. H. STEWART (without notice) asked the Minister for Education: Will the Minister so arrange the business of the day that the Parliamentary Allowances Amendment Bill may come on early, thus affording greater opportunity for a full debate of the measure?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: There are a number of items on the Notice Paper, all of which I hope will be subjected to whatever debate the House considers necessary.

SITTING HOUR.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.38]: May I be permitted to intimate to members that, in view of the desire of the Government and no doubt the desire of members generally to close the session this week, I intend to ask the House at the close of the present sitting to adjourn until 3 p.m. to-morrow. I make the announcement now because probably some members may not be present when the House adjourns.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: Do you propose to sit on Saturday?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not for me to propose.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We shall be sitting next week if the Land Bill comes up.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

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

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—PRICES REGULATION.

Assembly's Message.

A message having been received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendment No. 3, in Clause 11, Subclause (2), subject to a modification, consideration of the Bill was resumed from the 26th November.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

No. 3—Clause 11, Subclause (2), after the word "Act," in line 9 of the subclause, insert the following: "Provided that this part of the Act shall not operate where Section 16 of this Act has been complied with."

Modification—Strike out all the words in the amendment after the words "provided that this" and insert the following in lieu thereof:—"subsection shall not operate where section sixteen of this Act has been complied with, and the person on whose behalf or on whose place of business any foodstuffs or necessary commodities have been sold or offered for sale contrary to the provisions of this Act has, prior to such sale or offer for sale, given specific instructions in writing to the person who has sold or offered for sale any such foodstuffs or necessary commodities contrary to the provisions of this Act not to sell or offer for sale the same or any part thereof at a greater price than the maximum price fixed by this Act";

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the Assembly's modification be agreed to.

I think the modification does no more than carry out the desires of this Chamber. It will obviate any possibility of dispute as to whether the employer had instructed his employee or not.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am prepared to agree to the Assembly's modification, which will afford greater security to the bona fide employer. However, I wish to draw attention to the "Minutes of Proceedings" in connection with this clause. When I moved the proviso to this clause, it was inserted after the word "Act." Subsequently a new subclause was inserted beginning with the words "Any purchaser." According to the "Minutes of Proceedings" those words have been struck out so far as this House is concerned.

The Minister for Education: Those words have not been struck out.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Very well.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's modification agreed to.

Clause 11 as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This Bill differs in no way from the Roads Closure Bill which it is found necessary to submit in almost every session of Parliament. It deals with the closing of roads in certain districts. Four roads are affected by this Bill, three

of them at Narrogin and one at Peppermint Grove. Firstly, there is the closure of portion of a road at Narrogin in accordance with a request received from the Narrogin Municipal Council, who have fenced in that portion and planted a park. There is no departmental objection, and the closure is in accordance with the desire of the local community. The second closure relates to the recreation grounds at Narrogin. On behalf of the municipality a Bill is being brought forward authorising the sale of the present racecourse at Narrogin. The owners of the racecourse then propose to utilise the money in the purchase of a certain block of land adjoining the present recreation ground, show ground, and polo ground. The effect will be to make one large reserve for the whole of these purposes—recreation ground, show ground, polo ground, and racecourse. In order to do this, it is necessary to close one or two roads that run between the reserves as they are at present. The third closure relates to a small area at Narrogin which is required in connection with the establishment of a butter factory. Before the area set apart for the butter factory can be used for that purpose, it is necessary to close a road. As an alternative, another road is being opened in the vicinity. The Narrogin Municipal Council approve also of this closure. The road at Peppermint Grove referred to in this Bill is portion of a way that divides the land belonging to the Presbyterian College at Peppermint Grove. It is merely a way of convenience for the land belonging to the college, and the closure does not in any way affect the rights of the public or those of any private owner. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Closure of portions of certain roads:

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Have the interests of the local authorities been consulted in these matters?

The Minister for Education: Yes, in every case.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

[The Deputy President resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—DISCHARGED SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
(Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.47] in

moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Act which was passed in 1918. The second clause has been introduced to extend the provisions of the Act to nurses who served outside the Commonwealth and also to other war workers at the discretion of the Minister. This extension has been made at the request of the Federal Government. As the Act stands, it does not apply to war workers generally, but at the request of the Federal Government—and I see no harm in it—provision is made to extend the privileges of the Bill to war workers generally at the discretion of the Minister. So far as present information goes, about 35 munition workers went from this State and it will be at the discretion of the Minister to admit any of them to the privileges of the Act. The term "war workers" also applies to Y.M.C.A. workers. Clause 3 of the Bill is intended to amend Section 4 of the Act by inserting after the word "thereof" in paragraph 3 the following words:—

or who as the next of kin or under any testamentary disposition of a deceased person within the meaning of those words in the interpretation of the term "dependant" has acquired the holding of such deceased person.

That is merely intended to remedy an omission from the present Act. As the Act stands at present, no concession can be made to applicants in the case of conditional purchase lands acquired by transfer. The reduced purchase price can only be extended to men who selected their land direct from the Crown. The amendment provides that in the case of soldiers who acquire conditional purchase land by purchase, they shall be entitled to a rebate of one-half the balance of the unpaid purchase money due at the date of purchase. This concession will involve some loss to the Lands Department, but I cannot see any reason why soldiers taking advantage of the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act cannot be allowed the same privilege in regard to conditional purchase land acquired on their behalf as if they took it up originally from the Crown. This reduction applies only to the unpaid balance. If, on the land purchased, rents have been paid for a period of years, no concession will be made in regard to those payments but, for the remainder of the period, the soldier will have the concession provided for soldiers generally under the Act. Sub-clause 2 of the same clause extends the privilege to the dependant of a deceased soldier in respect of land owned by the deceased prior to his enlistment. This is a very proper amendment in the interests of the dependants of fallen soldiers. Clause 5 is introduced to give the Minister power to suspend rent for five years on pastoral leases acquired by transfer. At present the power of the Minister to suspend rent applies only to soldiers who select Crown lands. A number of pastoral leases purchased on behalf of returned soldiers are

quite unimproved and it is just as necessary that the soldiers should have this exemption from rent as in those cases where pastoral country is taken up direct from the Crown. Where pastoral lands are acquired for a soldier and are improved properties and going concerns, it will not be necessary to make the concession. Clause 6 seeks to amend Section 15 of the Act, and is necessitated by the increase in the amount bearing reduced interest from £500 to £625. The arrangement made at the outset was that this money should be advanced at a low rate of interest and that the Commonwealth and State Governments should share between them the loss represented between the low rate of interest and the full cost of the money, the rate being increased by one-half per cent. each year until the full rate was reached. The amount subject to this reduced rate of interest was £500. It has since been discovered that this is not sufficient and the Commonwealth have increased the amount of their advance from £500 to £625.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: What was the reason for that?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was considered that £500 was not sufficient. All this amendment proposes is to substitute £625 for £500 as the amount which the soldier shall receive at the reduced rate of interest. Clause 7 seeks to amend Section 16 of the principal Act. This section prescribes the form of security to be taken by the Agricultural Bank. Subclause 4 has been inserted at the request of the associated banks, who took exception to our security extending to land owned by a soldier other than that specifically charged in the mortgage. That is quite a proper provision. It is not desirable that the financial assistance of private institutions should be unduly restricted or that their security should be attacked. Clause 8 will give the board power to purchase alienated properties on behalf of any soldier applying. Now it is necessary to revest such land in the Crown and then grant it to the applicant under conditional purchase conditions. A good deal of the board's business consists of single properties, and no good object is served by purchasing property, revesting it in the Crown and then granting it again to the applicant. It is as well to make one transaction of it. Clause 9 amends Subsection 2 of Section 28. It is considered desirable to specify no particular amount of capital for the board's requirements. The amendment will provide for such money as may be required for the purpose and it will be appropriated by Parliament as necessity arises. This will obviate the necessity of amending the measure when fresh capital is required. If this clause is passed, fresh capital will be authorised as required under the Appropriation Bill. Clause 10 provides for the amendment of Section 29 of the principal Act. When the Act was prepared it was

thought necessary to grant the soldiers some concession with regard to the statutory fees payable to the various departments. By an oversight this was omitted. The most burdensome charges are involved by the stamp duties, and the amendment will give the Government the right to prescribe by regulation reduced stamp duties. Stamp duty is payable at the rate of 20s. for every £100 consideration, so that the duty payable on the transfer of a £2,000 purchase is £20. If this clause is agreed to, it will be competent for the Government by regulation to frame a lower rate of stamp duty to be charged soldiers in such cases. Clause 11 empowers soldiers under the age of 21 to mortgage freehold land and chattels. Under the present Act minors have not this power but Clause 11 will deem minors to be of full age for this purpose. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.57]: I have followed the parent Act closely and I believe the amendments outlined will facilitate the board's business. I am not going to be a carping critic of the administration of the board. The board have done well considering the position with which they were faced on their appointment, and the little which had been done for the settlement of our returned soldiers. I understand the board are hampered in their operations because they have not discretionary power to delegate certain matters for investigation and report. In another place, a clause to give them that power was struck out. I am satisfied that much dissatisfaction will exist until such time as a system of subsidiary boards is created throughout the State. I am not in accord with the proposal to further extend the definition of "discharged soldier." Prior to the passing of the Act, it was long proclaimed, and has since been promulgated, that first consideration would be given to those who went abroad on active service. The parent Act as it stands gives that preference. It further sets out that the Minister may extend the privilege of the Act to any person who enlisted for active service beyond the Commonwealth and was prevented from going to the front by reasons over which he had no control. The Act goes further and says that the Minister may, in his discretion, exercise the same privilege towards a person who served in the Imperial forces during the war. Therefore, the position is clearly defined, and, so far as the ramifications of this Bill are concerned, they clearly indicate that that particular class of man will receive first consideration. Now the leader of the House tells us that, at the request of the Commonwealth Government it is proposed to include other workers. The effect will be this. Soldiers who went beyond the Commonwealth have applied for, but have not yet secured land, and, before

