

ing to pay vermin rate, but had I done so I would have paid £10 under that heading alone. However, it will be seen that in that short time my rates have increased from £14 10s. 11d. to over £40. Yet we are not growling about it. I merely want to show members that when they declare we desire that somebody else should pay for our roads, they are not correct in that statement. We are quite prepared to tax ourselves in order to make and maintain roads. One member has said that the Government should retain control of the revenue from drivers' licenses. I do not agree with that. I do not know just how many drivers there are, but I take it there must be at least 20,000 motor vehicles in the State. The driver of a private motor car pays 5s. per annum, the driver of a car for hire pays more than that, and the driver of a motor lorry pays 10s. So the probability is that the amount received in drivers' fees is something between £5,000 and £10,000. I fail to see why Consolidated Revenue should have the advantage of that money; rather ought it to go into the main roads fund. To my surprise the Minister claimed that it cost a lot to collect those fees. As a matter of fact, the collection is done by the local policeman, and in the easiest way; for, meeting a man in the street, he demands the fee and gets it. I am sorry the Minister for Works is not here to-night. I realise that we on this side have not much chance to amend Bills, but I admit that the Minister has accepted suggestions offered from this side, and I conclude that, had he been here to-night, he might have accepted some of the suggestions thrown out. When the Minister has replied to the debate, I will decide whether or not to support the second reading. If he will not agree to amend the boundaries of the areas, I am afraid I shall have to oppose it.

On motion by Mr. Griffiths, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 2nd September, 1925.

	PAGE
Bills: Ministers' Titles, 3s.	648
Public Education Endowment Amendment, 3s.	648
Real Property (Commonwealth Titles) 3s.	648
Roman Catholic Geraldton Church Property, 2s., Com. Report	648
W.A. Trustees, Executor, and Agency Coy., Ltd. Act Amendment (Private), 2s.	649
Group Settlers' Advances, 2s., Com.	649
Land Tax and Income Tax Act Amendment, 2s.	655
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2s., Com. Report	655

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

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1. Ministers' Titles.
2. Public Education Endowment Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.
3. Real Property (Commonwealth Titles).
Passed.

BILL—ROMAN CATHOLIC GERALDTON CHURCH PROPERTY.

Second Reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to make the Roman Catholic Bishop of Geraldton a corporation sole. In law a corporation is an artificial body created either by Royal Charter or by Act of Parliament. Its existence is unaffected by changes in the members constituting it, and hence in legal phrase it is said never to die. There are two classes of corporations—corporations aggregate and corporations sole. This first may consist of several individuals, such as a municipality, whereas in the second the power is vested in a single person occupying an official position. In this case it is the occupant of the position who is given the authority. The need for the Bill was emphasised by the death of the first Roman Catholic Bishop of Geraldton. The official position which he occupied had not been created a corporation sole. Consequently the church was faced with the legal expenses and fees involved in the transfer of the whole of the church property to the new bishop. Apart from

that a similar situation might arise again at any time. If Bishop Ryan were promoted to a higher place, the same costly and cumbersome process would have to be followed. The Roman Catholic diocese of Perth found itself confronted with a similar difficulty about 14 years ago, when a Bill was introduced which became the Roman Catholic Property Act, 1911. The measure was introduced by the Government of the day in order to relieve the position. This Bill is on much the same lines. The Solicitor General states—

1. The bishop is incorporated so that church lands may vest in his successor in office; otherwise the land would devolve on his executor on death and transfers would be necessary.
2. See No. 34 of 1918 for the incorporation of diocesan trustees of the Church of England; No. 25 of 1921 as to Jews; No. 4 of 1916. Roman Catholic arch-diocese of Perth.
3. The provisions of this Bill are similar to previous Acts relating to religious bodies.
At the suggestion of Messrs. Parker & Parker, solicitors for Bishop Ryan, the executor of the late Bishop Kelly was consulted and a declaration was obtained from him as to what land belonged to the late Bishop Kelly in his private capacity. The declaration reads—

I, John Joseph Graber, executor of the estate of the late William Bernard Kelly, Roman Catholic Bishop of Geraldton, do hereby solemnly and sincerely declare:—(1) That the only land owned by the late William Bernard Kelly in his private capacity was Lot 8 of 122 and 123 Railway-parade, West Leederville, being all the land comprised in the certificate of title, vol. 81, folio 23. (2) That all other land registered in the name of William Bernard Kelly is the property of the Roman Catholic Church, Geraldton diocese. And I make this solemn declaration by virtue of Section 106 of the Evidence Act, 1906. Declared at Geraldton this 13th day of September, 1924. John J. Graber.

