consists of Dr. Hope, the Commissioner of Public Health, as chairman, Doctor A. T. White of Fremantle, Doctor J. S. Hicks of Guildford, Mrs. Harris, matron of the House of Mercy, Perth, an Australian-trained nurse, and Miss M. Tate, the late Silver Chain maternity nurse, now matron of the Valesco private hospital, Perth, and also an Australian-trained nurse. So it will be seen the personnel of the board has been carefully considered, whoever was responsible for it, and of course my friend Mr. Connolly was. This board can, I think, be relied on to make regulations to safeguard the public in every respect. I hope there will be no strong opposition to the Bill. If there is necessity for amendment any suggestions thrown out will be carefully considered in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 9.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 6th December, 1911.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: By-laws of Marble Bar and Brookton Roads Boards.

By the Minister for Mines: Papers re Inspection of Permanent Way, Midland Railway.

QUESTION — BUILDING SCAFFOLDING INSPECTOR.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (for Mr. A. A. Wilson) asked the Premier: In view of the large and increasing number of accidents in the building trade, owing to the faulty construction of scaffolding, will the Government consider the advisability of appointing a practical "Building Scaffolding Inspector" immediately?

The PREMIER replied: The attention of the Government has not been officially directed to the circumstances referred to in the hon. member's question, but the advisability of appointing a practical inspector of scaffolding will be taken into consideration.

QUESTION — RAILWAY OVERHEAD BRIDGES, SUBURBAN.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, In connection with the proposed improvements to the suburban railways, how many overhead bridges is it proposed to build over the railways between West Perth and East Perth? 2, What is the estimated total cost of same? 3. What is the estimated cost of the proposed extension to Beaufort-street bridge?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Four, exclusive of the extension of the Beaufort-street bridge. 2, As certain alterations in the design are impending, the estimated cost cannot at present be given. 3, Approximately, £20,000.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, WICKEPIN-MERREDIN.

Mr. BROUN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it the intention of the Minister to construct the first section of the Wickepin-Merredin line from Wickepin to a point in the vicinity of Lake Kurrenkutten? 2, Is it the intention of the Ministre to make an exhaustive inquiry into the claims of the Kumminin selectors for railway facilities before departing from

the route of the Wickepin-Merredin line, as shown on map marked P.W.D. 15285?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Question of route is now under consideration. 2, Answered by above.

QUESTIONS (2)—JARRAH PILES AND SLEEPERS.

Attacks by Sea-worms.

Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. Allen) asked the Premier: 1, Was the Premier correctly reported at the annual dinner at Fremantle Chamber of Commerce in saying that the jarrah piles in the wharves at Fremantle had suffered severely from the attacks of sea-worms, and that he would shortly make a statement on the matter? 2, If so, when will he make the statement?

The PREMIER replied: 1, It is true that a number of piles at the Victoria Quay and the North Wharf have been practically destroyed in from eight to 15 years, owing to the attacks of teredo or sea-worms, and from time to time the Government have been replacing, and will continue to replace, if required, the piles so affected. 2, This important subject is at present receiving close attention at the hands of the Hon. Minister for Works, and when a decision is reached it will be made known.

Reports.

Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. Allen) asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government, or the Government officials, received any reports, or have they any information respecting the destruction to the piles (by termites) of any jetties or wharves in this State? 2, Have the Government, or the Government officials, received any information from India respecting the destruction to jarrah sleepers by white ants or other destroying agents? 3, Does he intend to have the papers in connection with the above laid on the Table of the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No information has reached the Government to the effect that piles have been destroyed by termites, precautions having been taken from time to time to prevent their access. The hon. member is, however, referred to the answer which I am to-day giving to his further question on this subject. 2, Certain information has come to hand, and is at present receiving full consideration by the Government. 3, In view of the inquiries which are proceeding, it is not proposed to lay the papers on the Table of the House, but the hon. member may peruse same upon application at the Premier's office.

QUESTION—WATER BORE, GLADSTONE.

Mr. GARDINER (for Mr. McDonald) asked the Minister for Works: 1, On what terms is the Gladstone bore leased to private persons? 2, Do these terms include the right of the lessee to fence the water off from the travelling public? 3, Is the Minister aware that such is done at present?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The Gladstone bore is not leased, but the surplus water through a 2in. pipe, after full requirements of the public and of travelling stock have been met with, is granted to W. G. Statham in consideration of—(a) payment of £5 per annum; (b) Concreting at his expense the pipe of the bore to prevent corrosion; (c) looking after the bore generally; (d) fencing in the bore for protection; (e) tenancy being for 12 months from 15th May, 1911, to 14th May, 1912. 2, No. 3, No.

QUESTION—ABORIGINES PROSECUTED FOR TRESPASS.

Mr. GARDINER asked the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to the fact that four aborigines were recently prosecuted for trespass on a pastoral lease near Whim Creek?

The PREMIER replied: No; but in view of the hon. member's question, immediate inquiries have been instituted, and he will be informed of the result.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READINGS.

1, Transcontinental Railway (introduced by the Premier).

2, Parliamentary Allowances Amendment (introduced by the Premier).

3. Land and Income Tax (introduced by the Premier).

4, Permanent Reserve Rededication (introduced by the Minister for Lands).

RETURN — PRISON WARDERS, SUNDAY DUTY.

On motion by Mr. CARPENTER, ordered: That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing the total number of Sundays upon which each warder employed in the Fremantle Prison has been off duty from January 1st to November 30th of the present year.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Order of the Day for third reading read.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That the Bill be recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 3.

Question passed; re-consideration in Committee made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

BILL—APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon T. Walker) in moving the second reading said: This is a necessary measure incident on the changes that have taken place in the State since the introduction of Responsible Government. I believe this measure was intended to be introduced by the late Government, and undoubtedly it is a requisite piece of legislation. It has come down to us from the Legislative Council and it briefly provides for the proper course to be taken in appeals in divorce and matrimonial causes. When the colony did not enjoy the blessings of Responsible Government the court of appeal was the Governor-in-Executive Council. I need only mention that fact to show it is necessary to make an alteration in the law which up to date has not been made. It would be absurd to take appeals from the divorce court to the Governor-in-Executive Council, yet upon the files not long ago there was a case in the divorce and matrimonial court listed for appeal. That appeal court consists of the Governor and all the responsible Ministers, and I think every member will admit it is not a judiciously suitable court. Neither, considering the advancement of reformatory mattery generally, is it a course to be now followed. This measure provides, in the event of appeals being necessary in future, they shall follow the same course as in all matters of appeal, that is from the court in which the issue is tried to the Full Court. Moreover it provides one matter to which I draw the attention of the Chamber, namely, that in any proceedings taken hitherto, if it be possible anything should be listed for appeal before this Bill becomes law, the appeal shall be taken to the Full Court. I think with this explanation it is sufficient that I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MITCHELL: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL (Northam): I think the Minister should allow an adjournment. It only means waiting until to-morrow so that members can have an opportunity of reading the Bill. We are not necessarily opposed to it, and will probably agree to it, but I think we should have time to consider it. A postponement until to-morrow is not asking too much.

Mr. NANSON (Greenough): Unfortunately I was not in the Chamber when the Attorney General moved the second reading, but, glancing at the Bill, I am under the impression that its intention is to give an appeal in divorce and matrimonial causes to the Full Court. Some time ago a difficulty arose through its being discovered that the appeal was to the Governor-in-Council, and I take it the

Bill is to remove that anomaly. That being so, I do not think there will be any objection to passing the second reading of the Bill, or any need to interrupt its passage.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (in reply): That is the only purpose of the Bill. I believe it was during the hon. member's term of office that the difficulty arose, and it was then expected that the Governor-in-Council would have to hear a case of appeal. An anomaly of that sort must strike everybody, and perhaps the member for Northam will be content to let the matter go on, more particularly as the Bill has been thrashed out already in the Legislative Council.