their requirements are satisfied, it is proposed to bring in another kind of discharged soldier. That can only lead to one result, dissatisfaction. I cannot see the necessity for Clause 2 of the Bill. I have made inquiries at the source which is most competent to give the information, and I have been informed that no female who went outside the Commonwealth in the capacity of a nurse stands in the same category as a member of the A.I.F. Women were attested and went outside the Commonwealth as a definite unit of the A.I.F.: as such they have returned, and come under the interpretation of discharged soldier. There is now a proposal that the term discharged soldier shall include any person who, as a member of the army medical corps nursing service, was employed on active service outside the Commonwealth. I have consulted the District Headquarters in Perth, and they inform me that there is nothing on the records to show that such a unit was ever attached to the Australian army in Australia or outside the Commonwealth. There is an Australian nursing corps, and the District Headquarters informed me that they are classed, as I have already stated, as lieutenants in the infantry. Whom do these words in the clause propose to cover? Is it intended that they shall cover nurses who went from Australia not attached to Australian units, and who linked up with nursing corps in Britain? If so, I am against that, because the Returned Soldiers' Association have succeeded in obtaining from the Prime Minister a promise that any person rejected in Australia and who went beyond the Commonwealth and joined the army in Great Britain, and who was in Great Britain during the war should be placed on exactly the same footing as the Australian soldier. The Prime Minister agreed to that, but men who left Australia and went to England to get a commission there are taboo. I want to know the meaning of the clause. Will it include persons or nurses who went outside Australia though not under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth? There is also a proposal to extend the term "discharged soldier" to munition workers employed outside the Commonwealth, but is it not better to exhaust that class of soldier we originally set out to help in the parent Act, before we proceed to help any other? There is nothing in the Bill to say that a person who left Australia of his own volition, paid his passage and went to England as a munition worker, shall not obtain the privileges conferred by this Act. I take it the intention of the Prime Minister is that the Federal Authorities shall also recognise munition workers as war workers. But there is nothing in the Bill to say that that shall be done. I desire to offer a few remarks with regard to the clause dealing with the board, and it is my intention at a later stage to move an amendment to that clause. The parent Act says that the board shall consist of four persons appointed by the Government, one of whom shall be a returned soldier. On the board

there is also a returned soldier, in the person of Captain Throssell, V.C. Little or no information was received by the Returned Soldiers' Association regarding the appointment of Captain Throssell to a seat on the board. The Returned Soldiers' Association claim that they should have the right to nominate their representative. If the amendment I propose to move is agreed to, it will have no effect unless the clause is further amended to provide that the present occupant shall forfeit his office on this Bill being assented to, and shall be eligible for re-election. I welcome the decision of the Government to extend the provisions of the original Act in the direction we failed to do previously. That is to say, that if a man, before going on active service was on a freehold block, and who, while away at the war, was unfortunate enough to lose his life, the father of that man should step in and take up the position as if the son had returned. I congratulate the Government on making that provision. This was a request which was made to the Premier by the Soldiers' conference. I believe that the other clauses in the Bill are based on the light of experience, and are in the direction of liberalising the original Act, and endeavouring to overcome difficulties which have arisen. An amendment of the Act was to be expected. Legislation of this kind was an entirely new departure, and it dealt with problems that hitherto had never presented themselves. These had to be grappled with, and it is a natural corollary now that the amendments contained in the Bill should be brought forward for consideration. I desire to commend Mr. McLarty and those controlling the Act. The soldiers have the utmost confidence in Mr. McLarty. Although they do not see eye to eye with him in all things, they recognise that he is out to give them a fair deal. They all agree that he is overworked and is doing a lot of work that could be done by a less capable man.

Hon. J. MILLS (Central) [5.16]: Generally speaking I am not opposed to the Bill. I think its provisions are necessary. I am not altogether in agreement with Mr. Cornell over Clause 2. Mr. Cornell referred to those soldiers who have not yet been dealt with in respect of land. That is the fault, not of the department, but of the Act, which does not permit of sufficient land being taken to settle the soldiers. At present the operations of the Act are confined almost entirely to the South-West division of the State. Outside that division very little land is available, except such as is too far away from civilisation. During last session Section 4 of the Land Act Amendment Act of 1906 was inserted in the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act. It provides that the Governor may resume land comprised in any pastoral lease for agricultural or horticultural settlement or for mining or other purposes. When the Bill was sent back to another place the new clause was so mutilated that it meant no-

thing. In Committee I propose to make an attempt to have this provision, which was so mutilated last year, reinstated, and Subsection 4 of Section 10 of the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act deleted. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [5.19]: The reference to the Army Medical Corps Nursing Service is intended to make the meaning quite clear. Military men may have informed Mr. Cornell that the present definition covers the persons concerned, but I do not think there is any harm in having it clearly set out.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no such unit.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the term is wrong it can be amended. There is no doubt as to who is intended by it. As to the inclusion of munition workers and other war workers, an attempt was made in another place to have munition or war workers placed on the same footing as discharged soldiers. That was resisted by the Premier and negatived by the House on the ground that the discharged soldier was entitled to preference, and that the munition worker could only be considered afterwards. If there were a case of two persons, one a discharged soldier and the other a munition worker, both requiring a certain piece of land, the discharged soldier would have the preference. It was thought better to leave it in that form rather than make it appear that the war worker had the same right as the returned soldier.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 11—agreed to.

New clause, amendment of Section 5:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 4:—"4. (1) The member of the board required by section five of the principal Act to be a discharged soldier shall be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Western Australian branch of the Returned Soldiers, Sailors, and Nurses' Imperial League of Australia (2) The member of the existing board appointed as a discharged soldier under Section 5 of the principal Act shall, on the commencement of this Act, retire from the board, but shall be eligible for nomination and re-appointment."

Under the Act it is necessary that a discharged soldier should be a member of the board, "discharged soldier" apparently meaning a discharged soldier within the definition of paragraph (a) of Section 3 of the parent Act. An appointment has been made, but the governing body of the Returned Sol-

diers' Association in this State had little say as to who should be the appointee. The object of having a discharged soldier on the board is to give the discharged soldiers some representation. As our Act stands now any Minister may appoint a discharged soldier as a member of the board without any reference to the organisation which is dealing with discharged soldiers. I do not say that was done in the case of Captain Throssell, V.C., but I understand that very cursory information was solicited from the organisation concerned in regard to his appointment. The soldiers should be given some say in the choice of the discharged soldier who would fill the position on this board.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Can you instance a case in which the Returned Soldiers' Association have appointed any soldier to a board?

Hon. J. CORNELL: They have had the right to do so under a promise from the Prime Minister. If my proposal is agreed to Capt. Throssell must resign, otherwise he would be able to carry on indefinitely and the object I have in view would not be achieved. He would, however, be eligible for re-nomination and re-appointment. The Bill as it stands does not confine itself to any particular discharged soldier or any association to which he may belong. He need not necessarily belong to the Returned Soldiers' Association. I commend the new clause to the attention of hon. members.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I am in accord with Subclause 1 but must oppose Subclause 2. I have never heard any complaints because of the representation of returned soldiers, whether the selection was made from the Returned Soldiers' Association or not. It would be unfair to ask Capt. Throssell to resign and for the Returned Soldiers' Association to have to decide whether they would re-appoint him or not. The proposal means that Capt. Throssell will have to be discharged and run the gauntlet of the Returned Soldiers' Association.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The original intention in framing the Act was that the Government could select as a representative of the returned soldiers some one who had a practical knowledge of farming. The Government would not be likely to make an appointment without feeling satisfied that it was acceptable to the organisations interested. If there is a returned soldier selected by the Government because of his knowledge of land settlement, I rather think he would be a better man for the work than might otherwise be the case. The Act provides that members of the board shall hold office during the Governor's pleasure. I do not think that would be consistent with a provision that a member should be elected by an outside body. I do not know that it would be an enviable position for any member of the board to feel that his appointment was dependent upon the goodwill of the Returned Soldiers' Association.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Had not Captain Throssell already been appointed there might have been something in Mr. Cornell's contention. Unless he has given dissatisfaction to the returned soldiers and those interested in the matter I cannot see why this House should seek to upset the appointment. Unless there is anything behind all this I am not inclined to support the new clause.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not intend to reflect in any way upon Captain Throssell. Until, however, he resigned, the Returned Soldiers' Association would have no actual say on behalf of that organisation in the representation of the board. I am prepared to withdraw Subclause 2 of the proposed new clause, and to allow the first to remain. I am satisfied that Captain Throssell will act in the right way in this matter. I ask leave to withdraw the second portion of the proposed new clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw the whole new clause, or some other hon. member may move an amendment.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I move—

That Subclause 2 of the proposed new clause be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Whatever position is arrived at I trust there will be no room for ambiguity, which would occur if the first part of the proposed new clause were left in and the second part struck out. The inference would be that the appointment in question had not been made in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I want a clear vote to be taken on the first portion of the proposed new clause, and if the second portion is struck out we shall have a clear vote on the main question at issue.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The provision contained in the first half of Mr. Cornell's proposal is a wise one. It simply gives effect to what was originally intended to be done in connection with the representation on this board. It is only meet and proper that the representative of the association on the board should possess the full confidence of the association, and therefore the association should have the power of nominating their representative. The same thing obtains in connection with other departments of the State. I hope the new clause will be carried. The point raised by the leader of the House as to the validity of the appointment of the present holder of the office can be met by a simple proviso. Personally I do not see that any difficulty exists.

