

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 9th December, 1903.

	PAGE.
Motions: Lands Department, Commissioner to be independent	2581
Rabbit-proof Fence, to stop work	2594
Bills: Tramways Act Amendment, first reading	2584
Kalgoorlie Tramways, third reading	2586
Redistribution of Seats, Recommitment, reported	2586
Victoria Park Rates Validation, second reading, in Committee, reported	2600
University Endowment, Assembly's Amendments	2600
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, Assembly's Amendments	2600
Lunacy, Assembly's Amendments	2601
Private Bills: Fremantle Tramways, first reading	2584
Katanning Electric Lighting and Power, third reading	2586
Land Act Amendment (Salvation Army), second reading, in Committee, reported	2591

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

## PRAYERS.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: By-laws of Cue and Yilgarn Roads Boards.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

## MOTION—LANDS DEPARTMENT, COMMISSIONER TO BE INDEPENDENT.

HON. C. A. PIESE (South-East) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the Lands Department of this State should, as far as possible, be removed from political control, and that this object can (without any reflection on the present Ministerial head) be best achieved by the appointment of a Commissioner as permanent head.

He said: As I follow very closely the interests of land settlement in this State, anything that retards that settlement at once engages my attention. During the last three years matters in the Lands Department have not been what the country desires, and the reason is not far to seek. If members will go back in their minds to the time when Mr. Richardson was Minister for Lands and to the following period when Mr. Throssell was in office, they will see that in these two gentlemen we had the practical element required in connection with the successful management of the Lands Department. This successful period lasted from soon after the granting of Responsible Government until about three years ago, when a change in the Government necessitated the appoint-

ment of a new Minister for Lands. From that time till now we have had no less than five Ministers for Lands. In the first place we had Mr. Moran, and then Mr. Sommers, then Mr. Nanson, then Dr. Jameson, and now Mr. Hopkins. I do not desire to say any word that may be thought disrespectful of any of these gentlemen; and I simply state that they all did their best according to the best of their lights. We should not expect much more from any one of them on account of their lack of experience in agriculture and cultivation generally; but the result is that to-day affairs in connection with the lands policy of this State and the settlement of land are not in such a state as they should be. I am prepared to admit those gentlemen have done their very best, but in each instance, and more especially in the cases of Dr. Jameson and Mr. Hopkins, these gentlemen have had to acquire experience before they could take up the management of the department. I do not wish to say they are not as able as others; I simply say they have done their best—and I may say that especially with regard to Mr. Hopkins—to fill the position as it should be filled. However, they lacked experience. This is a big earning department receiving considerable revenue from the sale of lands, and if we look at the matter from a business point of view, all must admit that to have constant changes of managers, as it were, must retard the good work the department would otherwise do under a permanent head, instead of having so many changes—five Ministers in three years. These Ministers in each instance have felt it incumbent upon them to introduce ideas of their own, and naturally they have influenced the officers of the department in that direction. It is only right that they should do so; but when we come to consider that these gentlemen have taken up these positions without any previous experience, I maintain it is unfair to the country to ask them to conduct the management of the department as we do. We should have a permanent head, some one like the Commissioner of Railways or the Collector of Customs. If we had laws well laid down and defined, and without the latitude allowed in our present laws—for we have laws which are being twisted

according to the views of the Minister in charge of the department in all manner of shapes—there would be no difficulty in fixing a head for that department to carry them out, and we would have no radical changes unless Parliament desired it. A Minister for Lands would still exist to be the mouthpiece of the department, but it is necessary that a permanent head should as far as possible be appointed. It is only human nature after all, and I do not wish to say this sort of thing does exist in the Lands Department, that Ministers will be swayed by the fact that officers in their department are electors. Numbers of clerks in the Lands Department are electors in the Premier's district. Supposing some of these men are incompetent. Look at the difficult position in which we place the Minister. Should he insist on putting his foot down and dismissing a man, it was within reason that political influence could be brought to bear.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Do you think he would be swayed?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I do not.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then why mention it?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I am only showing the difficulty in which we place the Minister. It is only an honorary position. I consider the pay nothing in proportion to the responsibility; and I think it is unfair to ask any man to take up a position like this, unless under him there is a manager like the Commissioner of Railways, who could say whether a man was to be dismissed and would accept the responsibility. This would make the position more simple for any member of Parliament who would devote his services to the office. I do not say that there are officers in that department who should be dismissed. My experience of the Lands Department is that the officers there are all very good hard working fellows, who work day and night; but it is human nature that political influence should take place. Why should the political head be saddled with the dismissal of men? I maintain that the permanent head should be saddled with that responsibility, and with the responsibility of cutting out any drones that may exist in the office. I need not labour this matter much farther, but

would like to point out that it is unfair to the department itself and unfair to the officers to have so many changes in the head of the department—five Ministers having been in office during three years. The hon. member knows very well as a business man that it is a very bad thing to be changing managers every six months. We all know responsibility is thrown upon their shoulders.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What powers would you give the Commissioner?

HON. C. H. PIESSE: This matter has been in my mind for a considerable time, but I am not prepared to lay down any fixed scheme. I think something should be done in justice to the gentleman who occupies the position. Consider the amount of work thrown on the hands of the Minister. It is not fair that this should be done, but altogether wrong. There should be a responsible head, who should hold his position no matter what Government was in power.

HON. G. RANDELL: There should be a continuous policy, is that it?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: A continuous policy.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: Supposing it were a bad one?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Let Parliament alter it.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: You could not move it.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There would be no trouble about that. We lay down the laws and we must have a permanent head to carry them out. I think members must agree that there is something in the contention that there should be a permanent head, and that the Minister for Lands should not have thrown upon his shoulders the responsibility he has at present. It is altogether wrong. This is a big concern and Ministers should not be asked to take up with that class of work.

HON. G. RANDELL: Would you relieve the Minister of every responsibility?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I would relieve him of a great deal, and allow him to control matters of policy. I trust members will give this matter a little consideration.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): This, I think I am justified in saying, is a peculiar motion,

and its peculiarity is added to by the time of the session at which it is introduced. It is a motion which involves in the case of the Lands Department a complete reversal of policy; a motion which in my opinion, and according to the language in which the hon. gentleman has couched it, strikes at the root of responsible government; and a motion which I do not think for a moment the House would agree to. The hon. member said he was quite willing to have it applied to all departments. Since I have had the honour of being in this Chamber he has made the Lands Department the special object of his attention, and he intends to deal first of all with that department. The hon. member appears to have lost sight, in his remarks, of the fact that there is in the Lands Department a gentleman known as the Under Secretary of Lands who practically is fulfilling the functions which it is proposed the commissioner would fulfil in the future. That being so, I do not think that the Under Secretary requires any more power than he has at present, a power gracefully conceded to him by every one of the five Ministers the hon. member has enumerated who have been in possession of that portfolio during the last few years. The hon. member talks about shifting responsibility. I say if you shift responsibility, if you make the Minister merely, to use the hon. member's own words, "a mouthpiece" in Parliament of what is proposed by a commissioner, you will interfere with the status of the Minister and introduce a dangerous and most pernicious practice into a department where it is not required. The hon. member is pleased to say in the motion that this object can be achieved without any reflection upon the present Ministerial head. It certainly appears to me that the fact of the proposition being made is to a certain extent a reflection on the Ministerial head. [HON. C. A. PRESSE: No.] The hon. member, referring to the five Ministers, went on to say that none of the five had any experience. It is true the experience of some of the Ministers has not been gained in this State, but I think that, if one takes the present holder of that portfolio and judges him by his action and by his record, it will be admitted he has proved he has had experience, and that experience

has done him a large amount of good. With regard to the reorganisation of the department, I think I may say that the department is being reorganised and brought up to date at present at a rate which was never approached before. Mr. Hopkins found the department very much behind in certain particulars, and the work was a long way behind date; but with the assistance of the Government, who are spending, I forget what it is this year, but somewhere about £20,000 in employing extra assistance and extra labour, we hope to bring affairs in the Lands Department as much up to date as possible. The Government do not begrudge the money to do that, and feel certain that in Mr. Hopkins they have a man of youth and energy who will see it is done. I do not believe that the hon. member, having expressed his opinion, wishes to press the motion to a division. [HON. C. A. PRESSE: No; I do not.] If he did, I hope the House would not carry it. I would like to be plain with him, and to say that at present the Government have no intention to put the procedure advocated into practice. I can, however, promise him that as soon as his speech gets into print I most certainly will bring it under the notice of my colleague, the Minister for Lands, who, I have no doubt, will bring it under the notice of the Cabinet. I think the analogy the hon. member drew between a business concern and a Ministerial department is wrong. He alludes to a Minister as the manager of a department, and occupying the same position as the manager of a business; but I think that the manager is the permanent head; the Under Secretary, and the Minister takes the position of a director. The Minister defines the policy to be pursued by the department he administers, of course with the assistance and farther direction of Parliament, wherein he has an advantage over the ordinary company director, unless we can class Parliament as the shareholders in the concern, to whose dictum those directors have to bow. I think that the analogy was wrong, and as most of the arguments were based upon that analogy I am afraid that many of them must fall through. I hope the hon. member will not proceed with the motion. I am perfectly willing to take the course

