

and we can say that another place has accepted the amendments we made to measures in a generous manner. My only regret is that the State Children Act Amendment Bill, in which the House took a great deal of interest, did not go beyond the initial stages of another place. I trust, however, that it will be taken up next session as a lapsed Bill and that it will be dealt with as quickly as possible. I cannot but express a feeling of satisfaction at seeing back amongst us our old friend Mr. Cornell after a long absence on active service. A few days ago I received a letter from Dr. Saw, and he expressed the hope that he would shortly be able to return to England from Cairo and make arrangements for his early departure for Western Australia and as quickly as possible get back to Western Australia because it was his desire to take an active part in the public life of the State. I hope, Mr. Deputy President, that this Christmas vacation—the first that any of us has been able to look forward to with real happiness for what seem many years past—will be one of pleasure to all hon. members, and I entertain no doubt that the respite will prove acceptable, both to yourself and to our respected President.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.2 a.m. (Saturday).

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 20th December, 1918.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers Presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

QUESTION—PNEUMONIC INFLUENZA, QUARANTINING CONTACTS.

Mr. ANGELO (without notice) asked the Premier: Has his attention been called to the newspaper report of a mass meeting held on the Esplanade the night before last at which the following resolution was carried unanimously:—"That the Federal Government be informed that unless it assures the R.S.A. on or before midnight on Thursday, the 19th inst., that arrangements are being made to transfer the men from the "Boonah" to Rottnest Island not later than the 21st inst., the R.S.A., with the aid of the State Government and the people of Western Australia, will make and carry out the necessary arrangements themselves"? Can the Premier give any information in regard to the Government's attitude in respect of this?

The PREMIER replied: The full text of this resolution has only just been brought under my notice. The Government are no party to the resolution, nor have they been approached in the matter; neither have the Government given any intimation that they will render any assistance whatever in the carrying out of the suggested arrangements.

PERENJORI AND KULIN HOTEL LICENSES.

Royal Commissioner's Report.

On motion by Mr. JOHNSTON ordered: That the report and recommendation of the Royal Commissioner (Mr. Justice Rooth) regarding country liquor licenses be printed.

BILL—WATER BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's amendments.

Schedule of six amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Taylor in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 4, strike out the word "seven" in line 3 and insert "nine" in lieu:

The PREMIER: This deals with the number of appointees on the Lands Purchase Board. It is considered that it will be an advantage if the number is increased from seven to nine. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2.—Clause 10, in line 2, strike out the words "in all cases," with the object of inserting the words "in regard to discharged soldiers or dependants":

The PREMIER: This Bill deals with no class of people except discharged soldiers, so there is no need for the words "in all cases." The amendment was made in another place at my instigation, and I think it will make the clause much more intelligible. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 3.—Clause 10, strike out the words "in regard to discharged soldiers or dependants," in line 4:

The PREMIER: This amendment is really consequential on the previous one. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 4.—Clause 12, Subclause 1, add to the proviso, "unless in the opinion of the Minister it is necessary for the proper and more econom-

ical subdivision of any Crown land, including land acquired under the principal Act, to acquire adjoining private lands":

The PREMIER: This amendment is necessary. It is intended to cover cases where the Government have acquired or already hold land which is to be subdivided. In order to enable the subdivision to be made in the best and most economical manner, it may be necessary to acquire portions of small adjoining estates. If these words are not included, wasteful subdivision may result. The power is intended to be used only in the case of an owner who stands out for an unreasonable price.

Hon. P. Collier: Is this a Government amendment?

The PREMIER: Yes. There is a case in point now where the Government require 20 acres out of an adjoining estate. The Minister will not exercise the power unless it is necessary to do so in the public interest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When this clause was before the Committee, I moved the deletion of the proviso. The Premier then said that it would be wrong for any Government to have the power to take any holding of any man irrespective of the size of the holding. He said that a man must have a right, if using the land, to retain it. To-day the Premier uses the arguments previously advanced from this side in the opposite direction. Under the Bill the Government cannot acquire land less than £5,000 in unimproved value. That limit is not to be reduced, but by this amendment the Government propose to take the land of small men. The big holder is not to be touched, but the small man's land may be taken from him.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister): Are you opposed to the amendment?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am against the inconsistency of the Government.

The Premier: You wanted to make the provision general?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: By this amendment the Government propose to discriminate in favour of the large holder as against the small holder.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

[Mr. Stubbs took the Chair.]

No. 5. Clause 14—After the word "board," in line 5 of the proviso, insert "for a period not exceeding 12 months":

The PREMIER: This clause gives power to the board to extend the period for which the owner of land resumed may hold it after notice has been published in the "Government Gazette" of acquisition of such land. The Council think it desirable to restrict the extended period to 12 months. I am of the same opinion, and therefore I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 6. Clause 16—Strike out the word "five" in line 6 and insert the word "three":

The PREMIER: This clause deals with the right of the owner to retain part of his holding where the land has been compulsorily purchased. The Bill as it originally left this House provided that the owner might for the purpose of residence or business retain land in one block not exceeding in value £5,000. An amendment was made reducing the value from £10,000 to £5,000. It was thought now that the amount that a person might retain round his homestead should also be reduced, and with that object the amendment was made. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I do not think the Committee should agree to this amendment. There are people who run stock and do little else with land, and £3,000 worth of land is not much use to run stock on. If land was worth £2 an acre a man could only keep 1,500 acres, and if it was valued at £4 an acre a man could only keep £750 worth of land. When it comes to the cutting up of small farms, I object to such a proposal.

The PREMIER: The Government cannot take more than £3,000 worth of land round a man's homestead. The Government might desire to take all the land in a man's holding, but this provision will allow the owner to retain £3,000 worth of land round his homestead, and he may retain another £2,000 worth elsewhere.

Mr. BROWN: I am surprised that the Premier is agreeing to this amendment. People may have been struggling for years to make their holding worth having, and then the Government might come along and take away a valuable portion of it. If a man has property the unimproved value of which is £50,000 he is allowed to keep to the extent of £10,000 worth.

Hon. P. Collier: That is proportionate.

Mr. BROWN: It is absolutely impossible for a man to make a decent living on 1,000 acres of agricultural land, which area means that he has to be continually cropping, and therefore cannot work it to the best advantage, but must eventually kill it. Property can be improved only by carrying stock, and it is utterly impossible to go in for both agriculture and stock raising on 1,000 acres.

The Premier: Where is this 1,000 acres that you refer to?

Mr. BROWN: The Premier must admit that we have in Western Australia land worth £3 per acre unimproved; and 1,000 acres of such land would represent £3,000, the amount here proposed.

The Premier: Where is that land, unimproved, and in a natural state, with all the timber on it, worth £3 per acre?

Mr. BROWN: I can show the Premier the Beverley roads board books unimproved land values of £2 10s. per acre. That is why I urge that a man with 5,000 acres, which is a fair and reasonable holding, should be allowed to retain for himself more than 1,000 acres at £3 per acre. If such a man is to be restricted to the retention of 1,000 acres, it would be better for him to let his property go altogether.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But you can compel the Government, under this measure, to do that.

Mr. BROUN: I am aware of that. I am not blaming the Government, but the other House; though I must take the Premier to task for accepting the Council's amendment. Where is the land revenue to come from if we cut down our farmers to such miserable pittances of land? The amount should not be reduced below £5,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is extraordinary that, once again, and on the very last day of the session, I should be called upon to defend another place; and it is likewise extraordinary that these my defences of the Legislative Council always have relation to property. What a change of front on the part of the member for Beverley! Last week the hon. member was just as wrathful at the proposal to interfere with the franchise of another place, as he is wrathful to-day over this amendment. Now he charges the bulwark of the Constitution of the country with passing confiscatory legislation. I heartily agree with the Council's amendment. The member for Beverley, unfortunately, sees red whenever a question of property is concerned. The Government are not going to take away everything from a man. Estates will be resumed under this Bill for closer settlement in, say, a fruit growing district and cut up into 20 acre blocks. The £3,000 value will be quite sufficient to meet cases of that sort instead of the £5,000. I hope the amendment will be carried.