Amendment on the new clause put and passed.

New clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	8
Noes	14
Majority against	6

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. R. J. Lynn	(Teller.)
Hon. J. Mills	

NOES.

Hon. G. F. Baxter	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	

New clause thus negatived.

New clause:

Hon. J. MILLS: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 4: "Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by deleting Subsection (4) thereof and inserting the following in lieu: 'The Governor may from time to time resume, enter upon, and dispose of the whole or any part of the land comprised in any pastoral lease, for agricultural or horticultural settlement, or for mining or any other purpose, as in the public interest he may think fit.'"

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I would like some explanation of the meaning of this new clause. It does not appear to refer to discharged soldiers.

Hon. J. MILLS: In my opinion, Subsection (4) of Section 10 is valueless as it stands, from the aspect of soldier settlement. Under it the lessee is to be entitled to compensation for any loss or damage sustained. The clause I have moved would mean that the lessee would receive compensation for improvements, and for nothing else. To grant him compensation when the Governments take for the purpose of soldier settlement land on which he has merely the right to graze cattle, is in my opinion absolutely wrong.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The new clause seems to me most important, and to have it sprung upon us without notice is embarrassing. Even though the close of the session is impending, we ought to have some time to think over the clause. No one can quite gather its import from merely hearing it read. In fact, the clause is so important that I doubt whether it comes within the purview of the Title.

Hon. J. Mills: It was in last year's Bill.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I hope it will not be in this year's Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I support Mr. Mills's new clause. At the soldiers' conference Section 10 of the principal Act was the bugbear of many of the country delegates, especially those from pastoral districts. Their view is that this proposed new clause—which appeared in the Bill of last session—is much fairer to the soldier than is Subsection (4)

of Section 10. The soldiers are not so much concerned whether the lessee gets compensation or not, but they consider they should not be called upon to pay that compensation when persons similarly circumstanced under the Land Act would not be called upon to pay compensation. The soldiers are of opinion that the existing Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act bears upon them unduly. They hold that the general taxpayer should pay any compensation coming to the lessee, and that the soldiers should not pay it. This was debated at the soldiers' conference. It has been discussed with departmental heads, with lawyers, and with members of this House. The conference was unanimous that there should be no differentiation between soldiers and other persons respecting the resumption of pastoral leases. The soldiers are prepared to accept the same obligations as other people. This part of the Act has caused more dissatisfaction than any other.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Cornell has not put the position quite clearly. He said that in a general way when leases are resumed the taxpayers pay the compensation, but in this case the soldier has to pay. I would remind him that the soldier can get possession of a pastoral lease but the general public cannot.

Hon. J. Mills: How can he?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Under the existing Act. Provision was made last session that portions of pastoral leases could be resumed for returned soldiers. This is certainly an advantage in favour of the returned soldier. There might be something in the point raised by Mr. Cornell that, Parliament having provided that portion of the land shall be resumed for the soldiers, the general taxpayers, instead of the soldiers, might be asked to pay the compensation.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I should like a ruling whether the proposed new clause is in order. It seems to be a clause to amend the Land Act.

Hon. J. Mills: It was in order last year in connection with this measure.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Subsection 4, which was passed last year, gives the Governor power to resume land to be disposed of "to discharged soldiers." The hon. member should include those three words, otherwise we shall be putting into a Discharged Soldiers Settlement Bill power for the Government to resume land and dispose of it to anyone for any purpose.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's amendment is not in order. It must be made relevant to the subject matter of the Bill before I can accept it.

Hon. J. MILLS: I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot withdraw it; I have ruled it out of order.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Is there anything before the Committee?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Shall I be in order if I move a new clause?

The CHAIRMAN: It is not fair to the Committee for an hon. member to move a new clause without some notice of it having been given. Members are entitled to see the amendments in print; they should not be moved in this irregular way. Before being moved, they must certainly be put in writing and handed to the Chairman.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 4:—"Subsection 4 of Section 10 of the principal Act is further amended by the deletion of the following words:— 'whereupon the pastoral lessees shall be entitled to compensation for loss or damage sustained thereby.' "

The CHAIRMAN: I have not the new clause in writing and, until I have, I cannot take any notice of it.

Hon. J. MILLS: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 4:—"Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by striking out Subsection (4) and inserting the following words:— 'The Governor may from time to time resume, enter upon and dispose of to discharged soldiers, the whole or any part of the land comprised in any pastoral lease, for agricultural or horticultural settlement or for mining or any other purpose as in the public interest he may think fit.' "

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till the next sitting.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move the adjournment of the debate. He may move to report progress.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I cannot move to report progress.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Then I shall move—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	3
Noes	19
Majority against				16

AYES.

Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. R. J. Lyon
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The amendment is one that cannot possibly commend itself to the fair ideas of hon. members. I have never heard of such an arbitrary, unfair or unjust proposal in my life. It is suggested that the Government should enter on a property that they have induced a man to take up and improve, and take it away from him without anything in the shape of compensation.

Hon. J. Mills: You may add that.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not want to. Can we have anything fairer than the section in the Act? Everything has been done to induce people to take up pastoral areas, and then, when the stage is reached that those areas have become a little remunerative, the hon. member wants the Government to step in and take them away. When the hon. member referred in his speech a few days ago to cutting up leases into blocks of 20,000 acres, I know that he had in mind the grazing lands along the Murchison railway. Portion of those areas have been taken up in recent years. A lot of that country was never touched until a few years back because it was not considered to be any good. I admit that I held some of it once and threw it up.

Hon. J. Mills: And there are 40,000 sheep on it now.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Someone with enterprise and more go than I had took up this land, fenced it in, and, as the hon. member has stated, there are now 40,000 sheep on it. That man deserves credit, and we are asked to resume that land without compensation. No one wants to be fairer to the returned soldiers than I do, but if the Government want those places, let them do as they have been doing with other properties, namely, purchase them, and not confiscate them. I can hardly think that the hon. member could have thought out the position he was placing himself in. The hon. member has always been regarded as a fair minded man, and I am certain that in his good feelings towards the soldiers he has overlooked the good feelings he has for those men who have sweated their brows to bring their leaseholds into the position they are found to be in to-day.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am insistent upon the honourable carrying out of any contract, whatever it may be. The contract between the pastoral lessee and the Government is that the lessee shall have the use of the land for a certain period. The Government have power to resume freehold on payment of compensation. I do not know that they have power to resume leasehold, although they may have power to confiscate it. There is in another place at present an amendment of the Land Act. An attempt has been made by certain pastoral lessees to confiscate some of the rights of the Crown. I am opposed to that. But, on the other hand, I am opposed to the Crown confiscating the rights of the pastoral lessee, unless

compensation is paid. To put returned soldiers on 20,000 acres of pastoral land would be to settle them in a way in which this Committee does not desire they should be settled. The hon. member who moved the amendment has had practical experience of the pastoral industry. His experience led him to get out of it at the first opportunity, and he has not since attempted to get back. I do not think the good sense of the Committee is likely to be led away by the hon. member who, so far, has not put up any case at all.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: It is not a question of confiscation. We all want to give a fair deal to both parties. We should not confine our attention to any one class of the community. Power is given under the Land Act to resume agricultural land for any purpose. No complaint has been made of that provision of the Act.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Compensation is paid in that case.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: Yet immediately we attempt to lay hands on the pastoral areas, complaint is made. I am not in favour of confiscation. If, under the Bill of last year, the Government were to attempt to resume pastoral country for the soldiers, the resultant litigation would not cease until the Privy Council was reached. Sooner or later the pastoral country must be resumed. In the meantime the pastoral lessees are endeavouring to place every obstacle in the way. I think we can trust the Government to deal fairly by the lessees if their property is resumed. Under the present Act there is no possibility of the Government resuming any pastoral land whatever for soldiers. I will support the amendment, for it will tend to the more rapid population of the North.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I give credit for sincerity to the hon. member who moved the amendment, but I suggest that his amendment would lead to chaos. It gives the Government absolute power to resume pastoral land for soldiers. The result is likely to be disastrous to the existing lessees. If we are going to burden the lessees with the prospect of their land being resumed by the Government without compensation, we shall stop people from embarking in the pastoral industry, which means so very much to the State. Subsection 4 of Section 10 of the Act gives power to resume, but provision is made for the pastoral lessee to get compensation for the loss or damage sustained by such resumption. In connection with the resumption of any other land compensation has always been recognised as a principle. Property once created should not be taken away from the party who has acquired it until fitting compensation has been provided. If Mr. Mills agrees to the compensation clause being added there is no need to strike out Subsection 4 at all; and I must vote against his proposal.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Some compensation should be provided in Mr. Mills' proposal. It was not intended by the Returned Sol-

diers' Association conference that the lessees should not get some compensation. If the proposal is agreed to I do not think it will be within the power of the board to resume pastoral land for pastoral purposes. Section 4 of the Land Act provides for compensation for the resumption of pastoral leases for agricultural purposes, and under that Act the resumption does not entail loss or damage upon the lessee, such as would be the case under the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act. I suggest that instead of Mr. Mills' amendment the words in the Act "or loss or damage sustained thereby" should be struck out and "such resumption" inserted in lieu. I think this will be for the benefit of returned soldiers.

