

# MINISTERIAL STATEMENT— CLOSE OF SESSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [10-51]: I propose to close the session to-morrow. There is not much business before this Chamber or before the other House. The work to-morrow will largely consist of Messages between the two Chambers. I propose to put up for consideration the balance of the Council's amendments to the Land Bill, and also the amendments by the Council to the Sale of Liquor Regulation Bill and dispose of those measures first. We shall then deal with the other Messages and any additional matters which might require attention.

Mr. George: What about the Commonwealth Powers War Bill?

The PREMIER: That is a matter for consideration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: When do you intend to bring forward the matter regarding the export of wheat?

The PREMIER: There is to be a conference on Thursday morning at eleven o'clock to deal with that.

*House adjourned at 10-52 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 25th November, 1915.*

	PAGE
Question: Yandanooka station, forage requirements	2769
Leave of absence	2769
Bills: Prohibition of Treating on Licensed Premises, all stages	2769
Supplementary Loan, £1,300,000, Message, 3a.	2774
Sale of Liquor Regulation (No. 2), 3a.	2774
Appropriation, Com.	2774, 2796
War Council, all stages	2775
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, 2a. Com., 3a.	2781
Permanent Reserve (No. 2), 2a., Com., 3a.	2781
Land Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2793
Adjournment, Special	2799

## QUESTION — YANDANOOKA STATION, FORAGE REQUIREMENTS.

Hon. W. PATRICK asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has any baled lucerne

or other forage been sent to Yandanooka during the last four months, and, if so, what quantity (in tons)? 2, What was the cost, including railage to Yandanooka? 3, Has there been any necessity, on account of shortage of natural grass and forage, to send stock feed to Yandanooka?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. Ex Geraldton—17 tons maize, 29 tons lucerne hay; Northam—21 tons lucerne hay, 12 tons bran. 2, Maize, £7 per ton, plus railage; lucerne, £6 10s. per ton, plus railage; bran, £5 5s. per ton, plus railage. 3, The Industries Assistance Board has no information on this point.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom (North) on the ground of urgent private business.

## BILL—PROHIBITION OF TREATING ON LICENSED PREMISES.

*All Stages.*

Introduced by Hon. J. J. HOLMES and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.6]: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. J. J. Holmes in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Treating prohibited:

Hon. F. CONNOR: I am opposed to this clause. If a Bill of this description is passed, it will be the laughing stock of the community. I have no doubt that Mr. Holmes is imbued with enthusiasm in the temperance cause. This Bill is

brought in, I understand, because in England the same principle has been adopted, but I ask hon. members to take into consideration the difference between the conditions in England and those existing in this State. I do not envy Mr. Holmes when he goes before his electors in Derby, Wyndham, Hall's Creek, Marble Bar, and some of the other thirsty places in the North. This is purely grandmotherly legislation. I endeavoured recently when a Bill dealing with the liquor question was before the House to have inserted an amendment applying the provisions of it to Parliament House, but this was negatived. I say that this sort of legislation is iniquitous and wrong, and that the country will not stand to the people who pass it. I think the Bill will be thrown out in another place where the good sense of members should show them what is right and what is wrong. It is interference with the liberty of the subject. If the Bill is passed into law, I feel sure that the law will be more frequently broken than observed. I enter my most emphatic protest against the proposal.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am very much surprised at a Bill of this nature being brought before us at all. It is a most drastic piece of legislation, and perhaps the most drastic ever introduced into this or any other House of Parliament. I can only imagine a measure of this nature emanating from a lot of big schoolboys, who are holding what they are pleased to term a model Parliament. A Bill such as this emanating from an hon. member with the experience of Mr. Holmes, beggars description. It is nothing more nor less than trying to carry into execution one of the biggest fads that anyone can conceive. What would be the effect of the Bill were we to carry it? We would be the laughing stock of the world. Who would observe such a law? There are very few in this House who would abide by it. To attempt to foist a Bill of this nature on the people to satisfy the fads of a certain section is nothing short of a waste of the country's time. I have no hesitation in saying it

is the most foolish piece of suggested legislation ever submitted to this House.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. members to address themselves to Clause 2.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I am not going to speak against the measure because I have already stated I am in favour of such legislation, but when we come to the end of the Bill I propose to introduce a clause to limit the time of the operation of the measure. I think, too, that the penalty is too high. If it were reduced from £5 to £2 that would meet the case.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: If we pass a Bill of this description we shall be making laws for other people which we ourselves will not abide by.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I agree with Mr. Patrick that this Bill should be limited to war time. That was the intention when the clause was originally suggested, and as an experiment in war time, I think there are very few thoughtful men who will object to such a restriction on our liberty.

Hon. F. CONNOR: It might be pointed out that the less drink there is the less revenue there will be for the Government to work with. Of course, I do not hold there should be more drinking for the purpose of increasing the revenue.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: We might drink the country out of debt.

Hon. F. CONNOR: Most of the contingents which have passed through Fremantle on their way to the front have been very badly behaved, but one in particular whose conduct was most exemplary deserves some mention—I refer to the New Zealanders, who were very well behaved while they were in port, and they were about the only ones who had a wet canteen. All the extreme wowsersism that we have had instances of is answered by that example. I bring it under notice for what it is worth, but in my opinion it is an argument against extreme and silly legislation such as Mr. Holmes has brought forward.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: One would imagine from the remarks of Mr. Cullen that

the sale of liquor has increased, and that it was absolutely necessary during war time to take away the privilege of shouting. The figures which I have obtained from the Excise Department show that in the period from the 1st April to the 30th September last, compared with the corresponding period of the previous year, there was a falling off in the consumption of local beer of 326,761 gallons, and of imported beer of 28,227 gallons, a total of 354,988 gallons.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Those were the winter months.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In the face of those figures Mr. Holmes suggests a Bill providing for a penalty of £5 if a man shouts for another.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: With reference to the remarks of Mr. Connor, who referred to the position of the men at Hall's Creek and Wyndham, his argument falls to the ground because the unfortunate man up there will be able to have his drink in the usual way. But what the Bill proposes is to prevent him from pouring liquor into the man in the immediate vicinity, whether that man wants it or not. The limitation of hours represents a greater interference with the liberty of the subject. I have made five trips to New Zealand in the last 12 years and stayed as long as three months, and I got my anti-shouting ideas there. Twelve years ago I told the temperance party here they were on the wrong track, but my proposal, like every other sensible one, was turned down by them. The New Zealand soldiers came from a temperance country and were not accustomed to our pernicious system. In the last 30 years I have seen some of the best men ruined because of this pernicious system. Some are in drunkards' graves, some in the lunatic asylum, and some in the inebriates' home. Such legislation is not considered childish in other countries. In England it has been attended by marvellous results. I have no objection to the measure being limited to the duration of the war. If it is given a fair trial, I am satisfied the public will insist on its continuance.

Hon. W. Patrick: Is there no shouting in New Zealand?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It does not prevail to the same extent there. This Bill proposes to deal with licensed premises and, as Parliament is not a licensed house, it cannot be brought within the scope of the measure.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: If I had been in the House, I would have opposed the second reading. This is freak legislation. There are many social customs to which I object, but it would be inadvisable to legislate against them. The temperance party have not agitated for this reform and, before we legislate to abolish a recognised custom, there should be some move on the part of the general public.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about the resolution at the big meeting last week?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The question of shouting was merely a side issue at that meeting. There is no recognised public opinion behind this proposal and, before it could be successful, the community must be behind it. This House is supposed to guard against hasty legislation, but this Bill has been hurried through.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I have made 19 trips to New Zealand, some of them extending over six months, and have seen the evils prevailing in the dry areas. This measure would tend to produce similar evils here.

Hon. F. CONNOR: In the north of Ireland there is a model village of 11,000 operatives, who boasted of being minus the three P's—they had no public-house, no pawnshop, and no police barracks. Yet it was the most immoral and drunken village in Ireland. If we impose such silly restrictions upon the people, we shall only make them worse.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I have paired with Mr. Cornell, who is opposed to the clause. The Bill has not been rushed through. The question was debated at great length previously and members knew the Bill was to be introduced. If they were not present to speak on the second reading, it is their own fault. The conditions are different in England, where

there are hundreds of thousands of soldiers and munition workers, but there will be plenty of munition workers in West Anstralia soon and there are thousands of soldiers in the State. We all know that drink is forced on many young fellows, and that they drink merely out of good fellowship. If it were only for the protection of these soldiers, I would vote for the clause. Nearly the whole of the over-drinking amongst the soldiers is due to the abolition of the wet canteen. British army men and chaplains have told me it has been proved conclusively that the wet canteen is the best safeguard against excessive drinking amongst soldiers. The same thing applies here. Numbers of the men in camp have been accustomed to take a certain amount of liquor every day. They cannot get drink in the camp at all, and, naturally, when out of camp they want a drink, and, unfortunately, there are many people wanting to buy them drinks. I do not blame the soldier in this matter; far from it. In many cases it may be the last drink a man will have in his life; and if it is his idea of a good time to take some drinks, why should we throw stones at him? However, to try and lessen the drinking evil amongst soldiers, I support the clause. Having paired with Mr. Cornell, I cannot vote on the clause.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The clause provides a penalty for any person supplying liquor *gratis* to others. How would this apply in the case of a smoke social, say, held on licensed premises by a union or a lodge? Some of those present might be called on to pay, but others would be invited guests. Would an offence be committed in that case? Again, I may, like other hon. members, be asked for a shilling for a meal, the shilling being expended on food in liquid form. Shall I be liable to a penalty of £5 in such circumstances? I am afraid Mr. Holmes is taking on a large contract in endeavouring to abolish the well-established custom of shouting.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Bill does not affect social evenings, as is shown by the proviso. However, I think social evenings might well be given up in war

time, like other amusements have been given up.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	8

Majority for	..	2
--------------	----	---

#### AYES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. H. Carson
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller).
Hon. V. Hamersley	

#### NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. Duffell	(Teller).
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	

Clause thus passed.