I have indicated to him, that is to bring his arguments under the notice of the Minister controlling the department, who so far as I can learn is not very enthusiastic about them. I will urge Mr. Hopkins to lay the matter before the Cabinet at an early date. Perhaps if the hon. member had brought the motion before the Chamber earlier in the session an agreement might have been arrived at in time to communicate it to Parliament, but I do not think that will be the case in the present instance.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (in reply as mover) : I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that I have no desire to push this motion, for I merely wanted an expression of opinion. I brought this forward in good faith, and have said what I meant to say. I do not wish to cast any reflection. I recognise that in the present holder of the portfolio we have an energetic and deserving Minister, and I think it is a shame that he should be hampered to the extent he is. I know he is hampered in that office, the department being a tremendous one.

Question put and negatived.

#### TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

#### FREMANTLE TRAMWAYS BILL

(PRIVATE).

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by HON. R. LAURIE, read a first time.

#### MOTION—RABBIT-PROOF FENCE, TO STOP WORK.

Debate resumed from the previous day, on the motion by HON. C. E. DEMPSTER to stop the work and to assist settlers to fence their holdings with wire netting.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Walter Kingsmill) : It is not my intention to support the motion. The action taken by the Government in respect to minimising as far as possible the evil effects which would be caused by an incursion of rabbits has been taken after mature consideration, after consideration which I think members will agree with me has been, on the part, if not of this Government, at all events a previous Government, a little premature.

They have been talking about the subject since 1897, and when at last we are dealing with it at high pressure I think the remarks of the hon. member as expressed in his motion are scarcely generous. Now, with the regard to the policy that is pursued of erecting a fence, to which principally the hon. member objects, I may say the Government have been guided by all the expert advice they could obtain from the Eastern States, which advice I presume would be at least as valuable as the opinions expressed by the hon. member in his idea of keeping the rabbits out by fencing. For my own part, I have seen a great deal of rabbit country and a great many rabbits from my early youth, and my experience has been that, while it is very difficult indeed to stop rabbits from coming in in any way whatever, the best way to stop them is by fencing, for the reason that, instead of having to deal with the rabbits in battalions, we deal with them by means of fences in detail—we are able at all events my means of a fence to get that advantage. The experience of the hon. member who speaks against fencing is not borne out by those gentlemen consulted personally and by letter by the present Minister for Lands and other Ministers for Lands before fencing was finally decided on. It is the intention of the Government not alone to push on as quickly as possible with the first line of fence, but to erect a second line as quickly as possible, and we feel that, although the expense is large, the result to this State is of such immense value that the money spent in keeping out this pest, which has devastated the pastoral lands of Eastern Australia, must be money well spent. I feel satisfied that the measures being taken by the Government are the best possible measures. They have been taken after consideration that has been almost too mature, backed up by the experience of gentlemen of large and varied experience in this direction whom the Government have consulted. There is another important matter in regard to which this motion deals. It says in the latter part of the motion, "and in lieu thereof that every assistance should be afforded to settlers to efficiently fence in their holdings with wire netting when and wherever it may be necessary to prevent the

invasion of these pests." The inference is that the Government are not rendering every assistance to settlers to fence in their holdings. I thought Mr. Dempster ought to be one of the last to use that argument.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Quite right. I meant to convey that, if such an enormous amount of money was not spent on the present fence, the Government would have more to spend in other directions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: So far the Government have not felt the pinch of poverty in the direction indicated, nor is it thought they will be likely to do so. I do not think that any expense with this object, and with such a reasonable chance of carrying out the object, can be classed as wasteful; and so long as it is not wasteful, members in both Houses will not object to keeping this great pest out of Western Australia as much as possible. All arrangements are made whereby settlers can obtain wire netting for the purpose of fencing in their holdings on terms which I think are extremely generous and extremely liberal. I have here certain regulations under which this wire can be obtained. I will summarise them. In the first place, in regard to terms the man who applies for the netting gets in on 20 years' terms. Can the Government make more liberal conditions than that? Arrangements are being made whereby it is hoped that the carriage of netting to whatever part it is to be supplied at will be materially decreased to the people who wish to erect a fence. There again is an instance where the Government are straining every nerve to assist the industry. Again, it is proposed to check any wasteful expenditure by providing that an inspector shall examine the land that is to be fenced. Looking at this individual fencing as a substitute for the erection of a barrier fence, while this system of individual fencing is extremely satisfactory to the person who puts up the fence, it is extremely bad for those persons who come along and wish afterwards to take up lands which are unoccupied at the time this individual fencing is put up. The hon. member may not be aware of the fact, but I may tell him that country which is eaten out by rabbits takes a long time to recover. Rabbits

seem to have almost a poisonous agency with which they devastate land. Therefore we would render useless all the country not fenced in, an argument which members should study well before they decide to support the motion of the hon. member. It means that we save some holdings at the expense of practically stopping settlement. [HON. W. MALEY: No.] My reason for saying so is the personal experience I have had in the north-east of South Australia, a part with which I think the hon. member is well acquainted. I think this is an argument which could be well and legitimately used for the necessity of having both barrier fencing and individual fencing. The Government have used every effort to enable both schemes to be carried out, and I think that is a reasonable attitude to take up. I do not think that at this somewhat late hour motions of this sort, calculated if carried to somewhat embarrass the operations of the Government, should be passed by Parliament. With regard to the suggestion of Mr. Bellingham for simultaneously carrying out surveying and fencing, I am informed by the Minister for Lands that this is being done by giving the surveyors a start of a few miles on the people putting up the fence. It is thus possible—and I believe it can be done—to carry out survey work and the construction of the fence at the same time. The Government realise to the fullest extent the gravity of the situation, and they are making every effort to have fencing of both kinds—that advocated by the hon. member and the barrier fences, which are part of their policy—carried out as expeditiously and successfully as possible.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (in reply as mover): The Colonial Secretary has put rather a different construction on my motion from that which I would wish him to entertain. I had reason to believe there was cause for moving in the matter, and that the Government would be willing to have an expression from this House. I act on the opinions given to me by those who have had great experience with rabbits in the Eastern States.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not go into any fresh subject. He may reply to objections raised.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I think this all deals with objections raised, and I think that in all fairness I may be allowed a little latitude.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member cannot make a second speech.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I did not intend to reflect on the Government at all, and I am sure they have been anxious to do all they can in the interests of the State. The firm of Dempster Brothers applied to the Government for assistance, and were assisted with material in every possible way; and as one of the firm I cannot say anything against the Government in that matter. However, I thought the Government would be glad to have an expression from this House, and I think there are very many reasons why those who have the interests of the State at heart should express similar opinions to mine. I did not think the Government would be hurt and injured in any way. The matter of constructing a fence from the south coast to the north coast is not the simple thing many people think it is. We have to take into consideration the state of the country through which it passes, and the enormous extent of it which is waterless. I do not suppose in the whole district there is a permanent water supply or a water supply that would last 12 months. It is a most difficult and costly undertaking, and the rabbits are already in many cases on this side of the portion of the fence so far constructed. In that case I think it would be well to hesitate before spending any farther money in that direction.