Hon. J. MILLS: I would be prepared to accept Mr. Cornell's suggestion but that it is not clear to me that there is power in the Act to resume land for the purpose required. However, I am willing to accept his suggestion and ask leave to withdraw the proposed new clause.

New clause by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move—

That a new clause be added to stand as Clause 4, as follows:—"Section 10, Subsection 4, of the principal Act is hereby amended by striking out the words 'loss or damage sustained thereby' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such resumption.'"

I am advised that the lessee will be sufficiently protected by this amendment, and the compensation for such resumption will be assessed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: You will require to provide machinery for assessment.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know that there is any machinery provided in the present section.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: It is obvious that the object is to take away from the lessee the property from which he is making a living and give him as little as possible in return. When a freehold is resumed it is paid for, or the matter is taken to arbitration, and the whole business is taken into consideration and compensation paid accordingly. The same thing should apply to these leases. A man takes a lease for a certain number of years, and is induced by the Government to improve it, and it is as much his living as the freehold is to another man. If it is taken away he should have compensation. The object of hon. members is to allow the Government to resume not only a lease but portion of it, and also to pay only for the improvements effected upon it. The word "damage" includes loss due to severance. My theory is that if certain land is wanted for the soldiers, the entire station should be bought by the Government. They have induced men to go on pastoral areas and

improve them, on the understanding that up till 1928 they are absolutely secure in their holdings. But the supporters of the amendment want to step in now and resume, before 1928, and this without any allowance for damage by severance. I think I will leave the amendment to take care of itself.

Hon. J. MILLS: Sir Edward Wittenoom has put up a good case for those whom he represents, the squatters.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I represent the soldiers as much as you do.

Hon. J. MILLS: Some of the leases along the Cue railway have been in the same hands for 50 years, and the owners of them have made good and are wealthy men. There is an anticipated loss on the railways of over £600,000 for this year, and one of the reasons for that loss is the paucity of our population.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is that of compensation.

Hon. J. MILLS: In the new clause which I submitted I unintentionally left out a reference to compensation. The explanation is that the House went into Committee so suddenly that I overlooked the matter at the time. Hundreds of soldiers are anxious to settle on the Murchison country, where they could make a good living. I support Mr. Cornell's new clause. If a leaseholder who has made good is compensated for his improvements, that is sufficient.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I favour Mr. Cornell's amendment, recognising that it is impossible to defend resumption without compensation. The leasehold tenure is, in my view, just as sacred as a freehold; but an attempt is being made to turn the leasehold into something even better than the freehold. The valuations of resumed freehold properties, I understand, do not include anything except improvements. The Agricultural Bank inspectors, who act as assessors, make a very close valuation of the improvements, and allow nothing outside that. Proper allowance can be made for dispossession of a leaseholder without putting up a case for extraordinary damages. The returned soldier should understand that if he is to take up these pastoral leases, whatever compensation is paid to the present leaseholders will be capitalised and he will have to bear the whole burden of that compensation. I am afraid the load will be such as effectually to settle the soldier-settler. Justice will have to be done to the present lessees; but, unless this provision is to be altogether farcical, justice will also have to be done to the returned soldier. The strong fight which is being put up for the present lessee suggests that he is paying less than the value of the land. He always complains that his rent is too high, but when he is to be dispossessed he claims damages for being put out of a good thing. However, Mr. Cornell's new clause seems to meet the case.

New clause put, and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	8
Noes	17
			—
Majority against	..		9
			—

AYES.

Hon. H. Carson	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. H. Millington	Hon. J. W. Hickey
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. R. J. Lynn	(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—ANGLO-PERSIAN OIL COMPANY, LTD. (PRIVATE).

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—TRAFFIC.

Governor's Amendment.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had amended the Traffic Bill in accordance with a recommendation from the Governor, in which amendment it desired the concurrence of the Council.

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendment.

Returned from the Assembly with an amendment which was now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the Assembly is, "Strike out Clause 5."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is with a good deal of regret that I accept the amendment. The Bill as introduced contained three principles, one for the compulsory education of blind, deaf and dumb children; the second making it compulsory for parents to send their children to school when facilities were provided for their transit; and the third an amendment in regard to the employment of school children. The first two principles have been passed but the third has been struck out, the opinion being that it would be better to include it in the State Children Act. I do not agree with the decision but, at this late hour of the session, to disagree with the amendment would probably cause the Bill to be hung up. Out of regard for the great importance of the other two principles, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

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

BILL—LOAN, £3,339,000.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.39] in moving the second reading said: The Loan Bill authorises the issue of a loan of £3,339,000 and the reappropriation of £85,000. The Bill does not authorise the expenditure of that sum, nor indeed of any sum of money; the expenditure can only be authorised under the Appropriation Bill. It is well known to members that the agreement with the Commonwealth Government in regard to the raising of money expires at the end of the current year.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Do you mean the current financial year?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, on the 31st of December of this year. Subsequent to that date, it will be necessary for the Government to approach the London market for any moneys which have to be raised, but this will not apply to the bulk of the money concerned in this Loan Bill, because the bulk of the money so provided for is for the purpose of soldier settlement; and that money will be provided by the Federal Government even after the expiration of the agreement at the end of this year. For all other purposes, it will be necessary for the Government to raise such moneys as are required in London, and tentative arrangements have already been made in that direction. If, just at the moment when the money is required, the market is not favourable, the London and Westminster Bank is quite prepared to make temporary arrangements until the opportunity is ripe

for the floating of a loan. In considering this Bill, a very important feature is the amount of the loan which will constitute a permanent charge upon the Consolidated Revenue account for interest and sinking fund. This is a matter which always has to be kept in mind in raising loan moneys. If we are satisfied that loan money will be so invested as to pay interest and sinking fund, then I venture to think there is no member of the House who would not be in favour of raising such a loan. So, in each Loan Bill, it is important to investigate the intended expenditure—although, as I have already stated, the expenditure is not authorised by the Bill but only the raising of the money—with a view to seeing to what extent interest and sinking fund is to become a charge upon Consolidated Revenue, and to what extent it is to be earned by the undertakings in which it is to be invested. Under the present Bill, the amount provided for soldier settlement should not be in any way a charge upon Consolidated Revenue, with this exception, that the soldiers pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, increasing by a half per cent. per annum until the cost of raising the money is reached. In the meantime, a half of the difference is borne by the Commonwealth and a half by the State. In addition to that, the Commonwealth Government advance the money to the State and allow the State a sum of £125,000 out of each million advanced to meet losses. It is recognised that in a large scheme like the soldier settlement scheme, there will inevitably be losses; some men will not make good. This has been the experience in all our land settlement and, in fact, in connection with land settlement in all countries. We cannot expect that it will not be the case in regard to soldier settlement. The Commonwealth Government recognise this and, as the State Government accept the responsibility of any failure on that account, the Commonwealth Government allow the State £125,000 out of each million of money that is loaned to us to meet losses of this kind. Therefore it may be said that the amount borrowed for the purpose of soldier settlement should not be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue account, excepting to the extent of the difference in interest between the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increasing annually by one-half per cent. that the soldier pays, and the amount the money actually costs, one-half of which will be a charge on the Consolidated Revenue account. This, however, will be a comparatively small amount. It is also fair to assume that interest will be fully earned on a further £366,950 of the amounts to be spent this year from loan funds. This sum includes additional capital for the Agricultural Bank and the Industries Assistance Board amounting to £158,500. It is not contemplated that there will be any loss in regard to this, and it is a fair assumption that the money will earn its interest, and that sinking fund will be paid. Additional capital is provided for the Boya quarry to the extent of £800. This should be a payable enter-

prise. For State hotels and the tourists' department there is provided £6,500. This also should be revenue-producing capital, and should not become a charge on Consolidated Revenue. For tramways the amount is £46,900. This also should be a productive undertaking. The tramway system of the metropolitan area does, as a matter of fact, pay interest and sinking fund, notwithstanding its great over-capitalisation; and the additional capital that will be put into it, representing sound capital, should undoubtedly pay its interest and sinking fund also. For the electric power station at East Perth there is a further £35,000 provided. This also should be productive expenditure. For harbours there is £119,250. All these are reproductive works, so that in addition to the money for soldier settlement we have £666,550 which should fully earn its interest and sinking fund and not become a charge on the taxpayers.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Where are all these figures?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Some of this expenditure is reappropriation, and some will be found in the first schedule of the Bill.