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—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker) in moving the second reading said: I am well aware that in touching on the Licensing Act at all we are dealing with very debatable matter, and the Government would not have submitted any legislation for consideration upon the subject had there not been certain amendments necessary to the recently passed Licensing Act. This Bill confines itself to three matters. We could very well introduce amendments which experience of the administration and operations of the Act have disclosed as necessary, but it is not desirable that at this stage of this brief session amendments covering principles involving large debates should be introduced. We recognise the Act will have to be dealt with in a comprehensive measure and in a thorough fashion next session; and this Bill simply endeavours to remove certain anomalies and to do justice to those who, if the measure is not passed, will receive great injustice. The first portion of the Bill seeks to validate or make certain the boundaries of the licensing districts. It will be within the minds of members that the Licensing Bill was passed before we introduced the Redistribution of Seats Bill, and in the Act it is provided that the licensing districts shall have the same boundaries of delimitations as the electoral districts; but since then we have altered the boundaries of the electoral districts, and the question very naturally arises as to whether by that means we distribute afresh the licensing districts. Must automatically, as a matter of course, the established licensing districts swell out or recede in order to keep side by side or line by line with the redistribution of seats boundaries? And a further question arose as to whether the recent local option poll was valid if taken under the old licensing districts, inasmuch as we have altered those districts as some suppose at least inferentially by the Redistribution of Seats Act. Can we legally adopt the results of the local option poll? We want to validate the recent local option poll, and by this Bill desire to make it certain what the boundaries of the licensing districts are, notwithstanding the passage of the Redistribution of Seats Act. The first portion of the Bill therefore proposes to keep the old licensing districts as they were, giving power to the Governor to unite two districts into one, or divide one district into two or three, and giving to the Governor-in-Council power to designate these districts, that is to say, give them their names and boundaries according to the exigencies of the development of the population or the requirements of the Licensing Act. Lawyers capable of giving an opinion differ considerably as to the legality of the boundaries since the passage of the Redistribution of Seats Act. This will make certain of the continuance of the boundaries of the old licensing districts and will validate the local option poll. The next matter dealt with is the wayside licenses. The old Act provides that when a wayside license is situated in a district where the population has increased to 100, that is when the wayside becomes a township, and population has gathered there, that

wayside license automatically dies and the landlord passes out, while another person may be able to come in and obtain a general publican's license. In this way a stranger might obtain the advantage over the old settled resident. I believe the late Attorney General had his attention drawn to a certain wayside license in his district, and in some way the matter was patched up, but not, in the opinion of the Crown law officers, altogether in a legal fashion. That is to say, the legality of the course then taken may still be questioned. The emergency was met, but there was the uncertainty of whether the people concerned were legally holding the license when the population had grown. Not only that case but others were cropping up. At the present time the population in many of these places was shifting. We were settling new areas, and what may be wayside houses one year, the next year may be situated in the very heart of a populous district, and, under those circumstances, wayside license is not the proper designation of the character of the business done. The measure simply provides that when the matter comes before the Licensing Court, the court can substitute a general publican's license for the wayside inn license, and thereby enable the person there to continue the same trade that he was doing the day before, right up to now, the only difference being that the State will receive more in consequence, as there will be a larger license fee to be paid. It is no new form of license, nor are we increasing the number of hotels, or the quantity of liquor sold; it is simply designating by its proper name the license in accordance with the requirements of the old Act. The final provision of the Bill is to enable the Government to deal with a special case and I am not quite sure in Committee whether we should designate that a special case instead of making the matter general as it now appears in the Bill. I may take the House into the confidence of the Government by stating that the Government are resuming certain properties in connection with the railway in the neighbourhood of Perth station, and on the land which has been resumed is a certain hotel the license of which will be taken away. The question is whether we can adequately compensate the owner without this Bill. The Government propose that there shall be another hotel erected as near as possible to the site of the original one, and on all fours with it. There is one feature about it, however, that we cannot grant or covenant for, and that is that the new hotel shall be granted a license, and until we can grant a license the Bill will be absolutely useless. As the law stands the building must be constructed and approved before the court will issue a license. We want to deal with the resumption at once and before we can do that we must be able to guarante that we shall place the owner in full possession, build him the house and provide him with a license. The Bill, therefore, provides that the licensing court may issue or may give the license when the building is completed. This will guarantee that the money will not be expended in vain and that the building when constructed will not be useless. It would have been necessary otherwise to pay for what may be designated the goodwill, notwithstanding the fact that most of us believe that landlords get no goodwill, but that the public house is let only on a year's tenancy. The law, however, does not so regard the position. A hotel is looked upon as a valuable asset and that it has a market value we all know. Therefore, to avoid having to pay anything like an enormous sum for compensation for the loss of the license, it is proposed to build these premises and say to the party concerned, we build you a hotel and we guarantee you a license. In this way we shall save to the State a very large sum of money. Those are all the subjects comprised in the Bill; they are necessary and urgent, and only because the necessity and urgency warrant us doing so, are we bringing the matter before the Chamber. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I realise with the Attorney General that it is utterly impossible to touch the Licensing Act without bringing a hornet's nest around one. He has, however, declared

that he intends to make further amendments during next session, and it seems to me that there are quite a number of very peculiar things in the Licensing Act that require to be attended to. One of them I desire to refer to, and which is contained in Section 65, provides that a widow, if she be over 30 years of age, or a married woman if living apart from her husband, also over that age, or a divorced woman, may hold a license. It appears to me extraordinary that a single woman over 30 years of age, and who may be thoroughly respectable is not given the same privilege. I cannot understand why a divorced woman or a married woman living apart from her husband should be in a better position to hold a license than a thoroughly respectable single woman. I had thought of moving an amendment in Committee but on more mature consideration I realise that the opening of a discussion on this matter at the present time would not be wise. Under the circumstances I shall defer taking any action until a more comprehensive measure is introduced next sesion. I simply availed myself of this opportunity of mentioning the matter, in order that we may think seriously over it by the time the next Bill comes up for our consideration.

Mr. NANSON (Greenough): The House may, I think, congratulate itself that having devoted many hours last session and the preceding one, to the consideration of the Licensing Bill, it has not been necessary to reintroduce this session the subject in all its complexities. The Bill introduced by the Attorney General is entirely of a non-controversial character, at least it seems so to me, and the amendments sought to be made are of a machinery character which will make for the smoother working of the Bill. I do not anticipate that any objection will be taken by members on this side of the House to the passing of the Bill in the form in which it has been introduced.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth): I can endorse all that has been said by the member for Coolgardie with reference to the section of the Act which prevents a respectable single woman over 30 years from holding a license. I have a lady in my eye who has run an hotel, or a number of hotels, for a number of years, and it has always been necessary for her to have a substitute. As hon. members are aware, when females have to employ a man, and use him in the capacity of a dummy, and place his name over the door, it puts a woman very often in an awkward position. I know of a case at Donnybrook where a respectable woman could not get a license, and she had to employ a man. At the same time it seems strange that any divorced woman, or a woman living apart from her husband, can get a license. I trust that when the new Bill is introduced next session it will contain a provision to enable respectable single women over 30 years of age to hold a license.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker) moved—

That the Committee stage be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting day.

Mr. Nanson: Why not go into Committee now?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It might be necessary to make two amendments to this measure. First of all, it might not be wise to take Clause 4 so generally when it is required to deal with a specific case. It was desired also to provide that the holder of a general license should conform with all the requirements of the Licensing Act. However, if it were the wish of the House to go into Committee on the measure the proposed amendments could if necessary be made in the Council.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

In Committee.

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

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES.

Second reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The principle embodied in this measure is one which, I think, every member will cordially endorse. It is well known that it was part of the policy of the present Opposition at the recent general elections, and until my friend, the Premier, to use one of his own expressions, robbed us, or shall I say annexed it from us——

The Attorney General: It has existed in New Zealand and South Australia for I do not know how long.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: That is not to say that it was not our policy. We put it before the people. However, we bear the Government no ill will over their action in this regard. They can annex any part of our policy and we will be only too glad to assist them to carry it into law. We had not the time to work out the details of the scheme, nor do I think the Premier until lately had time to work them out. He says we shall probably join issue with him inasmuch as the Bill provides for leasehold in connection with these homes. I do not wish to join issue with him in this regard. I prefer freeholds, and I think nine out of every ten individuals would prefer the freehold of the land their homes were to be built upon, but I would not object to giving a man a lease if he preferred it; and inasmuch as, according to the Premier, the Bill provides for both leasehold and freehold, I take no exception to it at all. It will be remembered that the Premier when prosecuting his electioneering campaign made a good many statements in regard to these homes for the people, now designated by him workers' homes. First of all he stated that he intended to advance up to £500 on land already owned; then after some further consideration, and realising that this was in conflict with the general policy of the party of which he is the leader, he qualified it somewhat and said that the Government would be prepared to build up-to-date residences wherever desired, at a total cost, including the purchase of the land, of a sum not exceeding £500. Then, after having heard what members on this side of the House had to say on the subject, and on further considering the tenets of the great party controlled by caucus sitting in Bunbury some time since, he altered it again, and said that he would find the land, erect the house, and, to prevent dummying, give the land on lease. I say at once I commend him for having again altered his views, and having embodied in the Bill, in his own words, provision to provide homes on all sorts of terms and conditions. He is going to provide that those who come under the definition of worker shall be able to build homes on their own land. I commend him for that. It is exactly what my party intended to do. Then he goes further, and makes provision for those who wish to take up a lease from the Government of Crown land set apart for the purpose, or repurchased for the purpose. I do not object to that. He will soon find out where the preference comes in. I am satisfied that wherever a man has sufficient money to acquire his own freehold he will do it in preference to taking up leasehold. However, that is by the way. There is no harm in having the provision, and I hope the success of the Bill will meet the expectations of the Premier in this regard. There are several weaknesses in the measure which I intend to point out. First of all, as to the constitution of the board. It is provided that three officers employed in the Government service are to constitute this board. To my mind this is a step in the wrong direction The explanation given by the Premier was that it would keep down the cost of administration. But surely that would be a penny wise and pound foolish policy in administering a fund of this description; a fund which will require every bit as much care, control and consideration as the operations of the Agricultural Bank itself. Subject to the approval of the Minister the board will have power to repurchase estates. It will take upon itself the responsibility of assessing blocks when these estates are cut up for residential purposes. It is to see that the plans of the buildings proposed to be erected are in accordance with all the require-