Mr. HARRISON: There are some men who are kept poor because they have taken up too much land. There are many such properties quite close to a railway line. If a railway line is built through any land the fact of spending money on that railway influences the value of the land adjacent to it. In some parts of the country a man with £5,000 worth of land, being allowed to retain £3,000 worth, will have a considerably larger area to work than in the case of a man who had had land resumed from him in some more prosperous district.

Mr. HICKMOTT: This amendment will cause a good deal of dissatisfaction and will drive many people off the land. I feel inclined to oppose it. We should do all we can to encourage people to go on the land.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some people squeal very loudly if there is any chance of their own properties being resumed, but they are only too glad for the other fellow's land to be resumed. Apparently some hon. members do not want to protect the small man at all, but only the big man. It is ridiculous to say that a settler will walk off his property that is valued at £5,000, irrespective altogether of the improvements that may be put upon it. I do not think any Government would take land from one person and give it to another for exactly the same purpose. This is a step in the right direction. I do not know who moved the amendment in another place, but I say it is worthy of support.

The PREMIER: The compulsory provisions of the Bill are to be found, not in this

clause, but in Clause 12. Members seem to be under a misconception in regard to the amendment. The amendment simply deals with the right of the owner to retain a part of his holding. The Bill provides that the value of the land retained shall not exceed £5,000, and the amendment reduces this to £3,000. The amendment is to make this clause consistent with Clause 12. This will not affect any small landholder.

Mr. MONEY: Under the Bill, if a man holds an estate worth £5,005, unimproved value, that estate may be resumed, and under the amendment the owner may retain £3,000 worth of the estate. But an estate of the unimproved value of £4,900 cannot be resumed, and so the owner of the smaller estate is in a much better position than the owner of the larger one. Except the estate is under £5,000 in the first instance, it cannot be resumed at all, and the Act is inoperative. As to the amount of £5,000 unimproved value, those persons are very lucky who own land in a district where the unimproved value is £3 per acre. The value of the land is in consequence of the work done and the expenditure on it. Before the land becomes improved to some extent, speaking generally, the land has no value. The mere fact of cattle grazing on a block and carrying the seeds over the ground gives the land an improved value. When members say that they are rated on the unimproved value of £3 an acre, I should advise them to appeal against that value. The unimproved value of £3 is sufficient for the whole of the South-West. It is not only in Western Australia that land has no unimproved value. Recently I was in Victoria on the estate of Mr. Payne who breeds the best Romney Marsh sheep in Australia. I asked him how he was rated and he said that he did not pay any land tax whatever because the land had no value, the value being in the improvements. I support the Premier.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: As the member for Bunbury has pointed out, the land must be over £5,000 unimproved value before it can be resumed. I know a great deal of the country is valued at £2 per acre unimproved and 1,500 acres is not enough for a man. We heard a great deal about pastoral leases yesterday, when the Premier took up a very different attitude, but it was the correct attitude. I can assure the Premier notwithstanding his reading of the clause that if the amendment is carried, £3,000 worth of land will be the amount that a man can own in an estate of 5,000 acres. This is an ill thought out Bill, and will not achieve the object desired. If the land is transferred from one to another it will not add to the prosperity of the country. I think we should adjourn for a week to give the Premier an opportunity of consulting the Crown Law authorities and we can come back in January or February, for we must do justice to the people of the State.

Hon. T. Walker: Do you desire to sit tomorrow?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am in no hurry. Over a great deal of the State the land may not have a high unimproved value. The leader

of the Opposition says he is in league with members in another place.

Hon. P. Collier: My colleagues there. Since yesterday I am sure it is the more democratic Chamber of the two.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier has told us that unimproved land in this State was never worth £3 per acre, but he should know that at Three Springs, near Moora, unimproved land was actually sold at £3 per acre.

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

| | | | | | |
|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 32 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 6 |
| Majority for | .. | .. | .. | .. | 26 |

AYES.

| | |
|--------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. Mullany |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Nairn |
| Mr. Chesson | Mr. O'Loughlin |
| Mr. Collier | Mr. Pickering |
| Mr. Duff | Mr. Pilkington |
| Mr. Gardner | Mr. R. T. Robinson |
| Mr. George | Mr. Roche |
| Mr. Green | Mr. Teesdale |
| Mr. Harrison | Mr. Troy |
| Mr. Holman | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Hudson | Mr. Varyard |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Jones | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Lambert | Mr. Willmott |
| Mr. Lefroy | Mr. Hardwick |
| Mr. Lutey | (Teller.) |
| Mr. Money | |

NOES.

| | |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Angelo | Mr. Mitchell |
| Mr. Durack | Mr. Broun |
| Mr. Griffiths | (Teller.) |
| Mr. Hickmott | |

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment made.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—FORESTS.

Council's Further Message.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.27]: Before the House proceeds to the consideration of this Message, I desire to draw the attention of the House to the fact that on more than one occasion it has recorded its opinion concerning pressed Messages from the Legislative Council. This House has been inconsistent, I admit; but I consider it my duty to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that the privileges of the Assembly are being somewhat infringed upon. Before the business of the House proceeds further, I will accept a motion on this subject.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [4.28]: This is one of the Bills which are not what are known as pure money Bills. It is a quasi-money Bill,

and it contains a number of clauses, that relating to hewing, among the pressed clauses, for example, which have nothing in the wide world to do with money. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that this question cropped up some two years ago, and was referred to a joint select committee of both Houses, Mr. Walker and myself being among the members appointed by this Chamber. The Committee reported to both Houses, recommending that a Bill should be brought down to provide for such cases, to provide that clauses appearing in a quasi-money Bill, but not relating to money, might be discussed, though the financial clauses could not be discussed. That was the unanimous opinion of both sides. For one reason or another, the effect of that report has not yet been embodied in a Bill, though it had been my intention to bring down such a measure to this House during the current session. I most certainly advocate the bringing down of the necessary Bill during next session, so as to relieve the tension which must necessarily prevail between the two Houses when, owing to a technical objection, each House asserting its privileges, members of the Council and members of the Assembly cannot meet to settle an obvious difficulty. I move—

That in view of the report of the select committee on the procedure on money Bills and the fact that had the Bill recommended by the committee been law, the Forests Bill would have been freely open to amendment by the Legislative Council, this House agrees to consider the requested amendments now pressed by the Legislative Council, without waiving its rights and privileges.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Attorney General makes out that this Bill is not a money Bill. I want to point out, however, that it is a money Bill. The Legislative Council desire that the revenue that is to be taken from consolidated revenue to go into a special fund should be increased from one-half to three-fifths. The Bill also gives power to charge fees and so on. Apparently, we are willing to forego the rights of the House and be prepared not to insist on our privileges in regard to money Bills. Sufficient time has been fooled away to allow of the Bill referred to by the Attorney General to have been introduced. I hope the House will not agree to the motion. The Legislative Council now want to acquire the rights of this House to deal with money Bills. They say they insist on carrying certain amendments to which this House is opposed. It is the desire that the Legislative Council should have control of these matters? In my opinion the Forests Bill can well stand over until next session when it can have further consideration. Many of the provisions which have been insisted on have not been properly considered by the Government. There is no co-ordination between members of the Government. There has been a breach of faith towards those who were hewers before they went to the war and may desire to take up their old occupations when they return. While the Council have stuck out against us in every direction the Attorney General now

says we can give away our privileges and allow the Council to deal with matters which they have no power to insist upon. I hope that the House will reject the motion.

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

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Ayes | 23 |
| Noes | 15 |

Majority for 8

AYES.

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Angelo | Mr. Lambert |
| Mr. Broun | Mr. Lefroy |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Money |
| Mr. Duff | Mr. Nairn |
| Mr. Durack | Mr. Pilkington |
| Mr. Gardiner | Mr. R. T. Robinson |
| Mr. George | Mr. Stubbs |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Harrison | Mr. Veryard |
| Mr. Hickmott | Mr. Willmott |
| Mr. Hudson | Mr. Hardwick |
| Mr. Johnston | |

(Teller.)

NOES.

| | |
|-------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. Lutey |
| Mr. Chesson | Mr. Mullany |
| Mr. Collier | Mr. Rocks |
| Mr. Davies | Mr. Teesdale |
| Mr. Foley | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Green | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Holman | Mr. O'Loughlen |
| Mr. Jones | |

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General and Minister for Industries in charge of the Bill.