Hon. J. Duffell: There is only £92,000 in the first schedule.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is £92,000 set apart for harbours and rivers, and add to that the departmental expenditure and the figures will be about what I have quoted. Interest should be earned on a further £281,000. I say "should be," because these are items on which it may be questionable whether interest will be earned at once or not until a later period. For the Wyndham Freezing Works there is provided £155,000. That is, for the Wyndham freezing works and working capital.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Will interest be earned on the cost of the freezing works?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am speaking of the interest on the additional amount to be raised. So far as those works are concerned, the indications are that when they are working full capacity they will pay notwithstanding the tremendous amount that they cost. I am not in a position to say what the result of last year's operations was. We must bear in mind, however, that last year the number of cattle treated was much lower than the total capacity. The indications are, however, that the works will pay their way. The assumption is that the £155,000 for these works should be an interest-earning proposition. There is a sum of £2,000 for brick yards. That also should be reproductive expenditure. For abattoirs there is £81,000. These may not pay their way entirely, but they should be more or less reproductive. For town water supply £43,000 is provided. That also should be expenditure of a reproductive kind. Then there is a further item of £174,134 which should later on earn its interest. That item includes for new railways £48,760. That probably will not be immediately profitable to the extent of earning interest, but later on it should. For improvements to existing railways there is

provided £75,374, for rails and fastenings £8,000, and for rolling stock £42,000, making a total of £125,374, or a total on railways of £174,134 which should ultimately earn its interest. Then we come to the only remaining items, which will not earn interest. That is to say items which are not directly reproductive. The total is £156,490, made up as follows:—Fisheries £7,000; water supply £42,800; mining £20,000; immigration £8,000; roads and bridges £16,000; public buildings £28,000; resurrections £5,260, and administration £28,430, that is, administration in connection with that particular expenditure.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles : Does that include £20,000 for the Hedland water scheme?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: For water supplies there is provided £42,900. Town water supplies are expected to be reproductive, but water supplies generally will not immediately pay, so that of the total provided for in this year's loan expenditure it is contemplated that only £156,000 will be money on which the general revenue will have to provide interest and sinking fund. The balance should pay for itself. So far as money for soldier settlement is concerned the bulk of the expenditure is made up as follows—advances (2,000 at £625), £1,250,000; payment of trainees on Government farms and private training farms £2,000; clearing before selection £60,000; sinking tank sites at Yandanooka, etc., £5,000; boring on pastoral country £15,000; draining and irrigation £35,850; purchase of cattle £5,000; buildings on farms £10,000; erection of bush saw mill and running expenses £2,500; cropping land on estates purchased £1,000; free railway fares to soldiers and board fees £2,000; incidentals £10,000; purchase of estates £500,000; roads and railways (Big Brook railway) £8,990; overhead charges by Public Works Department £4,000; Agricultural Bank (working capital for soldier settlement scheme) £300,000, making a total of £2,211,340 for this year's expenditure. In connection with the soldier settlement scheme the number of applicants for land up to the present time is 4,041. Of these 228 have been rejected or deferred, leaving 3,813. The total number of certificates issued is 2,685. The number absolutely settled, and for whom loans have been approved is 1,472. The number pending qualification is 1,128. At the present time soldiers are being settled on the land at the rate of between 50 and 60 per week, and if that rate is maintained, and settlement is satisfactory, it will be a very good record indeed. It is very questionable whether the work could be done any quicker without being slurred. The Premier hopes to accomplish even a little more than that, but, to my mind, if we can keep up that record we shall have very little to complain about. The average expenditure per head in connection with soldier settlement up to the present time is £614. The repurchased estates number 28. The total number of holdings is 234, the total area 100,069 acres, and the cost

£268,071. These figures are excluding Yandanooka, Avondale, and Brunswick State Farm Estate. In addition, negotiations are approaching finality for five estates containing about 6,600 acres at a cost of about £20,000. Those are the purposes for which it is proposed to raise this loan. It may be suggested that the Government at the present time has extensive authorisations that are unused, but those authorisations are for specific purposes, and it would not be competent to borrow money other than for the purposes set forward in the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [8.55]: One speaks with a certain amount of ignorance on this subject, not having seen the Appropriation Bill, but I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the Loan Bill, and I can only hope that Ministers will take note of them. What I have to say will not affect the particular department represented by the leader of the House, but as we get such brief reports in the newspapers, it is not likely that my comments will reach Minister's ears unless a note is made of them. I am pleased to see amongst these votes that there is one for the supply of additional rolling stock for railways. In connection with some of the interests I represent there is nearly always a shortage of trucks for conveying stock to market. Under those circumstances I trust that the fact will be conveyed to the Minister responsible, that it is essential that there should be an adequate supply of trucks, not only for the conveyance of stock to market, but also in the event of a drought. At the present time a severe drought is being experienced in portion of the Murchison country, and in such circumstances thousands of stock could be saved were trucks available to get them away. There is another matter I would like to mention but which, not coming from an expert, may not be worth much. All the same it should be considered. It is that, in connection with our railway carriages, a good deal of weight might be saved were a different class of carriage constructed. We find on several of the lines that carriages are built with compartments to hold eight people, four to be seated on each side, and that there are continual divisions. These divisions should be done away with, and in that way considerable weight saved. The railway carriages should be built on the lines of our bigger tram cars. I remember travelling from Sydney to Brisbane at one time, and I got into a carriage in which there were chairs. There were no divisions at all in the carriage, and there was accommodation for 40 or 50 people. That kind of thing would do away with a great deal of weight, and, in a climate like ours, such carriages would be much more suitable than those which we have, and in which we coop up eight people. These remarks apply also to some of our tram cars. They are the most dreadful things I have ever seen. They seem

to be a continuation of divisions, and consequently add tremendously to the weight, while at the same time there is very little room for anybody. I make these suggestions in the hope that they will reach the source they are intended for. I remember when I was Agent General I asked why carriages which were being constructed for our railways were made so small, and why something more roomy was not supplied. The answer was that the carriages were being built to the orders issued by our own engineer. We want something suitable to the climate. What is good enough between Sydney and Brisbane should be good enough for use in this State. There is no mention in the Bill about the Geraldton harbour or the Geraldton water supply. That unfortunate town seems to have been entirely overlooked. There is no water supply there. The enterprising settlers there are trying to secure freezing works. They have subscribed a certain amount of money, but can get no farther without a water supply. Even if they had a water supply they could do nothing without a greatly improved harbour. Geraldton has a hinterland which includes some of the best country in the State, in respect both of pastoral land and of minerals. The harbour is but half improved, and the water supply is the most unsatisfactory that could be conceived.

The Minister for Education: There is a sum of £30,000 on the last loan schedule for Geraldton harbour improvements.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: And a nice mess they have made of it! I cannot impress too strongly on the Government the necessity for making provision next year for the bringing down of cattle from the North-West in the interests not only of the grower but of the consumer. Had it not been for the strike last season the price of meat in the metropolitan area would not have risen as it did. I hope satisfactory arrangements will be made for next season. The stock are up there and the people down here require the meat. There is here a vote of £10,000 for the purpose.

Hon. H. Millington: We require more boats.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The sum named would not go far towards the provision of suitable boats. All I ask is that the Government shall make such provision as may be necessary for the supplying of meat in the metropolitan area.

The Honorary Minister: Boats are quite unprocurable.

Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles: You allowed the Adelaide S.S. Co. to sell two boats to Japan. You made no attempt to buy them yourselves.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I hope the Government will do whatever is necessary to bring down the cattle from the North. I will support the second reading.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.5]: It would seem that we are approaching normal times again, seeing that it is proposed to go on the London market for a loan. I will support the second reading. At the same time I should be glad if this Chamber made certain suggestions to another place in regard to the schedule. The leader of the House said that £46,900 is to be set aside for tramway purposes. It is generally understood that a large amount of money is required to provide transit facilities in the suburbs of the metropolitan area. At least another £15,000 should be added to the sum named. Deputations have waited on the Minister for Railways and have succeeded in getting the Minister to go round and see for himself the necessity for tramway extensions. I understand on good authority that the Government have practically committed themselves to a scheme for increasing tramway facilities. Having regard to the extent of suburban settlement going on despite the lack of tramway facilities, one can imagine what it would amount to if the necessary tramway facilities were provided. It is imperative that a larger sum should be set aside for the purpose. People in Belmont, Cannington, South Perth, Maylands and other places are demanding those tramway facilities to which undoubtedly they are entitled. It is my duty to ask on behalf of those people that the Council should request the setting aside of a larger sum than is indicated in the schedule.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.10]: I ask myself what attitude the Council should take on a Bill of this nature. It is a very large sum which we are asked to authorise. We look at the figures presented to us, we read the Auditor General's report, and we can only wait and see what is going to happen. A more damning criticism of the methods of finance has rarely been seen than is contained in the Auditor General's report. In other parts of the world, of course, things are very much worse, but we have a certain duty to perform, and I suppose the only thing to do is to indicate one's views on the subject. I hope the Bill and the two or three others still to come before us will serve to awaken the country to the position in which we find ourselves. We shall be asked to pay something like six per cent. for this money. We are loading the State with debt. We are told by the Premier that things are in a most satisfactory condition and that the prospects are very bright. I sincerely hope he is right. Personally, I am more than ever convinced that we cannot possibly go on with the present system and avoid a complete financial break. Reference can be made to one or two passages in the Auditor General's report. On page 42 we read—

The Appropriation Act has been ignored, the bulk of the transactions are not in order and have not been passed. It is not understood why action has not been taken to place the matter on a proper footing.

And on page 11—

Loan expenditure. Similarly to the practice in other years, money was drawn from the Loan Fund without Parliamentary sanction.