Clause 3—Definition of "licensed premises":

Hon. F. CONNOR: I move an amendment—

*That after the word "held," in line 4, there be inserted "Parliament House."*

We want to be consistent. If this law is suitable at all, it is suitable for those who make it.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The hon. member knows perfectly well that Parliament House is not subject to, and cannot be made subject to, the licensing law. The refreshment room of Parliament House is entirely in the control of Parliament. Parliament can close it to-morrow, if Parliament likes. The hon. member, having perpetrated the same attempt at amendment a few days ago, and knowing the position, is hardly doing justice to the intelligence of members of Parliament in re-submitting the amendment.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: I am surprised at the remarks of the last speaker. We as members of Parliament should not put ourselves above any other section of the community, so far as the closing of bars is concerned. I shall support the amendment.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Parliament House knows no law, so far as the licens-

ing law is concerned. At present the entire control of the refreshment room is in the hands of the House committee. If Parliament passes a law prohibiting shouting outside, I feel quite sure the House committee will not have the slightest hesitation in framing a regulation, as they have power to do, that there shall be no shouting in Parliament House. I, as a member of the House committee, would not hesitate to bring the matter before the committee with that end in view if this Bill passes.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I support the amendment. Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Cullen have pointed out that if the amendment is passed it cannot be enforced. The question, however, is whether we are prepared to be consistent. I do not know whether those who have voted for this measure so far, have any idea of the difficulty of enforcing it. At all events, it will have a good moral effect if those passing the measure will voluntarily take upon themselves the inconvenience which they impose on the general public. Independently of the legal force of the amendment, we shall be morally bound to observe it if it is carried. I do not know what action the House committee might see fit to take, and I do not think we need leave the matter to them. If they see that we are in earnest about it, they may frame the necessary regulation. This measure will be classed as freak legislation, and I do not wish it said that Parliament was induced to pass the measure because it would not inconvenience legislators. I hope that those who have imposed the provision upon us will also allow us to include ourselves in it.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: The amendment is superfluous. I agree with Mr. Jenkins that the best thing to do is to leave it to the House committee, who will readily carry out the wishes of Parliament as expressed in the Bill. To insert in the Bill something which cannot be enforced is to pander to an imagined public opinion. As a member of the House committee I will gladly support a regulation giving effect to the wishes of hon. members.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I should have been pleased indeed to include Parliament House, but I have sense enough to know that we can deal only with licensed premises. Parliament House does not come within that category. If the Bill becomes law, members supporting the measure will see to it that the House committee impose the suggested regulation.

Hon. F. CONNOR: Mr. Lynn declared the amendment to be superfluous. To my mind, the whole Bill is superfluous. I resent Mr. Cullen's remarks. He is the only one who knows anything about any question which comes before us. I resent his manner and his matter.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am not in sympathy with the amendment, for the reason that the privileges of Parliament have been won by our forefathers in many a strenuous contest, and it would ill become us to do anything which would whittle away in the slightest degree the sanctity and privileges of Parliament.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	7
Noes	..	..	..	13

Majority against .. 6

#### AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. F. Connor
Hon. H. Millington	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. F. Cullen	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause:

Hon. W. PATRICK: I move—

*That the following be added as a new clause:—"This Act shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1916, and no longer."*

I would not support a Bill of this nature if made permanent. I regard it purely as a war time measure. Of course, some in the community would prohibit drinking altogether. People of that kind are developed in one direction only, and practically the whole of their reasoning capacities have become atrophied. In normal times extreme legislation of this kind would be a mistake, but we know that in Great Britain, not by Act of Parliament, but by the administrative action of the Government, an anti-treating provision of a very drastic nature has been put into effect with good results. My reason for supporting the measure at all is that in times like the present we must economise in order to find the money for the prosecution of the war.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will gladly accept the amendment. If the Bill becomes law and is allowed to run till the time stated in the amendment, I am convinced that there will not be any difficulty in then having it re-enacted.

Hon. W. PATRICK: I may say that the leader of the House had proposed to move the amendment if I had not done so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is so, but I should explain that I intended doing it in my private capacity, and not as a member of the Government.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

#### BILL—SUPPLEMENTARY LOAN, £1,300,000.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it had made the amendment requested by the Council.

#### *In Committee.*

Resumed from the previous day; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with the amendment made by the Assembly, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

#### BILL—SALE OF LIQUOR REGULATION (No. 2).

#### *Third Reading.*

Report of Committee adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

#### BILL—APPROPRIATION.

#### *In Committee.*

Resumed from the 17th November; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Schedule D, wherein an amendment had been moved to strike out, under the item "Further Undertakings," the sum of "£156,603," and to insert in lieu "£11,603."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I intend to move at a later stage to report progress. My reason for so doing is that I do not want to risk the loss of the Land Act Amendment Bill and the Licensing Bill, and a Bill which I understand has been introduced in another place to control this season's wheat. If the Appropriation Bill is passed, it will give the Government an opportunity of going into recess and prevent these measures being placed on the statute-book.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope the hon. member will not receive support from members of this House. The Government are serious in connection with the Land Bill, and I expected that it would have been down here by now. I do not say the Government approve of every amendment which has been made by the Council in the Land Bill. It would be a wrong position if this House held up the Appropriation Bill until the amendments to the Land Bill had been carried into effect. The Government could not tolerate that. The Appropriation Bill has been before the

Council for a longer time than in any period in the history of Western Australia. At the present time any expenditure which is being made is unlawful. It was permissible before the Bill was delayed in this House. But the Government cannot legally expend money under these circumstances when the fate of the Appropriation Bill is in question. That is exactly the position. If it is desired to postpone the measure until a later period of the day I have no objection, because it is the intention of the Government to endeavour to close to-night. I think that is the feeling of all hon. members, and if it is the wish of members that the Appropriation Bill should be postponed until a later hour, I have no objection so long as members are willing to sit.

Hon. W. Patrick: Do you suggest until 7.30?

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that cannot be done under the Parliamentary procedure.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: The Standing Orders have been suspended.

The CHAIRMAN: So far as the passing of Bills through all their stages at one sitting are concerned. I should be perfectly willing to meet the wishes of members if it can be done. On page 369 of *May* it says—

It is the practice for members who desire to close the sitting of a Committee to move that the Chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again in order to put an end to the proceedings of the Committee on that day.

I am afraid I cannot see any course open to me. I give my ruling, but if the hon. member wishes to disagree with my ruling we can investigate the matter.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Cannot the difficulty be got over by reporting progress and a motion then being made to recommit? Cannot a subsequent motion then be put by the leader of the House to move that the debate be adjourned?

The CHAIRMAN: That may be done in the Council, but not in the Committee.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: We can get to the Council in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: If members wish to report progress without naming a date, that is practically the same as dropping the Bill. On the other hand, if the Committee report progress and name a date, that date cannot be to-day.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Suppose a motion is made that the Chairman leave the Chair until 5.30, awaiting a Message from another Chamber, will you accept that?

The CHAIRMAN: I am anxious that the proper procedure shall govern this Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That you do now leave the Chair until 7.30.*

The CHAIRMAN: I will accept that motion, but I do not know that I can resume the Chair at 7.30.

Motion put and passed.

## BILL—WAR COUNCIL.

### *All stages.*

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

### *Second reading.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.33] in moving the second reading said: I desire to point out that there has been a growing feeling amongst the public of Western Australia that something ought to be done by legislative action in regard to the collection of moneys raised in the name of benevolent movements connected with the war. At the present time there is no control over the actions of anyone who wishes to collect money or to appeal for contributions for these causes. In many parts of the State persons can be found soliciting money on behalf of one or other of the many objects which are associated with the war, and it is very easy, under existing conditions, for abuses to arise. There is a feeling that some of the money raised by persons who have no proper authority to raise it never reaches its destination. Whether or not there is ground for suspicion in

this respect I cannot say, but the possibility of such a condition of things obtaining should not be permitted to continue. No one will dispute that every safeguard should be adopted to ensure that every penny raised for patriotic and benevolent purposes should reach its destination so far as can possibly be provided. This Bill has been introduced in order to assist in achieving that end. The Government have taken this action on the suggestion of the war committee and also with the approval, I understand, of members of both Houses, who have been privately consulted in connection with the question. I feel sure that the House will expedite the passage of the Bill. Clause 2 enables the Government to appoint a council to be known as the War Council of Western Australia and to consist of such number of persons as the Governor may think fit. The council, subject to regulations which will be made by the Governor in Council, under this Bill, will have power to regulate and control the collection of moneys and the collection of goods for purposes appertaining to the present war, and also for the purpose of relieving distress which may arise in consequence of the war. The Bill will also give the council power to control all committees and other bodies such as medical, hospital, welcome home and other committees. It also gives them power to devise means for the re-employment of returned soldiers and the training of disabled and partially disabled soldiers, and to devise schemes for the settlement of returned soldiers on the land. There is also provision for dealing with matters which may be committed to or delegated to the council by the State or Federal Governments. There is a provision that the Act shall not extend to contributions in aid of any object or undertaking which the Governor may declare to be exempt from the operations of the Act. Under Clause 4 it is an illegal act for any person to raise money or take up collections of any money or kind in aid of any object which comes within the scope of the council's operations without the authority or assent of such council, and the penalty for an in-

fringement of the law is £100. In cases in which it is decided to prosecute, it will be necessary, in order to get over technicalities, that paragraph (2) of Clause 4 should stand. It is to this effect, that "the certificate in writing of the Colonial Secretary that an object or purpose for which money is raised or collections are taken up, is within the scope of the said council's functions, shall be conclusive evidence thereof." If there is not a proviso to this effect it will be difficult to secure convictions, points of law would be raised and the War Council would be embarrassed in their efforts to see that the Act was properly carried out. Clause 5 gives power to the Governor to make regulations. Under Clause 6, on the termination of the war, the Governor may dissolve the State Council, although, of course, it may be necessary for some months after the war to have the measure in operation. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East) [4.39]: I second the motion.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.40]: I think it is a very good thing that this Bill has been introduced, and probably it would be a better thing still if the Colonial Secretary would be more explicit about the intentions of the Government in this connection, and also about the scope of the Bill. I would like to know if this War Council is to govern not only future collections but if it is to take over those funds which are at present in existence.