MEMBER: They are at Northam now.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I believe they are at Northam. I certainly think I have done right in bringing the matter forward. The distance which has already been covered by the fence is not very great, and if the expense were stopped and assistance rendered to those people who have pastoral leases and those who have selections, it would be very desirable. When a fence is erected around good grazing or agricultural land, or a holding of any kind, it is a permanent fence and affects the value of the property for all time. This barrier fence does not enclose anybody's land. It is simply a fence to keep any rabbits back. These rabbits are not coming here in large bodies. I form that opinion from

the fact that rabbits are already distributed from Esperance to Mt. Leonora. They have been seen all through this district in a number of places, and are not in one party, but are distributed all over the country. True that country is not much good. There is an enormous extent of it that is utterly useless, and will be for many years to come. It is waterless and subject to drought. We want to keep the rabbits out of the part of the State that is more profitable and will be more profitable in the future. With a view of obtaining expressions of opinion of the members of the House I put this matter forward, and if I have been wrong in doing so I give way to the ruling of the House, but I trust members will not take that view of it. I wish to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

#### KATANNING ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND POWER BILL (PRIVATE).

Read a third time, on motion by Hon. G. RANDALL, and *passed*.

#### KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

#### REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS BILL.

##### RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Bill recommitted for amendments and new clause.

Clause 2—Electoral Provinces, First Schedule:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendments on the Notice Paper, if accepted, would render the Bill absolutely self-contained, and not dependent on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill now before the Committee. By the Constitution Act Amendment Bill it was provided that the Constitution Acts Amendment Act of 1899 was repealed. If anything were to happen to the Constitution Act Amendment Bill now before the House—which he was sure all devoutly hoped would not be the case—we should be in the awkward position of having a redistribution in the existing Act of 1899 which had not been repealed. It was therefore proposed to insert at the beginning of Clause 2 of this Bill "Notwithstanding anything contained in 'Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899,' to the contrary," and to strike out "under

'The Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1903.'" He moved the first of these amendments.

HON. J. W. HACKETT saw no objection to the amendment.

Amendment passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY farther moved that the words "under the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1903" be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Clause 3—Electoral Districts, Second Schedule:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that after "Assembly" the following be inserted as the beginning of a clause to stand as Clause 4:—"Notwithstanding anything contained in the 'Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899'"; also that the words "Until otherwise determined by Parliament" be transposed to follow the word "shall," in line 3. This amendment would have the effect of splitting up the present Clause 3 into two clauses, and it dealt with two different subjects, again emphasising the disconnection of this Bill from the Bill for amending the Constitution.

Amendment passed.

New Clause—Amendment to be passed by absolute majority of members of Council and Assembly:

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the following be inserted as Clause 3:—

It shall not be lawful to present to the Governor for His Majesty's assent any Bill to amend this Act, unless the second and third readings of such Bill shall have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members for the time being of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly respectively.

It was almost a formal matter, and simply retained the power the Constitution gave at present to insist that any Bill that fundamentally altered the Constitution should be agreed to by a majority of both Houses.

Question passed, and the clause inserted in the Bill.

*First Schedule (Provinces)*—South-West:

On motion by Hon. J. W. HACKETT the word "Swan" struck out.

South Province:

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved:

'That "Boulder, Hannans West, and Ivanhoe" be struck out, and "Menziess" inserted in lieu,

Members would have another opportunity of deciding on this matter after farther consideration of the point. Great injustice was done by including these districts in the South Province, and members would have no desire to do anything but what was right and just. The strongest objection to the schedule was that the whole of the voting power on the Eastern Goldfields was given to Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Many of the returns made available to members were totally unreliable. It would have been better to obtain from the various registrars the number of names on the new rolls.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not the Council rolls.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: Yes. That the figures quoted by Mr. Connolly were wrong could be proved by telegrams he (Hon. J. T. Glowrey) had in his possession. He was unable to get the figures for Hannans West, but he understood there were 3,500 Assembly voters on the roll, and that about the same number of voters resided in the Ivanhoe district. Both these districts were practically portions of Kalgoorlie. The proposed alterations would not affect any province except the South and the North-East. The number of Upper House electors in the Coolgardie district had increased by 140, while there was a considerable increase in the Mount Burges district. The select committee did not have all the information before it, and unfortunately the two goldfields members appointed on that select committee were representatives of Kalgoorlie.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That matter should have been looked after when the committee was appointed.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: For that reason he now asked the House to see that justice was done to the districts on the Eastern Goldfields outside Kalgoorlie and Boulder. As the Bill stood now the six goldfields members would practically represent Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and places like Southern Cross, Norseman, Ravensthorpe and Siberia would be disfranchised. An exception appeared to have been made in regard to these particular provinces. In other provinces most of the old boundaries were retained, but in this case a very drastic alteration was made. He believed a fair compromise would be arrived at by the

exclusion of Boulder, Hannans West and Ivanhoe districts, and by the inclusion of Menzies.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: The inclusion of Menzies would mean an additional 200 voters to the province.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: By the hon. member's own figures it would be nearly 400. As mining representatives were equally divided on the point he asked other hon. members to give due consideration to his claim, and he asked members of the select committee to believe that they were perfectly right in voting against their own recommendation, thus giving justice to certain portions of the Eastern Goldfields.

HON. C. SOMMERS: The Committee should not accept the amendment. This matter was very fully discussed at a previous sitting, and the final division defeated the proposal by 14 votes to 10.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: What about the first division?

HON. C. SOMMERS: That was a tie decided on the casting vote of the Chairman. Should the amendment be carried it would mean that the South Province would have a total strength of 1,074 Upper House voters, made up as follows:—Coolgardie, 441; Dundas, 174; Yilgarn, 106; and Menzies, on the old boundaries, which were now altered, 353. The adjoining province would have a total of 3,820, if the hon. member got his way. The hon. member had a telegram as to figures, but he (Mr. Sommers) took it that the House would accept the official records. He did not for a moment think the House would consent to one mining province containing 1,074 voters and another mining province containing 3,820. Some members had stayed away from the House, believing that the question was settled once and for all.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The amendment should be carried. The province as at present constituted was the original goldfield of the East. A great deal had been made by the representatives of the province adjoining the South Province with regard to their area. He and those with him fancied that province had a large area, and they were willing to take area from it, but what they complained about was that there was an endeavour to put into the South Province one of the two large towns in

that district. It was distinctly unfair for districts such as the South Province to be taxed by having a town which would considerably outvote the other electors in relation to the Legislative Council; and the district from Yilgarn to Coolgardie was sufficiently important to deserve a province. A large town like Boulder or Kalgoorlie in the same province as Coolgardie or Yilgarn would be like killing a dog because it was wounded. Because there was a mining slump, it was proposed to take from Coolgardie a representative in the Council. Coolgardie and Boulder were different mining districts, worked with different processes. Members of the South Province were perfectly willing to have a town and district like Menzies, or if that was not according to members' ideas they would not mind going farther north. The South Province was growing in population at the present time, whereas Kalgoorlie and the Boulder were at the apex, having the highest population they would ever get. In the South Province new fields were opening every day, and during the last six months no less than five discoveries had been made; consequently people were looking forward to a great increase in population. During the last six months there had been an increase, and Southern Cross was never busier than it was to-day. If Coolgardie and the Boulder were in the same province there would be a continual inclination for the Boulder people to vote for a Boulder man and for the Coolgardie people to vote for a Coolgardie man. There probably would be parochial feeling. Kalgoorlie and Boulder were now connected by tramline and their interests were identical. To have Coolgardie in the same province as Boulder would be like tacking Subiaco on to Perth. Doubtless Perth would overwhelm Subiaco in a vote as Kalgoorlie would overwhelm Coolgardie.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: It was understood by him that the Redistribution of Seats Bill would not be on a population basis, but rather on a territorial basis. The interests of Kalgoorlie and Boulder were bound up together and they certainly should be in one province, instead of Boulder being in a position to dominate the votes of the South Province. Coolgardie was something like 26 miles from the Boulder, whereas Kal-



goorlie was connected with the Boulder by tram, being only a mile or two distant. It would not be fair for the other towns in the South Province and a vast extent of territory in that province to be dominated by the overwhelming vote in the Boulder. The South Province should have a fair vote and fair representation by members in this House. The Bill gave the six seats for the Eastern goldfields to Kalgoorlie and Boulder. The House should not regard these provinces on a population basis. If a population basis were adopted we might have to reconsider the granting of the North Province with only 500 voters. It was not fair that the whole of the Eastern Goldfields should be represented by members chosen from Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and this vast extent of country should not have a centralisation representative in this House.