The bulk of the money, it is true, is coming from the Commonwealth. I very much regret that when the question of repatriation was first mentioned this State did not refuse to load itself up, not only with capital but with interest, in connection with these advances from the Commonwealth Government. I do not consider that this House has any right to reject the Bill. The question of finances rests with another place, but I should like to warn the public that this performance that is going on is leading us into the arms of the Federal Government. There will be a complete breakdown in our financial system. We are now permitting ourselves with very little discussion to authorise this gigantic loan. I believe that the Parliament of this State has not on more than one occasion approved of a loan of such magnitude as this. We are simply banking again on this land settlement policy. The leader of the House tells us that he stands for the development of this country, and holds that it is the only way in which we can recover ourselves. His colleagues think the same. I think there is only one city representative in Cabinet. We are going to put this large sum of money into the country, which already has had two millions put into it by the Industries Assistance Board. This board has turned the farmers into State farmers. No one has a more hopeful view of the ultimate development of this country than I have, if that is carried out on modern and sound principles; but to hand over a million of money for agricultural development seems to be courting disaster. I understand the Labour party are supporting this because it is part of their platform. They acknowledge that they are going to have the whole life of the country centred in Government departments. I am grievously disappointed and surprised that the party which used to exist in this country is simply going one better than the Labour party. The most striking illustration I have seen during the last day or two is with regard to what is taking place in Victoria. In that State the Labour people have never been in power, and yet the country is committed to State enterprises, and is going to start off with State sawmills.

Hon. H. Millington: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We are becoming managing directors of this enormous number of State enterprises

Hon. H. Millington: Our screws will have to be raised.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That will be essential, for us as well as for the innumerable civil servants we are going to employ. It is a tremendous change in our policy to turn ourselves into one big co-operative and socialistic union. This policy will lead us into financial disaster, and one of the first steps that will indicate such disaster will be arrived

at when we shall be unable to carry on, and Australia will become one great co-operative socialistic union.

Hon. H. Millington: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am not surprised to hear that remark. This measure plays right into the hands of the Labour party. Instead of having individual development, which has brought Australia to the front in the past, we are committed beyond any possibility of getting out of it to this government and socialistic development. These measures involve the abolition of this Chamber. The Labour party have announced publicly that the principal plank in their platform is the abolition of State Parliaments.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is the third plank.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: And that another is unification for Australia. This Bill is playing right into their hands.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [9.22]: If the money that this Bill authorises to be raised is raised it will add to the indebtedness of the State £10 per head for every man, woman and child in it. I mention that to indicate the importance of the measure, and the seriousness of what we are doing, although I feel that the Bill is inevitable and must be passed. The indebtedness of Western Australia is at present very considerable. Mr. Watt has estimated that the indebtedness of the Commonwealth as a result of the war amounts to £60 per head of the population of Australia. The net indebtedness of Western Australia after providing for the sinking fund is £116 per head. This makes the indebtedness for every man, woman and child in Western Australia £176. If the money authorised to be raised under this Bill be raised it will mean that the net indebtedness of every man, woman and child in Western Australia will be £186 per head. It is true that we have wonderful assets, but this is a heavy liability. I can see only one way out of the position, which will be created by such a heavy debt, and that is by encouraging immigration. I was speaking the other day to a recent arrival from England, a man who knew a good deal about the affairs of the British Isles, and he told me there was the strongest possible desire on the part of a very large number of people in the British Isles to come to Western Australia as soon as shipping was available.

The Minister for Education: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: In conversation with Senator Pearce the other day I mentioned this matter, and asked him when shipping would be normal. He assured me that shipping would be normal in February and said he was perfectly convinced that a large number of immigrants would then be coming to Australia, and that it would be almost impossible to stop them. I presume the Government are fully aware of the position, and hope they will give every

possible encouragement to those people to come here, and do what they can to settle them permanently in the country. It is only by a vigorous immigration policy that we can hope to get out of our heavy indebtedness, and be relieved of the burden that is now resting upon us. We have no alternative but to agree to this Bill. I am sorry I found it difficult to follow the remarks of the leader of the House when he was introducing it. I understood him to say that this amount for land settlement of over two million pounds would be provided by the Commonwealth Government. The position then would be that the amount which would be required from London would be £739,000. When the sum of £2,600,000 is deducted from the sum of £3,339,000 there is left a sum of £739,000, which I presume will be raised in London. I am afraid the Minister is much more optimistic than I am regarding the future of some of the works indicated in the schedule of the Bill. I only hope that the bright anticipations of the Government paying interest and sinking fund on them, especially the Wyndham freezing works, will be realised. It seems to me that the Minister is sharing the optimism of the Premier, which in some respects is a very good thing, but I hope it will be tempered by a certain amount of caution. The schedule generally seems to me to contain works that are necessary at present. I cannot help being struck by the comparatively insignificant amount put down for the development of mining, including boring for coal and miscellaneous, as compared with the tremendous figures we find under the heading of "Development of Agriculture." Under that heading we have all sorts of items, including a grant of £2,600,000 for the settlement of soldiers on the land, £50,000 for the Agricultural Bank, and £100,000 for a variety of items such as abattoirs, cold storage, freezing, chilling, and canning works. The Government would, I think, be well advised to spend more than they have hitherto spent upon the development of mining. It should not be forgotten what mining has done for this State. My personal opinion is that if only one-tenth of the money spent on agriculture during recent years had been spent on mining, the results would have been more satisfactory. There are many directions in which the mining industry might be fostered. I only mention in that connection the recent discovery at Hampton Plains. The Federal authorities immediately provided everything that was asked for. When the State Government were asked for a road, their attitude was such that, had not some residents of Boulder put their hands in their own pockets, at any rate one of the roads to the new find would not have been constructed up to the present time.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But there was a Federal election on.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The State Government have not paid that attention to mining, and have not spent as much money in the development of mining, as the circumstances justified. Mr. Holmes has interjected a remark which indicates that he does not understand the position as regards the people on the goldfields. Whenever we have to appeal to Melbourne, we always find prompt satisfaction. The action of the Federal Government in connection with the Hampton Plains find was not in any way influenced by the Federal election. I am sorry to say that we do not get the same satisfaction when we appeal to the State Governments—not this State Government alone. I am associating these remarks with the question raised by the Loan Bill of the development of agriculture as compared with the development of mining. However, I shall vote for the second reading, and I only hope that the bright expectations of the Minister regarding the results of these works will be realised.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [9.33]: I am sure all of us wish to expedite the business of the House, and therefore I shall say only one or two words on this Bill. I take it that the £2,600,000 provided for soldier settlement is intended to include provision for the men who, as the Premier said some time ago, would be sent out from England, backed by £500 apiece.

The Minister for Education: No. That refers only to our own soldiers.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am glad to know that. The second point I wish to make is that the Minister referred in somewhat appreciative terms to the action of the Federal Government in allowing us a sum of £125,000—

The Minister for Education: I did not "appreciate" the fact; I merely mentioned it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Very well. The Minister mentioned that the Federal Government are allowing this State £125,000 per one million pounds to make good any loss in connection with soldier settlement. We must not forget that, except as to the £125,000 per one million pounds, the State is carrying the whole burden of the very considerable risk involved in the scheme. In the first place, the Commonwealth commandeers the whole of our gold, which amounts to a substantial sum per annum. It commandeers it at the old market price, which is pretty well what it costs our mining companies to produce it. Then the Commonwealth issue two one-pound notes for every twenty shillings' worth of gold they acquire. One of those notes pays for the gold, while the Commonwealth lends the other to the State at 4½ per cent. per annum interest. The deal is an excellent one for the Commonwealth; and therefore in connection with the settlement of soldiers, the Commonwealth ought to give us very much better treatment. As my constituents, so far as I can gather, have had enough

loans and do not want any more, I make no complaint that the schedules to this Bill contain nothing for Perth.

Hon. H. Stewart: What about the tramways?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: They already exist and they pay their way. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [9.37]: I would point out to Sir Edward Wittenoom that at the present time there is on the existing loan authorisations a sum of £30,000 for the Geraldton harbour works, and that this is the reason why that work is not included in the present Bill. A similar remark applies to the vote for the development of mining. There is a large sum still unraised for the development of mining—about £60,000. If Mr. Kirwan will look at the Appropriation Bill, which is to be considered presently, he will find that the sum there set down for this purpose, apart from £5,000 for State batteries, is £20,000, which is to be expended this year. That will suggest to the hon. member that the amount of £700,000 which he arrived at as the amount to be borrowed in London is not necessarily the exact sum for which the Government would apply in London, because it may be that there are certain amounts on existing loan authorisations which will be required. A glance at the schedule to the Appropriation Bill giving the contemplated loan expenditure for the next 12 months would also suggest that to the hon. member. I take it that the sum to be raised in London will be about a round million. Mr. Duffell's suggestion that more loan money should be spent about the city is one that does not altogether appeal to me. There is in this Bill a sum of £50,000 for tramway extension, but in the present condition of Western Australia there is far more need for the expenditure of loan money in the country than in the metropolitan area. The curse of all Australasia has been the centralisation of people in the capital cities. While I do not for a moment say that the facilities of transit in and about the city which can be properly undertaken should not be undertaken, I do say that the future prosperity of the country and also of the city requires that the money we can raise by loan should for the most part be spent on developmental works in the country, to encourage people to settle there. I do not take the gloomy view of Mr. Sanderson, but I do not know that any arguments I could use would alter his opinion. The suggestion of Mr. Kirwan that this Loan Bill will mean an increase of £10 per head on the population requires some qualification, because the successful expenditure of this money will undoubtedly mean a good many more heads over which the loan indebtedness of the State will be spread. If expenditure of this kind were not incurred, if the Government had not gone whole-heartedly into the settlement scheme for returned soldiers, we undoubtedly should

have had an exodus of people from this State; and then the indebtedness per head would have inevitably increased. I entirely agree with Mr. Kirwan that the solution of our difficulties is to be found in immigration. There is no doubt the hon. member is correct in stating that there are hundreds of people in the Old Country turning their eyes to Australia, and especially to Western Australia; and I can assure the hon. member that when the time is ripe and shipping facilities are available, this question will not be lost sight of. The Government feel that their first duty is to settle the returned soldiers. After that, if the Government can come to a satisfactory arrangement with the Imperial Government for the settlement of Imperial soldiers in Western Australia, they will encourage that class of immigration, and also any other class which will help in the building up of this State. I do not think there is any other point which it is necessary for me to reply to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

