Roads Act. This was the maximum fee and in certain cases it would be regulated according to the local conditions.

Mr. TAYLOR: Again it might be pointed out that the Committee were dealing with a traffic Bill and the taxes which had been set out had been worked out on a scale according to the damage done to roads by vehicles. Could anyone tell him that a bull camel carrying six cwt. woud do more damage to a road than a cow camel carrying a similar load?

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 11.27 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 10th September, 1913.*



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

## PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Petition of Inmates of Claremont Hospital for the Insane, with papers in connection with Rudolph Hein.

## QUESTION — PERTH TRAMWAYS, BATHING TICKETS.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS asked the Minister for Railways: As the Premier has several times made the statement that there would be no alteration in the tramway fares until such time as the new power-house was completed, and as the bath ticket which was attached to a return ticket from any part of the City or suburbs to Nedlands Park was withdrawn on or about the 28th May last, or some months after the Government had paid the purchase money for the Nedlands Park trams, will he take steps to have the agreement with the lessee of the Nedlands baths reinstated, so as not to make it prohibitive for the public, and especially the school children, to make use of those convenient baths?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The issue of combined tram and bath tickets was discontinued before the tramways were taken over by the Government. The question of re-introducing them is under consideration.

## QUESTIONS (2) — GOVERNMENT ABATTOIRS.

*At Kalgoorlie.*

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What was the original cost of the Kalgoorlie abattoirs? 2, The total cost of subsequent alterations and additions? 3, Who designed these abattoirs? 4, Who prepared the plans? 5, Were these officers qualified men?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, £22,617. 2, The only alteration or addition was the lengthening of the skin-drying shed at a cost of £400. 3, The chief architect of the Public Works Department, acting under the expert advice of the State controller of abattoirs. 4, The chief architect. 5, Yes.

*At Midland Junction.*

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What area has been secured for the Midland Junction abattoirs? 2, Is this area freehold or leasehold? 3, Who selected this site? 4, Who

prepared the designs and plans? 5, Has drainage been provided for? 6, What area of holding yards and resting paddocks have been secured in conjunction wth these abattoirs? 7, Estimated cost of above works?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, Forty-one acres. 2, Crown land. 3, The site was determined on, after a thorough examination on the spot of the different areas available, by a conference of Public Works, Railway, and Agricultural officers, together with representatives of the local municipal council. 4, The architectural division of the Public Works Department, acting under the expert advice of the controller of abattoirs and a gentleman outside the service, who possesses considerable abattoir experience. 5, Yes. 6, Yardage and lairage for a week's supply are provided. It is considered that stock-owners will make their own arrangements for holding and resting paddocks, there being a large area of land available in the vicinity. 7, £23,000.

## QUESTION—RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' VISION AND HEARING TESTS.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What is the total cost, including equipment, of the car used for testing the eyesight and hearing of railway employees? 2, What is the approximate cost per annum, including salaries, allowances, haulage, etc., in conducting these tests?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Approximately £763. 2, The car has not been in use 12 months. The cost from the 6th January, 1913, to the 31st August, 1913, is approximately £370.

## QUESTION—SWINE FEVER, RECRUDESCENCE.

Mr. LANDER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that swine fever has again broken out in the Fremantle and Canning districts? 2, If so, what action is being taken to check the spread of this disease?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: 1, Yes. 2, Destruction of diseased animals, disinfection and quarantine of premises.

## QUESTION—KIMBERLEY HORSES AND THE STOCK DEPARTMENT.

Mr. LANDER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that a great number of horses are dying annually from some disease in the Kimberley district? 2, Will he endeavour to obtain the opinion of Professor Gilruth, of the Northern Territory, upon this disease? 3, Will he place upon the Estimates a small amount for research work in connection with this disease, if the stock-owners will provide a similar amount? 4, Is it the intention of the Government to take any action to improve the status of the Stock Department by retiring the incompetents occupying prominent positions in that department.

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: 1, Yes. Losses have occurred more or less annually from what is known as the Kimberley disease, resulting from the coarse nature of the pastures, and aggravated by the presence of internal parasites. The disease was specially investigated and reported on by the officers of the department, and where settlers have acted on the expert advice the results have been satisfactory. It must necessarily occur, however, that where horses are running loose on stations, they succumb to the disease without the knowledge of the owners. 2 and 3, The matter will be considered. 4, The position of the Stock Department, in common with the others, is necessarily from time to time subject to review by the Public Service Commissioner. In the absence of specific charges of incompetency, no action is contemplated.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. HEITMANN, leave of absence for one month granted to Mr. Dooley on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Declarations and Attestations (introduced by the Attorney General).