No. 8—Clause 24, paragraph (a), strike out this paragraph and insert "after such area has been cut over for sawmilling purposes or":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Before I move, as I propose to do later, that Managers be appointed to confer with Managers from another place, I think the proper course to adopt is that I should give hon. members an opportunity of saying whether they will or will not agree to any of these pressed amendments. This amendment relates to hewers. The other evening I remarked that one of the companies had put on a number of men hewing on its lease. My remark was challenged, and the company concerned has now written me, giving the precise number of hewers employed, as follows:—Canning 11, Worsley 12, Wellington 19, Kिरrup 7, total 49. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

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

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Ayes | 24 |
| Noes | 13 |

Majority for 11

AYES.

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Mr. Angelo | Mr. Hudson |
| Mr. Broun | Mr. Lefroy |
| Mr. Brown | Mr. Mitchell |
| Mr. Davies | Mr. Mullany |
| Mr. Duff | Mr. Nairn |
| Mr. Durack | Mr. Pilkington |
| Mr. Foley | Mr. R. T. Robinson |
| Mr. Gardiner | Mr. Teesdale |
| Mr. George | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Veryard |
| Mr. Harrison | Mr. Willmott |
| Mr. Hickmott | Mr. Hardwick |

(Teller.)

NOES.

| | |
|--------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angwin | Mr. Munsie |
| Mr. Chesson | Mr. Pickering |
| Mr. Green | Mr. Rocks |
| Mr. Holman | Mr. Walker |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Jones | Mr. O'Loughlen |
| Mr. Lutey | |

(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 9—Clause 24, add at the end of the clause the following:—"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section it shall, subject to the provisions of Section 76 of this Act, be lawful for any person holding an active service discharge from the Australian Imperial Forces who satisfies the Conservator that prior to the passing of this Act he followed the occupation of a sleeper bower in this State, to hew timber for railway sleepers on the area of any timber concession, lease, or permit granted before or after the commencement of this Act, but no such permit shall be granted within any virgin forest. For the purpose of this section 'virgin forest' means forest from which no timber has been drawn":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 10—Clause 24, after the words inserted in the last amendment add the following proviso:—"Provided that no person shall be entitled to enter on the area of any concession, lease, or permit without first obtaining the consent or approval in writing of the owner thereof":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 14—Clause 41, Subclause 2, strike out the words "one-half" and insert "three-fifths":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 15—Clause 41, Subclause 2, before the word "revenue" in line (1) insert "net":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 23—Add a new clause to stand as Clause 75 as follows:—"The area comprised within the boundaries of the Greenbushes State forest, excepting any area within such boundaries the subject of any timber lease or permit is hereby excluded from the provisions of this Act, and shall be subject to the Mining Act, 1904":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 24—Add a new clause to stand as Clause 76 as follows:—"The provisions of Section 24 of this Act in relation to the issue of hewing permits shall have effect from the commencement of this Act until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and no longer":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Request for Conference.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly transmitted to the Council requesting a conference on the amendments which the Council had pressed and which the Assembly had not made, and acquainting the Council that Mr. O'Loughlen, Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (Honorary Minister), and the Attorney General (Hon. R. T. Robinson) had been appointed managers for the Legislative Assembly at the said conference.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th December.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.3]: In dealing with the second reading of this Bill I want to state that an important measure of this description should not come here at this time of the session. Statements have already been made that in all probability this Bill as amended, will not be dealt with this session. I want to point out that members of the Assembly have a right when legislation is introduced, to improve on that legislation if they think improvement is necessary.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Or try to improve.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If we have to accept the Bill as introduced it is useless to discuss it. I want to say there are some clauses of the Bill which I am entirely opposed to, and I feel that I should not be doing my duty if I did not ask members to make the Bill better than it is. This measure deals principally with the Children's Courts, institutions and bastardy cases. I want to say also, I think the innovation carried into effect in 1915 of appointing the Children's Court and women justices for the Children's Courts was a move in the right direction, and I believe the members of the courts have done a lot of good and assisted the State materially in the work which they have performed. The buildings have been

bad, but they are not to be blamed for that. They have endeavoured, as far as possible, to carry out the desires of the people of the State. Unfortunately, their hands have been tied. If a child has committed an offence, no matter how small, if it is necessary it should be sent to some institution for the purpose of detaining it for a while, that court has been compelled to commit that child until it is 18 years of age. That provision is in the present Act, and I maintain is a blot on the Act. There has been no discretion with the court. The court has no opportunity of sending a child to an institution for six months, 12 months or two years at their discretion, but they have had to commit without discretion until the child was 18 years of age. I am hoping members will agree with me when in Committee, to remove that in future, and place more discretion in the hands of the court than previously. I have known instances where children have been committed until 18 years of age. They have been sent away for a month or two and it has had the desired effect: all that was necessary, and then they could have been removed entirely from the control of the State, but the Bill has not given the court power in the past. There has been no provision and there is not to be in the future. As far as this Bill is concerned, I hope we shall remove that in the future. It is proposed to alter the constitution of the court. I have seen no reason why that should be done. I believe the justices have done their work favourably and well and I see no necessity to appoint a special magistrate for the purpose of presiding over the court. I maintain, and from what I have read of the evidence placed before us recently, that the resident magistrates have not had time to attend to the Children's Courts in the past and when the Minister stated that it was the intention to appoint a police magistrate as a special magistrate according to the evidence before the select committee, then if he has had no time in the past to attend to this work he will have no time in the future. I think the court should be left as at present; the resident magistrate attending to cases, and I think the resident magistrate should attend to all bastardy cases in conjunction with magistrates who desire to be present. That can only apply to one or two places in the State. In my opinion there is no necessity to go to increased expenditure in appointing some gentleman, with the full powers of a police magistrate, over the courts when we have had the work in the past carried out so favourably and well by the justices. There is another provision in the Bill which in my opinion should be altered and which I think the Minister made an error when placing the Bill before members. He stated that the provision in the Bill in regard to rehearings or applications to the court for a child to be released on probation, that the Minister retained the same powers that he has at present, and if he did not exercise those powers as required by the parents of the child, these persons could appeal to the court. I maintain the present system is right. I maintain there is no court in the land that has the power

given it as these courts have. If a person is convicted in any court, police, High, or Supreme court, the power is vested entirely in the Governor-in-Council whether the person should be released or there should be any reduction in the sentence made; but in this Bill, once a child is committed until 18 years of age, taking the Bill as it is, the State Children Department carry out the intentions of that court.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The direction of the Minister.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Act takes away the powers of the Minister. It says it shall be the duty of the department to carry out in all particulars the orders of the court and if the punishment which has been given has been quite sufficient to meet the case and all the circumstances in connection with the child—it might be a boyish freak—

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Or a girlish freak.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, a child led away as boys are, because none of us have been angels. We all know what we did when we were young. Once a child is convicted and sent to an institution, the department has then to carry out in all particulars the orders of the court, and before the child can be released there must be an appeal to the court to release him. Power is given to this court which is not given to other courts.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): But you do not remove the Minister's power.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When the Act says definitely and distinctly that it shall be the duty of the department to carry out in all particulars the orders of the court, the department must carry them out. It is their duty and it follows that no alteration in the conditions can be made without first asking the court's opinion. Let us take the position in the first place. The persons who have issued instructions for the detention of the child have to reverse their decision. They have a certain amount of bias. They believe their action in the first instance was right and correct, and at the time they sent the child to the care of some institution it was necessary in order to bring about an improvement in that child. Thus there is a certain amount of bias. But when the case reaches the Minister, his judgment is based entirely on the reports of the case, on the conditions prevailing at the time of the application, and on the reports obtained from the police and from other quarters concerning the parents. The Minister is in the position of an umpire, and deals fairly with the child. That position should be retained, and the power ought not to be transferred to the court. Accordingly, I hope that provision will be struck out in Committee. There is a clause which when I compare it with the corresponding section of the principal Act does not seem to me to say what is intended. Section 95 of the principal Act prohibits street trading by children, but this Bill provides a new and distinct clause dealing with the subject of trading by children. If the amendments had been made in the sec-

tion dealing with street trading my opposition would probably not be raised. But there is a distinct clause which says, among other things, that no person shall cause a child to offer anything for sale, and so forth. That is the portion I wish to bring particularly before hon. members. I have known cases of widows left with large families, who received assistance from the State during the infancy of the children, and who started small shops for the sale of lollies, stationery, school books and so forth. With the help of the children, such widows have occasionally built up fair businesses in a brief space of time, and thus there was no longer any necessity for State assistance to them. But under this Bill a widow cannot have the assistance of her child in a shop unless the child is 16 years of age.