ments of the board, and of the regulations which will be framed under the Act. It has then to inquire into the character of the applicant who wishes to take advantage of the conditions of the Act. I suppose the board will have to supervise the construction of the houses, to see that they comply with the plans and specifications; and then when the client is installed in the house the board will have to see that he fulfils all the conditions, including the payment of the rent, and, if necessary, to take action to enforce that payment In addition to this, the board will have to keep a watchful eye on the maintenance of a property in which the State has so large an interest. I take it the board will have pretty well the bulk of its time employed in administering the Act if the Act is to be a success, and therefore I say it will be a penny wise and pound foolish policy to have a board consisting of permanent officials in the public service. The Premier objected very strongly the other day to advisory boards advising the Government in connection with the construction of railways; his reasons being that it took responsible officers away from their duties and that, therefore, they neglected the work of their departments. Does the same argument not apply in connection with the administration of this measure? The next point I wish to make is in regard to Ministerial control I see the Minister is to have absolutely full control. Notwithstanding that he appoints a board which apparently will carry out all the details of the measure there is to be no responsibility taken away from the Minister. He has even to sanction and endorse the valuations made by the board. Indeed, every application has to pass through his hands, and it appears to me that whilst he possibly might be able to shelter himself, to some extent, behind the recommendations of the board, yet the sole power rests in the Minister's hands. I do not think it is advisable that the Minister should in a matter of this description take the responsibility on his own shoulders. Here is an instance where we have an institution which is on all fours with our Agricultural Bank, which is lending money for the improvement of a man's estate just as much as that institution lends money for the improvement of a settler's holding. And we have on the one hand the Minister taking the full responsibility, whereas, on the other he hands it over to trustees, almost in its entirety. We thus are forging another weapon for the opening of the door to political patronage. I think if the Government are wise they will amend the Bill in such manner as to place the administration under trustees who are outside the public service, give them full powers and make them take the full responsibility. Thus we would have an administration which, I think, would be of advantage to the whole of the community and which would be free from any sort of political control or influence. Now, the next matter I would like to draw attention to is that the Act provides that the Government may set apart certain Crown lands for the purpose of cutting up same and establishing homes; it also provides that they may repurchase estates, and that when this is done and improvements have been made upon these Crown lands or re-purchased estates in the way of providing roads and other facilities, then an annual charge of 3 per cent. on the unimproved value, plus the cost of improvements, shall be made by way of rent. To-day we have the announcement by the Government of a loan put on the market for half a million pounds at 4 per cent., plus charges. By the way, I cannot congratulate the Treasurer upon his first attempt to raise money for the works of the State. It seems to me that he is making a very bad beginning. During the last five or six years when I have been intimately connected with the Treasury of this State, and through very much worse times than we have at the present day, we were able by judicious handling of the finances and careful management to raise all the money we required in the London market at a cost of something like £3 15s. to £3 17s. per cent., but here we have the Treasurer in his first act on assuming office raising the rate of interest to four per cent. on a loan of 20 years' duration, which means

that when we add charges on to it, and perhaps exchange too——

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to pursue that line of discussion.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: But I am drawing the conclusion that the Treasurer will lose money by this transaction.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is a long way off the Bill in discussing the financial proposals of the Government.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: May I not show what it is going to cost the Government to raise money for this Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall not object to that, but to my mind the leader of the Opposition is making statements in regard to the Premier's financial proposals. I have no desire to limit the hon. member's remarks in any other way.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: My object is to show that the loan announced this morning will cost the Government anything from £4 1s. to £4 2s. per cent., and if we are going to lend money out at 3 per cent. to the people who will be accomodated under this Bill, there is going to be a deficiency of over one per cent. What does the Treasurer propose? How is he going to get that one per cent.?

Mr. Bolton: He does not propose to charge 3 per cent. on the buildings.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Three per cent. on the unimproved value.

Mr. Bolton: That is not 3 per cent. on the money lent out.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No, but he will have to create the improvements and this expenditure will be capitalised and added to the unimproved value of the land, and 3 per cent. is to be charged by way of rental. Now, if the Government are going to charge 3 per cent. for something that is costing £4 1s. per cent. they are going to make a loss of 21s. per cent.

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Mr. Bolton: It is costing nothing for Crown lands.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Will the hon. member say that the Government will not have to re-purchase land in the majority of cases?

Mr. Bolton: I know of many instances where we will not have to buy land.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in interjecting out of his seat.

Mr. Bolton: Well, it is your seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so it is all right.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The fact that we have this loan announced fixes the value of money to-day and if we are only to get 3 per cent. for money that is going to cost the State over 4 per cent. we are going to make a loss, and some provision ought to be made for that loss. What is the Treasurer going to do? Is he going to charge it up against Consolidated Revenue, or how is he going to deal with the loss he must make on operations of this description? Let us apply the argument to re-purchased estates only, if hon. members like, and we can deal with the other later. It appears to me that there is a defect in the measure in this respect. We ought to know not only where the funds are to come from—and that is not specified, nor is the amount which the Government propose to find for this purpose; that is left for a future time and for Parliament to decide—we want to know whether the money is to be taken from Consolidated Revenue or from loan funds specially raised for the purpose or raised in the ordinary way. The scheme, if it is to be financially sound and if it is to pay its way, must, I maintain, be fashioned upon sound financial principles, and certainly I think the country is entitled to collect from anyone enjoying the benefits of the measure at any rate the cost of the money which is provided to build these homes. Surely it is never intended that the general revenue of the State should be utilised for this special purpose. At any rate, so far as I and my colleagues were concerned, we always intended, when drafting this scheme, that it should be self-supporting, that it should pay its way, and not become a burden upon the general revenue of the State. Now, the idea mentioned by the Premier in passing of having model cities fashioned and erected in Western Australia is one that must commend itself to everybody. We have only to cast our memories back to

what has been done in the old country in the building of garden cities to realise how desirable it is, when the time is ripe for that purpose, to establish cities of this description, but I wish hon. members to realise that in a country such as ours, with a large area and a small population, the time is hardly ripe for establishing cities of this kind. Of course in the Old Country, where they have these garden cities, they collect into them the people engaged in the industries established in the cities and around the cities, and as a rule we find that the residents of these places are all employed in the cities themselves or in their immediate neighbourhood, but we cannot do that here, nor is that our object. Our object is to give the existing workers—and I do not mean the ordinary mechanic but also those, as defined in the Bill, who are engaged in offices and shops, anyone who is employed in a situation, or engaged in manual labour —to give those who are employed as workers in the State to-day an opportunity of fashioning their own homes, in the first instance on their own freeholds, and secondly, if they so desire, on leaseholds provided by the Government. But then comes the question as to what suitable land we can make available for this purpose. The Minister for Lands suggested endowment lands, and, undoubtedly in some instances endowment lands would be available, but in very many instances the board, or the Government who are the board, would have to acquire special areas for this purpose. Many workers would much prefer to build on their own lands and to acquire those lands nearer to their daily employment, and in this respect I commend the Bill because the Government have not confined it solely to leasehold lands but have made provision in the measure for money to be loaned to those who build upon their own holdings. I have pointed out that no capital was provided in this Bill and I want now to also point out that even when the capital is provided there is a provision that some time or other the Minister on the recommendation of the board may from time to time draw on the fund for repayment to the Treasurer of any funds provided by Parliament for the purposes of the Act. That is all right so far as it goes, but it does not, so far as I can judge, make any provision as to what the Treasurer has to do with the money which he draws out of the funds.

Mr. Moore: It has to be paid to the Colonial Treasurer.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes, but what is the Treasurer to do with it?

Mr. Moore: It is to go to general revenue.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Is it to go to general revenue when loan moneys are utilised for this measure? I should say not, but what is the Treasurer going to do with the money when it is drawn out of the fund? There ought to be some provision in the Bill telling him how he is to handle these funds when they are withdrawn from the board. We had trouble some time ago in connection with money which had accumulated in the Treasury over a number of years on acount of the sale of certain Government property. The sum amounted to about £30,000, and we passed a special Act permitting Parliament to revote the money for any purpose it chose from time to time, and since then the money has been handled and dealt with in that way. Is it proposed to deal with the funds created under this Bill in the same way, or is the money to lie in the Treasury until special legislation is passed?