2. Fremantle Improvement (introduced by the Premier).

3. Perth Improvement (introduced by the Premier).

## MOTION — AGRICULTURAL SETTLERS' LIABILITIES, TO INQUIRE.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE (Toodyay) moved—

*That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the causes of the financial distress at present existing among the Crown leaseholders resident on the Eastern agricultural areas.*

He said: My motion is the outcome of a petition presented to the House a few days ago, which contained 97 signatures. Since the presentation of that petition further copies have come to hand bearing 44 additional signatures. This petition, I maintain, proves the importance of the request embodied in my motion. The question, I submit, demands the most careful and sympathetic consideration of the House. I hope hon. members will deal with this matter strictly on non-party lines, because it is a question which affects the prosperity of the settlers in the Eastern Districts to a very material extent. If we take the history of the back country settlement, which I feel sure is not generally known, members will realise that the people out on the drier areas are entitled to every possible consideration and assistance. For many years these districts were looked upon by the old pioneers —I am refering now to the country lying eastward of Meckering, what is now known as Yorkrakine, Cowcowing, Mount Marshall, and the Kununoppin country—those areas were looked upon as an almost impossible proposition from an agricultural point of view. However, since the days when that opinion was held by the old pioneers a new set of people pluckily ventured into that back country and took up large holdings. For several years a few of them succeeded in cultivating the land for abundant crops. By merely scratching the land with a cultivator, and in some instances sowing without any cultivation at all, considerable yields of grain were taken from the land. Knowledge of this fact quickly spread throughout the country and there followed a rush for land in the dry areas, with the result that during the last year or two, when the seasons have been unfavourable, failures have happened. I hope I shall not raise the ire of members on the Government side when I say that much reflection has been cast upon the late Administration and blame has been laid at the door of the late Minister for Lands for being responsible in a large measure for the hasty and unwarranted settlement of that back country. I claim that much credit is due to the late Minister for Lands, and the time will come when the people will realise that the reflections so freely cast on that gentleman were not altogether merited. There is no doubt that blunders were made, particularly in the classification of land, by putting too high a value on these lands, but one who goes among the settlers hears very little complaint about the over-pricing of the lands. It is not the classification that worries them, but their present financial liabilities which are too much of a burden, unless some special scheme is brought forward to afford them temporary relief. Much was done by the late Government, and I would like to say that we are indebted to the present Government also for material assistance, particularly during what undoubtedly was a drought. Water was freely conveyed along the railway lines and supplied to the people on credit, at any rate without payment, and I question whether the Government will ever receive payment for some of it. The result has been the weeding out of the unworthy, and I claim that the worthy remain, and it is for those people I am so anxious that Parliament should make a special effort to devise means to tide them over this very distressing time. The issue of my motion, unless it is dealt with in a sympathetic way, must have a far-reaching effect, not only on those people, but on the public generally. It is well

known that the financial obligations of these people reach a considerable figure. Already many of the larger merchants have been obliged to write off their books large sums of money, but still large sums are owing. We must not forget that very much credit is due to the merchant and storekeeper. I have had some three or four years' experience amongst the farming community in a portion of this State, and I know from that experience that the storekeeper and the merchant were largely responsible for the early development of much of our agricultural land. Even to-day those people are carrying the settlers in the back country, who are being kept by the credit that is given to them. It is true that this giving of credit is the storekeeper's only hope of obtaining from the people the moneys already owing to him, but there has not been to my knowledge an instance where undue pressure has been brought to bear on these people by the merchant and storekeeper.

The Premier: What about the banks?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The banks have not been so much concerned in these particular instances as they have been with their freehold clients. So far as my knowledge goes, the banks have closed down on only a very small percentage of the settlers of whom I speak.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: They have not lent them anything.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: They have not lent considerably. Most of the banking business was done with those who hold freehold.