Mr. Roake: But a child can go into a racing stable at the age of 14.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have in my mind now a widow, known also to yourself, Mr. Speaker, who, having lost her husband on the goldfields, came to the coast with her family of four children. She is a hard working woman and with the assistance of the State in the first place brought up her children, and with the assistance of those children she is now earning a nice livelihood, being in a good way of business. But she could not have done it under the provision of this Bill forbidding that any person shall procure, cause, or suffer any child under the age of 16 years to offer anything for sale. Do hon. members intend that that clause should go through?

Mr. Davies: What age do you suggest?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the case I am referring to, the children went to school and were not neglected. But the woman had to get her living. And it is to be noted that as soon as a child reaches the age of 14 years there is no more State assistance towards its support; that is, unless the child is an invalid. In the case of the widow, whom I have mentioned, the eldest child can hardly be 16 years at this date. I believe the provision in this Bill was intended to apply to street trading, but it is not so. Had it been added to the section dealing with street trading, I would perhaps agree; since it is not advisable to let young children go into the streets for the purpose of trading. A child under 16 years of age is prohibited from serving in the mother's shop, and yet a boy is allowed to be apprenticed at the age of 14 to become a jockey. The Bill is ill-considered. It will hamper those left in indigent circumstances when endeavouring to obtain a livelihood. There is another provision of this Bill with which I am largely, though not entirely, in accord. I think it a good move that illegitimacy cases should be heard away from the police court. The provision whereby such cases can be heard in the Children's Court, with other justices, including women, is a distinct improvement. Under such conditions greater protection will be afforded to the girl. But I certainly object to an inspector being permitted to visit at any reasonable time any house where there is an illegitimate child. Many persons who care for

children born out of wedlock desire to keep the matter as secret as possible; and assuredly it is not right that a departmental inspector should be permitted to visit at any time that might be considered reasonable a house where an illegitimate child resides, for the purpose of inspecting such child. In my opinion, the clause oversteps the mark. Perhaps the Honorary Minister can give some reason for it. Another objection I have to raise is to that clause which provides that a member of the police force, or an inspector, shall have power to enter any building, house, or premises, if he has reason to suspect that there is in such building, house, or premises, any child whom he believes, on reasonable grounds, to have committed, and to be liable to be tried for, any offence.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Keep on at that. I like that. I have a full and complete answer.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I contend that a child who is suspected of having committed an offence should be written to, instead of being summoned. This Bill contains another improvement in that respect, providing, as it does, that a child may be required by letter to appear before the court, instead of being summoned to appear. The only ground on which a police constable should be permitted to arrest a child is that the child is destitute and requires immediate attention. I can quite understand the police arresting a child in such circumstances. Because the child is suspected of committing some offence he cannot be deemed to be guilty until he is proved to be so. A police constable has no right to be given power to enter anyone's house and arrest a child for any offence. There is a clause which provides that a special magistrate may at any time visit a subsidised institution, in which State children are kept. I do not know whether that implies that the only person who can visit these institutions on behalf of the State is a special magistrate.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): We want to go further than that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The institutions will be right in claiming that Parliament has decided that a special magistrate is the only person who can go there and would have a perfect right to claim the protection of Parliament in that direction. Any person who has visited these institutions must agree with me that no complaint can be lodged against them. They have always been open to the officers of the department. I have myself paid many surprise visits to them, and have been well pleased with the manner in which the children have been looked after. These institutions are a credit to the denominations which manage them. They have assisted the State materially and have done a lot of good work. While I am more in favour of the boarding out system than institutional life, it seems impossible to do away with the institutional system altogether in this State. The work they have been doing in the past is such that the State should give them every credit for it. I find from the Bill that the court desire the right to state to what

institution a child shall be sent. I do not know if that is altogether wise.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Do you think the court is no good?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is a matter for the department to ascertain the views of the parents of the children, so that they may have some say in the direction of what institution a child shall go to. I remember several complaints on the part of parents on that ground some years ago.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The parents of the children that go to those courts are not of much class.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is not true. I know of dozens of parents who are just as respectable as the hon. member, if not more so.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I object to that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have seen respectable parents who have been broken-hearted over the boyish and unmalicious actions of their children, who because of these pranks have had to be sent to some institution. I have on many occasions had these cases investigated so as to ascertain whether the children could not be sent back to their parents. It is not true to say that the parents are all bad. There are many cases which come before the court which should never come before it. To give the court the right to say to what institution the child shall be sent amounts to saying that the department has not dealt fairly or rightly with the children in the past.

The Colonial Treasurer: May they not have said, "Here is a boy who has committed a boyish offence. We do not wish to punish him unduly."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He must be sent somewhere, either on probation or to an institution, unless he appeals a second time to the court. There is no department of State which has better officers in it than the State Children's Department. They endeavour to deal fairly with the children and see that they get good homes to live in and that their welfare is looked after. They have at all times tried to assist and meet the wishes of parents as to the particular institution to which the child shall go. A good deal of ill-feeling is sometimes caused when a child is sent to a certain institution or to a certain boarding-out home. The parents like to be consulted.

Mr. Roake: Is not that governed by the religious training of the children?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The department arranges the matter in accordance with the wishes of the parent as far as possible.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): We want to let the court judge and use their judgment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want to let the department do it.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I think the court is better than the department.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think the officers of the department, male and female, who have been for years engaged in the work, are in a

better position to deal with the question of the kind than those who merely go to the court once or twice a fortnight.

The Colonial Treasurer: Do you advocate the officials directing the court?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I advocate that once a child is arrested or taken to the court the court should deal with that case. If the court finds that the child should be retained in some institution for some period the court should hand that child over to the State, and when it is handed over to the State the officials of the department, under the supervision of the Minister, should decide what should be done with the child in future, and as to what institution it should go. The child is then made a State child. I have tried as far as possible to show how this Bill can be improved. Members should not run away with the idea that it is impossible to amend the Bill at this hour of the session. The Standing Orders are suspended, and there is no difficulty in altering the provisions of any measure as may be desired. It is wrong to pass a Bill through or to keep quiet merely because it comes in late, especially if there are clauses contained in it which are to the detriment of the children of this State. That is a retrograde step. I shall vote for the second reading, and in Committee will move certain amendments, which I am of opinion will be beneficial on behalf of the children who unfortunately have been made State children.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.43]: I should like to congratulate the Government upon fulfilling the promise made by the Premier to introduce a Bill dealing with the employment of children of tender years. I regret that the measure is introduced so late in the session. It is almost impossible to get a grasp of such an important Bill in the time at our disposal. There are certain clauses in regard to the adoption of children which appear to call for great consideration. This Bill can, as the member for North-East Fremantle has said, best be dealt with in Committee, and when we reach the Committee stage I shall have something further to say. I desire to congratulate the Government on having given an earnest of their intention to cope with the serious position in regard to the employment of children of tender years.

Mr. JONES (Fremantle) [5.45]: I very much regret the interjection of the Honorary Minister in regard to parents and families of children who come under the Bill. In this respect he shows a lamentable knowledge of heredity and environment. Whilst in the main I follow the member for North-East Fremantle in supporting the Bill, it lacks a provision in regard to the publication in the Press of anything undesirable which might be revealed at the children's court. I propose, when in Committee, to submit an amendment dealing with that omission. I am influenced in this by an affair which occurred at Cannington a few months ago, the sordid details of which were published in a certain newspaper. In the interests of the children's court and of childhood generally, I do not wish to see a recur-

rence of that outrage on public decency. When the Honorary Minister interjects that the court is better than the department I join issue with him, if only in that particular case. The department would never use the court for obtaining vulgar newspaper copy.