First Schedule:

Hon. J. EWING: In regard to the question of rolling stock, I hope that the policy of the late Commissioner and the late Chief Mechanical Engineer will not be continued by their successors. There is urgent necessity for seeing that all the locomotives to be constructed in years to come are constructed with the idea of assisting our own State. In years gone by due attention was not given to this very important question. The design of our locomotives has been unsuitable for local fuel. The local fuel is an entirely satisfactory fuel, and the Government have at last realised the great importance of our coal mining industry. I hope, therefore, that the new Commissioner of Railways and the gentleman who may succeed Mr. Hume will change the policy which has been in force for many years past, and that they will consider the interests of this State rather than the interests of the burning of a fuel imported from another part of Australia.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I wish to emphasise the remarks of Mr. Ewing. The coal industry is one of the most important we have and, if the engineers could only find a class of engine to consume our coal satisfactorily and without danger to property along the line, it would be the best thing that could happen for this State. Gold mines are good, but coal mines are better because they employ more men, and the more men we can employ the better for the State. I commend the hon. member's remarks to the attention of the leader of the House.

Hon. H. STEWART: During the debate on the second reading Mr. Lovekin replied to an

interjection of mine that some money was being expended in the city on the Perth tramways. I might also have included the power house. The hon. gentleman said the tramways were being worked at a profit. I have looked up the report of the Commissioner of Railways for the year 1919, and I find that the earnings of the tramways amounted to £134,059, working expenses £111,098, leaving a balance of £22,000. The interest on the capital invested was £27,000, showing a loss of £4,046.

The Minister for Education: There is a large amount for repairs.

Hon. H. STEWART: Perhaps so. The report does not give a comparison with previous years as in the past, but each year under Government management the position of the trams has been growing worse.

Schedule put and passed.

Second and Third Schedules, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Land Act Amendment.

2, Presbyterian Church Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—AJANA-GERALDINE RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [9.52] in moving the second reading said: The owners of the Surprise lead mine—mining lease No. 150, Northampton—have been considerably hampered in their operations owing to the expense of carting their lead ore over the roads. They have been able to secure material and plant for laying down a light line, and have sought power to carry out the work. This

Bill is to permit them to lay the line. Care has been taken to protect the interests of the State and of the public in the neighbourhood. The Bill gives authority for the line to be constructed, operated, and maintained. The length of the line is about 11 miles. The owners of the Surprise mine have some 20,000 tons or more of lead ore to send away during the coming year, and to cart it to the Government railways will cost 18s. a ton, whereas, by laying down a light railway, the cost will be about 5s. a ton. Although they will have to tranship into Government trucks, they are satisfied it will pay them handsomely to lay the line and that they will make more than the cost of the line out of the savings. The gauge of the railway will be two feet six inches. The company have purchased material for the line and locomotives and rolling stock in Victoria, and I understand it is now on its way to Western Australia, so that there shall be no delay in getting to work. Provision is made for the cartage of goods for other mines and the people in the district, and also for the carrying of passengers. The Government are authorised to make by-laws in order that the railway be safely run and the interests of passengers preserved. The Public Works Department will do the survey at the cost of the owners of the mine, the reason being that if the trade grows and the place develops and it is ultimately decided that the State shall lay down a standard gauge over the same track, the same survey and the same land resumptions will do. It will not be necessary to make any further disturbance of the land owners and a great saving will be effected if at any future time it is decided to lay a standard line. The schedule contains a description of the route and the usual right of a three miles deviation on either side is given. It will be agreed that this is an important work which the State should be glad to see undertaken. Of the land required to lay the line, that which is unalienated from the Crown may be used and other land may be resumed under the usual land resumption conditions. Provision is made that, should the Government think it in the interests of the country to acquire the railway, it may be purchased and the sum will be determined by the Engineer-in-Chief, but such price shall not exceed the cost of construction less a reasonable amount for depreciation. It is also provided that, should matters turn out unsuccessfully from the point of view of the company, the lessees may surrender their lease and, if they do not make arrangements for the Government to purchase the railway, they may remove the rails and material. In those circumstances, however, they will be required to level off the road and make it suitable for traffic. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [9.56]: Having not only a theoretical but a practical knowledge of the locality, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading. It seems to show a good deal of enterprise

on the part of those who are undertaking the work, and the conditions seem to be satisfactory with one exception. I am not quite satisfied about Subclause 3 of Clause 4, and I shall probably exercise my right to suggest in Committee that the matter be made a little clearer.

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [9.57]: I am glad the Government have introduced the Bill, but it is regrettable that they cannot undertake the construction of this line themselves, and thus show a little more confidence in this portion of the State. It speaks well for the district that we have men who are prepared to spend £30,000 to cart their ore from the mine. Still, I am glad that the Government have consented to the owners of the Surprise mine building the line.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [9.58]: The Minister stated that the gauge of the line will be 2ft. 6in. This is a very narrow gauge and the traffic will be pretty heavy. Every consideration should be given to the safety of the people who will travel on the line. Only last week, a very serious and dreadful accident happened in my district on a line having a gauge of 2ft. I hope the Government will inquire into this matter and see that the speed is very low and that the rolling stock used is suitable. I would not have mentioned this but for the serious accident which happened. We do not want a repetition of anything of that kind.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [9.59]: I support the Bill. I might inform Mr. Ewing that even 2ft. gauge railways are being successfully run in mountainous districts and other places, notably on the west coast of Tasmania. The Zeehan and Dundas tramway is of 2ft. gauge and is fully equipped for passengers and goods traffic, carrying goods and passenger traffic just as on our 3ft. 6in. gauge. But the introduction of a new gauge is a serious matter. I hope this will not be the beginning of the establishment of a break of gauge.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: This is merely a private tramway.

Hon. H. STEWART: Still we require to be careful. We should see that there is no obligation on the part of the Government to purchase a 2ft. 6in. railway on a basis of the cost of 2ft. 6in. gauge railway construction which, comparatively, will be more expensive than the 3ft. 6in. gauge. It is just as well that when valuing the line for purchase that aspect should be borne in mind. It is almost certain that if the Government did exercise the right of purchase, it would be desirable that they should then alter the gauge to 3ft. 6in. and run their own rolling stock over the line.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [10.2]: The idea underlying the Bill is to provide a railway, not for the purpose of passenger traffic, but for the conveyance of ore and materials, while at the same time

utilising it for the conveyance of passengers. That being so, I see no objection to the Bill. Had it been the reverse, had the object of the railway been the carrying of passengers, I should have instanced the case of the South Perth municipal council, which wanted the Government to build a tramline to Como and guaranteed interest and sinking fund. The Government would not give them consideration, nor would the Government give consideration to a private company which was prepared to build the line. However, as I say, this proposed railway is for the carriage of goods rather than of passengers, and therefore I see no objection to the Bill.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [10.5]: I support the Bill, but I regret that the Government could not see their way clear to building the line on the standard gauge. The small gauge will be objectionable sooner or later. I support the Bill because I have a very good knowledge of the district and of the syndicate. I regret that it should be necessary to grant the concession for a private railway, because I am convinced that some day we shall have a State railway up there. Still, I agree that the concession should be granted to this company, which is probably the most enterprising in the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6.—Carrying goods and passengers:

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I move an amendment—

That the following be added at the end of the clause:—“‘Goods’ shall, for the purposes of this Act, have the same meaning as is given to that word by Section 2 of the Government Railways Act, 1904.”

The amendment may seem superfluous, but under the clause “‘goods’” might mean anything. The amendment will make it perfectly clear, and will preclude the possibility of the company refusing to carry certain classes of goods.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In view of the clear wording of the clause, and particularly in view of the next succeeding clause, I fail to see any necessity for the amendment. I might ask whether the amendment is intended to be of a restrictive or of a liberalising character? It is provided that the Governor can prescribe conditions covering the charges for goods of any kind. Yet the hon. member says his amendment is to prevent the possibility of certain goods being shut out.

Hon. H. STEWART: Seeing that the clause renders it mandatory on the company to carry goods, and taking into account the object of the amendment, which is to prevent certain goods being shut out, this position

might arise: the company might have to carry goods at the cost of leaving its own ore behind. I agree with the Minister that, taking Clauses 6 and 7 in conjunction, the amendment appears to be superfluous.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think the amendment is a wise one.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: It only simplifies things.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It makes it clear that the goods to be carried are those stated in the definition. At present there is no definition for goods.

The Minister for Education: And therefore no limit.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It could be contended that machinery does not come within the meaning of the word "goods."