HON. S. J. HAYNES supported the amendment, because he saw perfectly well that if Boulder was included in the South Province the dominating power would be the Kalgoorlie and Boulder votes, as these centres were practically one. The representatives of the two cities might differ among themselves on some matters, but on provincial matters they would vote together, and the outside centres would be practically submerged by the strength of the voting power in the two cities. The danger would arise also that six members would sit in the House solidly for Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER supported the amendment. It was unfair that Coolgardie, Bonnievale, Burbanks, Londonderry, Esperance, Ravensthorpe, and Southern Cross, all very important localities with great probabilities, should be dominated by Kalgoorlie and Boulder. These districts were fairly entitled to proper representation.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: This question was very fully debated at a previous sitting in a House of 24 members, and although the first division resulted in a tie, when the other divisions were taken the voting power against the proposals of Mr. Glowrey grew stronger until the last division was 14 votes to 10. Surely that was sufficient. Should the amendment be now carried its opponents would have to recommit the Bill once

more. It was always necessary to have one dominating centre in a province. At present Coolgardie dominated the province, and the inclusion of Menzies would make little alteration. As a matter of fact, by the rearrangement of the Menzies electorate only 150 Council voters could be included in the South Province, so that there would only be 1,030 voters in that province as against nearly 4,000 in the North-East Province. Surely no separate interests could arise between Boulder and Coolgardie. He was happy to say there was no parochial interests on the goldfields at the present, and where these parochial interests did not arise provinces should be arranged on a population basis. On this point the select committee decided unanimously. It would not be right to go back on a division taken in a full House, otherwise there would be no finality to any matter. Was the House to consider that a test vote once taken was a final decision, or was it going to allow the matter to be reopened night after night?

HON. W. T. LOTON: It seemed to be a question whether Kalgoorlie and Boulder should remain one or be separate. The South Province evidently did not desire to have one of these towns in its area because it would be a dominating power. The arrangement of the provinces was not altogether on a population basis, but the select committee considered the division adopted by the Committee to be the fairest and most equal in area and population. It was unfortunate this feeling should have arisen between the representatives of the two provinces, but recognising that all the interests on the goldfields were identical and that the country would be more equally divided as to area and population by the scheme of the select committee, he would still feel bound to support the recommendation of that committee.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It was somewhat unfortunate that this division of opinion should arise between mining members. A crucial division taken on this question showed that there were three goldfields members on one side and three on the other, though he had hoped we should have a unanimous vote from mining members. The sole desire of agricultural and metropolitan members was to do what a majority of the mining

members desired. Unfortunately there was an even division of opinion among those mining members, so other members must make up their minds on other grounds. He took a great interest in the debate, and felt the great strength and force of the remarks of Mr. Glowrey, Mr. Bellingham, and others. When the matter was first presented to the attention of the select committee he was penetrated by the argument that the proposed division would give Kalgoorlie a province and Boulder a province; but he could not now accept Mr. Glowrey's proposal in its present shape in place of the recommendation of the select committee. Mr. Glowrey practically proposed that a province of 1,000 electors should be formed as against a province of 3,000 electors. The House could not assent to the creation of such a province.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: The hon. member should look at the territories.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Dominant importance was not attached to the question of acres.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: What about the North Province?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That province was entirely formed to represent the pastoral industry. In the case of the goldfields provinces their interests were identical, just as the three agricultural provinces had identical interests. The agricultural provinces averaged as nearly as possible 1,700 voters each. In the same way we should distribute the electors in the mining provinces. He would have desired to have Boulder and Kalgoorlie form one province, as was done in the case of Perth with its enormous electorate of 4,500 voters and the suburban province with 1,000 less; but such a scheme did not commend itself to the Government or to the select committee. We were then driven back upon the proposal made by the select committee. If Mr. Glowrey could have seen his way to construct a province out of the outlying districts which would have given a nearer approximation to the number of electors in the province containing Kalgoorlie, the hon. member would have had his<sup>2</sup> (Dr. Hackett's) vote. Now, however, he (Dr. Hackett) was prepared to vote for the recommendation of the select committee.

HON. C. SOMMERS: All he asked was that the House should consider interests that were identical, and then make as far as possible an equal division of votes. If we did what Mr. Glowrey desired, one province would have 1,074 voters and the other 3,820. As to area, the area of the two provinces was about equal. With regard to discoveries being made, that argument was as likely to apply to one mining district as another.

HON. W. MALEY: The South Province had not had a fair trial. Its representatives were all young members to this House and had their spurs to win, but we had reason to be proud of the South Province through the way in which those representatives conducted the business of their constituents in this House by debate and in every other particular. Now, after three years, the boundaries of the South Province were to be entirely altered, but it had not been shown that the territory which that old province comprised had been backward in regard to development. Its energy had been manifest. Discoveries had been made, developments had occurred, and apparently there was a very bright future for the province, if it was not interfered with. It was a misfortune that the select committee made any alteration in the South Province. It was also a misfortune that the committee suggested any alteration of the other agricultural provinces, seeing that neither the South-Eastern Province nor the South Province was represented on the committee. Apparently the select committee were very strong in protecting the interests of those who sat on the committee, but they did not consider as they might have done the interests of those provinces not represented, so he dismissed from his mind the recommendations of the select committee. He would vote with Mr. Glowrey.

HON. G. RANDELL said he would vote for the recommendation of the select committee, though he had some sympathy with members representing the South Province. We should not be justified in having one province with, say, in round numbers 1,000 voters, alongside another province, with the same interests, having 3,500 voters. The only alternative seemed to him to be for

Coolgardie to take all there was outside Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and the immediate surroundings, but that would, of course strike one as being preposterous, and we should be having interests which would be divergent between the South-East and the North-East. We must leave out personal considerations, and endeavour to do the best we could to make the constituencies and provinces as equal as possible.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Members in the Southern Province would not mind the alterations so far as they themselves were concerned, but they were looking purely at the injustice done to that province. As an alternative he would ask the committee to give the province Menzies and Kanowna. The people on the Coolgardie fields were pretty old inhabitants, being men of steady ideas and not likely to have fancy legislation or drastic reforms. They had always been steady politicians and cool in counsel, and they deserved better consideration than they were getting from this House at the present time. As to the select committee, it was distinctly unfair to put two members of the South-East Province on that committee, and leave the South Province out altogether. He made this final appeal not to disfranchise, regarding the Legislative Council, the old district that started the name of Western Australia as a gold producer, but to give her the right of representation which she fully deserved.

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

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

Majority against ... 6

Ayes.  
Hon. G. Bellingham  
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage  
Hon. C. E. Dempster  
Hon. J. T. Glowrey  
Hon. S. J. Haynes  
Hon. W. Maley  
Hon. J. M. Drew  
(Teller).

Noes.  
Hon. E. M. Clarke  
Hon. J. D. Connolly  
Hon. J. W. Hackett  
Hon. A. G. Jenkins  
Hon. W. Kingsmill  
Hon. R. Laurie  
Hon. W. T. Loton  
Hon. C. A. Piesse  
Hon. G. Randell  
Hon. J. E. Richardson  
Hon. Sir George Shenton  
Hon. C. Sommers  
Hon. J. A. Thomson  
(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived, and the First Schedule as amended agreed to.