Mr. ROCKE (South Fremantle) [5.48]: I support the second reading. Any movement having for its object the welfare of the children will have my support. The children's court should receive due consideration. I believe if the court is left constituted as at present it will continue to do good work. I disagree with the compulsion proposed under the Bill. A court of review should be held so that a child might be released when the lesson had been taught. There is a good deal of inconsistency in the Bill. For instance, in the matter of children engaged in trade, it is provided that a child under 16 shall not sell in a shop under the control of its mother, whereas that child could go to a racing stable at 14 years of age. The right is given to the department to take a child from its parent if that parent is not a position to sustain the child. But that regrettable position may have been brought about through circumstances over which the parent has no control, and in such a case I think the Government should provide necessities for the child in the child's own home.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Government do that already.

Mr. ROCKE: I can commend the work of the State Children Department. They are sympathetically dealing with children under their care, and are prepared to listen to recommendations from responsible people. I approve of the boarding-out system, but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that the institutions are doing splendid work. When the child welfare conference was held in Perth some two years ago, Mr. Green, from New South Wales, extolled the value of the boarding-out system as against institutions. But when he was asked what he would do with an incorrigible child of 16, he said, "I would send it to an institution." Certainly there was some inconsistency there. I will support the second reading, and will attempt to improve the Bill in Committee.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister—Pilbara—in reply) [5.53]: I sincerely regret that the Bill was not brought down earlier. It is not altogether a Government Bill; it is a Bill framed by a number of good citizens who have the sincere desire to assist the child life of the State. They have asked me to endeavour to get the Bill through. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) pointed out that under the existing Act, and under the Bill also, a child is committed to an institution until it is 18 years of age. Like the hon. member, I think that is wrong; but to defeat the Bill will not improve that condition of affairs, because, as I say, it is provided also in the existing Act. Children alter very rapidly, and we require to have dealing with them only those people who study children. To lay down a limit of 18 years is wrong. In regard to Government as-

sistance, it has been pointed out that the age limit has been made 14 years. Generally speaking, in the Bill we say that 14 is the age at which children may go to work. I do not know whether 14 or 15 is the better age. Certainly 14 is better than leaving it without any limit.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am not objecting to that.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I am doubtful whether the hon. member has any real objection to the Bill. The hon. member made a reasonably good point in regard to the provision that officers of the department may visit a house where it is known there is an illegitimate child. We desire to see that illegitimate children are not ill-used. I recollect the hon. member, when discussing the Health Bill, predicting the humiliating experience of an innocent daughter of a parson under the provisions of that Bill. That imaginary young lady has not been interfered with yet. If we had to pass the police regulations in this House, we should not have a dog's chance of getting them through; yet those police regulations work reasonably well. So, too, with this, we must take full power to protect the kiddies. Neither the children's court nor the department is likely to abuse that power. On the other hand, they must have it. In regard to the special magistrate, the Bill provides that a special magistrate may be or shall be appointed. I am speaking for the Government, and so far as the Government are concerned, if the Bill is passed, we intend for the time being to appoint one of the magistrates who is at present acting as a special magistrate for this court. We do not intend to appoint any special man for this job. I am giving members that as a clear statement of Government policy.

Hon. P. Collier: For how long?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Until next session. The leader of the Opposition knows that if he has the numbers he can put the Government out next session and come in himself and appoint whom he likes.

Hon. P. Collier: I have not the numbers, but I have numbers enough to stop this just now.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): That is the intention of the Government. We do not intend to appoint any special man to these courts. I want to say, however, on this point, that I am of opinion, thinking of the improvement of the conditions of children, that a special magistrate should be appointed—I am expressing my own individual opinion—I have told members the Government's opinion—a police magistrate who has been dealing with the poor unfortunates of this country, the criminals and drunks, becomes hard and callous and is not likely to have that feeling towards children which a man dealing with children should have. And supposing it would cost £500 or £600 a year to put a special magistrate on to look after our children, are not our children worth that?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are only doing it in a portion of the State.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): That is the trouble. I have pointed out previously that this country stands practically on its own. You may talk to me about Chicago, of New York, London, Melbourne and Sydney, in this State of Western Australia our children stand higher than any of them. Children are bred in slums and reared in slums, but we have our free open country and if we have free open country we do not want too many children's courts. At the same time when we are talking about the special magistrate I say again I am expressing my own opinion, the police magistrate who fines and imprisons drunks, and sentences criminals, is not the right man to deal with children.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He would have to deal with them everywhere else.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): We are fortunate in having real good magistrates. No one can complain about the magistrates we have. We could trust Mr. Canning or Mr. Davies to do this work. At the same time we would get better results if we had a man who is not in the police court. I want to impress on members that I am asking members to carry the Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We want to help you with improvements.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): If there are genuine amendments I give this guarantee that we will bring them down next session.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not move any amendment if it is not genuine.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): If the House is desirous, and carries the Bill, I undertake to say the Government will bring them down the first thing next session. If we amend the Bill to-night that is the end of it. In regard to the inspection of institutions the Bill only provides that the special magistrate may inspect. If I were able to move amendments I would say any member of the Children's Court should inspect any institution at any time at all they thought desirable. I was in another Government and I appointed inspectors for the Aged Women's Home. The department endeavoured to set down certain times at which notice should be given. I said those inspectors must go to that home at any time they desire, and after about two years' experience that committee has proved an advantage to the aged women in the homes. I might just mention that it is the intention of the Colonial Secretary to appoint an inspecting committee for the Old Men's Home, and although in another place the select committee has laid it down that only special magistrates shall be inspectors. I hope next year we shall be able to amend the Bill and say that any member of the Children's Court may inspect any institution in which children are maintained at any time whatever.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do you not think a Government official could do that?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I ask members this: These are improvements in the Bill. Would it be better to

throw the Bill out or pass the Bill and amend it next season?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Some of the clauses would not be in five minutes if I had my way.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): There is nothing dangerous in the Bill. The people looking after our children are most desirous to get the Bill. Shall we say, pass it as it is to-day and amend it next year, or shall we say we will pass it out and have a new Bill next year?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: As far as I am concerned, I would see it go out.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I ask members, and I am speaking seriously, to pass the Bill and if there are defects in it, I give an assurance that I will do my utmost to get them remedied next session.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There might be another Government next session.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—FORESTS.

Request for Conference.

Message from the Council received, in reply to a Message from the Assembly, agreeing to the conference on the requested amendments pressed by the Council in the Forests Bill, and notifying that Hon. H. P. Colebatch, Hon. J. A. Greig, and Hon. H. Millington had been appointed managers on behalf of the Council; the time of meeting for the conference being 7.30 p.m., and the place of holding the conference, the President's room.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 9.0 p.m.

Conference Managers' Report.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [9.8]: I have to submit the following report of the Managers appointed by the Assembly to meet the Managers appointed by the Council in a conference upon the Forests Bill:—

Your managers beg to report that they have met the managers of the Legislative Council and have agreed as follows:—1, That amendment No. 8 be not made. 2, That amendment No. 9 be not made. 3, That amendment No. 10 be not made. 4, That Clause 24 be amended by striking out the words "except as hereinafter provided," in the first line, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "excepting in the case of a person who prior to the passing of this Act followed the occupation of a hewer in this State," and by striking out all the words in the clause after the words "Act" in line 5. 5, That amendment No. 14 be made. 6, That amendment No. 15 be made. 7, That amendment No. 23 be made with the following alteration:—That the words "the administration of this Act in regard to" be inserted at the commencement of the proposed Clause 75, and that all the words after the word "permit" in line 4 of the same

clause be struck out, and the words "shall be carried out subject to the concurrence of the Minister for Mines" be inserted in lieu thereof. 8, That amendment No. 24 be not made.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The agreement arrived at was that amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10 be not made and that Clause 24 should be amended by striking out the four words at the commencement of the clause: "except as hereinafter provided" and inserting in lieu the words "excepting in the case of a person who prior to the passing of this Act followed the occupation of a hewer in this State," and by striking out all the words in the clause after the word "Act" in line 5. The effect of that will be to leave hewing as it is to-day but to confine it to those persons who had licenses prior to the passing of the Act which will include soldiers who have gone to the war. It will practically allow those persons who were hewing before the passing of the Act to continue their occupations. It includes them without specially referring to them as soldier men. I move—

That Clause 24 be amended by striking out the words "except as hereinafter provided" in the first line and inserting in lieu the words "excepting in the case of a person who prior to the passing of the Act followed the occupation of a hewer in this State" and by striking out all the words in the clause after "Act" in line 5.