The Colonial Secretary: No, it does not take over anything.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They should be taken over.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Then I venture to say that the War Council will fail to a considerable extent in its functions. In my opinion the palmy days of collecting in Western Australia are gone, never to return. I think that the cream is gone from the public milk, so to speak. Never again will the public subscribe as liberally as it has done in the past. The time for spontaneous and voluntary contributions is past, and we are faced with



the desperate, dour and unescapable time of taxation. Now that war taxes are beginning to make their appearance a large number of the public is thinking that it has had enough of taxation, and that the romance is going out of these matters. I am certain that the collections in the future will be nothing to what they have been in the past. I most certainly think it is the greatest pity in the world that some step of the kind was not taken when the collections were first initiated. I had the pleasure—it was a melancholy pleasure—of going through the other day with the secretary of one of the funds the list of the other funds. I think the list ran into somewhere about 26 separate funds. Some of these had very large amounts in hand and some of them were not using a penny of the money, and it is questionable whether these funds would be used. Some of the organisations had made use of most alluring titles, which bring money out of the pockets of the people like a magnet draws iron filings together. What has been done with the money in the past and what is to be done with it in the future does not appear. The most useful of these funds are not those which hold the present highest amounts. I look upon the War Distress and Unemployment Fund as the most live fund of the whole bunch, and as that which comes more nearly home than any others of the kind to the daily cases of distress which have been created during this war time.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The money has gone in connection with the unemployment.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It has not all gone in connection with the unemployment; it has gone to relieve distress which has been partially caused by the war and partially caused by the drought. It has not gone on unemployment, as we have got into the habit of using the term in this country. When we talk about unemployment I think most of us mean the unemployable. That fund has been administered with very admirable discretion. No one has been making money out of the fund, and many deserving women and children have for months past been kept alive when, if the fund had not been

in existence, goodness knows what would have become of them. I was hoping that the Government would be able to introduce a measure, although I can see legal difficulties in the way, whereby a central body could take control of these funds and allocate the amounts contained in them to the purposes they best think fit. If that procedure had been undertaken in the first place we would be in a much better position in regard to the funds than is the case at the present time. I welcome the Bill and I only regret it cannot be made retrospective. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary when he replies will tell us—I presume it is the intention of the Government to appoint the present War Council—

The Colonial Secretary: Not necessarily.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I notice that. There is absolutely nothing to bind the Government in this Bill, and in that connection I am perfectly prepared to trust the Government. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill and regret that these omissions—they may be compulsory omissions—to which I have alluded will find a place in it.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [4.47]: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, although I think it has been somewhat hastily prepared and is open to some little criticism. The Colonial Secretary has not told us anything definite as to the existing funds. I think the Bill should contain a clause empowering the War Council to take charge of the funds already contributed with the consent of those now lawfully in charge of those funds. This would apply to the West Australia Day fund and the older patriotic funds. One of the largest funds, the Belgian relief fund, has, of course, been depleted by transmission to Belgium. I think that the Government would find it useful to have power to take over the administration of the funds already existing, with the consent of the trustees now in charge of them. Of course there is a War Council now existing, but hanging be-

tween heaven and earth it has no authority, no funds and no operative power. It is a War Council in name only, and I assume the main object of the Government is to give the War Council legal status. To a certain extent this Bill will do that, but in the most important function of that War Council, this Bill will do nothing at all. The War Council was created at the request of the Defence Department and it exists in name, with no direct authorisation from the Defence Department, no definite data as to its functions and no money. This Bill is silent as to funds. It assumes that the War Council is an honorary council, but even so that War Council would have to expend money; it would require clerical assistance. That ought to be provided for in this Bill or by direct arrangement with the Defence Department. I do not want to be hypercritical, but I think it is a pity to call it a War Council which it cannot be, for the Federal Defence Department has full control of defence matters and that department is very properly called, not a War Department, but the Defence Department. I offer another point of criticism, which I think the Minister would do well to consider. The Bill proposes to regulate recruiting. The Defence Department must keep all regulation of recruiting in its own hands and it will be quite sufficient for the purpose of this Bill to encourage recruiting, that is to say, this Council will be a non-military council, a citizens' patriotic council to help the Defence Department and to help the wounded when they come back from the war. I entirely agree with the Government that it is necessary to have some Act of Parliament or authorisation from the Federal defence authorities for the council in this State, and as the Government think this Bill the best way out of the difficulty, I will support it. I have another suggestion to make to the Colonial Secretary. He has dealt with the importance of preventing fraud in cases of charity, but we must not discourage the spontaneous action of people all over the State for these patriotic funds. For

instance, a number of people have a social gathering and decide to give a contribution to some of the patriotic funds. That has occurred again and again. An auction sale may be held and two or three people have produce to sell, say, for the Belgian or wounded soldiers' fund. It would be a pity if spontaneous movements of that sort were damped in cold blood. In the future it will be necessary to get authority to hold these auction sales so that it will be necessary to have in each country centre someone with power to give consent for movements in aid of any of these funds. That can easily be done. The heyday of these patriotic movements is past, at all events for the time being. There may come some fresh impulse that will outshine all that has yet been done, but apparently for the time being there is a lull and we do not want to damp the desires of the people to help, but to encourage them. This Council will, therefore, need representatives in every country centre. I think that the desire of the Government to be fortified by statutory authority is right and I shall support the Bill.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West) [4.55]: We know to-day that we have a considerable amount of money raised in connection with the various funds, and I would be the last to damp the ardour of any of the enthusiasts or throw cold water on anything they might have done in connection with these funds, to help the soldiers on their return. But with all the funds which are in existence to-day it is extremely wise that what there is should be conserved, because while at the present time the returned men are in receipt of their wages and their keep in the hospital, and all the other necessities essential for their welfare, the money which we have in hand should be conserved, because at the expiration of the war we shall be faced with a serious problem. It is unfortunate, but nevertheless true, that we will have some thousands of men in the various towns of Australia maimed and crippled for life, and when a time like that comes, after the glamour of this war is over and all

the enthusiasm has spent itself, they will be faced with the position of having to live their lives in our midst, and in that direction the funds should be conserved in order to supplement the pensions that will be granted by the Government. It would be wise if it were possible at all, to have some supervision over the large amounts which have been collected. However, I do not think that the Bill is too late in the day. It is a pity it was not introduced earlier, but being introduced now, I shall have much pleasure in supporting the second reading. Legislation should have been passed long ago to regulate and control the collections which have been made in our midst. We have seen many people rushing to organise something in connection with these various funds, but I question whether the full amounts which have been subscribed have really been handed over to the funds. Mr. Cullen mentioned that nothing should be done to discourage the auction sales. I personally think that if people still have that enthusiasm and desire to raise funds by means of auction sales, they should work up sufficient enthusiasm to apply to the War Council for permission.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The impulse comes up at the sale.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I know what the generosity of these people amounts to. I can give an instance of an auction on behalf of one of the relief funds in which I was interested. I donated a truck of coal to Australia Day and when it was submitted to auction it did not bring 75 per cent. of its value. Was there any charity there?

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Was it good coal?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Absolutely the best, and of the highest calorific value. I know also of a ham being put up for auction, and it was good ham I was told by experts, and yet it brought only half its value. At many of these auction sales arranged to raise funds, goods have been sold at half their value and, if the enthusiasm of these people will not last half an hour or sufficiently long to en-

able them to write to the War Council, it will be of little use. I hope the Bill will not be amended. It is essential that collections should be made only by the permission of the War Council. The people in the metropolitan area are being badgered in every direction by unauthorised persons, and I question at times whether the funds always reach the right channels. I welcome the Bill to regulate the management of these funds.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [5.1]: I support the Bill. It is a very timely piece of legislation. The only clause to which any exception can possibly be taken is Clause 4, and this would depend a good deal on the regulations framed for giving effect to it. It is quite obvious that it should be within the authority of the War Council to regulate these collections. At the same time Mr. Cullen has suggested, it might do harm if people promoting a function in the country, perhaps a long distance from Perth, had to first send to the War Council for permission. I have every faith in those who form the council, and it should not be difficult for them to frame such regulations as will overcome this objection. I do not think it was the intention of the framers of the Bill, and it would not be the intention of the council that before any action could be taken, the promoters must write to the War Council and obtain a special permit. If the wording of the clause really means this, a slight amendment might be desirable. The intention, I think, is rather that the War Council might intervene and say that a certain thing must not be done. No doubt the Governor-in-Council, in making the regulations, will be guided by the recommendations of the War Council.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.3]: I have the honour to be a member of the War Council, and I can assure members that it would be no object of the Council to in any way damp the ardour for raising funds. If people raised funds and the War Council found they were raised bona fide by people of repute and had every reason to believe

that the funds were transmitted intact, such people, I think, would not be harassed by the War Council. The Bill would give the War Council power to step in and prohibit anyone, of whose bona fides they might be doubtful, from promoting any function. The War Council can be trusted to interpret this measure in an elastic way.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.4]: Mr. Cullen was quite right; there is nothing in the Bill in the direction of giving the War Council power to take possession of funds already raised or to be raised in future. This Bill is simply for the purpose of controlling collections of money in the street or elsewhere, and to exercise some control over the various committees. It would not be desirable for the War Council to assume the big undertaking of distributing these funds. This would require a fairly large staff. The two leading funds, so far as I can gather, are being conducted satisfactorily. I am Chairman of the Patriotic Fund Committee appointed by the Governor, who are providing funds for the relief of the wives and dependants of those who have gone to the war. The funds have reached a very high figure, and among the members of the committee are a judge of the Supreme Court, the Mayor of Perth, and gentlemen occupying very high positions in the community. Then there is the War Distress Fund, which was started by the Premier, and on the committee all the churches are represented, and there are men in whom the community have every confidence. The Government, through their officials, are assisting in every way, and both these funds are being satisfactorily administered. There are scores of other funds which require to be supervised, and it will be the duty of the War Council to exercise some control over them and see that the money reaches the intended destination. Regarding the fear that Clause 4 might have the effect of chilling spontaneous movements, I think it would be the desire of the council to obtain as much money as possible in aid of bene-

volent purposes connected with the war, and they are not likely to discourage bona fide collecting. It will probably be necessary for some of those people who intend to organise entertainments, to communicate with the War Council. Under existing circumstances, I receive many communications from such people. They might desire to hold a Sunday entertainment and charge for admission and, with the permission of the Colonial Secretary, they may do so. The matter however, is thoroughly investigated by the police. It is necessary to submit the programme, and I must be satisfied that everything is genuine. I receive numerous letters asking permission to hold art unions; art unions, of course are illegal, but the surrounding circumstances have always to be considered, and we have to inquire whether anyone is likely to derive personal gain from such undertakings. If there is any such possibility, the police are instructed to suppress such movement immediately. That is the attitude we adopt.