At 6-30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.  
At 7-30, Chair resumed.

*Second Schedule*—Coolgardie Electoral District:

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: Having desired to amend the boundaries of this district, he had given notice of an amendment; but seeing the attitude of the House as displayed by the recent division, he did not desire to push it.

Amendment not moved.

Bill reported with farther amendments, and the report adopted.

# LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

## SALVATION ARMY SETTLEMENT.

### SECOND READING.

HON. C. SOMMERS (North-East), in moving the second reading, said: I do not intend to detain the House at any great length. I have been asked by the leader of the Salvation Army in this State to take charge of the Bill which was introduced into the Legislative Assembly by Mr. Nanson, the late Minister for Lands. The desire is that the ground now held by the Salvation Army in the Collie district should be reclassified by the officers of the Lands Department. Some years ago the Army desired to select 160,000 acres at Collie for the purpose of forming an oversea colony. At that time an inducement was held out to General Booth to establish such a colony; but some feeling was shown against the proposal, and the Army were induced to alter their scheme. General Booth was allowed to believe that he could take up land in this State as an ordinary selector, but permission to take up such a large area was refused. General Booth then applied through his agents for something like 20,000 acres. Suddenly, however, lands in the South-West were reclassified, and no one was allowed to take up land in the district other than first-class land. These Salvation Army people had no knowledge of the value of the land in the State, and being anxious, as they had already made arrangements to establish some sort of settlement in this State, not to abandon their idea, they took up 20,000 acres under 20 different names. A private Bill was passed to enable the whole of these lands to be taken up under one name.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: In the name of General Booth.

HON. C. SOMMERS: Yes. It was in order to establish this colony at Collie. The only concession made to this denomination was that all the improvements were allowed to be concentrated on a small area. Under the Land Act they should expend not less than £10,000. I think up to the present something like £22,000 has been spent on the land, being over double what they were compelled to spend under the Act. They found, however, after some seven or eight years' work on this spot, that they had been very much misled as to the quality of the land, and that, instead of having first-class land for which they are paying 10s. per acre, the land they have, to say the very least of it, is second-class land. The greater portion of it is really third class. The evidence taken by the select committee included that of Mr. Suttor, of the Salvation Army, Mr. H. F. Johnston, Surveyor General, Hon. G. Throssell and other prominent gentlemen of the State. Members will see that the amount of first-class land owned by the Salvation Army is really only 1,000 acres, and instead of this 1,000 acres being in one block it consists of narrow pieces of land in the valleys and gullies, so in order to cultivate 1,000 acres they have to scatter all over many miles of country, which makes it very difficult and very expensive to work. What they desire is that they should be treated now just as an ordinary selector is. This is a special case, and it is not to benefit one particular man, because General Booth holds the land just the same as Bishop Gibney holds land for the Roman Catholic Church; he holds it in trust. The Salvation Army have spent £22,000 in developing the land, they have settled a great number of people there, the industrial schools are well conducted, farming operations are quite up to date in every way, and the place is a good training ground for young people committed to their charge instead of being sent to gaol or to industrial schools. In every possible way these people should be encouraged. They made a very great mistake in relation to the land, and instead of the Army having to pay 10s. an acre the Government should be empowered by this Bill to re-classify the land and then charge them according to classification. If the Government officers, after the passing

of this Bill, classify the land as second-class or half of it as second-class and the other as third-class, the Army will pay accordingly. This is a moderate request on the part of these people, who have no personal interest to serve. The Bill has passed the Legislative Assembly and has been recommended by a select committee. In every way it is commended to the House. All that the Salvation Army ask for is to have a reclassification, and that they should be allowed to surrender an area of land not exceeding 2,000 acres and to take up a fresh piece some 16 miles away in lieu thereof. They require this land by way of exchange, a change of country being necessary for their stock. Those members versed in pastoral pursuits know that in the South-Western district, or in that part of the country, cattle are apt to become cripples unless they can get a change of pasture. The Salvation Army had bitter experience, and if they cannot get a change of land for their cattle, they will almost be compelled to give up stock keeping. From the report of the evidence of the select committee Mr. Suttor gave a brief history of the case, and in his reply to a question by Mr. Illingworth as to what money was spent, he said "£22,000," the sum being spent in this way: "in buildings £10,000, in stock and plant £5,000, in clearing £2,500, in fencing £2,500, and the remaining £2,000 in sundries." The Army only desire that their land shall be classified by the inspectors of the Government, and that they shall pay for it accordingly. It will be seen that the department sent down Mr. W. W. Thompson, one of their officers, to inspect the country, and he reports very unfavourably on the quality of the land. The inspector examined it thoroughly, and in his evidence he states that he does not think there is more than 1,000 acres of good agricultural land in the whole of the 20,000 acres selected. That means that they are being charged 10s. an acre for 20,000 acres, whereas the quantity of first-class land in the whole area is only 1,000 acres, the rest being second-class and third-class. In reply to Mr. Burges, Mr. Suttor states that on the 20,000 acres they have 500 merino sheep, and about 120 head of cattle. Seeing that the land has been enclosed and subdivided I do

not think we want much greater evidence of the poorness of the land, when we find that is all the stock the land has carried.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Have the stock done well?

HON. C. SOMMERS: This estate has been run by quite a practical and up-to-date manager, a man whose heart and soul is in the work, and I think those who have visited the settlement will agree with me that it has been very well run. They started with 4,000 sheep, but owing to the poverty of the land the number has now dwindled down to 500. Mr. Suttor stated that they perished in the winter, and in reply to Mr. Burges as to the cattle, he said they were doing better, but they got the rickets through eating the zamia palms. He said that they required this change of country. The 2,000 acres it is proposed the Government shall give are to be granted for the surrender of 2,000 acres out of the 20,000. Mr. Hopkins, the Minister for Lands, was examined, and he states he is in accord with reclassification. When he is asked what he thinks of it after a personal inspection, he says:—

I certainly think there is little if any first-class land on the holding. It appeared to me to consist principally of third-class land, and in many instances very inferior third-class land. There is one compensating feature in some places, the existence of some passable jarrah, which of course would be taken into consideration. The proposal is simply to ask the department to do for the Army what we do for every other selector, that is to classify the lands. The Army have 20,000 acres under a private Act. Four persons could have applied for that area as grazing leases of 5,000 acres each. Then we would have classified and have secured it subject to classification. In this instance the whole of the land has been classed as first-class.

Mr. Illingworth asked Mr. Hopkins:

We have it in evidence that only about 1,000 acres of it could be called first-class land, and that is scattered about in pockets. Is that your experience?—Undoubtedly it is so. There is no large area to the best of my belief—no large continuous area—of first-class land. It consists principally of patches and flat country here and there. I do not know of anything that would be more convincing to the committee than that they should pay a visit to the estate if it can be arranged.

I think in the face of that I need not say very much more. Mr. Illingworth asked Mr. Hopkins: "Speaking generally, you consider the request made by the people

a reasonable request?" and Mr. Hopkins replied:—

Certainly I do. There is no objection to it. Why should we not have the same faith in the capacity of our officers to classify this ground as we have in their ability to classify land under other applications which come before us every day?

He was asked:—

As Minister, do you think it would be establishing a precedent which would perhaps put you or your department in an awkward position?—Generally speaking, I would not approve of the reclassification of the conditional purchase lands held within the State. I think that would be a very foolish step to take. This is a philanthropic institution. There is a large population now living on the land as a result of its settlement, and several schools have been established. These are all reasons which, I think, point to this being certainly a special case.

He also said that these people took the land as first-class, and they had put forth a plea that they were really ignorant of what the country was. That no doubt was so, for they would not have taken up inferior third-class land as first-class. In reply to Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Hopkins stated that his department was satisfied with the improvements made on the land, and that the Army had spent a large sum of money there. We come to the evidence of the Hon. George Throssell, M.L.A., in which he states that he thoroughly approves of this; and he seems very sorry indeed for these people. From personal observation he has not the slightest doubt that the Salvation Army made out a good case for the reclassification of the land.