Mr. Holman: Will that be confined to hewers who had licenses prior to the passing of the Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It could not be made wider.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

Amendment No. 14. Clause 41, Subclause 2—Strike out the words "one-half" and insert "three-fifths";

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This means that it will take away more of the Consolidated Revenue.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will give more to the Consolidated Revenue.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 15. Clause 41, Subclause 2.—Before the word "revenue" in line 1 insert "net":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In answer to the member for Sussex I may say that when the revenue returns to its normal state and the revenue from all sources comes to £3,000, then the three-fifths method will be equal to the half and half method. When the revenue reaches £16,000 the Treasurer, if the administration is the same as now, will receive £2,000, while the forest side will have £6,000. When the revenue is £30,000, it will mean that the Treasurer will receive £5,000 more. Members in another place thought that it was a proper thing to deduct the costs of earning the rev-

enue, and they suggested that the forests should be given three-fifths of the revenue and the Treasurer two-fifths and they based this on figures supplied by the Conservator of Forests. When the revenue is normal, it will be equally divided.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

Amendment No. 23—Add a new clause to stand as Clause 75 as follows:—"The area comprised within the boundaries of the Greenbushes State forest, excepting any area within such boundaries the subject of any timber lease or permit is hereby excluded from the provisions of this Act, and shall be subject to the Mining Act, 1904";

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The object of the amendment of another place was to throw this State forest, six miles square, surrounding Greenbushes, into the administration of the Mines Department. I was very much opposed to two departments having rival claims in respect to the one article, but it is reasonable to say that in respect of timber surrounding a mining area the Forestry Department shall administer it, with the concurrence of the Mines Department. That is exactly what we are doing, and it has now been incorporated in the recommendation of the conference. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 24—Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 76, as follows:—"The provisions of Section 24 of this Act in relation to the issue of hewing permits shall have effect from the commencement of this Act until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and no longer";

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not made.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Council with a schedule of five amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2—Strike out the clause:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We cannot understand the meaning of the amendment until we see the next amendment, which is to strike out Clause 4. In other words, the

Council propose to strike out the executive board, when, as a consequence, Clause 2 will fail because it will not be necessary. I move—
That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not surprised at the Council striking out the clause, and as the Minister in charge of the Bill has stated, this amendment and others are consequential on the striking out of Clause 4. I regret the Government could not see their way to appoint a real executive board to administer the Wheat Scheme. All that the executive board, under this Bill, would have power to do is to advise the Minister that certain things are necessary. In the Council the Government allowed the clause to be struck out merely on the voices. The advisory board has proved a failure for the reason that they were used merely at the Minister's whim, being an advised board instead of an advisory board from the time Mr. W. D. Johnson left office as Minister for Agriculture. In Mr. Johnson's time the board were really an executive board. What they decided was carried into effect, the Minister being chairman of the board. Upon the change of Government I do not think the new Minister ever went to see the board; the board had to call upon the Minister. Communications did pass between the board and the Minister, but generally through the Scheme's manager. Upon the next change of Government the board were not so much as called together for three solid months; and this although the advisory board had been established by Act of Parliament. From September to November of 1917 the board neither met nor made any recommendation. And the Minister could ignore the executive board under this Bill.

The Attorney General: But the Minister does not ignore the board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No; because inquiries have been made and because the Press reported daily as regards the board. The farmers saw that the board were being ignored, and thereupon the Government appointed two public servants to sit on the board. Then, upon the complaints referred to in the Royal Commission's report, the Government appointed a farmers' representative. I am honestly of the opinion that the people directly interested in the Wheat Scheme are those who desire an executive board. Is the carrying of this amendment to be taken as a direction from Parliament that the whole of the power is to remain the Minister's hands? If the Government had followed the Royal Commission's recommendations, satisfaction would have been given to the farmer. The executive board under this Bill represent merely a fraud, a bluff put on the farmers of Western Australia. The Council had an inducement to vote against this proposal in the treatment accorded to the advisory board. The members of the advisory board carried out their duties honestly and faithfully, and one of the best members of the board was Mr. Deane Hammond. I regret that the executive board are not to be established. Unfortunately, the Government policy stands like a stone wall against the creation of an executive board.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Government have no desire to bluff. The clauses put forward are genuine, but so far as the Government had to guarantee the difference between 3s. and 4s. 1d.—half of that amount—they were of opinion that they should control the finances of the board.

Mr. Johnston: Is the Minister in order in discussing the whole question on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The first amendment carries with it several others and they ought to be dealt with together.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am agreeable to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the hon. member is in order.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When I was acting Minister and Mr. Baxter himself was administering, the advice of the board was on every occasion followed. The advisory board for the last year to all intents and purposes was an executive board. Another place was against the principle of an executive board. This is a Wheat Marketing Bill and it is the matter of the acquisition, the continuing of the Pool, the acquiring of wheat from the farmers and the gisting of the wheat with the millers that are the principles embodied in the Bill, and although the principle as to the executive board has been cut out the present advisory board will be continued during the current year and will be treated as if it were an executive board. The Government have done their best to incorporate in the Bill and executive board, but another place has turned the claim for the executive board down. Members must bear in mind that if this Bill is turned down, the Government cannot acquire the farmers' wheat and a general state of chaos will result, for the Government cannot compel the farmers to hand over the wheat if we lose the Bill. The principle of the Bill must be regarded as a wheat acquisition Bill. I am sorry the executive provisions have been struck out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They were not worth a hang.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then why grumble? The Government have little more consideration for the finances of the country than some other people who talk so glibly.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Clause 2 has no bearing on the appointment of an executive board. The advisory board has not been a failure. When the Pool was instituted and controlled, it was done without any Act of Parliament. The Minister controlled the board, which did not have executive powers. The advisory board was always listened to and their advice taken. Their requests were attended to and recommendations carried out.

The Attorney General: I followed that same principle.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the advisory board is to continue, I hope the Minister will put Mr. Bickford back. I know Mr. Deane Hammond did a great deal of work when on the board, but what we want to-day is an executive board that ought to be properly

clothed with power. There is no reason why next year we should not amend the Bill and appoint an executive board. When talking about the board controlling the finances, how much do they control? The money belongs to the farmers, and the expenditure they control would be that dealing with the shipping of wheat and the office expenses. To-day the Government are spending money in buying timber, erecting sheds and so forth, but all the funds belong to the farmers. I would like to see this work removed absolutely from political influence. If the Pool is to continue, I hope the Minister will endeavour to have a board provided for.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It would have been an improvement to the Bill to have given the board more independent status. One of the main principles of the Bill was the provision that was made for the Wheat Marketing Scheme to be administered by a board of five members. The Minister was to be chairman and two members were to be elected at ballot by the farmers who sent their wheat to the Scheme. In view of the convincing reasons put forward by the Attorney General, I cannot understand why the Government should abandon this important portion of the measure without a fight. I do not remember an important proposal of this nature being abandoned without any fight at all. The Government policy is outlined in this measure, and I regret to say the Attorney General has not put forward any reason why we should give way to the Council. Why not have a conference on this Bill also? It would not hurt us to come back to-morrow rather than the Government should be defeated.

Hon. P. Collier: But the Minister in another place supported the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am not concerned about that just now, but I want this Chamber to stick to the policy introduced by the Government and accepted by the House.

The Attorney General: The Country party members in another place strongly opposed it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I should like to see the division list.

Hon. P. Collier: There was no division in another place. Your Country party Minister voted against it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The Attorney General told us that the adoption of the main recommendation of the Royal Commission was embodied in this clause. The Government retained not only complete control of the financial side of that board, as recommended by the Commission, but retained complete control of the board itself, by providing that in a board of five the Minister should be chairman and should have the right to nominate two members of the board. Yet even this is to be abandoned by the Government. The announcement that the executive board was to be appointed has been circulated all through the farming districts, and I want the Premier to see if the decision of another place cannot be altered. I am sure the House would stand behind the Government in any such attempt. I have here a copy of the "Primary

Producer" of the 6th instant, containing an announcement by Mr. Piesse, the deputy leader of the Country party, that the Government, with the concurrence of Parliament, had agreed to appoint a board with executive powers to administer the Act. If this board is not appointed it will not be possible for the Government to carry out their desire of referring to an executive board for decision the question of handling into depots by the acquiring agents. I urge the Government to make an effort to get this clause reinstated in the Bill.