Question—put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Constitution of council:

Hon. H. CARSON: Most of the members of the War Council, I understand, are resident in the City. Would not it be possible to have a representative in the outlying districts, more especially at Geraldton, where a large amount of money has been raised, and where the people are administering their own funds? The Perth and Geraldton committees have come into collision. Residents of Perth have gone to Geraldton and applied there for assistance, and assistance to people from outside districts has been refused. I believe there is an arrangement whereby if Geraldton assists those coming from Perth. Perth assists those who go from Geraldton. I believe that in proportion to the population a greater number of men have

enlisted from the Geraldton district than from any other.

**The COLONIAL SECRETARY :** There is provision to meet the hon. member's desire. It might be necessary to increase the number of the council, and the council would have representatives in different towns.

**Hon. J. F. CULLEN :** When the War Council come to settling returned soldiers on the land, I hope they will fortify themselves with the advice and help of experienced land men. It will be of no use getting a town man to draw up a nice paper about work in the country. If experienced men are consulted much trouble will be saved. It would be a good idea to have a representative from the Geraldton, southern, and eastern districts.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Unauthorised collections prohibited :

**Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH :** I move an amendment—

*That after "council" at the end of Subclause 1 the words "or its agent" to be inserted.*

The clause might mean that anyone must first write to the council in Perth and secure their consent before organising any function. This can hardly be desired, because often the time between the origination and the carrying out of an idea is too short. The council might make the mayors of municipalities and chairmen of roads boards agents, and empower them to grant permits to hold such functions. If there is any objection, I shall not press the amendment, but if some such provision is not made, a vindictive person might bring an action against the promoters of some of these functions.

**Hon. H. CARSON :** I hope the amendment will be carried, because in the absence of such a provision there will be a check to activity in the collection of funds.

**Hon. J. F. CULLEN :** In support of the amendment I may say that City men hardly appreciate the advantage of hav-

ing agents who can be applied to on the spot. Two of the funds in my district were administered through my office, and I found the spontaneous generosity of the people amazing. With local agents appointed, necessary authorisations can be obtained in the course of an hour or so.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 5, 6—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading.*

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

## BILL — METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate, on the motion for the second reading, from the 18th November.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee, etcetera.*

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

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Assembly.

*Sitting suspended from 5.24 to 7.30 p.m.*

## BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (No. 2).

### *Second Reading—Amendment, six months.*

Debate resumed from the 18th November.

**Hon. F. CONNOR (North) [7.30] :** I only moved the adjournment of the debate because there was no hon. member present at the time who was interested in this particular subject. I have no desire to speak.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West) [7.31]: I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. I think that it is one of those propositions which the country can very well undertake. I understand that for the last five years there has been about £1,000 per week sent out of the State for the purchase of cement. It is intended by the company who is making the application to be allowed to use this reserve, in entering into the industry to employ about 100 men and it is estimated that it would require 7,000 tons of Collie coal per annum. This will give great impetus to traffic on the railways and I think there is everything to commend the proposal. I do not know one single objection which can be raised to it. I have no particulars about this reserve, but I have heard no objection raised in regard to its use. I think the settlers in that part of the district will welcome the suggestion of the industry being started in their midst. We find that it is expected to operate this on a pretty extensive scale. I have some figures here which indicate that the quantity of cement which has been imported into Western Australia during the last five years amounts to 1,850,839 cwt. It takes one ton of coal to make half a ton of cement. To carry on an industry on the scale contemplated, a great quantity of Collie coal will be required. I firmly believe in private enterprise. If we can get men to come into this State with capital—and I understand these men have plenty of it—and they are prepared to invest it in this undertaking, we should be prepared to give every encouragement to them. These people are not here to make what they can out of the country.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Who are they?

Hon. E. McLARTY: They are represented by a Mr. Scott. I do not know that I am at liberty to divulge the names of those behind them.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The House ought to know something about this.

Hon. E. McLARTY: I believe they are men of substance. I have heard the names of some of them, and know that they have a considerable amount of capi-

tal behind them, and would not go into an undertaking of this kind unless they were certain of its being a success. They are not asking for a single shilling from the Government. All they are asking is to use the limestone on a portion of this reserve. I understand they are prepared to put a substantial sum of money up as a guarantee of their bona fides. They do not ask for 1,000 acres of land or for large bonuses from the State. They are not asking for any concession except the right to go on to the reserve, where they have tested the limestone and found it is of a suitable quality. They desire to start an industry to manufacture the cement and also to grind the limestone into a fine substance which is suitable for agricultural purposes. We hear from all parts of the demand that there is for lime on the part of the agriculturists in the South-West portion of the State. I am assured that this substance is of a very high quality of carbonate of lime, and that it is intended to manufacture it in a way that it will become just as fine as phosphates, and easily put through the drill and distributed over the land. I can see no objection to the proposal. I am further assured that our cement has been costing a duty of up to 1s. 6d. per cwt. That is an enormous sum of money to be going out of the State. If we can save £1,000 by our own labour and by producing our own cement, it would be a great help to the State. There is every probability that this company will not only manufacture to meet local requirements, but I understand it is intended to operate on such an extensive scale that it will probably be able to export a considerable quantity. I am sure that the proposal must commend itself to the House. We want to see local industries carried on and to bring money into the State. I am quite satisfied from the information that I have that the men behind this undertaking are men of substance and men of honour, who will carry out the work to the satisfaction of the Government and the people of the State. I think these works are intended to be centred about Brunswick, so that it will be possible to bring the lime from

Capel and the coal from Collie. There is a further suggestion that the Swan river should be dredged. The enormous quantities of shell contained in the bottom could thus be obtained for a twofold purpose, one of deepening the river and the other of producing a high quality of lime as the result of the grinding up of the shell. I feel that so little is needed to commend this to the House that I will not labour the question. I discussed the matter with Mr. Clarke last night and learned from him that he has no objection to the proposal. I believe that if any objection had been raised Mr. Clarke and myself would have been sure to have heard of it.

The Colonial Secretary: I think Mr. Clarke voted against the proposal.

Hon. E. McLARTY: He moved the adjournment in order to obtain certain information which was not at his disposal. The fact was this was sprung on the House at the time.

The PRESIDENT: He did not speak.

Hon. E. McLARTY: He merely wanted inquiries made. I think I am safe in saying that the result of the inquiries has been to convince Mr. Clarke that there is no objection whatever on the part of the people in that locality. I am sorry Mr. Clarke is not here, because I feel satisfied that he would have supported the proposal. I do not know that I need add anything to what I have already said. I am entirely in favour of encouraging such an industry as this. I wish we had many more of them. The Collie coal industry is languishing and many of the men are not able to get in more than a day's work in a week, and things at Collie are just about as bad as they can be. If the Collie coal industry can be assisted in this way I think it will be a good thing. There is a comparatively large population there which depends entirely on the output of coal, and if the output is small depression follows as a consequence. If I thought there was any reason which was not in the interests of the people of the South-West, against the encouragement of this industry, I would not utter a word in support of

it. I am quite confident there will be no cause to regret it if these men are put into the position of carrying on the business. It may be that hon. members may think it is a natural thing for the Government to do this work as they are doing almost everything else, but I do not think the Government are anxious to go in for this and I am sure the people are not anxious that they should. The lime-stone has been there for hundreds of years and no attempt has been made to develop the deposits. We now find people coming along with capital prepared to do this work, and the House will be doing good for the people of the State if they induce these people to enter into the undertaking. They do not ask anything in the way of bonuses from the State, or anything in the way of a concession. I understand they are prepared to put up a considerable sum of money as a guarantee that they are in earnest and intend to go on with the work. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East) [7.45]: The information which has been supplied does not justify me in voting for the second reading of this Bill. We know that for some time past negotiations have been going on in various directions by local people in the State in regard to locating payable lime deposits. I believe that those negotiations are fairly well on the way but we find now that a Bill is passed through another place almost in a few minutes and is sent to us suddenly because someone has come along with a capital of £200,000 to open up deposits mainly for the purpose of making cement and not to supply farmers with lime. I understand, however, according to a motion which was moved in another place a few evenings ago, that the consideration was that these people were to supply the farmers in Western Australia with lime from that area at about 7s. 6d. per ton. However the information which has been supplied does not justify me, at any rate, in supporting the Bill. My opinion is that the people who have been negotiating with the Government for some considerable time past should be given

the opportunity of opening up these deposits in the interests of the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [7.48]: I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill and at the conclusion of my remarks I shall move an amendment. I am going to approach the matter as it appears to me. I object to it because of the lack of information. I have read the speech of the Minister who introduced the Bill in another place and I can find no reason in it to justify me in supporting the measure other than that a gentleman from South Australia is prepared to start the venture of manufacturing cement with a capital of £200,000. It appears that before anything can be done 50 acres of class A reserve has to be excised from this area. If that is done whichever Government is in power will then be in the position to negotiate and enter into an agreement with these people. When the Minister moved this Bill in another place he was asked by way of interjection if those people who were after this concession had submitted any agreement. The reply was in the negative. He was also asked by way of interjection, if this Bill were agreed to by both Houses, whether the agreement, if entered into, would first be submitted to Parliament. That was a question the Minister would not answer. I am referring to the Minister for Works. Further on the Minister went on to explain that certain propositions had been put to the Government. I have always religiously opposed concessions and I am prepared to oppose this Bill, which provides for the excising of a portion of a reserve in our State, until such time as an outline of the draft agreement which is to follow is placed before one or other or both Houses of Parliament. I am convinced that whatever it is intended to do should be first submitted to us before the presentation of the Bill itself. I have not heard any public man speak in favour of this concession until I heard Mr. McLarty do so just now. I am not in sympathy with the hon. member, I am sorry to say, but if it can be proved to my satisfaction that the proposed agreement will be satisfactory to those whom it is

said it is going to benefit so much, namely the people on the land, and they are the people who should receive first consideration, there is probably room in this large State of ours, even for private and State enterprise to work together in the development of the lime deposits. At this juncture I do not think the House is justified in passing the second reading of the Bill. I therefore move an amendment—