Hence the block referred to by Dr. Graber as belonging to the late Bishop Kelly in his private capacity has been excluded from this Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND AGENCY COMPANY, LTD., ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.45]: I asked for the adjournment of the debate on this Bill in order that I might have an opportunity of looking at the evidence taken by the select committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is on the Table.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Possibly the measure requires a little looking into, because as regards a company dealing with large sums of money and trust estates, members should know exactly what they are doing. The objects aimed at by the Bill are, in my opinion, entirely desirable. If the Bill passes, the company will be able to place its shares more readily and secure a larger number of shareholders at the reduced denomination of shares. Thus greater security will be afforded in respect of trust moneys invested through the company.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

As to Committee stage.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move—

That consideration of the Bill in Committee be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

This being a private Bill, it is necessary that three days at least should elapse before a further stage is taken.

Question put and passed.

BILL—GROUP SETTLERS' ADVANCES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.50]: I moved the adjournment of the debate because I had heard that by this measure the Government would seek a security over the whole of a group settler's livestock and chattels, including the progeny of the livestock, and also over the crops raised on any holding. Clause 2 of the Bill provides—

Whenever livestock or other chattels are supplied by the Department of Lands and

Surveys to a group settler or other person, and whenever advances are made, and so far as advances have hitherto been made, by the Department of Lands and Surveys to a group settler or other person to enable him (a) to acquire livestock or other chattels; or (b) to cultivate crop, or improve a holding, such livestock and chattels (including the progeny of livestock) and the crops raised on such holding, while growing and afterwards when cut or severed from the soil, shall, by virtue of this Act alone, be mortgaged to and the property therein shall vest in the Minister for Lands, on behalf of His Majesty the King, until the money due from such group settler or other person to the Department of Lands and Surveys in respect of such chattels or advances shall have been paid by such group settler or other person to the Minister.

It was explained by the Honorary Minister that the idea of the Bill was to make the position of a group settler much the same as that of a settler on the Industries Assistance Board. The object undoubtedly is worthy of support, subject to such safeguards as may seem reasonable and proper in the interests of the general public and of those having dealings with group settlers. The difference which presented itself to my mind between the group settler and the man on the wheat belt is this: In the case of the man on the wheat belt the Government sometimes undertake the marketing of the whole of the crop. As a rule the wheat is taken charge of and the Government market it. In the ordinary course it comes by rail, and the Government therefore have a means of noting the wheat coming from the various farms and so securing their lien over it under the Industries Assistance Act. There are cases where frauds have been committed, and it is the duty of the Government and of the public to see that due punishment is administered in such cases, seeing that the offender has been receiving public money to help him to establish himself on his farm. Under the Industries Assistance Act the results of the crop must be paid to the Treasurer.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Government collect the proceeds.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The point is that under Section 10 of the Industries Assistance Amendment Act of 1915, it is provided that even though a settler or a farmer may be given the right to sell his crop, still that does not entitle him to receive payment of the proceeds of the crop. The Treasurer is the only person who is entitled to receive the proceeds of the crop, and any person paying the money to the farmer would not be

discharged. Suppose I came along and purchased from a farmer under the Industries Assistance Board his crop of wheat, then I would be in this position, that if I paid the farmer the amount and he failed to pay it into the Treasury, I would still be liable to the Treasurer, because the property in that wheat is the Government's, and rightly so. The Government can follow that wheat, and if a man has been foolish enough to pay the farmer the purchase price of the wheat he may find himself in the awkward predicament of having to pay twice over if the farmer has not honestly paid the amount over to the Treasury. Now, with regard to the group settlers the position is somewhat different. Wheat, as we know, is a commodity that can readily be taken control of and can easily be watched. Its destination can be followed with much more facility than is possible in the case of dairy products or small crops, such as the group settlers will be raising. I may instance potatoes, vegetables and so forth. The chief purpose to which the group settler will devote his attention, I understand, is dairying and raising small crops. The group settler will also lay out certain parts of his area under pasture, in the past largely of subterranean clover. If hon. members will refer to the last clause of the Bill they will notice that "crops" include sown grasses for permanent pasture. Suppose a man has sown 30 or 50 or 100 acres, according to the size of his block, with some permanent pasture such as subterranean clover, and suppose he gathers the produce of that crop and sells it, as is being done throughout the State, the question then arises whether in the event of my purchasing so many bags of subterranean clover in the burr from the settler and paying him the amount I have agreed with him, I would be doing the right thing. I contend that legally my position would be exactly the same as that of the man who has been foolish enough to purchase wheat from an I.A.B. farmer and paying the amount to him without seeing that it was then paid to the Treasurer.