[Mr. Foley took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister has said it is the finances that have to be considered, and that the Government were not going to give to the board the responsibility of controlling the Scheme. The Minister made reference to my financing. I was in office for five years, and I spent £53, out of which I went a trip to Brisbane on departmental business. The Minister has been in office for 15 months and has spent £250 in his personal expenses.

The Attorney General: No, that covered all the departmental expenses.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Moreover, I have never been a traitor to my leader.

The Attorney General: I do not think this has anything to do with the question before the House.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have never advertised myself and tried to do my leader out of his position, as you are doing to-day. You are never satisfied unless you are in the public Press every day.

The Attorney General: You are a very objectionable character.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is time to be when I am insulted by a snake like you. The Minister is trying his utmost to turn his leader out, and every person in the country knows it. He is one of the most dangerous men in the Ministry. He costs more money than any other man in the Ministry, and he is not qualified for his position.

The Attorney General: I again object to this. Not a word that the hon. member has said during the last five minutes has anything to do with the clause. It is purely a spiteful personal attack on me.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the words that are objectionable to the Minister.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He has not asked for a withdrawal—and I will not withdraw to him. He insulted me, and I insult him. I will not be insulted by a snake like him. You can expel me if you like.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to desist.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have said all I wish to say, but I am not going to sit here to be insulted. I do my duty to this country to the best of my ability, and I have a responsibility to every other member. In my opinion this board has been wiped out owing to the fact that its wings are clipped. It was

made an executive board in name only, and if I thought there was a possibility of getting the Bill through by sending these amendments back, I would support the member for Williams-Narrogin. The hon. member must realise, however, that the hour is late and that the amendment would have to go before another place, and they would have to deal with it and then send it back here. Managers would then have to be appointed, and I am satisfied the Legislative Council would not do all this. I hope the hon. member will agree to the amendments proposed.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think there is any other course open but to accept the amendments of another place. I regret exceedingly that these clauses have been struck out. We have always worked for an executive board, but what was provided in Clause 4 was not an executive board at all. It received my support because it was an advisory board. My idea of an executive board would be that they would have the full administration of all the provisions of the Act, and the Chairman would be elected from the five members constituting it. The board as proposed under the clause would have been of very little use to the Scheme. I fully expected that the Bill would come back mutilated.

Mr. Teesdale: But not by your own people.

Mr. BROWN: Perhaps not, but I am not aware that it was done by our own people. Unfortunately, there is a certain section up against the Westralian Farmers, Ltd., handling this wheat and that section would not stop at anything to prevent them from handling it. They are against that body entirely because of prejudice. The Westralian Farmers, Ltd., were described by those people as buccaneers, but we are hoping to be able to show that by co-operation we can handle our own wheat satisfactorily and that we will receive the full benefit.

Mr. HARRISON: I am sorry the executive board has not been appointed on the lines recommended by the Royal Commission. If that had been done it would have been a very good thing for the Wheat Scheme. If there are men in charge, men in whom confidence can be placed, the relief the Minister would get would be considerable. I do not agree with that part of the clause which provided that no public servant of the State or the Commonwealth, and no person acting as a Government acquiring agent or a servant of any incorporated company or firm acting as a Government acquiring agent, should be appointed a member of the board. If we had agreed to that where would we have got our expert men from? Good men to fill such positions are not to be found outside some of the firms who have been handling the wheat, but the clause would have debarred any of those men from being appointed.

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

| | |
|--------------|----|
| Ayes | 28 |
| Noes | 7 |
| Majority for | 21 |

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Brown
Mr. Brown
Mr. Collier
Mr. Davies
Mr. Duff
Mr. Durack
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. George
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Harrison
Mr. Holman
Mr. Hudson
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lefroy

Mr. Lutey
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Money
Mr. Mullany
Mr. Munsie
Mr. Nairn
Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Roche
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Troy
Mr. Underwood
Mr. Walker
Mr. Hardwick
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson
Mr. Harrison
Mr. Hickmott
Mr. Johnston

Mr. Pickering
Mr. Wilcock
Mr. O'Loughlin
(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 7:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The sentiments of this amendment have already been voiced in this House and speak for themselves. The Government are agreeable to the proposal, and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If this amendment is agreed to arrangements will have to be made very early next year for the handling of the harvest. Subject to that assurance, there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I draw attention to the wording of the amendment, which says, "no further agreement shall be entered into or signed prior to its being submitted to Parliament." I think the amendment should read, "no further agreement shall be entered into or signed unless subject to the approval of Parliament." I move a modification on the amendment—

That the words "prior to the same having been approved by" be struck out and "except subject to the approval of" inserted in lieu.

The CHAIRMAN: This House has already considered that question and sent it to the Legislative Council and the Legislative Council has voted against it, and sent the clause back to this Chamber altered as it is before us now.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I think you are mistaken, Sir. I want that modification made so that the Government may make arrangements very early in the year for the handling of the wheat.

The PREMIER: The words in the Council's amendment will do just as well as those the member for Williams-Narrogin proposes.

Mr. MONEY: There is nothing to prevent any Government from negotiating with a view to a subsequent agreement. That must be the desire of the member for Williams-Narrogin. He would be well advised to withdraw his modification, which serves no purpose.

Modification put and negatived.

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

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

- 1, Roads Closure.
 - 2, Water Board's Act Amendment.
- Without amendment.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendment.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment which was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Foley in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Add a new clause to stand as Clause 3 as follows:—A report and balance sheet of the operations of the board shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament by the Minister in charge of the department on or before the 30th day of September, 1919:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a very vaguely worded message and resembles very much the rather doubtful amendments of another place which we dealt with previously. I do not want to delay the business of the country or there might be objections to the new clause. As a matter of fact, the department for years have laid the balance sheets and report before both Houses of Parliament. The new clause does not say that the report shall be for the current year and only for the fact that we might delay the Bill at this stage, I would object to the amendment. However, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council. Sitting suspended from 11.23 p.m. until 12.30 a.m.

BILL—DISCHARGED SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT.

Council's Further Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it did not press its amendments 1 and 4; that it agreed to the modification made by the Legislative Assembly in requested amendment No. 5; that it pressed its requests Nos. 2 and 6 now considered.

Mr. SPEAKER [12.32 a.m.]: In regard to the decision arrived at, earlier in this sitting, in connection with the Forests Bill, I may

point out that this Bill is on all-fours with that measure. I presume that in view of the attitude the House took on the Forests Bill, it will proceed to deal with this Message on the same lines.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 2—Clause 4, strike out Subclause 2:

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Another place appears to be unanimous on this matter, which is really one of administration. The reference is to the clean discharge. However, the matter is always subject to the Minister's approval.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 6.—Clause 11, in the first proviso after the words "discharged soldier" in line 2 insert "or in case of a deceased soldier the surviving":

The PREMIER: I do not like this amendment, but I believe the object of another place is that if a soldier holding land has gone to the Front and been killed, his parents should have the same advantage with regard to the land as the soldier would have had if he had returned alive. I see no great objection. The matter is subject to the discretion of the board, and is not unreasonable.

Mr. MUNSIE: As regards the wording of this amendment, suppose the deceased soldier had left a will?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (Honorary Minister): The will is bound to be supreme over the wishes of the board.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

Sitting suspended from 12.40 a.m. to 4.0 a.m.

BILLS (6)—RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

1. Appropriation.
 2. Loan, £780,000.
 3. Treasury Bonds Deficiency.
 4. Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amendment.
 5. Discharged Soldiers' Settlement.
 6. Forests.
- Without amendment.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCES.

Lieutenant McCarthy, V.C.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [4.10]: I am quite sure hon. members will not mind me delaying them for a few moments while I submit a motion which I desire members to carry. Another gallant

soldier, a West Australian, has won the blue ribbon of the army. Lieutenant McCarthy, who was engaged in the timber industry at Lion Mill before he left here, has been awarded the Victoria Cross. This House has been pleased in the past to honour those men who have, in my opinion, received the highest distinction that anyone can receive. Lieutenant McCarthy was one of the original Anzacs. He left here on the 22nd December, 1914. He was at Gallipoli and his work on the Peninsula was notable, and later in France his deeds at Pozieres secured him the Croix de Guerre, which is equivalent in France to the Victoria Cross. He has had a most remarkable career. The "Gazette" which notifies that he has been awarded the Victoria Cross states—

Lt. L. D. McCarthy, 16th Battalion, of Western Australia, outdistancing two companions, he captured single-handed a machine gun post near Madame Wood, in the vicinity of Verman Villiers. He fought his way down a trench, inflicting heavy casualties. He killed 25 Germans and captured 50, also five machine guns.