The Minister for Lands: There are numerous instances in the financial administration where loan money was expended and repaid into revenue.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I know there have been cases.

The Minister for Lands: Well, what provision was made in those cases?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: We passed a special Bill to deal with that money.

The Minister for Lands: No. You did not pass a Bill to deal with the money expended at Hamel and Nangeenan.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: If I mistake not there was one fund into which all these moneys were paid and the amount was re-voted by Parliament.

The Minister for Lands: That fund relates only to the sale of Government property.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Well, this was a sale of Government property surely.

The Minister for Lands: No. Well, what became of the money repaid from those special settlement schemes?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I suppose it was paid into the fund.

The Minister for Lands: It is paid into revenue.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No, not loan moneys?

The Minister for Lands: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I think the hon. member is making a serious mistake. I do not think he will find that any loan moneys have been repaid into revenue. The only other point I might draw attention to—and I do not know it is perhaps necessary to do so—is the limitation as to "worker." It specifies a worker shall be a person who is in receipt of not more than £400 per annum, and it is further specified—and I think reasonably so, too—that he shall not be the owner of a dwelling-house. That means, I suppose, that he shall not have a dwelling-house in his own name. Perhaps we ought to take a little greater precaution and specify that neither he nor his wife should own property. They might get over the provision of the Act by a member of the family holding any property and still come under the Act. I do not know that it matters very much if they do.

Mr. Harper: Why should it matter?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not know that it does, but the clauses are made very stringent in order that no one except those who have no home can take the benefit of the Act, and we do not want to make special provision of this kind for those who own property. The end of the Bill, its specific object, will be defeated if we do not include a provision to exclude a member of the family holding property.

Mr. Lander: How would you get over the case of a man living apart from his wife?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: He would not need a home then; he would be in lodgings. I do not think we need consider that case. As I said at the commencement of my remarks, the Bill, as a whole, is one we can cordially support. I regret the Premier has not given us more time to study the different clauses and compare them with similar legislation in the Eastern States. It is undoubted that legislation of this description will be of immense benefit to the people of the State. The main object it has is to overcome the high rents which are being paid at the present time owing to the undoubted prosperity of our country. If once a country is put on the upgrade, if once its people are made prosperous, if we fill up the cities in addition to the vacant portions of the State, naturally rents must advance, and this has been the result in Perth of late. I am happy to think we have had this result in Western Australia, and I am happy to think that now we are able to do something at any rate to assist our people to counteract the result from going to the extreme.

Mr. O'Loghlen: It has gone there.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I do not think so. I think it will go further still. The law of supply and demand will come in in regard to labour or any other article or commodity we utilise in our daily life. I think the Bill will receive the approbation of every member of the Opposition. I trust the Premier will allow the Committee stage, at any rate, to rest over for a day or two until the clauses can be given that due consideration which they ought to receive at our hands, and so that we can table any amendments that will make the Bill even more workable and more in the interests of the people it is designed to serve. It is a non-party measure. I am glad to hear the Premier say so. It is taken, I repeat, from the policy of the Opposition, and in that respect we can give it our most cordial support, only we want to see it made as perfect as possible in the circumstances.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): I rise to prevent the Bill being put through too hastily. We naturally expected that the other side would have had something to say on the matter which apparently is so dear to their hearts. The leader of the Opposition has practically voiced almost all that can be said from this side of the House, and it is not necessary for me to make much of a speech.

Mr. Underwood: What about those tenements of yours?

Mr. GEORGE: I wish the hon. member would restrain himself. I did not catch what he said, and I do not suppose it matters very much. One thing I notice particularly in the Bill is the constitution of the board. The leader of the Opposition has pointed out the Premier's inconsistency with regard to the advisory board when the Public Works Committee Bill was under discussion, and the way this Bill has been drafted; but the point I desire to have considered is the effect that the Premier is practically creating another department of the State. If the policy is fully carried out the board under this measure will go to greater lengths than even anticipated by the authors of the measure, however sanguine they may be and whether they be on this side or on the other side, or whether there is a sort of coalition in regard to it. I am satisfied there is not the slightest chance of success for the scheme unless the men appointed to the board have wide experience in connection with similar matters. I notice full power is given, as one would expect, and one would require, to appoint "such inspectors, valuers and other officers" as may be needed to carry out the work. That of itself must necessarily mean a large staff, even if the operations of the board were to be confined to Perth alone; but I take it the object of the Government is that the provisions of the Act shall apply to the whole of the State, in which case it will be necessary to have not only a permanent staff so far as Perth is concerned, but a travelling staff of inspectors, valuers and officers. No doubt there are inspectors and other officers in the Public Works Department dealing with other duties; but when this particular work comes on, the board will require a staff of their own; that I am satisfied about. When the Premier was leader of the Opposition carrying on a campaign against the late Government he is reported to have stated that he required from the person who might take one of these houses 51 instalments of £3 10s. each as repayment for every £100 that might be advanced. There could not be a much better business proposition if people would only fall down to it and pay that amount of money, which I doubt; but there could not be a better proposition as a business matter put before a group of financiers in the whole world. Taking 51 instalments at £3 10s. each per £100 on a £500 house it would practically return something in the neighbourhood of £900 before the house became the property of the person who took it. I am satisfied that system of financing would be far more stringent and oppressive on the person than an ordinary building society.

The Minister for Works: Does the Bill say that?

Mr. GEORGE: I am speaking of what the Premier, as leader of the Opposition, stated in his campaign. It is in a newspaper, and we always believe the newspapers, and it is a matter that may be legitimately referred to in the House, and contrasted with the contents of the Bill.

The Minister for Works: You know the statement is absolutely ridiculous; it would not come from a sane man.

Mr. GEORGE: I would be sorry on the authority of the Minister for Works to say that the Premier is not a sane man.

The Minister for Works: You know perfectly well he did not say it.

Mr. GEORGE: He is reported to have said it; and, to adopt the tactics of hon. members on the Government side, if you do not contradict a statement it is true. However, that is correct, and we all know it.

The Minister for Works: The Premier never said it, and possibly it was never reported.

Mr. GEORGE: The statement appeared in the *West Australian* at the time, and I am giving it accurately.

The Minister for Works: I would like to see it.

Mr. GEORGE: I can show it to you; I give my word for it. There is another provision I cannot quite see the justice of. Probably it will be explained by the Minister. Every worker's dwelling is to be exempted from assessment under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act. That is hardly in consonance with the statement put forth by the platform which was used to lead to victory our friends on the Government side, the statement or plank of "land taxation without exemption." Why should there be exemption with regard to workers' dwellings?

The Minister for Works: They are under leasehold tenure.

Mr. GEORGE: That makes no difference.

The Minister for Works: Do you tax Crown tenants?

Mr. GEORGE: I do not know what I would do if I had a chance, but I am certain the hon. member would tax everyone but himself if he had the opportunity. There is provision made by which a person may sell his interest in a worker's dwelling, and the board shall repurchase the same by refunding the whole of the instalments. It hardly appears to be in consonance with usual business rules that a person shall enter into an engagement with the Government of the day for the erection of a building, and then, if he repents of the bargain or wishes to shift away from the country, or to another part of the country, that the Government will practically hand over to him all the money he has paid in connection with the house with the exception of the rent of the ground on which the house is being built.

Mr. Carpenter: And a sum for depreciation.

Mr. GEORGE: Exactly; but still we all know that if there is a constant change of tenants in connection with a house there is a considerable amount of damage done by the shifting in and shifting out of the various parties which can hardly be appraised or brought to a fixed sum; and without wishing to make the measure in any shape or form to operate otherwise than for the good of those it will benefit, it seems to me that the repayment of the whole of the money paid in by the man under these conditions is asking a little bit more than can be considered reasonable. It is stated very clearly that the only part on which there shall be no refund shall be the moneys paid by way of interest or rent. It seems to me the Government might reconsider that point. I do not wish to make it penal, but I do not think the Government should enter into the erection of dwellings and make shifting from them as easy as it apparently is in this House. I think a man should have some sort of feeling that he has some possession in his house, and that he cannot leave it at caprice as he might do in regard to a rented house. I notice with regard to every mortgage under this Bill there is provided a period under which the length of the mortgage shall be, and it is set out that for stone or brick houses the term shall not exceed 30 years, for concrete 20 years, and for wood and iron houses 15 years, and yet I see no reference in a previous clause to the repayment of the capital cost of the dwelling-house, as to whether it shall be paid by the lessee in instalments extending over these periods. It seems to me that these two clauses will have to be brought into accord. There is another matter I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to. Under certain provisions it is possible for the board to enter into and take possession of the dwelling of the lessee, and dispose of it, but it does not appear, at least I have not been able to see it, to be imperative that the disposal of this house must be to another of the same class of occupier. It may be sold even to a bloated capitalist.