The Honorary Minister: Why should you not be?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am going to point that out. The wheat farmer is engaged on much more extensive lines of cultivation and on a far bigger scale than the group settler, who deals with comparatively small things. Whilst the wheat farmer crops hundreds or thousands of

acres the group settler works only small areas. Suppose a group settler had 15 or 20 acres under subterranean clover, and had also five or 10 acres in potatoes. The crop he would get from the subterranean clover in the shape of clover burr would be comparatively small, as would also his potato crop. He would want to sell his small produce. Now, there are no central markets or depots to which the produce from group settlers go. If there were a central depot for such produce, all the group settler would need to do would be to dump his produce there and say to the Government, "Let me have credit for that produce at so much." But he must find the market for himself. We know the Government do not undertake the marketing of that produce. The group settler is dealing with small quantities and he may go to the storekeeper in the vicinity, or communicate with some people in the nearest town, and say, "I shall have so many hundredweight of potatoes by a certain date; will you be prepared to take them from me?" Surely the Government will not put a man on each of the groups to deal with matters of this description; the cost would be out of all reason. The position should be made clear as between the group settler and those people to whom the settler happens to sell his produce.

The Honorary Minister: How can you do it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The explanation is very simple. Suppose a man gives a bill of sale over his stock in trade; by virtue of the bill of sale the property and goods pass over to the mortgagee; he becomes virtually the owner. But in business concerns, where people are buying and selling over the counter, invariably what is done is to accept the goods sold in the ordinary way of business so that the people dealing with the individual who has given the bill of sale will not be exposed to the position of having to risk some sort of conflict with the mortgagee. I wish the Minister to understand this position and I think no harm would be done by deferring the further consideration of the Bill for a day or two. I would be only too pleased to discuss the matter with the Crown Law authorities and see whether a suitable provision could be inserted to prevent any possible risk of trouble between the group settler and those with whom he is dealing. Such a provision

as that would not be necessary if the Government had a central depot and actually took the goods from the settler direct. I am saying this in the interests of members whose constituencies actually include the group settlers, because if a conflict should arise between the Government and the settler and the person who may have bona fide purchased produce, it would place the settler in an awkward position and make it difficult for him to sell his produce in the future. It could also be made clear that nothing in such a proviso would affect the security over the livestock, implements or chattels which were included in the security. For example, it would not be a sale "in the ordinary course of business," if a man who got an advance to purchase a cow, sold that cow. That would not be selling the produce of the land. All I am seeking to do is to make it easier to give the opportunity to the group settler to sell his produce without the possibility of coming into conflict with the Government; that is all. If the Honorary Minister will look into the matter he will see there is good reason for what I have stated. I suggest therefore that a clause on the lines I have set out should be included in the Bill.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central—in reply) [5.7]: I appreciate very much the hon. member's viewpoint. I understand exactly what he is aiming at, but I assure him there is no necessity for what he suggests. I previously stated that the group settler would be in the position of a settler under the Industries Assistance Act, but it has to be remembered that we are only dealing in a small way with the position until such time as all the settlers will be able to come under the Agricultural Bank which will then take the full responsibility. I recognise that Mr. Nicholson is endeavouring to be helpful, but I wish to impress upon him that the Bill we are now considering is very urgent. At the same time, it has been framed after mature consideration. Mr. Stewart proposes to move a small amendment to which I have no objection, but with all due respect to Mr. Nicholson, I ask him not to move on the lines he suggested when the Bill reaches Committee. The Bill has had very thoughtful consideration and those members who have group settlers in their districts have also been consulted, as well

as the officials. All have agreed that the Bill is urgently required and will fill the position. I thank Mr. Nicholson for his offer of assistance, but I think he would be better advised not to press the suggestion that he has advanced. Everyone associated with the groups, and likewise with the prosperity of the State, will be satisfied with the Bill as it is.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Advances for chattels, etc., to be a charge thereon:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) after cultivate, the word "and" be inserted.