This gallant officer has been awarded the Victoria Cross and I am sure the House desires to place on record their pleasure and appreciation that this man has brought this honour to Western Australia by the distinction he has had conferred upon him. He has conferred an honour on this country of ours. I cannot imagine anyone making better soldiers than those who have wielded the axe. I can imagine the man who can wield the axe with that lightning speed that the heaver can, is the man above all others who will make a remarkable soldier. This man has been brought up in that life, and has now distinguished himself in this way. I move—

(1) that this House desires to express its pleasure on learning that Lieut. L. D. McCarthy has been awarded the high distinction of the Victoria Cross, and at the same time places upon record its great appreciation of his merit and gallantry; (2) that the foregoing resolution be forwarded by His Honour the Speaker to Lieut. McCarthy and to the colonel of his battalion.

I am sure we all wish Lieut. McCarthy the best of good luck in his future in Western Australia.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.15 a.m.]: I have great pleasure in seconding the motion. This we may take it will be the last V.C. to come to Western Australia, seeing that the war is over. Certainly the record and the deeds of Lieut. McCarthy are a fitting crown to the glory won by the Anzacs throughout the war. It is rather remarkable that the final V.C. to be won by a Western Australian should be won by a man coming from the open life of the bush lands. Lieut. McCarthy's career is remarkably similar to that of Colonel Murray, in that Lieut. McCarthy left with the original Anzacs as a private, and has won his way to the distinctions enumerated by the Premier. Similarly Colonel Murray was a timber worker, left with the Anzacs as a private, and, during the war, has won almost every distinction which it is possible to win on the battle-field.

We are proud of those men, as indeed we have been proud of all our boys who went from this State. While we are pleased to congratulate Lieut. McCarthy on the honours conferred upon him, we hope that never again in the history of Western Australia will there be occasion for any of our boys to engage in those deeds, even though they bring such honours. I have pleasure in seconding the motion.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Irwin) [4.18 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till the 29th January, 1919.

Parliament in the meantime will be further prorogued by proclamation. In doing this I am following out the practice of several years past. I desire to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy and consideration you have extended to me, to members of the Government, and to members of the House. I wish also to thank the Chairman of Committees for his attention to the duties that devolved upon him. I have also to thank the officers of the House for their courtesy, which has always been unflagging and unselfishly given. Above all, I desire to thank my hon. friend opposite for the kindness he has extended to me. I recognise in the hon. member a most astute parliamentarian, and perhaps the keenest debater in the House. The hon. member has never indulged in factious opposition. I am pleased that the session, although strenuous, has passed with none but the little differences that occur from time to time on the floor of the House. We have sat longer during the current year than the Parliament of Western Australia has ever before sat in any one year. We have sat for eight months, or 33 weeks, during which we have had 99 sittings. Hon. members may think it has been a strain on them, but they can well imagine the strain it has been on members of the Government, and on the leader of the Opposition, who has to watch everything that comes into the House, and whose time is so fully occupied in attending to the business of the House. We are now in the season of goodwill, and I can assure hon. members I have nothing but the most kindly feelings for those around me. I have never regarded a political foe as a personal enemy. I desire to wish you, Sir, and the officers of the House, the Chairman of Committees, and the deputy Chairmen, a happy Christmas and a prosperous new year. When we started this session we were still in the midst of the great war, and did not know when it would end. I do not think any of us realised that the German bubble would have burst so soon. We are now in an armistice, and I trust that before the House meets again peace will have been declared, peace not only for the time being, but at any rate for the term of our natural lives. I trust that in that time of peace we shall endeavour with due consideration and without factious criticism to solve

those great problems which we shall have to solve. We have before us problems greater to us than the war has been, and I trust that we may master them.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.25]: In seconding the motion submitted by the Premier, I desire to thank you, Sir, for the kindness and courtesy you have extended to me and to members on this side. I should also like to join with the Premier in expressing my gratitude to the clerks and all the officers and servants of the House. We are fortunate in having a staff which has given entire satisfaction to every member. The Premier has been good enough to say some kind things regarding me. If I have been able to assist in the conduct of the House, and if I have proved an honourable opponent, I suggest it is because one could not be otherwise to so honourable a gentleman as the Premier. We have indeed had a strenuous time. During the 13 years I have been in the House we have never before sat so many days and weeks in one year as we have during the present year. I am sure we are all glad that we have been able to get through before the Christmas holidays. We might fairly look forward to a lengthy recess. At the same time I hope the Government will not unduly delay calling Parliament together next year, a year fraught with great problems for the State. It is essential that Parliament should meet reasonably early next year, so that, by our united efforts, we may face and deal with the difficult situations which undoubtedly will confront the State. We certainly have had a very strenuous session, and although not overworked in the early stages, we can safely say that during the past month or two we have not been idle. I am pleased that we have been able to get through without any bickering. We have differed, certainly, but honestly and openly, and I am glad to think there has not been that strenuous party strife which has characterised the proceedings of Parliament in other years. One thing we can be glad of is that even though we face a difficult future that difficulty is nothing at all to be compared with the difficulty we have just left behind us. We can thank the powers that be that we enter the new year with peace throughout the world. With that before us, with the hope and indeed the knowledge that with the coming year there will once more descend upon the earth that kindness and that friendship and that love which obtained prior to the war, we can well face the future stout-heartedly; and I hope that never in our lifetime or in the lifetime of our children and our children's children will there be a crisis like that which we have just gone through. I join with the Premier in wishing everyone the compliments of the season. I hope that all hon. members will have a pleasant holiday through the Christmas time, and that the future years will bring happiness and prosperity to all hon. members.

The PREMIER (Hon. H. B. Lefroy—Moore) [4.32 a.m.]: Before the motion is submitted, I would like to offer an expression of appreciation to the "Hansard" staff for their labours. There is no doubt that

these gentlemen have the hardest work of any of us. I always feel very sympathetic towards them, and I recognise that the work is done efficiently. I feel, moreover, that we are under a debt of gratitude to those gentlemen for the manner in which they do their work. I desire to join them in all the good wishes which I have extended to officers of this House and to hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.33 a.m.]: Mr. Premier and Mr. Collier, allow me to thank you for the kind references you have made to myself. Whatever courtesy I may have extended to you, Mr. Premier, and to you, Mr. Collier, as leader of the Opposition, has been reflected to the fullest degree. Let me thank you also for the kind references both of you have made to the Clerk and the Clerk Assistant and the officers of the House and also the "Hansard" staff. The Premier pointed out that the work of the "Hansard" staff was very heavy. As the Premier has said, we have sat during this year which is about to close on more days than in any session in the history of responsible government in Western Australia; and the "Hansard" staff have reported those proceedings with one of their comrades at the Front, which fact has made their task indeed much more difficult. Let me give thanks also on behalf of the Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chair-

men of Committees. They have had their struggles in this Chamber during the past strenuous session. However, the session is now closing and I wish hon. members a very happy and prosperous new year. Hon. members will now be freed from their labours, and as one who has been for a good number of years associated with the public life of this State I know how free hon. members will feel to-morrow. Those hon. members who reside in the country will speedily reach their homes, and I am sure they will feel perfectly happy in the bosom of their families during Christmas time. This session is closing under happier auspices than we have known during the four years that now happily lie behind us. We are closing the session with the armistice signed, and a prompt declaration of peace in prospect. When the next session opens, we shall meet under a brighter heaven than we have known for four years. We shall, I hope, meet renewed in vigour to carry out the duties which we are called upon to perform; and our labours will be conducted without the anxiety of the war hanging over our heads. I wish hon. members a pleasant Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.35 a.m. (Saturday).

Parliament was prorogued to the 7th May, 1919, by Proclamation issued in the *Government Gazette* published on Friday, 10th January, 1919.