HON. G. RANDELL: You do not read Mr. Throssell's evidence.

HON. C. SOMMERS: I would, but it is rather long. I commend Mr. Throssell's evidence to the House. I marked a portion. Mr. Throssell was asked by Mr. Burges:—

Did Mr. Ranford, as Government agent, show them this land to select from in the first place?—Answer: Yes; he showed them the land. I can only say that he is an admirable man, but he is an enthusiast. When I and Mr. Paterson and the Surveyor General visited the land we were silent. We had read the gushing reports as to the quality of the land, and we could only look in each others' faces with surprise when we saw much good money being spent. The Surveyor General looked into my eyes, and I looked into his, and Mr. Paterson looked into mine. When we got to

ourselves we made exclamations of surprise that there were such gushing reports on the quality of the land when such a small proportion of it was really good. Moreover we had had some experience, and we knew that we were not all fools as the new comers made us out to be, and that the quality of the land was not there.

That is, briefly, the history of the case, and I would like to remind members that this is not the case of an ordinary individual applying for classification. These people were strangers; they came here, and I am afraid they were "taken in." If we want any greater evidence, we have only to look at the fact that out of 4,000 sheep they have now only 500, and their cattle number about 120. They have spent £22,000 on the property, which is more than they would be likely to get for it. They have established quite a number of families there, and they have paid the highest ruling wage in the State for all work they have ever had done. They have only 1,000 acres of good land scattered over this large acreage of country, and its scattered state makes it very unprofitable for them to manage; in fact, the speculation is a very disheartening and disastrous one, in whatever way one looks at it. I am sure the Army will have the sympathy of members in the very fair and equitable demands they are making, considering that they are charged 10s. per acre for this land, and what they want is that the Government should be empowered to appoint valuers to inspect the land, reclassify it, revalue it, and charge them accordingly. I trust the Bill will pass the second reading.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I second the motion.

HON. W. MALEY (South - East): Some members, having heard the remarks which have fallen from Mr. Sommers, will no doubt be of opinion that this land which was selected by the Salvation Army was not classified at the time of selection. As a matter of fact, Mr. Harry Frederick Johnston, Surveyor General, in his examination stated that the land was classified in 1897. It was taken up by the Army in 1900, so that the department was responsible for the classification, and the Army must have been aware of the Government classification at the time they took the land up. It appears that the fault does not rest

with Mr. Ranford, who is perhaps the most capable man connected with the Lands Department, but with the Lands Department, if the land was classified as first-class when it should have been otherwise classified. We are told by Mr. Harry Frederick Johnston that it was classified by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Brazier. With the classification attaching to the land it strikes me that Mr. Ranford's duty was merely to introduce the buyer to the property, to show him over it, which I believe he did, and if the purchaser or selector was satisfied with the property, then I should say the deal ended. I and others in this State have land we took up years ago at 10s. an acre, and we would be glad to exchange it for some of the good lands we have since discovered. I have land for which I paid 15s. per acre at Geraldton, and I paid as much for land at Jandakot, at Albany, and in other parts of the State. It has not yet occurred to me to bring in a private Bill to have my land reclassified and exchanged.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not state personal motives.

HON. W. MALEY: I simply say that I would not bring in a Bill for this purpose.

THE PRESIDENT: You are rather exceeding the limits of debate. It is laid down that no member can bring in personal feelings on a measure before the House. You are not speaking as a member of Parliament, but speaking of your own personal motives.

HON. W. MALEY: There are individuals in this State who have selected land under similar terms, and they have never come before this House in the way the Salvation Army, which is practically a joint stock company, have approached this House.

HON. C. SOMMERS: Do not say that. The cases are not the same.

HON. W. MALEY: When the Lands Department and the Government are dealing with the public estate, and when they are dealing with more than one individual, they must treat these individuals as a company. It is not for the Government to discriminate as to whether six or seven persons shall be styled a company, and six or seven other persons under some other name. Should a group of persons deal with the Government, the

Government must recognise them as a company and not as an individual. If the Army come to this House they come by virtue of the position they occupy, not as an individual, but as a number of persons or a company. If we are to admit the Salvation Army as an individual, then we must admit that all the individuals who have selected land during the last 20 or 30 years at 10s. an acre and are not satisfied with their purchase, are deserving of the same consideration and the same redress that we would give to the Salvation Army or any other body. Perhaps that word would be more palatable to the hon. member. I am satisfied, from what I know of Mr. Ranford, that he has not done anything improper in connection with his dealings with the army.

HON. C. SOMMERS: No one said he had.

HON. W. MALEY: If my knowledge of what took place is of any value, not only did Mr. Ranford go down on that occasion, but one of the old settlers of that district went with him and with the agent for this body, and that person was asked all sorts of questions and answered them to the satisfaction of the agent, while he was able to show the agent, or representative of the Salvation Army, land under actual cultivation so as to show what could be done with similar land. It has been stated to me as a fact that the stocking of that country with sheep was entirely premature, that no care was taken to protect the sheep against the wild dogs that abound in the neighbourhood, and that the fences were put up in an unsatisfactory manner and were not sufficiently closely wired so as to prevent the sheep from escaping. I am also assured that numbers of sheep escaped from the paddocks, and that numbers which did not escape were destroyed in the paddocks by wild dogs. If a religious body go into a speculation or enter into the domain of commerce—[HON. C. SOMMERS: It is not a speculation to benefit themselves]—we have all high motives. We are all striving to make money for other people. I will not for one moment take away from the Salvation Army the credit which is due to them, any more than I would take away from any other body, religious or otherwise, the good name they enjoy;

but I say that, so far as I have yet been informed, or so far as it has yet been proved to my mind, the Salvation Army had a very fair deal, and having had that fair deal—and they were satisfied at the time, but have been unfortunate—I can only sympathise with them. Beyond that I cannot go.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: They were not favoured in any way.

HON. W. MALEY: Why should they be? We have the public estate to take charge of. We are the custodians of the public estate, and we have no right to give a religious body anything unless we can get an equivalent in hard cash in a commercial enterprise. It is our duty as a Parliament to resist any encroachment on the public estate which is not ours to give away under these conditions. If special deals are to be made for religious bodies we would have the place flooded with religious bodies who would be only too glad to have the whole of the estate of Western Australia partitioned amongst them.

HON. C. SOMMERS: They would not spend £22,000 on 20,000 acres.

HON. W. MALEY: Perhaps they would not be so foolish. But there is no reason why we should give these people a better class of property to make so little use of. It would be far better to put it in the hands of free selectors taking up small areas. On some occasions members say: "Why build up big estates? We want to burst them up and have small areas;" but on this occasion members wish us to give preference to this religious body over the small selector who comes to the State.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, and I sincerely trust that members will agree to it, and that classification will be given to these people who, without the slightest doubt, are paying too much for their land. I hope if the Bill becomes law that this classification will be a true and just one, and that these people will get land under the conditions under which they should be holding it at present.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I support this Bill and I can say unhesitatingly I am not a champion of the Salvation Army by any means. I looked upon this scheme from the very

first as a sort of a fad; but I contend it is the duty of the Government to protect the simple as well as the innocent. I flatter myself that when I see a bit of good land I know it, and that when I see a bit of rubbish I know it also. If this is what Mr. Ranford or any other agent classes as first-class land, I would dearly like to see third-class land. I have not seen it yet. These people came here; the land was shown to them; they were new to the State, and the biggest price at which the Government were selling land was asked for it. There was ample warranty that it was good land. In that respect, if in no other, these people were deceived. This land is just between wind and water, so to speak. It is on the edge of the better class land, and between the better class land and the timbered land, so that it is neither good timbered land nor good agricultural land. I know the land well. Formerly it was held by selectors who paid £1 per 1,000 acres per year to run stock on it. It is first-rate land for stock when it is burnt, and that is once in three years. Members can make what they like of that. I am not going to say that everything the Salvation Army did when they went there was done judiciously, or cleverly, or with wisdom. They went there and laid out the money as if it was first-class land, and as if they were going to make the settlement a success. If it had been good land they would have made the place a success. Major Suttor, the officer in charge, was a good man, but he did not know the quality of the land. He cannot be blamed because he did not know it. He was simply sent there to make a good job of what the Army considered was a good bargain from the Government. Some of the land is good for timber—part nearest to the Collie coalfields, and if it is exchanged and the Army are allowed to take up other land in exchange for this, the piece of land they would give up would be of more value for timber than it is for agricultural purposes. I can say straight away that I would not take up that land at a gift, if I was compelled to go and make a living by cultivating it. That is a strong statement; but concerning land down south I am a good authority, I have travelled over this land and say unquestionably that it is second-class land, and that the