If the Committee accepts that amendment I shall move for the deletion of the words in the same line "or improve." The line will then read, "to cultivate and crop a holding." It does not seem to me important whether "or" or "and" is inserted. The Minister, however, has intimated that he would prefer "and." The Minister has also accepted the position that I put before the House yesterday and the requirements of the Government will be fully met if they take security over everything except those improvements that have been done to the holding. The Bill as it stands really provides that the mortgages that will come into operation will really remain in operation until the full amount of the advance to the group settler in any particular case, is liquidated.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) the words "or improve" be struck out.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Why strike out these words? Someone might challenge the amount owing to the Government where perhaps portion of the money has been applied towards carrying out improvements, and where, perhaps, another portion has been applied towards cultivating and cropping. I consider the words should remain; it would be a mistake to strike them out.

Hon. H. STEWART: The position is not to protect the security; the Minister said it was to give protection to the Government over movable stock and produce. The Bill is not an attempt to protect the Government in connection with expenditure over individual groups. The object of the paragraph is not to protect the money that has been advanced for the holding, but to give as a mortgage all the produce and the stock supplied. This is only to prevent people from selling stuff off the place, and giving the money to the storekeeper. In my opinion Mr. Nicholson has raised a mares nest.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The clause deals with advances for the improvement of holdings. Some settlers might get an advance for the purchase of wire netting or wire or a new gate, but unless they were prevented from doing so they might sell those articles. If the words "improvement of a holding" are deleted, it may lead to dishonest practices. The honest man has nothing to fear from interference on the part of any Government institution. It would be unwise to delete these words.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Mr. Stewart is rather hyper-sensitive. Because he and the Honorary Minister have agreed to the amendment that is not to say the Committee should not criticise it. Mr. Stewart has failed to give any reason why, if it is necessary for the Government to have a lien over live stock, including the progeny of live stock, and the crops raised on the holding in order to protect the advances that have been made to enable the settler to cultivate and crop his holding, they should not be protected with reference to money advanced for improving a holding.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It is not suggested they should not be protected.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I presume the Government at present have not a lien over these things.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Stewart and I have come to no arrangement. When I saw the amendment on the Notice Paper I could see no reason for it in the first place, but now I see no great objection to it.

Hon. J. EWING: It would be wise not to omit these words. The Minister for Lands says that all stock is being held back pending the passing of the Bill, and we should get it through as quickly as possible.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not wish to relieve the Government of any desired security. The view put forward by Mr. Willmott is the only man that has any real bearing on the amendment. The clause as it stands gives the Government a lien over all the produce resulting from the settler's spare-time effort until the moneys advanced by the Government have been repaid. I would not propose the amendment if I thought it would weaken the security of the Government. I am afraid that the Bill may set up a position that may result in difficulties, in view of our experience in the wheat belt with the I.A.B.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Do I understand that Mr. Stewart proposes to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. H. Stewart: No, not at this stage. I understand that some other members think along the same lines, and do not wish the amendment to be withdrawn.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The amendment will undoubtedly weaken the security of the Government. When the Government advance money to group settlers, the funds go to the settlers' account and probably no distinction is made as between advances for stock, crops, or improvements. If the amendment be agreed to, a settler might contend that the Government had no claim against him respecting advances for improvements. In such circumstances the Government would not know whether the whole or what part of their money was secured adequately.

Hon. H. Stewart: What do you think is the real worth of a security in the form of the annual produce from a group settler's holding?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is not the point. The security is intended to cover past advances as well as any future advances. If the amendment be agreed to, it will be more difficult for the Government to enforce their claims.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: The Bill is necessary and complete. The clause should be passed as it stands.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I support the amendment. Bearing in mind the experiences of settlers in the wheat belt under the I.A.B. and Agricultural Bank, I regard this proposal as merely setting up a similar duplication of work amongst the group set-

tlers. Anything we do in that direction will lead to a further tangle.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Some of them were very tricky and got out of the tangle all right, owing a lot of money to the merchants.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: And the merchants will be in an awkward predicament if they trade with group settlers and find out that the produce belongs to the Government.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: It will be their fault if they do.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The wheat belt farmers did very well. You are arguing against the whole Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It will hamper trade operations. We should endeavour to safeguard the group settlers from getting into a tangle similar to that in which the wheat belt farmers found themselves.