The Minister for Education: It is specially excluded from the definition which Sir Edward Wittenoom wants to put in.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that the word "chattels" should be added. I am sure the owners of the railway would provide such means as would meet any increase in business that might come along.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I should say that undoubtedly the word "goods" must include the definition which is in the Railways Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: I suggest that the definition of "goods" should be inserted in the next clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—SAND DRIFT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [10.18] in moving the second reading said: This is a small and a simple Bill. Its object is to repeal the Sand Drift Act of 1899, and practically to re-enact it with amendments, which experience has shown to be necessary. One of the objects of the Bill is to enable local authorities to require the owner or occupier of land where a drift of sand is causing a nuisance, destroying the roads, or doing anything of that kind, to plant the ground with marram grass in order to combat the nuisance, or adopt such other means as the local authority may think fit to require. It is some 20 years ago since marram grass was first planted at Fremantle. Its growth has proved a very successful method of combating sand drifts. There are several places in the State where it has also been successfully planted, for instance, along

the ocean beach at Cottesloe. When the lands are privately owned and are cut up into allotments and sold, there are cases where, owing to the fact that marram grass has not been planted, the drifts of sand have caused a great nuisance and much destruction of roads. The Bill will compel the owners or occupiers of blocks of land to do their part in stopping the sand drift by planting marram grass wherever it is found that the planting of that grass is likely to have the effect of preventing the drift of sand. Power is given to the local authority, in the event of the owner or occupier objecting to carry out the work after due notice has been served upon him, to do the work themselves, and recover the costs from the owner of the property. For any work performed by the owner or local authority which benefits some adjoining owner, that adjoining owner may be called upon to pay his proportion of the cost.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Is there anything about recovery from the Crown?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: One can never recover anything from the Crown. The Government have planted marram grass in various parts of the State for the prevention of sand drift. At the mouth of the Warren River, where the sand was prevented from drifting over a number of valuable swamps, a great deal of good has been done. At Cottesloe this grass has also been planted with excellent results. In Karridale, where three roads were covered with sand before the utility of marram grass was discovered, the grass has since been planted, and the road that is now made is protected by this grass from the sand drift. This is between Yallingup and Augusta. The Government do not intend to call upon people to do that which they are not prepared to do themselves. The Government have done a great deal in this direction and are prepared to do their part upon Crown lands. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [10.25]: I support the Bill. I had an opportunity of being taken round by a member of the Cottesloe municipal council to see what they have done there to prevent sand drifts, and what it is proposed to do. I understand that the council were unanimously in favour of this Bill. They gave an ocular demonstration of the efficacy of the system of planting marram grass, and anyone who has any doubt about it can go to Cottesloe and see for himself what enormous benefit has resulted from the adoption of this system.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West) [10.26]: I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. There is one spot in the Fremantle road board district where the Government of recent years resumed a large block of land near the Fremantle abattoirs. During the last two or three years, since that resumption, the sand drift has become so bad that the main road to Rockingham has been covered, and it is almost impossible for the

local authority to deal with the difficulty. Several Ministers have been down there inspecting the site, and the Conservator of Forests also visited the locality. If a small local authority like the Fremantle road board has to deal with a sand drift of this magnitude it will cost them practically the whole of their revenue. Up to the present the Government have done nothing to stop the drift. The local authority is called upon to employ carts daily to take away the sand, which is encroaching upon the road. Already one or two small cottages have been covered, but I understand that these cottages are situated upon land which has been resumed by the Government. Some assurance should be given by the Government that they will deal with this particular sand drift. It is the most serious sand drift in the State. I hope the Minister will give an assurance that this will be dealt with.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [10.27]: When this House was discussing the Road Districts Bill I took the opportunity of moving an amendment to the definition of "owner or occupier" so as to exclude the liability of a person, other than an owner, who might be a trustee, attorney, or agent. This is a very serious matter, and we are only beginning to recognise it now. I called attention to the fact that a trustee, attorney, or agent was personally liable as an owner, and might have no redress. In the definition in this Bill "owner or occupier," as applied to land in any district, has the same meaning as it has in the Local Government Act. That Act includes the Municipal Corporations Act of 1906 and the Roads Act of 1911, and any Acts amending the same respectively. If hon. members prefer that this should stand and think it is right that a person who is a trustee, attorney, or agent should be personally responsible in these matters, then it is a matter for them to decide. Personally I think it is wrong for Parliament to seek to impose this obligation on persons who are not able to protect themselves. I take this opportunity of raising my voice against it once again.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [10.29]: I sympathise with the remarks of Mr. Lynn. He suggests that it would take the whole of the revenue of local authorities to deal with this sand drift. I would point out to him that this is not a Bill to empower or require local authorities to do anything. If the local authority has any money it can do these things now. This Bill empowers the local authority to compel the private owner to do something. When the matter was under discussion in another place the Minister for Works gave his assurance that the Government would do their part. I have no doubt that the particular sand drift that the hon. member has in contemplation was in the Minister's mind at that time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—WYALCATCHEM-MOUNT MARSHALL RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [10.33] in moving the second reading said: This Bill provides for the extension of the Wyalcatchem Railway from its present terminus, Beneubbin, for a distance of 25 miles. It will eventually be continued to join up with the main goldfields line, but the point at which it is to join that line has not yet been determined. Those members of this House who took part in the Parliamentary trip arranged by the Premier a few weeks ago had an opportunity of seeing a good deal of the country that will be served by this line, and I have no doubt whatever that all those members, at all events, will support the Bill. The gross area to be served by the line will be 640,000 acres: of that, 126,000 have been leased under C.P. conditions, and 238,000 acres are vacant surveyed land. From the available classification of the vacant surveyed land, it is gathered that there is in that 238,000 acres 131,000 acres of first class land, 38,000 acres second class land, and 65,000 acres third class land. Of the area already leased a small portion, about 18,000 acres, have been forfeited and is in the hands of the Agricultural Bank. The owners of that land at the time of the drought went away to the war, and there being no railway communication accounted for the fact that the proposition was not as attractive as it might have been. The approximate length of the line from Beneubbin to the point of junction will probably be about 53 miles, and the cost of construction of the whole distance will be about £189,000. That includes, in addition to construction, rails and fastenings and the cost of water supply for the whole length. The Bill, of course only provides for an extension of about 25 miles.

Hon. H. Stewart: What will be the estimated cost of that?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The estimated total cost is £189,000, and I take it the cost of constructing 25 miles will be something less than half that total. The rainfall of the country to be served by this line appears to be sufficient for wheat growing. At Mangowine the rainfall over 30 years has averaged 12.48 inches; at Stoneham's farm, on the rabbit proof fence, to the east of Lake Brown, it averaged 12.45 inches over eight years; at Dumsday's, near Talgomine, 14.66 inches over five years, and up to 56 miles north of Buracoppin, on the rabbit-proof fence, 12.05 inches over 10 years. The construction of this line will make available a good deal of wheat-growing land for settlement by returned soldiers, and there is no

doubt that when the line is constructed, blocks will be quickly applied for and occupied. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [10.38]: I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. I know the country well; it is fair wheat-growing land. A report from a farm some 14 miles south of where the line will run came to hand today, and the owners of the property advised that the crops, as far as they had gone, had yielded eight bags to the acre. The land through which the proposed railway will run is similar, and the rainfall statistics, which have been accurately kept, show that the average, spread over 11 years, has been 14 inches. Of course in the drought year only three inches fell, which had the effect of somewhat reducing the average. The crops in the district this year are very good, and with reasonable rainfall they may be expected to continue satisfactory.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time, and passed.

BILL—WICKEPIN RACECOURSE.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [10.43] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to permit the Wickepin Race Club to dispose of their present racecourse on Wickepin agricultural lot 3821, containing some 106 acres on Reserve 13036, and to expend the money raised by that sale in the purchase of another property, adjoining the town of Wickepin, for a racecourse. Races have been held at Wickepin, I believe, for many years past; and the existing racecourse was established a long time before there was any railway to the district. When the railway went to the present town of Wickepin, it established a centre there which is some seven miles distant from the present racecourse site. The Wickepin people have continued to hold their races at this distant place, but of course it is very inconvenient and unsuitable for the purpose. The present intention is to sell the old site, and invest the money in a new site in the district. The Wickepin residents have asked the Government to permit them to sell the present site. Without a Bill of this kind it is impossible to effect a sale, the land being a reserve for the purpose. The object of this measure, therefore, is to permit the Wickepin people to establish a racecourse on a site adjoining the town and handy for the purpose. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [10.46]: In accordance with the intimation I gave earlier in the evening, I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th December, 1919.

	Page
Questions: Police Department—1, Methods at Bicton: 2, Minimum rates of pay	1986
Sewerage: city tenements not connected	1986
Potato shortage	1986
Motion: State Children Department, evidence of select committee	1987
Bills: Traffic, Governor's amendment	1986
Zoological Gardens Act Amendment, 3a.	1987
Public Education Acts Amendment, 3a.	1987
Land Act Amendment, 2a., Com., etc.	1987
Electoral Amendment, returned	1988
Carnarvon Electric Light and Power, returned	1988
Northampton Mechanics' Institute, returned	1988
Roads Closure, returned	1988
Prices Regulation, Council's Message	1988
Presbyterian Church Act Amendment, 2a., etc.	1988
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Council's Message	1989
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, Council's Message	2000
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2000
Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act Amendment, returned	2000
Public Education Acts Amendment, Council's Message	2000
Motion: Orders discharged	2000

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

BILL—TRAFFIC.

The Governor's Amendment.

The SPEAKER: I have received the following Message from His Excellency the Governor—

His Excellency the Governor desires an amendment to be made in the Traffic