worst of it is third-class land. [HON. C. SOMMERS: And bad at that.] Some timber on that land would be of value to the Government if exchanged. There is another way in which we should look at this matter. Whatever any hon. member may think of the operations of the Salvation Army, they are an organisation known nearly all the world over, and if the rumour will go out that the Salvation Army were planked down on some of the first-class land in the State of Western Australia and could not make a do of it, the reputation we should get for our State would be something bad. I will not give the exact English word, but some hon. member might understand the meaning I intend to convey. It would be far more reaching than a little bit of harm there might possibly be if we give this concession to them. I went over the place. The question has been asked as to how much money has been spent there. I thought they simply lavished their money in such a way that they could never get a return for it. Everything you could imagine has been done. A sawmill has been erected, and there is a place for everything, and everything is in its proper place. The only thing wanting was stock, and that I believe was absolutely because the place was not fit to carry it. I went through the institution, not through the boys' school because the boys were out on the farm, but through the girls' school, where there are girls from six years of age upward. The amount of order was something painful. Everything was clean, everything was in its place; but over and above that, notwithstanding all the order maintained, these children looked as healthy and as happy as any lot of children could be. I was absolutely astonished at the work they did, and at the comfort they evidently enjoyed; and I venture to say that was not got up for the occasion. They did not know we were going there, but there was something about the place which enabled one to see very plainly that this state of things prevailed all along the line. I can only say I believe they were deceived. It may not have been Mr. Ranford's intention to deceive them, but if Mr. Ranford or any other gentleman classified that land as good land I have not much opinion of his idea. If that is the



good land, where is the bad? I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill, and I hope that other gentlemen, bearing in mind the facts of the case, will do so, and see justice done to this organisation.

HON. Z. LANE (Metropolitan-Suburban): I would like to add just one word to the remarks which have fallen from other members. Although I have not a retainer from the Salvation Army, and I do not agree with many of their methods, still, although it may be that we are establishing a precedent, we shall be doing justice by passing this Bill. I know the country there, and have seen it, and I am satisfied the land is not first-class land. I have seen the good work the Salvation Army are doing in that district, and although I do not know much about land myself, still they have had a very hard, uphill job, and I really think we should not be doing a wrong in helping them. Therefore, I shall certainly support the Bill.

HON. J. A. THOMSON (Central): I wish to say only a few words. I must oppose the Bill, because it is not exactly for a charitable purpose, for it is well known, or it ought to be, to every member of this House, that the Salvation Army property throughout the world is vested, not in the Salvation Army, but in General Booth and his heirs and successors. [HON. C. SOMMERS: No.] I say without fear of contradiction I am right. The Salvation Army is not a proper church, because it is a trading concern. I know plenty of my constituents who also took up land under the same terms, because they could not get it under any better conditions; but it is not first-class land, and should never have been classified as first-class. They, too, are anxious to have their land reclassified as second or third-class, but the Minister objects to it. Yet we find there is a private Bill brought in to enable a private individual to get his land reclassified. For that reason, which I think is a good one, I object; but do not let me be misunderstood at all. I give full credit to all the individual workers of the Salvation Army, because in my opinion they have striven to do their very best according to their lights. This, however, is not a question affecting the individual workers, but of vesting a

certain amount of property in the name of General Booth and his heirs and successors.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): It is my intention to give this Bill all the support I am capable of. I do not intend to touch upon the land aspect of the question, because I think that when we read the report of the select committee and see what experts have said, and when we bear in mind the remarks of Mr. Clarke, who knows as much about the land as most persons in the State, our minds may be set at rest on that point. I am going to support the Bill, because in my position as Colonial Secretary I am almost daily face to face with the work the Salvation Army are doing, not alone in this place, but throughout the State. They have been alluded to by the last speaker (Mr. Thomson) as a trading concern, but I should be sorry to think they are a trading concern.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: They are.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If they are, all I can say is that the result of their trading in this instance is either a tribute to their bad luck or their want of intelligence. I do not know about their luck, but I do not think they have any want of intelligence. They are not a trading company, and I assure Mr. Thomson and Mr. Maley that when they can show that any of their constituents are doing the same disinterested, good work for the State as the Salvation Army are doing, I shall be ready and willing to support any Bill for the reclassification of the land of those constituents. The Salvation Army at the Collie—and I may say I hold no brief for the Salvation Army, but I am speaking from my own observation of what they are doing—are endeavouring, in common with every other industrial school, to meet a need which is a crying one in this State, that being to supply, in the first place, agricultural labourers, and, secondly, settlers with a good knowledge of the conditions of the State.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: They are teaching boys from our own industrial school for nothing.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am quite aware they have them, and the reason is because they are able to give those boys greater facilities in the way of

teaching them trades, in the way of teaching them agriculture, than can be afforded at the industrial school.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Other farmers would be glad to have them.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:

They are giving to not only boys, but girls also, tuition which is calculated to make them more likely to turn out good citizens than would the tuition which they would get at the hands of the ordinary farmer; and in saying this I am not casting any reflection whatever upon the farmer. Again, there is another thing which has been brought to my notice lately, that being that they are going to extend the Collie branch of the work, by which they must be distinguished in this State, by having a branch of their prison gate brigade work. Apart from a religious body which has started within the last few months, the Salvation Army is the only denominational body in the State which carries out this work, a work which is one of the most admirable I think that can be taken in hand by any body, religious or otherwise. I would like to point out to the House that in speaking I am not referring so much to the religious aspect of their work as the social aspect of it. I maintain that they are initiating works which will have the effect of converting into good, reputable and creditable citizens of this State boys and girls who might otherwise have become the derelicts of society. While they are doing that I am willing for my own part to go not only a little but a good deal out of the ordinary way to help them. I think the Salvation Army deserve every credit for the work they are doing. I most certainly cannot associate with them that idea of self-interest which several members think exists. I do not think that for one moment. I most certainly must acquit those representatives of the Salvation Army here, and I do not think that the idea exists in the minds of the heads of the Salvation Army, but as I have already stated, when I find an institution doing what I am satisfied is a good educational and reforming work for the benefit of the State and not for its own benefit, then I am very willing indeed to give that institution my hearty support in any measure which will conduce to its welfare.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I am very sorry that the Salvation Army did not select a more desirable spot than they chose. I wish they had gone somewhere in the neighbourhood of York, where they would have had some return. I think we all admit that the Salvation Army have done a great deal of work in the colonies, and set a good example in very many respects. I do not think the State will lose anything by making this concession to them. There is not the slightest doubt they have been woefully deceived in the nature of the country they took up. We are all aware how hard it is for a stranger coming here to know what are the capabilities of the country. Many years ago numerous settlers came from South Australia and thought they could raise stock successfully on certain land; but what was the result? They lost nearly the whole of the stock they put there, and they learned to believe that this kind of country was perfectly useless for stock-keeping. I cannot see that the State would lose much by granting the Salvation Army the concession they ask for, and I shall certainly support the Bill.