Hon. T. MOORE: You are attacking the whole Bill.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I support the amendment because I know what happened in the wheat belt when the Industries Assistance Board was originally established. It was to be an adjunct to the Agricultural Bank and was established with a view to assisting settlers to continue working their farms. The Bill has a similar objective regarding group settlers. There is no necessity to bring into consideration the fixed improvements as suggested. If a similar proposal had been applied to the wheat belt, the farmers there would still be under the I.A.B. because they would be compelled to place the whole of their returns with the board to wipe out the deficit with the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. T. MOORE: Are you opposing the Bill?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I support the amendment because I believe it will assist the group settlers.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: You are hoping that it will settle the Bill.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: No.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: It will drive a nail into its coffin.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Not at all.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The whole question is whether we are to give the Government power to take a mortgage as security for advances made or to be made. I oppose the amendment. If the Government make advances they should have protection.

Already traders have taken advantage of the position and have lodged caveats, thus putting the Government into an awkward position.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It does not concern the money advanced.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, it concerns any money advanced to improve the holding. The Government are responsible, not only for the money they themselves advance, but for the money advanced by the Imperial Government, and so they must have due protection.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Government have been advancing money for improvements to the holdings, for buildings and for generally settling the settlers, and the inference to be drawn from Mr. Nicholson's remarks is that unless the Bill be passed, the Government will have no security for all the money advanced. The mere fact of our having arrived at that stage justifies the amendment as a lever for eliciting some pronouncement as to what security, if any, there be for the advances made.

Hon. T. MOORE: Whatever may have been done in the past, machinery had to be set up at some stage or other and, it not having previously been set up, it is necessary that it should be set up now. Some hon. members declare that the settlers should not be allowed to trade. However, with the scheme as it is, it becomes necessary that some security should be taken over them, for they are receiving sustenance and are supposed to get nothing more except what may accrue to them for stock they have themselves produced. And this sort of thing is expected to go on until the Agricultural Bank takes them over. What will happen in respect of spare-time work when the settlers are taken over by the bank, remains to be seen. I take the view adopted by Mr. Willmott. Whatever the Government have advanced upon should be the property of the Government until the Agricultural Bank comes in.

Hon. H. STEWART: The discussion has brought us to a better understanding of the position.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It seems the Government have no hold over those properties on which they have spent £2,000 or £3,000.

Hon. H. STEWART: There is nothing definite in the way of security to the Government.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They have no assets yet.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not want to impose conditions that will interfere with the reasonable handling of perishable produce, and so with the permission of the Committee I shall withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I want to ask how it is possible for those settlers to have mortgaged the land to the Government when they have not a title to the land? Under the scheme we agreed to take so many men and settle them for so much money, the land to become theirs under certain conditions. It is not theirs to-day, and the Government cannot take a mortgage from a settler who has no title to the land.

Hon. T. Moore: As yet they have only a permit to occupy.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: As soon as they get the titles to the land the question of mortgage will arise, but not till then.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Then there is no necessity for the Bill.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: There is every necessity for the Bill. The Government have no mortgage, for the very excellent reason that the settlers do not own the land.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: If the Government have been able to get along so far without having any lien upon the holdings or improvements, I do not see any necessity for the Bill. The Government might just as well go on lending the settlers money as before. Having a lien in respect of cattle and chattels is quite right, but there it should stop, while the improvements should be carried out as they have been in the past.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There has been a good deal of confused argument over this. This is not a Bill to give anybody a mortgage over improvements, but to give a mortgage over chattels and stock and crop for money that has been advanced to effect certain things and improvements.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 5—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.59]: I moved the adjournment of the debate because I hoped to bring forward an amendment providing an exemption for the equivalent of a thousand acres of cultivable land, which is provided for in the Assessment Bill in respect of a thousand acres of cultivable land or 2,500 acres of non-cultivable land. On the Address-in-reply I pointed out an anomaly in that the Lands Department grant up to 5,000 acres of grazing land, and the Minister for Lands is hopeful of getting power for the department to allocate larger areas of inferior lands for grazing purposes. The Land and Income Tax Assessment Act does not provide that when a person takes up under a conditional purchase lease 5,000 acres of inferior land as the equivalent to 1,000 acres of first-class land, he shall receive exemption for the first five years. Yet a person taking up first-class land gets the exemption. The anomaly appears to have escaped notice until I directed attention to it on the Address-in-reply. I saw the Solicitor General to-day and he told me it was an anomaly that must be rectified. He promised to get into touch with the Lands Department and the Leader of this House. I hope the Minister will not ask the House to pass the second reading until he is in a position to bring down a suitable amendment to provide for the exemption. I endeavoured to draft an amendment this morning, but concluded that it was a task for a legal man owing to the peculiar wording of various sections of the Land Act. Perhaps the House, too, would give greater credence to an amendment framed by the Solicitor General than to one framed by a layman.