*That the word "now" be struck out and "this day six months" added to the motion.*

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West) [7.53]: I hope the amendment will not be carried. I followed Mr. McLarty in his speech on this measure but I must confess at being somewhat cloudy about his remarks. This Bill is simply to empower the Government to enter into negotiations to utilise any material that may be on the reserve in question. I take it that any member who refuses to concede this to the Government is simply passing a vote of censure on them, inasmuch as they say here that we have a measure intended. It is hoped, to bring about a development in a certain portion of the State. We hope to have this particular land utilised and an industry started and considerable work afforded the people of the State. We in this House have objected from time to time to the number of State enterprises entered into by the present Government. Now they come along and ask permission to excise a certain portion of this land from the reserve mentioned in the Bill and we are told incidentally that it is their intention, if power is given to excise this property to lease a portion of it in order that an industry may be started. I have no information as to whether the industry is about to be commenced or what the position is. But we are told in this House the object is to utilise the material on this reserve in order to start the making of cement. I think that is something that should commend itself to the House and if that is the reason for the Bill I shall be prepared to support it, and give the Government authority to excise this portion of land



from the reserve and enter into negotiations in order to bring about the establishment of the industry. If we refuse to pass the Bill it will amount to this, that we have no desire that any industry shall be established by private enterprise, or it may be argued by some that we have not sufficient confidence in the present Administration to give them permission to excise this area so that an important industry may be entered upon. This appears to be a very simple question. It is whether the House will favour the Bill being put through in order to empower the Government to enter into the agreement I have referred to. I take it that the Government, or the responsible Minister who administers the Lands Department, will see that everyone is given an equal chance in this matter and that no big asset of any value to the State will be handed over to any particular company unless the Government are fully satisfied that it is in the interests of the State to do so. As one believing that private enterprise is in a better position to carry out a work of this kind, I think we should assist the Government in order that they may be able to do what is desired by the Bill. I hope the House will not support any amendment which will prevent the Government from entering into an agreement to permit such employment to be provided and this portion of the State to be developed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [8.1]: I oppose the amendment, but we are entitled to more particulars regarding such a matter. This debate has been adjourned from time to time in the hope that the members for the province would give us some enlightenment. One of the representatives of the South-West Province has spoken and apparently has not as much information as we have. I cannot vote for the second reading on such meagre information. Mr. McLarty said a considerable sum of money would be spent in his district. One would imagine that the representatives of that province would have found out that a good offer had been made and not accepted by the

Government. Those who made the offer can get no information from the Government. Their operations would have developed the district and assisted farming for a considerable distance around; and an offer from a firm of good standing is preferable to an offer from speculators. The offer I refer to is one made by Mr. Newnham, whose company agreed to spend £200,000 to work the lime deposits at Lake Clifton. In addition they are prepared to build to Waroona a line that the Government can take over at any time by paying the cost plus bank interest. This offer should have appealed to Mr. McLarty. They would supply the lime at cost price, as they would not look for any profit from the lime. They would look for their profit from the cement.

Hon. J. Duffell: Too good to be true.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The offer has been submitted by a firm of repute. The lime has been tested and proved to be of the best quality for agricultural purposes. I have it on the best authority that suitable clay can be found adjacent to manufacture good cement and on top of this the firm are agreeable to pay a royalty. However, we are entitled to more particulars before we agree to pass the measure.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.5]: I oppose the amendment. It comes as a surprise to hear that such magnanimous offers are being made around the country. Failing any definite information regarding the matter mentioned by Mr. Baxter and taking heed of the remarks of Mr. McLarty, I am bound to support the Bill. The fact that any enterprising company are prepared to invest £30,000 or more on portion of a reserve which up to the present has not proved of utility to the State is too good an offer to hang up for six months. The country is crying out for capital to develop it and, when we are assured that we have this asset, it is only right to encourage capital to develop it; and we should not lose sight of the fact that they undertake to find employment for at least 100 men. We should make all possible haste to clinch the offer. Other

people have been dillydallying so long, and to deny these people the opportunity they ask for would be a serious matter in times like the present. This new industry would be a good thing for the State generally and particularly for the province concerned, and would be the means of utilising other natural resources such as Collie coal and timber. From information received from various sources, I am satisfied that this is not the only deposit of the kind in the State. If we can get £80,000 invested in this portion of the State and employment guaranteed for 100 men we should not be doing our duty if we told these people we do not require their capital.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan—on amendment) [8.10]: I think most of this trouble is due to me. When this Bill came before the House, it was I who first questioned the advisability of giving away reserves. I did so because it was a reserve, and I always want to know as much as possible about giving away these reserves in any form. I asked the leader of the House for some information, but I can assure hon. members I got plenty of information from another source. So far as I can judge, the offer seems to be a perfectly legitimate one. I was afraid the offer was being made by persons who desired to secure an option for a lease and hawk it around the place in search of capital but, from information I have received, I believe the capital has already been found and that there will be no difficulty in that direction. This offer, however, should not be exclusive of other offers. The only reason why it comes before Parliament is that the land, which apparently these people, after carefully testing other deposits in the State wish to obtain, is embodied in a class A reserve. The Lake Clifton reserve, I understand, is ordinary Crown land and not a class A reserve and needs no Bill to permit it to be thrown open for leasing. If the two offers have been made, I do not see why the Government cannot accept both.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The amount of trade would not justify it.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: That is not the concern of the Government. People

who have large sums of money to invest generally have a bit of common sense and, if they like to come into this State, knowing they are not going to get a monopoly—and this Bill does not in the least give them a monopoly—why not accept the offers from everyone we can.

Member: It gives them a monopoly.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I cannot see that it does.

Hon. J. Cornell: The agreement might give them a monopoly.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The hon. gentleman knows his Government, and surely they would not enter into an agreement which would have such a deleterious effect.

Hon. J. Cornell: They might not always be in office.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The Colonial Secretary is wearing the happiest smile possible and has an appearance of stability which I very much admire and envy him, and there need be no fear. Having caused all this trouble I wanted to say that, having had information brought to me, I see no reason for opposing the Bill in the slightest degree and I intend to vote for it.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East) [8.13]: I intend to support the amendment because we have not been afforded any information on which we can act. The Colonial Secretary, in moving the second reading, said the matter was submitted to Parliament to decide, but how can Parliament fairly decide this question without having more information before it? The agreement which the Government propose to enter into with the company should have been submitted to this House. Mr. Duffell referred to other people dillydallying about. The information conveyed to me is that the original discoverer of material suitable for making cement has been endeavouring for the past couple of years to come to terms with the Government, and he has shown me a great number of documents which indicate that he has not asked for anything unreasonable or improper. In another place a few days ago, the member for the district strongly supported the claims of these people. I refer to Mr.

George, who stated that he had himself investigated the matter and was satisfied that these people were entitled to consideration. The position as it is represented to me—I do not profess to speak with any practical knowledge of the matter—is that there is not room for more than one cement company in the State, and that consequently the company getting the first start are pretty sure to win out. At the present time it looks to me as though we were asked to decide between local people, including the original discoverer, who have been battling for this thing for a couple of years, and people whom we know nothing about, who have come amongst us during the last five months. The Colonial Secretary says he understands the new comers have a capital of £80,000 available. He has given us no draft agreement, however. I believe, unless I have been wilfully misled, that the local people have submitted a draft agreement in which they undertook to spend a great deal more money than £80,000. It seems to me that all that the local people wanted could have been granted without any special Act of Parliament; but for some reason there has been dillydallying, not on the part of these people, who wanted to get to work manufacturing cement, but on the part of the Government. About a couple of months ago, I am given to understand, everything appeared to have come to a conclusion and it seemed that these people were at the end of their troubles. Then suddenly the other applicants from South Australia came along, and ever since the local people have not been able to get any satisfaction from the Government. With the small amount of information before us, I do not feel inclined to pass this Bill and to allow what seems to me an unfair advantage to newcomers over local residents, who ought to have any preference which may be granted.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (Metropolitan) [8.17]: To judge from the speeches of hon. members here, two sets of individuals are tendering for the same concession; and, of course, there may be others wanting the concession besides the people with whom the Minister is in treaty.

It is said that the agreement to be made will be submitted to the House.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: No. The Minister did not promise that at all.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: If there is any agreement to be made, it should be submitted.