HON. E. McLARTY (South-West): I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading. I am pretty well acquainted with the class of country the Salvation Army have. I do not know that I have been over the particular country, but I know exactly the class of land, and I am at a loss to know how any man with any knowledge of land could class any of it as first-class. I should say some of it is a very poor second, and the remainder a very poor third-class. I fail to see what the State has to lose by granting this concession. At all events it would be so small that the State would be compensated a hundred fold by granting the concession. I know the good work the Salvation Army have been doing at the Collie. They have been taking children from the streets, and bringing them up to become useful members of society. If I had the power I would not only go so far as to reclassify the land, but I would absolutely give them the land for the good work they are carrying out. I have always been under the impression since the Salvation Army first applied for the land at the Collie that the Government

at that time at all events did not take a proper view of the question. The Government in every way seemed to hamper the Army, and I feel sure that for the good work the Army are doing with the rising generation they are deserving of all the encouragement they can possibly get. I certainly do not agree with what has fallen from Mr. Thomson that this is a speculation on their part, and that they are working for their own good. I think it would be very bad business people who would select 20,000 acres in that wretched ironstone country and expect to make a profit. The country is as poor as it can be. Glancing at the report of the select committee I see that the result of the stock raising is that whereas they started with 4,000 sheep they have only 500 at the present time. That is a very poor record, but it does not surprise me in the least, because I know from the state of the country the Salvation Army settled upon it is impossible for that land to carry stock all the year round. It is a poor class country of very little use for cultivation, and of very little use for stock raising. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I am exceedingly pleased at hearing members like Mr. Clarke, Mr. McLarty, and Mr. Dempster speak favourably of this motion, and I most heartily endorse all that has fallen from the Colonial Secretary. I am prepared to say that the evidence given by the Hon. G. Throssell is, I think, in most respects absolutely true, and that the Salvation Army were most ungenerously treated. I say that, although I was a member of the Government at the time, or I became a member soon after the personal negotiations, and I know that Mr. Throssell was desirous of dealing more liberally with them. I agree with what Mr. McLarty has said, that if the Government had given them the land, that would have been a right and proper thing to do, considering the amount of good work the Army intended to carry out for the benefit of this country. I, also, as far as I could, assisted Mr. Throssell in his efforts to secure better terms, and I made a promise when Mr. Booth, son of General Booth, came over here in the first instance, that as soon as they were ready we would

transfer from Subiaco some of the boys who were in the institution there, and I did that exactly on the ground the Colonial Secretary has stated, because they would receive a better training to fit them for the work and service of this country than they could possibly receive at the Government institution. We had no opportunity at Subiaco of teaching them useful trades beyond a little shoemaking or cobbling, and perhaps a little tailoring, and washing for the girls; but the Salvation Army seemed to have arrived at the secret of training young people, and I believe they are doing it by the two principles of firmness and love. They turn out a large proportion of useful citizens. I am sorry to say they have made such a poor bargain, but I anticipated it at the time. I knew some of the land at the Collie, and I expected there was not much difference between what I saw and what they took up, and I was afraid they had not got the best position in which to establish this colony for their own profit. I do not think we need have the slightest suspicion that the land being invested in any one individual will operate to the enrichment of that individual. I think it will be for the benefit of the work the Salvation Army have undertaken, which in its social aspect at any rate is a noble work. I only hope that they will go on in the same lines and be aids to other denominations and to the State generally. Wherever they go I think the same conditions prevail, and they are doing a most useful work in training up the young people to a knowledge of discipline and prudence, and so fitting them to be useful members of society. This measure has my most hearty concurrence, and although public institutions, especially Governments, are supposed to have no soul or heart, I am pleased to see the Government in this case at any rate have realised that a hard bargain was driven with these people. Indeed I was going to say they were deceived, but so far they have not got any generous treatment from the Governments of the day. At least they should receive some consideration, and this is the least that could possibly be granted to them. I hope this Bill will be carried through with an immense majority.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Power to exchange lands :

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: Would the hon. member in charge of the Bill inform the House if the 2,000 acres proposed to be given in exchange was adjacent to the other property?

HON. C. SOMMERS: It was about 16 miles away. It was desired to simply give this land in exchange so that there could be a change for the stock. Stock kept in one particular part of the country all the time were inclined to get rickets, especially in the South-West. The land had of course to be approved by the Government inspector.

Clause passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## VICTORIA PARK RATES VALIDATION BILL.

## SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Walter Kingsmill), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill is one of those that have come before Parliament on several occasions. It is brought in to validate the striking of certain municipal and health rates of which the validity is in question. Some little time ago at Victoria Park there was a little difficulty about the mayoralty, and the rate was struck while the matter was *sub judice*. It is not decided that the rates struck were absolutely invalid, but in order that any doubt may be removed, and in order that the Council may be placed in a proper position and have proper legality given to their actions, this little Bill has been introduced. I do not think members can find any objection to it. It is purely owing to unfortunate circumstances that the necessity for the Bill arises. I therefore move the second reading.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

## IN COMMITTEE.

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

## UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT BILL.

## ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Assembly now considered, in Committee.

Amendments 1 to 4—agreed to.

No. 5—Clause 10, strike out the word "two" in line 2, and insert "four" in lieu :

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the amendment be agreed to. This alteration had reference to the number requisite for a quorum of the board. Formerly it was considered that the board should consist of not less than three or more than five members, but now the number was fixed at seven; therefore the quorum was altered from two to four, which was a better percentage.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 6 (new clause)—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

## FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of 13 amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered, in Committee.

No. 1—Clause 1, strike out the word "January," in line 2, and insert "July" in lieu :

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: These amendments were the result of investigations by a select committee, and he himself would like the amendments to be passed *in toto*. The select committee consisted of gentlemen in another place who had special experience in this particular line, and he thought members would admit that the Bill was an intensely technical one. The object of the amendments was to render it harder for imperfectly prepared or adulterated fertilisers or feeding stuffs to be sold to the agriculturists, and as a matter of fact the Bill was brought more into line with the measures which existed in other States and in England. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

Numbers 2 to 13—agreed to.

Resolutions adopted, and a message returned to the Assembly.

## LUNACY BILL.

## ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of seven amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered, in Committee.

No. 1—Clause 43, strike out the word "fifty," in line 1, and insert "twenty-five" in lieu:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the amendment be agreed to. The amendment effected an alteration in the number of patients which might be kept in a licensed house without there being a resident medical practitioner. A licensed house for the purposes of this Bill was a house which had been proclaimed by the Governor, after careful examination by the authorities, as a fit and proper place in which the insane might be confined. The original clause was taken from the Act of New South Wales, which State had perhaps the most modern method of dealing with the insane, and we proposed to be still more cautious by reducing the number from 50 to 25. There were three or four licensed houses, he thought, in New South Wales, but he did not believe that any of them had the full number of patients. In the case of a lower number than 25, medical officers would have to visit at certain intervals according to the number of patients.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

Amendments 2, 3, 4—agreed to.

No. 5—Clause 161, strike out the words "the Commissioner of Public Health or":

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the amendment be agreed to. He had, in explaining this amendment, to give away a Cabinet secret. This Bill was prepared contemporaneously with the Health Bill, which was not proceeded with, because it was thought we had enough legislation of a large kind on the Notice Paper for the session. In that Health Bill reference was made to a commissioner of public health, but the Health Bill not having been proceeded with, those words had no meaning.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 6 (new clause)—agreed to.

No. 7.—Add new clauses Part IV. (as in Notice Paper, providing for the

detention and treatment of habitual drunkards):

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that these new clauses be agreed to. The provisions contained in these clauses were in the New Zealand Act, and related to accommodation at hospitals for the insane being provided for habitual drunkards. In other States these places were kept separate, and were generally known as inebriate retreats. In New Zealand it had been found advantageous both from a financial and an administrative point of view to place these people under the same roof, and although he did not know that we should be able to immediately act upon the clauses, still he thought they might certainly afford us a means of doing good, and at all events they did not interfere in any way with the provisions of the Bill.

Question passed, and the new clauses agreed to.

Resolutions adopted, and a message returned to the Assembly.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly, Wednesday, 9th December, 1903.

	PAGE
Bills: Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amend-	
ment, in Committee, reported	2602
Tramways Act Amendment, third reading	2602
Collie-Narrogin Railway, second reading,	
debate resumed, amendment (six months)	
negatived, Select Committee negatived	2602
Private Bill: Fremantle Tramways, third reading	2602

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

## PRAYERS.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Tenth Progress Report of Royal Commission on the Public Service.