The Minister for Mines: That is covered by the definition of the term worker.

Mr. GEORGE: When it comes to the question of sale, either by private sale or public tender or auction, what provision can be made to prevent the property

from falling into the hands of a person who does not come within the provisions of the measure.

The Minister for Mines: It says that no one can hold it except under certain conditions; none therefore can purchase outside these conditions.

Mr. GEORGE: I would point out that there is considerable danger even in that. From the mere fact of one of these homes being put up for auction it does not follow that it will be taken up by someone else and occupied, and the State, especially when bad times come along, would be in the same position as any other owner of property when his house is empty. Who will bear the brunt then, the general taxpayer?

The Minister for Works: Of course you have the deposits which can be forfeited.

Mr. GEORGE: Let us suppose, under the present conditions, the cost of building is protected under the provisions of the Bill. We all know perfectly well that the cost of building at the present time is probably from 25 to 30 per cent. more than it was two or three years ago, and probably double what it was 10 or 12 years ago. Assuming to-day a house was erected under the provisions of this measure, and a slump came, as they do come at times, it might possibly pay, and it would pay the owner under this Bill, to forfeit his deposit and clear away. I see no provision to prevent later on another application coming from the same person to get a dwelling erected in another part of the State. That is one of the dangers with our shifting population, and I think we can call our population shifting. This Bill is taking the responsibility of building homes for the people and we are not objecting to them doing that, but it is only just that we should see exactly where we are going. Take, for instance, in Kalgoorlie, or Menzies, or in any other goldfields town, if this Act had been inforced 10 or 15 years ago, there would have been a great demand for houses at that time, but at the present time where would the State be in connection with these houses?

The Minister for Works: The State would have had 10 or 15 years' rent from them.

Mr. GEORGE: Would that have paid the capital cost of the houses?

The Minister for Works: But what would the value of them have been?

Mr. GEORGE: In connection with any gold-mining boom, where the people go right out back, for instance, in connection with the Bullfinch boom, where the people went out to Mount Jackson, I understand, and it was published in the newspapers, that there were houses found out there in which the people had left their household goods some years before, when they left that district. We all know that in goldfields towns something of the kind must occur. It seems to me that the board, and the Government, and Parliament also, will have to be careful how far they will allow the extension of this matter to go. Perhaps in Perth, Fremantle, or any large cities there might not be so much danger, but this measure will apply to the whole of Western Australia, and, with a shifting population, there is an element of almost certain loss with regard to Government transactions in this matter. I think that is about all I desire to say, as the leader of the Opposition has dealt with the matter exhaustively. If it seems desirable that further expression is necessary it can be done in Committee, when we shall have the opportunity of speaking on the individual clauses.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): I wish to point out, for the information of the leader of the Opposition, that if any credit is due to a member of this House for originating the idea of workers' homes, it is due to the member for Forrest, because I think in the session of 1909 he outlined to a very considerable extent the proposals for the establishment of these workers' homes, the proposals upon which this Bill is largely drafted.

Mr. Frank Wilson: In this House?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, and as recorded in *Hansard*. However, I am not materially concerned as to who

spoke about it. The question is as to who performs the particular service. One of the objections raised by the leader of the Opposition was in regard to the constitution of the board, and he seemed to infer that the objection raised by the Premier to the constitution of an advisory board in regard to railway concerns could also be lodged to the constitution of the board as embodied in this measure. I would point out a very vital difference.

Mr. Frank Wilson: It takes them away from their work.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That objection is quite true in regard to the advisory board because it necessitated travelling round the country away from their offices, and necessitated long absence from their offices. Under this particular proposal we can avail ourselves of the services of the officers who are engaged in this particular work. The supervision of public buildings at the present time is work which is of a similar character.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You cannot put them on a board of this sort.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We can avail ourselves of the services of the officers.

Mr. Frank Wilson: The board can do that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We can avail ourselves of the services of the officers by placing them on the board, or one at least of them, for the purpose of advising on work which would be very much of the nature of the work already undertaken by that officer, and which will not necessitate his leaving his office, or disregarding his particular work at the present time. Then again, there is nothing to prevent the appointment of officers already at the command of the Government, who have a particular capacity in this direction, by giving them a permanent position on the board. The objection to the Premier's arguments against an advisory board are certainly not tenable. The leader of the Opposition also refers to the fact that certain matters will have to be decided by the Ministers, and, as an alternative, he suggests that we should have three trustees appointed who will be free from some vague entity called political influence. I think this question of political influence is sometimes flogged to death.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You flogged it to death when you were on this side of the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: After all, Government is political influence, and it is very undesirable that we should have officers from departments, or trustees, administering an important concern, who, by being absolutely freed of Government control, may become ultimately out of date and entirely out of touch with the opinions of the people. If by political influence is meant control by the Government representing the people, then it is essential we should retain some measure of that, or otherwise we would have a number of inadequate conservative institutions which would be entirely out of touch with the progress of the community. If, on the other hand, is meant that political influence which might be exerted from outside through politicians, and I take it the leader of the Opposition has in his mind something of what occurs in America, then he is not going to free the administration from that kind of influence by the appointment of trustees. They could be approached just the same in this way. We might lay down or prescribe a provision that members of Parliament should not be allowed to approach the trustees, but that would in no measure prevent the trustees from approaching members of Parliament, or certain individual members of Parliament, to the exclusion of others, and exercising or creating political influence which would be of a very undesirable character. What we want is that if there is to be Government, or control through representatives of the people, that it should be direct, plain, and apparent to the people.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Make it a department, do not have trustees.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am merely dealing with the argument of the leader of the Opposition that we should have three trustees who would be entirely free from political control. We are

constituting a board to carry out the administrative work under the general power of the administration which is exercised by Ministers responsible to Parliament, and in their turn responsible to the people who elect them. The question of the loan proposals of the Government is one which, of course, the Premier and Treasurer will deal with in his Budget speech. I hardly think this is an occasion to deal with the point as to whether the 4 per cent. loan——

Mr. Frank Wilson: I did not intend to raise a discussion on the action of the Treasurer in floating a certain loan. I was pointing out that that loan would cost the country over 4 per cent., and that if under this Bill we were to lend the money out at 3 per cent. we would lose by the transaction.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): We are not lending it at 3 per cent.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Yes, you are.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the leader of the Opposition will look up the provision for fixing the value on which this percentage is based, he will find there is ample power in the Bill to protect the board from sustaining a loss, even if we have to pay 4 per cent. When we are in Committee we can point out that safeguard to the leader of the Opposition. We must also remember the fact that in a number of instances we would be able to avail ourselves of Crown lands for which we would not have to expend money for which 4 per cent. is paid, and we could then bring down the percentage and average the land we had to purchase with money at 4 per cent. with what we have not had to pay anything for, and so we could provide this general accommodation at an average of 3 per cent. and still keep ourselves on the right side.

Mr. Frank Wilson: That is a very bad financial proposition.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The leader of the Opposition has another objection which, after all, is nominal, namely that where money may be repaid by the board to the Treasurer we do not say how the Treasurer shall dispose of that money. Perhaps it would be an advantage to express in the Bill just how that money shall be utilised, but I do want to point out to the leader of the Opposition that he has acquired a very great measure of virtue since he has been in his present position. If he will turn up successive reports of the Auditor General, he will find that in many instances where we have utilised Loan Funds, moneys which have been repaid and which should have gone to the redemption of those Loan Funds have been paid into revenue. I have an instance in connection with the Denmark estate, in which the Auditor General states that the estate had been originally purchased from loan, and that all subsequent expenditure had been charged thereto, notwithstanding which a small portion of the estate had been sold and any money received paid to revenue. And the Auditor General went on to draw the attention of the department to the necessity of providing some method of dealing with the receipts on an equitable basis, remarking that it was quite apparent that all the receipts should not go to revenue while, on the other hand, revenue was providing the interest and sinking fund in connection with the loan expenditure. There are other places where this policy has obtained of paying out of Loan Fund and placing the receipts to revenue.

Mr. Frank Wilson: That has been all fixed up. You will find a minute to that effect.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think the matter has been completely adjusted. However, the point raised will be easily remedied in Committee, and I have no doubt the Premier will readily fall in with any reasonable amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition. The member for Murray-Wellington calls attention to the provision for exempting from taxation the holders of workers' dwellings on the leasehold principle. I certainly think the clause needs more careful drafting; because the idea is to exempt him from payment of land tax only because his payment of rent on the unimproved value of the land is really a land tax and, therefore, he

should not be charged again with the statutory land tax. As we make provision for reappraisement it would be absolutely unjust to charge him land tax over and above the annual economical determination on the unimproved value of his holding.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You collect land tax on other leasehold land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, because under our existing land taxation measure no provision is made for reappraisement of leasehold rents.