Hon. W. Kingsmill. Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. JENKINS: The House has very good grounds for asking that. Hon. members may remember a debate during last session relative to a whaling license in closed waters granted under the Fisheries Act by the Government to a company of whom nobody here had ever heard. That license was granted over the heads of other people, and without public tenders being called. The farce was gone through of submitting the license to Parliament. Each House of Parliament had the license before it, and was entitled to disallow the license. This House almost unanimously disallowed the license, and yet the Government granted it. Possibly we may have the same farce gone through if some agreement is prepared under this Bill. The agreement might be submitted to Parliament, and granted whether we disapproved of it or not. If there is going to be any concession granted in this case, we should first of all have many more particulars given to us that we have had. If there is going to be any concession granted, Parliament should have the agreement to be entered into submitted to it for approval. In these circumstances I intend to support the amendment. I hope that the subject may be re-introduced during the next session, and that the Government, if they desire to excise this portion of land from the class A reserve, will introduce clauses by which they will either submit the land to public tender or allow the Parliament of the day to have an opportunity of saying whether or no it approves of the lease.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) [8.20]: I intend to support the amendment. The real reason for it is the attitude of the Government in the matter. They come blandly and ask that portion

of a reserve shall be taken out and left in their hands. They know the purpose, and they have evidently been supplied with a good deal of information on which they have decided to ask Parliament to give them power over this piece of land. But they do not give that information to Parliament. They keep it secret. I asked the Colonial Secretary when he was moving the second reading for the information, and he gave only very scanty replies. Why should not the Government be frank and open with Parliament and say, "We want this piece of land because here is a company prepared to do so and so and we want to lease the land to them"? Then Parliament would be in a position to deal with the matter. If this Bill were passed here and in another place, what would happen? The Government would make their own bargain with the speculators behind the back of Parliament. In an important matter like this, even the present Government have submitted previous projects for Parliamentary sanction. There was the black-boy concession and also another concession within my recollection during the last few years. Why should not that course be followed in this case? I know Mr. Kingsmill, as a reason for voting against the amendment, asked why we should not let any number of speculators have a chance. The position is that a small industry like the cement industry cannot possibly support more than one manufacturer here. Then why should a second come in? I have a case in point. A company had secured rights for a certain industry and had started it at considerable cost. Another company then sought rights, and people asked why? The second company got their Bill through its second reading, and then the reason why came out. The second company went to the first company and said, "What will you give us? There is only room for one." So the second company had to be bought out. The Legislature must not open the door to that sort of thing. I hope when the Colonial Secretary comes to reply he will explain why the Government have kept that legiti-

mate West Australian company, who desire to develop the Lake Clifton lime deposit, hanging on tenter hooks for nearly two years. What is the reason? Why should this new proposal be rushed with lightning speed through Parliament? Certainly, knowing as much as I do of such matters, I must vote for the amendment, and will hope for clearer light when the matter comes up again.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON (North-East) [8.25]: I notice that some hon. members are averse to taking the responsibility of voting for this Bill, but although I have not any additional information to supply I wish to point out that there is a great deal of responsibility in refusing the Government the power they ask. When this power is given, there is a probability of an industry being established; and I do not feel disposed to take the responsibility of putting that back for probably six months. There has been a certain amount of suspicion thrown upon the Government, but presumably, as they have asked Parliament to give them the power to resume this land, they will have to take the full responsibility for any agreement into which they may enter with the new company. No matter how we try to hedge the Government in the matter, the responsibility will still be theirs. Although I regret that more information has not been given, I am not prepared to vote for the amendment, because I am not prepared to stand in the way of the establishment of any industry which will have the effect of bettering the State. I realise my responsibility in voting for the measure, but I also realise that I should incur a greater responsibility in voting against the second reading.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN (West) [8.27]: I can quite understand the attitude of Mr. Cornell in connection with this matter, but I am very much surprised to find opposition coming from other quarters of the House. If this were a proposition for the Government to start the manufacture of cement—as might naturally have been expected from the Government, who are so very fond of experimenting in en-

terprises of this description—then I could have understood the opposition to the project. But when it comes to a question of a company or firm proposing to exploit the natural wealth of the State in a manner which has not been employed so far, I am surprised to see such strenuous opposition from members who have on many occasions fought for the fostering of private enterprise. This Bill simply gives the Government power to lease this land, having first released it from the reserve. The object is to enable the natural products which lie there to be used. As one who some 25 years ago was associated from an engineering point of view with one of the first cement works established in Australia, I can assure the House that it is not only necessary to know that the ingredients required for manufacturing cement exist in the soil, but also to possess high technical knowledge and considerable engineering skill to convert the natural ingredients into a marketable commodity. Cement works are of a highly technical nature, equivalent to a chemical factory in which the products have to be up to a certain standard from year's end to year's end. It is not only necessary for individuals to know that the ingredients exist for the purpose of manufacturing, but the individuals must have the necessary knowledge for turning that material into proper constituents in order to obtain a commercial product. That knowledge is necessary for the success of the venture. I feel satisfied that the Government will not, in opposition to their ordinary traditions, allow this chance of State enterprise to pass into the hands of a private company unless the private company are up to standard in every respect, with knowledge and capital to develop the deposit. No opposition has been raised in this Chamber in the past when mineral leases, pastoral leases, timber leases, and other means of exploitation of the natural wealth of this State have been granted to private companies for the benefit of themselves and of the community at large. Therefore it is astonishing to me to find this Chamber, of all Chambers, opposing

the present proposal of the Government. I shall vote against the amendment and support the Bill.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West) [8.30]: Hon. members seem to require a great deal of information on this subject. I am in a position to say that these two offers have nothing to do with each other. The proposition to take lime from Lake Clifton and to deliver it at 7s. 6d. per ton is, in my opinion, all moonshine. Hon. members desire information; but have they got any genuine offer from any other company to put down £200,000? Personally I do not believe one word of it. The construction of a railway of from 14 to 16 miles is involved, and it is always a vexed question whether we should allow a private company to construct a railway. The Government are not in a position to build the railway, and it is questionable whether they would be justified in giving an option to a private company to construct the line. It is understood that this Lake Clifton proposition will supply farmers with lime. I have never previously heard it suggested that cement works were to be considered at all. In regard to the other proposition, at Capel, I am informed by those who know the locality that there is no timber of any value on the ground, and that no harm can be done by resuming the land and giving those people permission to quarry for limestone. If the Bill is passed, those people are prepared to put up £5,000 as a guarantee of their bona fides, and to immediately indent the necessary machinery from America and proceed with the work with the least possible delay, whereas the other company, of which we have heard, has been talking about it for the last two years.

Hon. W. Patrick: If they cannot get the concession, how can they start?

Hon. E. McLARTY: They cannot, and it is a question whether they will ever get permission to construct the private railway. I am not too sanguine about the Lake Clifton proposition at all. I know the lake as well as I know my own fields. No doubt there is an enormous quantity of lime there, but the lake

is a sheet of water 14 miles long and half a mile wide, and has a considerable depth for the greater part of the year, so it will be a pretty difficult matter to commercially produce the lime. However, I say let them carry on, by all means. People are asking for lime, and if the Lake Clifton proposition is practicable, there is no reason why it should not be gone on with. The company are asking for no concession at all. They are prepared to start at once to open up an industry which will be of great benefit to the country. I cannot understand why the Government should not be trusted in this simple matter of making an agreement with those people to work the deposit. Germany has been getting £52,000 a year from this State for cement for the last five years, and the sooner we manufacture our own cement the better. I am confident that this is a genuine offer. The people of the locality are most anxious that the concession should be granted. The one offer has nothing whatever to do with the other. We have heard of the circularising of members, but it seems to me there has been a little wire-pulling on the other side.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan) [8.37]: So far as I am concerned, I have not been circularised by anyone, and consequently I approach the subject with a perfectly open mind. As I listened to Mr. Cornell I thought I would have to refer to the company as the late Mr. Deeming referred to his late wives, namely, as the "late cemented"; but after listening to Mr. McLarty I think the conclusion may be reversed, and I trust the amendment moved by Mr. Cornell will not be carried, and that the Government will be able to negotiate with some company in order to utilise these lime deposits.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [8.38]: Both the mover and the seconder of the amendment, and most of its supporters, appear to have missed the purport of the Bill. The object of the measure is, not to grant a concession to any particular individual, but to exise 50 acres of land

from the permanent reserve at the Stirling estate. That is the whole object of the Bill, to exise this land for the purpose of granting to some person who may be in a position to develop it in the only way it can be used. But at the present time, as far as I can understand,—and I have repeatedly approached the Minister for Works on the matter; the Minister is desirous of securing cheap cement for the Works Department—there has been no guarantee that any particular individual or company will be granted this concession. I have asked the Minister for Works for information, and he says there is none; except that a representative of a South Australian company, Mr. H. J. Scott, located this limestone quarry and reported the discovery to the Minister for Works, expressing a desire to enter into negotiations. Mr. Angwin discovered that the land was part of a permanent reserve, and that before he could take action it would be necessary to release it. The Bill is for the purpose of releasing it, and when it is released negotiations will be entered into. The matter has never been discussed by Cabinet.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: There is nothing to prevent a preliminary agreement to prove the genuineness of the company.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I understand it is the only application for this particular land. Mr. Angwin said that if there are other applications they will be considered together with this one, and that the lease will be granted to the company or person most likely to develop it in the best interests of the State. No doubt I could have furnished a lot of information to the House if I had adopted a certain course. Mr. H. J. Scott has repeatedly sought an interview with me in connection with this matter in order to supply me with information, but I declined to see him. So far as I know he has no connection with the Bill. Up to the present his negotiations with the Government have never been considered, so I did not feel justified in accepting the information which he desired to give me, when there might be some doubt as to whether he will get the concession. I am

sure the Government are desirous of showing the company every consideration, if they are prepared to embark on such an enterprise. We would go a long way to encourage them, but they have no absolute guarantee of that at the present time. The question is does the House wish this 50 acres to continue to be locked up and undeveloped? I am informed that the land is useless for the purpose of agriculture, of grazing, or of recreation. What does the House propose to do; to allow the quarry to remain undeveloped, or to permit the Government to come to a decision as to which is the best offer in the interests of the State?

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Why was Newnham blocked? Why was the Lake Clifton proposition held over?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I know nothing about it, except the references I have seen in the newspapers.

Amendment (six months) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	7
Noes	..	..	..	14
				—
Majority against	..			7
				—

## AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	(Teller).

## NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller).
Hon. W. Kingsmill	

Amendment (six months) thus negatived.