Hon. J. Ewing: Could it be inserted in this Bill?

Hon. H. STEWART: Yes. All that would be necessary would be to provide that the tax should not apply to conditional purchase lands where the area held by one person does not exceed more than 1,000 acres of cultivable land or its equivalent in inferior land. In the past, not many people

have taken up such areas of inferior land, but now that such areas are being allocated, it is futile to continue allocating them if the anomaly that they are not free from taxation for the first five years, as is first-class land, is not remedied.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [6.4]: I hope the second reading will be passed to-day, and that Mr. Stewart or any other member who wishes to move an amendment will have it placed on the Notice Paper so that it can be carefully examined. We shall want to know whether it will conform with the policy of the Government and whether it can rightly be included in the Bill.

HON. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [6.5]: This is a Bill to amend Section 7 of the Land Tax and Income Tax Act, and if we pass it we shall be shot as regards being able to make any amendment.

Hon. J. Ewing: The Minister has replied to the debate.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Anyhow, I have got that point in.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. EWING (South-West) [6.6]: This Bill is apparently the outcome of a request by fruitgrowers who are desirous of keeping their orchards free from fruit fly. A close inspection seems to be necessary, particularly in and around the metropolitan area, where fruit fly is likely to be prevalent. Fruitgrowers naturally desire to keep their orchards free from disease, and they no doubt will appreciate the introduction of this measure. Penalties are provided in the event of disease being found in an orchard and not reported, so that fruitgrowers will need to be particularly careful. Anything that will protect the fruitgrowing industry, however, will be welcomed by those engaged in it. At the South-Western Conference held recently, attention was directed to what is termed the red mite, which is considered to be a dangerous enemy of vegeta-

bles and fruit. At the request of the conference I have made representations to the department, and I would like the Leader of the House to get into touch with the Minister for Agriculture with a view to instructing the Government Entomologist to proceed to the South-West as soon as possible and investigate this disease, together with the clover flea and lucerne flea, which prevail in and around Brunswick.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 2nd September, 1925.

	PAGE
Questions: State Battery, Mt. Keith, removal ...	656
State Children Department, Nurses' Hours ...	656
Hotel Accommodation, Bassendean ...	656
Bills: Primary Products, Marketing, 1R. ...	657
Ministers' Titles, 1R. ...	672
Public Education Endowment, 1R. ...	672
Real Property (Commonwealth Titles), returned ...	672
Divorce Amendment, 2R., Com. ...	673
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R. ...	674
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2R. ...	676
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R. ...	685
Motions: Prisoners, transport ...	657
Fremantle Harbour Trust, to disallow regulations ...	665

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

QUESTION—STATE BATTERY, MT. KEITH; REMOVAL.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that certain vital parts of the Mt. Keith State battery have been removed to the Wiluna State battery and that further material is in process of being shifted? 2, Has this work been carried out with his knowledge?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, (a) Yes. On the 8th January approval was given for reconstruction of Wiluna plant and the use of the gas producer and mechanical sampler from Mount Keith, which had been idle since May, 1922. (b) For some time the Department has been awaiting an opportunity to remove the engine from the pumping station to Wiluna for the same reason as set out in (a), but word has not yet been received that it has been removed. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—STATE CHILDREN DEPARTMENT.

Nurses' hours.

Mr. PANTON asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. S. W. Munsie): 1, Is it a fact that nurses are working 72 hours per week night duty, and 60 hours per week day duty at the State Children's Receiving Depot, Mt. Lawley? 2, If so, will he immediately take steps to reduce the working hours in this depot?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE replied: 1, Yes. 2, The matter is now under consideration. There is a difficulty regarding accommodation.

QUESTION—HOTEL ACCOMMODATION, BASSENDEAN.

Mr. LUTEY (for Hon. W. D. Johnson) asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is he aware that a special effort is being made by a company registered outside the State to secure a publican's general license at Bassendean? 2, Is he aware that while a large section of the local residents would support an hotel they are strongly in favour of its being erected and controlled by the State? 3, If a majority petition is presented to the Minister praying for a State hotel will he favourably consider the matter?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, Yes. (a) A petition from Bassendean has been forwarded by the Governor to the Licenses Reduction Board for report under Subsection 2 of Section 47 of the Licensing Act; and (b) an application has been made to the licensing magistrates in the Midland Junction Court for a provisional certificate for premises situated at Bassendean, in the Guildford licensing district, by one G.