Mr. Frank Wilson: It only runs a certain number of years.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member will remember that when the measure was going through I called attention to that very point, and stated that there were pastoral lessees who had secured large holdings at 10s. or £1 per thousand acres, which were infinitely more valuable; and I contended that the tax should be based on what those holdings were worth. That is precisely the point of view we take to-day, and in this case, seeing that we are making provision for reappraisement at the end of a specific period, we think it would be unjust to impose a land tax over and above the rent annually imposed.

Mr. Frank Wilson: You propose to redraft this clause?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think it will need to be redrafted in order to make it absolutely clear. I do not know of any other point which cannot be just as well dealt with when the particular clauses are before the Committee, except to express gratification at the general commendation and acceptance which has been given to the measure.

Mr. DOOLEY (Geraldton): I rise to support the Bill, and particularly that portion of it coming under the head of administration by a board of permanent employees of the civil service, in preference to delegating the power to some outside authority. From the experience we have had of this particular phase of public administration, I think we must admit that it has proved itself a failure. I remember when the Public Service Commissioner was appointed how that appointment was hailed as one likely to effect a great reform and do away with a great deal of dissatisfaction existing throughout the public service; but instead of that, we find, after years of experience, that the position is rather accentuated than otherwise. Then it was argued that if we appointed a Commissioner of Railways instead of a general manager as we then had, it would effect a great reform and give general satisfaction. As far as my experience goes, I can only come to the conclusion that as the administrator of an important department he has been a failure. For these reasons I commend the Government for having dealt with the matter in the Bill in the way they have done, keeping it well within the control of the Minister in charge of the department. Seeing that it is a new measure of an experimental character I think it is just as well to keep the administration under the control of the Minister, and so subject to the criticism and influence of the House. In regard to the remarks of the member for Murray-Wellington about the houses and land, and in respect to the possibility of a community or locality going down, there is this to be said: that no matter what undertaking of a public character we initiate, there are always certain possibilities to be considered. If certain public necessities are required the Government have to meet them and provide accommodation in many ways, and if the place happens to go down there is a certain amount of loss entailed. If the clauses are not sufficiently elastic to give power to a board to satisfy themselves that the communities referred to by the member for Murray-Wellington are not sufficiently stable, I think discretionary power should be given to the board to say whether the investment is or is not sufficiently safe. I think these little bogies should not disturb members' minds in regard to the general and ultimate success of this measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[*Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

BILL—COLLIE RATES VALIDATION.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker), in moving the second reading, said: This is one of the necessary Bills occasionally passed by this Chamber. I may mention that the member for Collie should have introduced this Bill, but as there are some objections to a measure of this kind being in charge of a private member, I have undertaken the introduction of it. It is for the purpose of validating certain rates imposed by the Collie local board of health, for the year ended the 31st October, 1910.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Why did the rates require validation?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was some doubt as to the methods of imposition, as to certain formalities having been complied with. The rates have been collected and no objection was offered to them, and it is to avoid the possibility of future litigation that it is desired now to have this Bill passed. I therefore move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): I take it from the very few remarks made by the Minister in introducing this Bill that it is merely to validate some action by the municipality of Collie, acting as a local board of health, with respect to the collection of rates. I presume from the necessity of this Bill that they had no authority to collect the rates, but there has been very little explanation of the measure, and it is just as well that one should know what it means. I know that in the past measures of this kind have been passed through this Chamber. Local bodies have collected rates, believing they had authority under the Act to do so——

The Attorney General: In this case they had the right to collect the rates, but did not formally comply with the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, and to prevent litigation on the part of those who, though not dissatisfied when they paid the rates, yet having later found out that all the formalities had not been complied with, felt injured and threatened in some instances legal proceedings, validating Bills have been brought forward. In such circumstances as those Parliament has rightly passed Bills to validate the rates and I take it that this Bill is on all fours with those instances I have mentioned. That being so, I intend to support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—Validation of rates:

Mr. NANSON: This was a general validation of rates, but the Attorney General had not informed members in what particular the Collie municipality had failed to comply with the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act or the Health Act. Perhaps it would be just as well before actually passing the Bill through Committee that members should be informed of the reasons which had made the measure necessary. There was some danger in giving validation for a rate struck, when the Committee were in entire ignorance of the causes rendering the validation necessary.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The measure had been originally in charge of the member for Collie, who had informed him there had been some mere lack of technical formality, such as the issue of the rates on a particular day and at a particular time. There was nothing radically informal or illegal, but some negligence on the part of the council, acting as the board of health, had made it questionable whether, if the matter were tested in a court of law, the imposition of the rate would be held to be legal.

Mr. Taylor: Is there any litigation pending?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not so far as he had been informed. The rates had been collected and the measure was only for the purpose of settling a doubt.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 30th November.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; Mr. McDonald in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Saving:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

That the following words be added to stand as Paragraph 5:—"To the shearing of sheep in any city, town or municipality."

Those words were taken from the Victorian Act and provided for the contingency of shearing being done in a town or municipality. In some Eastern States schools of shearing were established in the towns or on the show grounds. There was some experimental shearing done on the show ground in this State, and he understood that there was a school of shearing at North Fremantle. The amendment would obviate the necessity for providing accommodation for shearers in those circumstances.

Mr. McDONALD: So far as he was concerned there would be no objection to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Definition:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

That the definition of "shearer" be struck out with the view of inserting another definition.

It was his intention, if these words were struck out, to move another definition which was taken from the Victorian Act, with the exception of the last four words referring to aboriginal natives.

Mr. Taylor: Those words are really objectionable here.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was thought by those interested that the definition he would propose was much clearer than the one in the measure, and that the definition in the measure would possibly cover people whom it was not intended to cover. For instance, a station hand, might happen to be about the shed, and he would consequently come under the definition of shearer as provided in the measure.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was possible that in Victoria the last four words dealing with aboriginal natives might be applicable, because there were not so many natives there who were following the occupation of shearers, but in this State he was led to believe that there were many employed. So far as the other portion of the proposed amendment was concerned, there would be no objection to it. He was not aware how shearing was carried on in Western Australia, but he was familiar with it in three of the other States of the Commonwealth. There the shearer was very easily identified, because he had to sign an agreement with the squatter as to the price he would receive and the conditions under which he would work. The shearer was defined by common practice.

Mr. Frank Wilson: But we want to include it in the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was to be hoped the last four words of the proposed amendment would not be pressed, unless it was the desire of the member in charge of the Bill to see them included.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Is it necessary to provide them with the same accommodation?

Mr. TAYLOR: It was necessary to provide them with everything that was provided the white man.

Mr. McDonald: They provide white and blacks with the same accommodation on some stations.

Mr. TAYLOR: They certainly did not provide them with accommodation under the same roof.

Mr. McDONALD: When shearing was not in progress the matter would have nothing whatever to do with those who were interested: all they were concerned about was when the shearing was in progress, so whether the words were included was not material. The objection raised by the member for Sussex that somebody who might happen to be about the shearing shed being mistaken for shearers was quite ridiculous. There was no desire to countenance the aboriginal native at all, and with the ex-

ception of those words, he would be content to allow the proposed new definition to take the place of that which appeared in the Bill.

Mr. MALE: It seemed necessary to have the four concluding words relating to the aboriginal natives, and he failed to see why the member for Gascoyne should raise any objection, more especially if he did not desire to countenance natives at all. Not mentioning anything about the natives would bring them under the scope of the measure, and it was to prevent the white men being accommodated with the natives that the leader of the Opposition wished to include the words, by substituting the definition he had suggested, which would make the position clearer.

Mr. GARDINER: The four concluding words relating to the aboriginal natives were objectionable. Members of the Assembly were not desirous of perpetuating that system of slavery which had existed for a considerable time, and if these words were inserted in the clause it would be implied that we tolerated the employment of aborigines in shearing sheds. Some stations in the North-West employed nothing but natives to do their shearing, and if we inserted this clause as proposed it would be by inference allowing these people to think that members were in favour of the employment of natives for shearing purposes and other station work.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

That the following definition of "shearer" be inserted—"Shearer means any person employed in or about a shearing shed in the shearing of sheep or in work connected therewith, but does not include a person who is employed on the holding on which the shearing shed is situate when the shearing is not in progress nor does it include any member of the employer's family, or any aboriginal native."

Mr. A. E. PIESSE moved an amendment to the proposed definition—

That after the word "family" in the last line the words "wool classers or experts quartered and dining apart from shearers" be inserted.