Question (second reading) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	14
Noes	..	..	..	7
				—
Majority for	..			7
				—

## AYES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller).
Hon. W. Kingsmill	

## NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	(Teller).

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Excision of portion of reserve:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I would like the Minister to get us some information before the Bill goes through Committee. He informed the House that he knew nothing about the Lake Clifton lime deposits or the men who have been dealing with the Government for nearly two years for permission to use these lime deposits. It is clear that some other member of the Government must know. I do not want the Colonial Secretary to have the responsibility of carrying this House into a position before the public which we shall all regret. If the Minister had said that the Government wanted this piece of reserve excised so that they might enter into negotiations with some one to develop the lime, and that they would first submit the lease to Parliament before granting it I would then say, "By all means." But the Minister came to us professing to know nothing about the intention to grant the lease in the future. Until he was questioned he did not mention it. He must have known a great deal more than that, otherwise he should not have come to the House with such a request. If he knew more he should have told the House. If the Minister will say now that no lease will be granted without submission to Parliament I will withdraw further opposition.

If he is not in a position to do that I want a lot of information from some other Minister before I can withdraw my opposition. Men who are well known in Western Australia as reputable and straight men have been negotiating with the Government and kept on tenterhooks for nearly two years for the development of lime deposits at Lake Clifton. Why are these men kept waiting all this time? If the Government can put through a Bill for other persons with lightning speed, why are the Government turning down these other well-known men? It would be folly to engage upon two industries of this nature so close to each other at the present time. The Minister does not know anything about this new company. What does it consist of? Are they substantial men? Scott is reported to have found this lime. The kind of company promotion indulged in in this case is a common one, but this House must not lend itself to business of that sort. I hope the Bill will be postponed until the Minister can give us information that will satisfy us about the two projects, why they hindered the one and why they rushed the other. If they cannot I want the Minister to promise that Parliament will be consulted about the lease just as it was consulted about the blackboy lease and other concessions.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I intend to oppose the clause and if it be passed I shall endeavour to insert an amendment to provide that no lease shall be granted until after the expiration of one month and until it has been laid on the Table of both Houses of Parliament and Parliament shall have had an opportunity of disallowing the lease. The Government will then have the opportunity of making the best terms they can with any person who may come along whether it be Mr. Scott or anybody else.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The course suggested by Mr. Jenkins is certainly the proper one to pursue and not the tactics adopted by Mr. Cullen, who has been making all sorts of insinuations and innuendoes. It will be a matter now

for the Minister for Lands to decide. As a matter of fact, the Minister told me to drop this Bill, but in conversation with Mr. McLarty I found that he was an enthusiastic supporter of the proposal and he gave me a certain amount of information. The Minister, however, again this afternoon asked me to drop the Bill.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Good advice.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have certainly no objection to Mr. Jenkins's amendment but it will then rest with the Minister in another place as to whether it will be accepted.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Although I could not follow Mr. Cullen and Mr. Jenkins on the division on the second reading I will support both of them and thank them for what they have done.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I deny having made any insinuations or innuendoes against the Government. I blame them for not having satisfied themselves in regard to necessary information and for not giving that necessary information to this House. This House ought not to act in the dark. However, I am satisfied with Mr. Jenkins's proposal.

Hon. E. McLARTY: The amendment which Mr. Jenkins proposes to move will mean that the capital which these people have to invest will be hung up for 12 months. If they want to invest this money in a certain industry they should be given the opportunity to do so but the question is whether they are prepared to be shilly-shallied and kept waiting for 12 months. If there is a company here with a capital of £200,000 to put into this industry we should encourage them to come along and invest it in the opening up of these deposits and the manufacture of cement. I shall certainly oppose the amendment to hang the matter up for 12 months.

Clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I move—

*That the following be added as a new clause:—"No lease shall be granted under this Act in respect of land excised until the expiration of one month after the draft of such*



lease has been laid on the Table of each House of Parliament; if either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such lease has been laid before it disallowing such lease then the same shall cease to have effect.

My object is only to see that if any concession is granted the best possible terms shall be obtained for the State. I am glad that the Minister has consented to accept the amendment. No one knows better than Mr. McLarty that any company that is going to develop an industry like this, if they are going to put any money into it, they will not do it all in one day. No hardship will be inflicted on them by a little delay.

New clause passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

Sitting suspended from 9.20 to 9.45 p.m.

## BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

### Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly notifying that amendment No. 1 requested by the Council had been made and amendments Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 had not been made, now considered.

### In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill. No. 1.—Clause 2: In paragraph (a) line 5 strike out the word "ten" and insert "nine":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted upon.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The reasons given by the Legislative Assembly for accepting this amendment are not

strong enough; in fact there have been no reasons given. The Colonial Secretary does not attempt to defend their action. The Minister for Lands when introducing the Bill said that all lands prior to 1910 would receive consideration. The increase in the price of land commenced in 1907 and two areas were sold at a higher rate than the existing rate of 10s. The next increase commenced in 1909 in the Yorkrakine area. Whilst the Minister states these matters will receive consideration, he still denies the people who took up those lands the right to come under the Bill. I hope the Chamber will insist upon these amendments:

Hon. H. CARSON: The Minister declares that if there are any anomalies they will be looked into and corrected, but under the present Land Act any man making an application for the re-pricing of his land will have to surrender his lease and if the price is reduced it will be put up for re-selection. I hope the Committee will insist upon its amendment.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: No reason has been given why the amendment made by this House should be struck out. The Minister repeats the statement that under ordinary powers he can rectify anomalies and that is apt to catch hon. members who do not bear in mind the point Mr. Carson has repeated to-night, that the aggrieved settlers would not have an equal opportunity under the ordinary provisions of the Land Act to what they would have under this measure.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I hope the House will insist on the amendment. There is strong reason for adopting it because re-pricing took place in 1909, and one of the settlements, in regard to which the people had to submit to the greatest hardships, and which has done the most good, was the civil service settlement. That was taken up at the end of 1909. If the people on those areas are to be excluded from the privileges of the Bill I can see no reason for passing the Bill. They had the misfortune, as soon as they got their land ready, to sustain the full force of bad seasons. I cannot

understand the reason the Minister has for refusing to accept the amendment of the Council.

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

Ayes	..	..	4
Noes	..	..	15

Majority against .. 11

#### AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Cornell
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)

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

No. 3.—New clause: Add the following to stand as Clause 4:—"In respect of any land held under conditional purchase lease, which is more than twelve miles from any station or siding on an existing railway, the Minister may exempt the lessee of such land from payment of rent for any period up to five years, and may extend the term of the lease, subject to the conditions set out in the last preceding section":

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing is that the adoption of this clause would incur a loss on general revenue which the revenue of the State will not permit.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the amendment be not insisted on.*

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Bill is intended to give relief to the settlers whose land has been priced at an excessive figure. This exemption was recommended by the reclassification board. The reason for disagreeing to the amendment is a poor one because the Government cannot claim that they will lose revenue in this way when they have no hope of collecting it. It

is impossible for settlers so situate to pay their way. Most of them took up land on the understanding that railway communication would be provided, but the policy of the Lands Department has been to increase the price of the land in order to provide railway facilities. This is a wrong policy because the townspeople benefit most from the railway. The clause is permissive, not mandatory. When the Labour party were in opposition, they contended that land rent should not be regarded as revenue. Now they are converting loan moneys, advanced to settlers to pay rent, into revenue. The Bill, without this clause, will afford no relief.

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

Ayes	..	..	4
Noes	..	..	15

Majority against .. 11

#### AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. R. G. Ardagh
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Carson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)

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

No. 4.—New clause: Add the following to stand at Clause 10: "The land shall be divided into six different grades, as shown in the schedule hereto, marked respectively A, B, C, D, E, F. The selling price for the land shall not be more than that shown in the schedule under the respective grades, according to its distance from a railway station or siding, as indicated therein":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is that the amendment could not be applied inasmuch as the grades proposed would have no practical application as the land to which it refers is not defined.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the amendment be not insisted on.*

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: This is really the Government's proposal. Without it I would like to know on what lines the Government intend to proceed. The reference to the grade is necessary to make the Bill workable.

Hon. W. PATRICK: We have been told time after time that this is not really an amendment of the Land Act, but a repricing Bill. It cannot, however, be a repricing Bill unless there is something in it about prices. Mr. Baxter's amendment inserts the prices proposed by the Government themselves. Then why should the Government object to it? Power is given to the Minister in Clause 2 at his discretion to vary the price of land, but he has that power already under the existing Land Act. The Council should insist on its amendment.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The objection of the Assembly to the amendment seems to be that the land is not sufficiently well defined. If it is agreeable to Mr. Baxter, I move an alternative amendment—

*That the following be added, to stand as Clause 10:—"Conditional purchase land coming within the meaning of this Act shall be divided into six different grades, as shown in the Schedule hereto, marked A, B, C, D, E, and F. The selling price for the land shall not be more than that shown in the Schedule under the respective grades according to its distance from a railway station or siding as indicated therein."*

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I move an amendment on the alternative amendment—

*That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that in the case of land infested with indigenous poison plants, situated in any part of the State, the maximum price for such lands selected since the first day of January, 1905, shall not exceed the*

*price of third-class land for grade or zone A; that is to say, six shillings per acre if within five miles of an existing railway, or four shillings and ninepence per acre if beyond five miles but within ten miles of an existing railway, or three shillings and ninepence per acre if beyond ten miles of an existing railway."*

This proposal had much support in another place, and it would be of great value to the holders of poison land.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: Mr. Cullen's proposal seems to introduce a new element altogether into the clause. So far I am only dealing with the amendment which we have submitted to the Assembly, and which the Assembly has rejected. If new matter is to be introduced, it had better be introduced separately.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That cannot be done. This is part and parcel of the clause under consideration, and would not at all put it out of its place in the Bill. Of course it could not be brought forward as a new clause at the present time.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I hope Mr. Cullen will not press his amendment. I am entirely in sympathy with it, but I do not think the introduction of new matter into the Bill at this stage would be advisable. I hope Mr. Cullen will consent to withdraw his amendment.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I think the proviso would be a great improvement, but at the same time I do not wish to give added cause to another place for objection. Mr. Baxter having moved the amendment to which the Assembly disagrees, I will be guided by his advice. Accordingly I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Cullen's) by leave withdrawn.

Hon. H. CARSON: I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government have not accepted our amendment. In speaking on the second reading, I pointed out that under existing land legislation the Government have all the powers they ask for in this Bill. If

they were really in earnest as regards the reduction of the price of land, they could have carried it into effect without bringing this Bill before the House. Unless we insist on our amendment, we shall be no further ahead. I also support Mr. Colebatch's alternative amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Colebatch's) put and passed.

No. 5, New clause: Add the following clause to stand as No. 11:—Regulations and by-laws.—1, Any regulation or by-law made or purporting to be made under or by virtue of this Act shall—(a) be published in the *Gazette*; (b) take effect from the date of publication or from a later date to be specified therein; and (c) be judicially noticed, and unless and until disallowed as hereinafter provided, or except in so far as in conflict with any express provision of this or any other Act, be conclusively deemed to be valid. 2, Such regulations and by-laws shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after publication if Parliament is in session, and if not, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session. 3, If either House of Parliament pass a resolution at any time within one month after any such regulation or by-law has been laid before it disallowing such regulation or by-law, then the same shall thereupon cease to have effect, subject, however, to such and the like savings as apply in the case of the repeal of a statute":

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the amendment be not insisted on.*

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing with the amendment is not ingenuous. The provision in the principal Act requires both Houses of Parliament to disallow regulations. The amendment provides that either House may disallow regulations. The administration of the Bill will rely largely on regulations.

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

No. 6, Add a schedule as follows:—

	5m.	10m.	15m.	5m.	10m.	15m.
A	1st	25/0	20/0	18/0	20/0	17/6
	2nd	9/0	7/3	6/9	8/3	6/9
	3rd	6/0	4/9	3/9	5/3	4/6
C	1st	15/0	13/0	11/0	13/6	12/0
	2nd	8/0	6/6	6/0	7/9	6/3
	3rd	5/0	4/3	3/9	4/9	4/0
E	1st	12/0	10/0	9/0	11/0	9/0
	2nd	7/0	6/0	5/0	6/6	5/9
	3rd	4/6	4/0	3/9	4/3	4/0

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the amendment be not insisted on.*

Question negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

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

*Sitting suspended from 10.35 to 10.45 p.m.*

## BILL—APPROPRIATION.

*In Committee.*

Resumed from an earlier period of the sitting; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Schedule D:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move—

*That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I wish to make a statement. Hon. members will realise the responsibility of the position. This Appropriation Bill has been

before the Legislative Council since last Thursday, namely, one week. There seems to be a disposition to delay it. Members will not proceed with the consideration of it, and under these circumstances the Government will have to consider the position to-morrow morning. For the past week we have not been able to pay public accounts. It was all right before then because the measure had not been interrupted in its progress through Parliament, but during the last week there has been an indication that this Bill is in jeopardy and consequently a different position altogether has arisen. But what was pardonable before is approaching definite illegality now, and the Government will be in such a position that to-morrow morning, unless the Bill is passed, every public work in Western Australia will be closed down and every expenditure, except where absolutely unavoidable, will be stopped. I am not using that as a threat. I wish to explain the real position. There is no justification whatever for holding up this Bill. It is held up on the plea that members wish to see the Land Bill put through, and also, since then, the Liquor Bill put through. I hope that the majority of the members of the House will not be parties to creating such a position. No Government which have ever been in power in Western Australia have been treated like this Government have been treated in regard to the Appropriation Bill. As a rule such a Bill has gone through in less than five minutes, but it has been hung up now for a week. That is not fair and I do hope that members will recognise that it is not fair and pass the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: May I be allowed to make an explanation?

The CHAIRMAN: No. The hon. member can withdraw his motion temporarily if he likes.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I will withdraw the motion temporarily.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

Hon. H. CARSON: Is it not possible for the Government to hold this up until the Liquor Bill has gone through? I ask the leader of the House to do this.

The Colonial Secretary: I cannot hold up the Appropriation Bill.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I do not think the remarks of the Minister should be allowed to go uncriticised. He charges this House with holding up the Appropriation Bill. The Government, on the other hand, have been holding up the Land Bill for two days. They have allowed it to lie whilst they adjourned and did no business. To-night Parliament has been turned into a chorus hall, while hon. members are neglecting work they are sent here to do. This House, too, has been adjourned repeatedly whilst waiting upon another place.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Whilst they finished their songs.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: And now the Minister asks this House to carry the responsibility. I do not think he has fairly stated the position. There is nothing to hinder the business being done in another place. It is very clear to me that had this House passed the Appropriation Bill last Thursday, Parliament would have prorogued on the following morning, and all the business this House has on its heart and conscience, for instance the Land Bill and the Licensing Bill, would have gone by the board. I think the Minister must withdraw his strictures upon this House.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I am at a loss to understand what the leader of the House means. Parliament has already granted to the Government ample temporary supplies pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill.

The Colonial Secretary: That is not correct.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: We were not given to understand that the Government had only obtained supplies up to the 25th November. It is by no means unusual for the Appropriation Bill to take even longer to pass through other Chambers. If the Government have not sufficient supplies to pay their way, it is not a matter for this House. We are abundantly justified in refusing to pass the Appropriation Bill until the Land Bill and the Liquor Bill have been dealt with,

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: This seems to me to be the crux of the position. Some hon. members are deliberately hanging up the business of the House until the land and liquor Bills are passed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I have said that here.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: That is to say that the Government are not to be trusted.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They disappointed us with the Land Bill last session.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: The Minister has already assured us that the Land Bill would go through.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I had that assurance last session.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: You will get it again.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What is the use of it?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: It appears to me that it is a case of tweedledum and tweedledee. This sort of thing becomes a political farce.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not make reflections.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not correct to say that we have supplies. The supplies were exhausted on the 31st October last.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: If you have gone on so long you can go on a little longer.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We have been carrying on without supplies since then. It was pardonable because the measure was before the Assembly and there was no prospect of supplies being blocked, but during last week the position has become different. Instead of the Bill being automatically passed through, as has been the case on previous occasions, it has been hung up for some reason or other, and we do not propose to live under that condition of affairs.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: I have a distinct recollection of the Government some time ago purchasing State steamers out of a vote they had no right to use in that direction, and also of the Government fleching trust funds and giving an I.O.U. for the money. We are told that if we do not pass this Appropriation Bill

within 24 hours they are going to stop spending money. Suddenly we are told that the Government are going now to do so according to the law, after defying the law for a considerable period. The Government have spent money illegally for 24 days, and they can go on for 25 or 26 days so far as I am concerned.

The Minister I would assist him in so far as I could in helping him to close the session this evening, but when one sees that there is not the slightest prospect of doing so, and that business is not being proceeded with in any haste in another Chamber, the Colonial Secretary cannot wonder if this House objects to agree to the closing of the session to-night. There is no desire to hang up the Government in regard to the Appropriation Bill. The House has just reason for fearing, from the statements which have appeared in the public Press given by Ministers, that the end of this session is going to be determined at once. In the circumstances the House is justified, when there is important business to be done, in saying that this business shall be done even if it means holding up the Appropriation Bill for another 24 hours.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I resent the situation that the House is hampering the Government.

Hon. J. Cornell: Of course it never does so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think that during this session the leader of the House has had a fair measure of support from me. My mind is made up that, so far as I am concerned, any influence I can give will be directed in having another place to deal with the Liquor Bill and the Land Bill, and when they had come to a final decision on these Bills, I am prepared to deal with the Appropriation Bill.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I was sent here for a specific purpose, and that was to see that some measure of liquor reform for war time was carried through this session. I have tried to avoid party strife, and like Mr. Holmes I have supported the Government on many occasions. I am firmly convinced that if we

pass this Appropriation Bill the fate of the Liquor Bill is sealed and it is for that reason I intend to support the continued hanging up of this Bill. If the Government have been acting illegally for several weeks in spending money they have my permission to do so for another few more days.

The CHAIRMAN: I must now ask hon. members to confine their discussion to the question before the Committee.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move—

*That progress be reported.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	12
Noes	..	..	..	8

Majority for .. .. 4

#### AYES.

Hon. J. F. Allen	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. H. Carson	Hon. B. J. Lynn
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller).
Hon. J. J. Holmes	

#### NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. H. Millington
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. M. Sewell
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. Sanderson
	(Teller).

Motion thus passed.

[The President resumed the Chair.]  
Progress reported.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until 3 p.m. to-morrow.*

Question passed.

House adjourned 11.10 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 25th November, 1915.

	PAGE
Papers presented	2799
Questions: Rottnest Island as a holiday resort	2799
Wyndham Freezing Works machinery	2800
Bills: War Council, all stages	2800
Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments	2810
Sale of Liquor Regulation (No. 2), Council's amendments	2827
Prohibition of Treating on Licensed Premises, 1a.	2846
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, 1a., 2a.	2846
War Council, Council's amendment	2847
Permanent Reserve (No. 2), returned	2847
Land Act Amendment, Council's message	2847
Price of Goods, all stages	2848
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, all stages	2862
Adjournment, Special	2863

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Return showing position of audit of Government Trading Concerns as on 20th November.

By the Minister for Lands: Regulations under the Industries Assistance Act.

By the Minister for Works: By-laws of Midland Junction municipality relating to motor traffic.

#### QUESTION—ROTTNEST ISLAND AS A HOLIDAY RESORT.

Mr. SMITH asked the Attorney General: Now that the German prisoners are being removed from Rottnest, will the Government arrange to have the island thrown open to the public for the Christmas holidays?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: An endeavour will be made to have Rottnest Island available to the public by Christmas, at all events for campers providing their own requirements. The buildings require considerable renovations, and the camps are useless. What can be reasonably done in the short time available will be done as soon as the island is formally handed over by the Military Authorities, probably on Wednesday next.