It was understood that the member in charge of the Bill had no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no necessity for the amendment. These persons never did remain in the same quarters as the shearers.

Amendment (Mr. Piesse's) passed.

Mr. TAYLOR moved a further amendment—

That the words in the proposed definition of shearer "or any aboriginal native" be struck out.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It must be borne in mind this definition would apply throughout the Bill. There was no question of slavery in regard to the aborigines in this country, but there were a number of people in Western Australia who employed natives for shearing and paid the union rate of wages to them. Was there any necessity to provide that a native who was paid as well as the ordinary shearer should have accommodation provided for him?

Mr. Green: Where was this? Give an instance.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: In his own case. There were many places in Western Australia where natives were employed as well as at his own place, and there was no reason to compel the employer to put up accommodation for these men who did not require it. These aborigines came to a station with their wives and families, they had tents and vehicles and they camped on the station. South of the Murchison all were farmers, the squatting element was being eliminated from that part of Western Australia, but there was a number of people who had sheep and aborigines went about from place to place and were employed. Members should not object to aborigines being employed at this work if they were willing to work and were paid the proper rate of wages.

Mr. Green: There was an objection to their being employed for nothing.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: That was foreign to the issue. This definition would work a hardship to some people. The word "shearer" included the aboriginal

native under the Bill because the only person exempt was the Asiatic. In the North-West an employer might have 10 or 16 shearers and amongst them several aborigines, and should this employer have to put up separate accommodation for both classes of shearers? The object of the amendment was to make an aborigine not a shearer under the Bill, and therefore accommodation would not have to be provided for him. It was absurd to force persons to put up accommodation for people which would not be used. In the interests of the sheep owners and not in any way interfering with the shearers, the words should not be struck out.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Moore stated that an aborigine native was a shearer and yet he wished to have an aborigine native struck out of the Bill.

Mr. Nanson: Only in regard to accommodation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In the first place the member for Moore was not agreeable to the aborigine being included as a shearer and at the same time he said that the aborigine was a shearer.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the definition of shearer as printed with the words which had been added was carried then, if an aboriginal was employed, other shearing accommodation would have to be provided for that native. That was the object of the amendment so he understood. He desired to place the aborigines if employed at shearing on the same level as other shearers, as in that case the aborigine would not be employed, for it must be understood he was not in sympathy with the employment of aborigines.

Mr. Frank Wilson: The white shearer would be inconvenienced if two aborigine shearers were allowed to occupy the same accommodation as the white shearers.

Mr. TAYLOR: Unless the spirit of the white shearer had deteriorated since he (Mr. Taylor) was one of them, they would see to that aspect of the question. He was credibly informed that the shearers in the North-West had no accommodation provided for them, and this Bill was brought down so that the squatter should provide adequate and decent accommodation. There was a large number of aborigines employed at shearing and he was informed these men received nothing. If the employer had to provide accommodation for the native shearer he would not employ him. There was certain work that an aborigine could do better than a white man but it was not shearing sheep or laborious work. As far as tracking and hunting stock were concerned the aborigine was all right, he was preferable to the white man unless the white man was well schooled in that line of work. If the striking out of the words would discourage the employer from having aborigine shearers then he (Mr. Taylor) would be glad.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was all very well for the hon. member to indulge in heroics as to the aborigines. The hon. member wanted to give aborigines the same accommodation as the white man, but the aborigines would not use the same accommodation. They would not live in the quarters with the white men. They travelled round the stations with their families, and in some instances camped all the year round on squatters' stations. Certainly the squatter got their services, but often had to keep the whole tribe. Was it in the interests of the white shearer that where an aboriginal was employed the station owner could order the aborigines to sleep in the room with the white shearers? By striking out the words as the member for Mount Margaret proposed, it would legally give the station owner the power to order that. There was no desire to do anything wrong in connection with the natives. The State provided for these natives better than most of the States of the Commonwealth; and our squatters, taking them all round, were generous towards the natives. In fact, many squatters kept whole tribes the whole year round when they would rather have natives off their stations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When squatters did not want niggers they would not have them there. It was a fact that squatters got their sheep shorn by natives at about a quarter of what it would cost by employing white men. In many instances the whole of the shearing was done by natives, and it was astonishing to hear

the member for Moore claim he paid union rates to aborigines. It was the first time he (Mr. Underwood) had heard of a man even pretending he was paying union rates to aborigines.

Hon. H. B. Lefroy: I hope the hon. member does not wish to insinuate I do not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD would not doubt the hon. member's word, but there were many who would. Members' desire was that the aborigines should be considered as shearers. The natives might be a conquered race, but it was up to members to see that they got fair conditions and had fair accommodation provided. As the Bill stipulated for a certain number of shearers to be employed before the accommodation provisions of the Act would apply, by employing natives with a few white men the squatter could avoid the provisions of the Act, should the words the leader of the Opposition wished to remain in the definition be retained, and a station employing four white shearers and eight native shearers would not be required to provide accommodation. It was necessary to fairly consider the position of the natives. People employed them practically for their tucker, and the State spent thousands of pounds a year in keeping them when they became old and unable to work. The tale about squatters keeping large tribes was to a great extent a romance. As a general thing the squatters employed the natives so long as it paid them to do so. When it no longer paid them, and when the natives could not earn tucker and clothes, the aborigines had to go out into the bush, where, in the North-West, miners and prospectors gave them tea and sugar. The amendment should be struck out as a step towards dealing with the whole aborigines question, which, later on, should be considered and dealt with in regard to all its phases. At any rate, where aborigines were shearing they should be counted as shearers.

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

Amendment (to insert new definition as amended) put and passed.

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

That the definition of "shearing shed" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu,—"Shearing shed means any shed or building used in the shearing of sheep or any operation connected therewith."

This also was taken from the Victorian Act. The words in the Bill were rather superficial and not required. The Victorian words were a better definition.

Mr. McDONALD: The amendment proposed to strike out the words "scouring, sorting or pressing wool." If passed the result would be that no accommodation need be provided for men employed in this work. The object was to save expense to the squatter, while the labourer could put up with "pot luck." The definition should remain as printed in the Bill, because, though there was little scouring or sorting done about wool sheds now, undoubtedly before long this work would form part of the work performed during the wool season or a little afterwards.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: One must take exception to the expressions of the hon. member. The hon. member was most unfair to others, as men of his class always were, being unreasonable and unfair. Members could simply stand back and oppose the Bill tooth and nail if they wished to ignore the rights of the shearers, but their principles were to do justice to all men. Because someone proposed a definition acceptable to the unions of the Eastern States, the hon. member commenced to claim that the object was to do the utmost to injure the shearers.

Mr. Taylor: Under the amendment no scourers or sorters will get accommodation.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Because they had already accommodation when scouring was done on the station, which did not occur in many instances. He did not care whether members accepted the amendment, but it was a reasonable suggestion taken from the Victorian legislation. It would have been much better had the hon. member left the Bill for

discussion between the squatters and the shearers' union. The union had never asked for such a Bill. In fact, it was intended to discuss the whole measure at a conference next year. It was unfair to charge members of the Opposition with wishing to do an injury to the shearers, merely because an amendment had been moved which was accepted in Victoria and elsewhere.

Mr. McDONALD: There had been no intention of being unfair, but why should the wool scourers and pressers be debarred from the rights of accommodation? As to the contention that conference had not discussed the Bill, it was nearly two years since the conference held by representatives of the pastoralists' association and of the union, and there was a clause in the agreement which distinctly stated that full and proper accommodation should be provided for the men engaged. It was well known that the agreement had not been carried out in the northern parts of the State, while it had not been satisfactorily carried out down in the South-West, although it was to be admitted that in one instance down there the best accommodation in Australia was to be found.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the leader of the Opposition struck out the definition of shearer and shearing shed, and inserted the amendment he desired, he would certainly remove those employed in sorting and pressing. He hoped the hon. member had no desire to remove the sorters and pressers, who should be provided for in the same way as the shearers. Why should the employer expect those engaged in scouring to live under worse conditions than the other employees? At the time when the industry in the Eastern States was in the stage it had now reached in Western Australia the conditions prevailing in the Eastern States were much the same as those existing in Western Australia to-day. We therefore had the advantage of knowing what had happened in the Eastern States. And why should we not make use of this knowledge, and see to it that the conditions in our own State were levelled up to reasonable requirements? He hoped the leader of the Opposition would not pin his faith too closely to something which was wholly inadequate to the requirements of Western Australia.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The amendment stated that the shearing shed meant any shed or building used in the shearing of sheep, or in any operation connected therewith. If pressing were done in that shed it was an operation in connection with the shearing of sheep, and so, too, was the scouring; consequently the provisions would apply to those operatives just as much as to the shearers. The intention of the amendment was that the provisions of the Bill should not apply to a place where they engaged in nothing but the scouring of wool. It would not cut out any man employed about the shed. The Victorian Act, the latest we had in regard to the accommodation of shearers, contained this very amendment, which had been given mature consideration in the course of the debates in the Victorian Parliament. He was sorry that any hon. member on the Ministerial side should have said that hon. members opposite were desirous of being unjust to the employees.

Mr. DOOLEY: Having heard members on the Opposition side it seemed to him that it was a question of six of one and half a dozen of the other. Where, then, was the necessity for adopting a new clause which was not so explicit as that in the Bill?

Mr. GREEN: It was just possible that the amendment might be loaded. In the clause in the Bill certain avocations were noted, such as scouring, sorting and pressing, but these were not included in the amendment. It left a suspicion that some legal objection might be raised to exclude these particular workers. Moreover, he had failed to discover any definite reason why the amendment should have been moved. For these reasons he intended to oppose it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 4, 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Sufficient accommodation in other building:

Mr. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

That paragraph 2 of Subclause 2 be struck out, and the following words inserted in lieu:—"Proper and sufficient accommodation as regards sleeping room shall mean not less than 250 cubic feet of space for each shearer sleeping in any room or apartment. Provided that the requirement shall be deemed to have been sufficiently complied with if the shearers are provided with tent accommodation to the satisfaction of the inspector."

The reason for the amendment was, first of all, not to compel separate rooms to be constructed, which he held would be detrimental to the health and comfort of the men, and secondly to enable tents to be utilised to the satisfaction of the inspector. The first portion of the amendment was taken from the South Australian Act of 1905, and the latter portion from Clause 14 of the recently passed Victorian Act. In South Australia provision was made for 240 cubic feet for each shearer, and in Victoria 250 cubic feet. The member in charge of the Bill, he knew, objected to the latter portion of the amendment dealing with tent accommodation, but that hon. hon. member's statement, that the men were all against tents, was hardly borne out at the conference between the pastoralists and the representatives of the union, when Mr. Buntine, one of the vice-presidents of the union, said that none of the men would object to good duck tents, two men in each. This provision had not been objected to by the Labour members in the Victorian Parliament, and he hoped that the member for Gascoyne would accept the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD: So far as the conference between the shearers and the pastoralists was concerned, he had already admitted that one of the men had spoken in favour of the use of tents, but that gentleman had been sorry ever since because the men had given him a rough time.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Why?

Mr. McDONALD: Because tents were most uncomfortable, as the hon. member would know if he had ever slept in a tent after a hard day's shearing; shearing was the hardest work a man could undertake.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Have you ever worked in a ballast pit?

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, but not at shearing.

Mr. Male: Why did the men not accept the accommodation provided for them, and take tents in preference?

Mr. McDONALD: Had there been any such instance?

Mr. Male: What about Mr. Butcher? He made that statement.

Mr. McDONALD: All Mr. Butcher's cubicles had been filled, and that gentleman objected to tents. The member for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) had stated that the owner of a station in Kimberley might have only two rooms for himself, and yet might have to put up 8 rooms for 32 shearers; what an anomaly it was, that the squatter should have to erect 8 rooms for 32 shearers, when he required two rooms for himself! The space of 360 cubic feet per man was asked for in the Bill, and that provision in Queensland was considered fair. The members of the Opposition were suggesting that the shearers should be content with 250 cubic feet each.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Only in a large room.

Mr. McDONALD: Surely a man required as much air to breathe in a large room as in a small room. So far as tents were concerned the men objected to being obliged to spend the whole of their Saturday afternoon and Sunday in tents; in fact, tent accommodation wherever it had been tried in the North-West had been a failure, and had been condemned by both shearers and shed hands. He might also make it known that they stood out for 360 cubic feet of air.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member for Gascoyne had stated that all men were dead against tents, yet Mr. Butcher, who owned a station which was recognised as one of the best fitted stations in the State——

Mr. McDonald: The second best.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Mr. Butcher stated that only this season some of his employees had asked for tents that they

might pitch in the bush; that showed that the men did not object to that accommodation. Mr. Gooch stated that last season some of the shearers refused to go into the buildings erected for them, and asked for tents, and the reason was that some of the men played cards, some smoked, and some read late, and others did not. Were the Committee to accept the statement of the hon. member that the men all objected to tents, and not attach any weight to the statement of the pastoralists that men in some cases had asked for tents? Surely the hon. member could accept what had been accepted in the Parliament of Victoria, without opposition, viz., that tents, subject to the approval of the inspector, should be regarded as complying with the accommodation requirements?

Mr. Munsie: Are the climatic conditions as bad in Victoria as here?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The climatic conditions in Victoria, with its sudden changes of temperature, were very much worse than they were in the North-West of this State.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If Mr. McDonald insisted on the clause as printed he might be doing an injustice to many of the shearers in the North-West. Many of the stations there had no timber within miles of their property, and the owners would be compelled to utilize corrugated iron, and hon. members could well understand what it meant to go into an iron shed after a hot day and heavy work. He felt certain that a tent would be preferable to such iron sheds. The Committee surely did not intend to compel pastoralists to carry timber 200 or 300 miles inland.

Mr. McDonald: They carted their homesteads in.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Many of them regretted having done so because white ants had eaten a number of the houses down in recent years. Tents would supply much more comfortable accommodation than would be provided if the clause as printed were to be insisted upon.

Mr. MALE: It was his intention to support the amendment which made provision for supplying tents instead of other accommodation. The member for Gascoyne referred to the question of living in Kimberley. Would not the honourable member, when he had finished work, rather go into a nice cool tent than into nothing more or less than a hot oven. The thing would be absolutely impossible. The honourable member could not possibility live in iron rooms in the tropics, especially when it was considered that shearing started in the middle of March. It would be impossible for men to settle comfortably inside these iron buildings. Instances could be given where men had asked for tent accommodation. Reference had been made to shearers' delegates. He (Mr. Male) had spoken with delegates and others and one had expressed the opinion that in the hot part of the State, he would prefer to live in a tent every time than in a building. He (Mr. Male) did not say that buildings should be done away with altogether, but provision should be made that tents might be used in those parts where it would be advisable to use them rather than a properly constructed building.

Mr. LANDER: It was to be hoped that the clause would be allowed to stand as it was. It would be a very different thing for the squatter to define what a tent really was. The honourable member who introduced the Bill deserved credit for having done so; the only regrettable thing was that the step had not been taken years before to protect not only the shearers but the rouseabouts and wool sorters.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The member for Gascoyne ought to accept the amendment with regard to tent accommodation. So far as the 250 cubic feet of space was concerned he did not think that was sufficient; he would prefer 360 cubic feet and if the hon. member accepted that increase he might also accept the provision with regard to tent accommodation. This question would not remain in the hands of the squatters; it would be for the inspector to decide whether it was proper tent accommodation.

Mr. GARDINER: The clause should be permitted to stand as it appeared in

the Bill. Those members who had spoken could have no conception of the climatic conditions of the various parts of the State, particularly where shearing was carried on. The hon. member for Kimberley knew that at times in his electorate the heat was most oppressive, and probably in the course of a few days there would be heavy rainfall and violent winds which would make tent life absolutely impossible. He knew where shearers had refused to live in the accommodation provided as it was absolutely inadequate. In almost all instances bushmen who were working at shearing, followed a most arduous occupation and they preferred other kinds of dwellings than tents. From experience he knew that tent accommodation would be quite useless in many parts of this State, chiefly where shearing was carried on.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : As one who had no experience on shearing stations or among shearers he was particularly struck with the fact that members who had had experience on sheep stations and shearing sheds had expressed their opinion that tent accommodation was not proper accommodation for a man after he had completed his work. There was a point, however, which had been lost sight of. There was another sub-clause which stated that suitable flooring must be provided in these dwellings, and it would be realised that it would be practically impossible to provide suitable flooring in a tent. The very fact that this was put into the Bill showed that it was intended that the structure was required to be of a permanent nature. In the two States where the bulk of shearing in Australia was carried on, so far as could be gathered, tent accommodation was not considered sufficient. Tent accommodation was provided for in the Victorian Act but in Victoria the climatic conditions were undoubtedly different from those of the North-west of this State or of New South Wales or Queensland.

Mr. Male: In what way ?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: In Victoria they did not get the very extreme heat which was experienced in the North-west of West Australia, nor the severe tropical rains and the severe winds. Moreover there was no proof that the provision about tent accommodation was inserted in the Victorian legislation without opposition.

Mr. Frank Wilson: I was informed there was no debate.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: From the expression of opinion by those members who had practical experience the clause should be allowed to remain as it was printed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 7th December, 1911.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3.0 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Draft Indenture between the Government of Western Australia and Henry Barron Rodway under Fisheries Act Amendment Act, 1911. 2. Report of the Inspector General of the Insane for 1910.