The Premier: They may not have closed down on them, but they stopped their credit.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: It is only reasonable that they would in the circumstances stop credit, because of the general financial stress. It is not to be expected that they could find money any more than that the State could find money for the Agricultural Bank.

The Premier: We found treble the amount your Government found even in good times.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I claim that credit is due to the Associated Banks, because they have in the past materially assisted the settler. It was only due to the financial stress and the tightness of money that advances had to be called in from different clients, whether they were Crown leaseholders or otherwise. The storekeeper is to-day carrying these people. The business people are doing their share, and it is up to the Government to assist——

Mr. Thomas: The storekeeper.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Not so much the storekeeper, as to assist these people to right their financial position, so that they may at no distant date place themselves on a sound footing. The storekeeper is entitled to his money, and undoubtedly if he were to close down on the different selectors there would be general stagnation; a number of people would be cast on the labour market, and it is well known that employment is not very plentiful at the present time.

Mr. Bolton: Owing to the Federal Liberal Government.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Owing to the late Federal Labour Government.

Mr. Bolton: No, indeed! The Federal Liberal Government closed down different works.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The difficulty that is being felt is more due to the Federal note issue and the Labour Administration generally. It is not necessary to deal with Federal financial administration or with the late Labour Government, but their administration has had a very far-reaching and disastrous effect, particularly on this State. The last two years have been a very trying and anxious time for the settlers in the drier areas.

Mr. Thomas: In referring to leaseholders, do you mean the conditional purchasers?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Crown leaseholders. They have undergone a most serious and trying time owing to the bad season, and the financial position of these people is, I may say, appalling. The majority are practically bankrupt, and I may refer to a couple of cases, the particulars of which may interest members. Settler A has gross liabilities to the Crown of £178 and to merchants £215, or a total of £393; his area under crop is 300 acres;

if we allow him an average of 12 bushels he would reap a total of 11,620 bushels which, if sold at 3s. a bushel, would give a return of £581. If we deduct for harvesting expenses 10s. per acre, including carting, delivery on trucks, there is a net result of £431. This looks very good, but we have to bear in mind that there are increasing liabilities. There are next year's seeding operations and living to be provided for. We may put down living at £100 as a minimum, a very low calculation, and for seeding operations actual out of pocket expenses, £150, making a total of £250. This leaves £171 as the next profit on the crop. There are this year's rents to be faced, and there is the total gross liability of £393, which is payable on demand. One may say in round figures that there is a total liability of £450 with a net profit of a little over £100, which leaves the settler in practically a bankrupt position. I claim that the time has arrived when the Government should extend at least that portion of the settler's liabilities to the Crown over a considerable period. These people are undoubtedly converting into a good asset what was formely considered worthless.

Mr. Bolton : But they require to be carried all the time.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : It is only a matter of time. Anyone who has had experience of making a home for himself in the drier areas will realise that these people have settled this country under serious difficulties. Carried away by the impression that the 20 bushel average would be continuous——

Mr. Thomas : Who suggested it ?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : They ventured into that speculation with far too little capital.

Mr. Foley : They were coerced by your Government to go there.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : I hope the hon. member will dispel from his mind any party bias. It is not a matter of who is responsible from an administrative point of view. I have already pointed out that much credit is due to both the past and the present Administrations, and I voice the sentiments of the people when I say that we are deeply grateful for what has been done for those settlers.

Mr. Bolton : But there comes a breaking point.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : There comes a breaking point, it is true, but if the payment of these liabilities to the Crown is deferred and placed on a proper basis, the credit of these people will be improved. Let us take the position as it is to-day. The Seed Wheat Board has grappled with the situation to the best of its ability, and there again we have nothing but gratitude to express. The board grappled with the question in as sound a manner as possible, but I would draw the attention of members to the circular issued to the settlers. Let us for a moment consider the liabilities to the Crown as viewed by the board. The board says to the settler, "If you make an assignment, we will distribute any proceeds from the crop in payment of your liabilities as follows :—1, The actual working expenses connected with the current year's crop, such as stores, jutes, seed wheat, fertilisers, and other planting and harvest requirements. 2, Other expenses connected with the production of the current year's crop, such as rent, mortgagee's interest, Agricultural Department's interest, machinery and water supply. 3, Provision for next year's cropping. 4, For the payment of liabilities incurred prior to January, 1913." Now, what hope have they of making payment of any liability due to the Crown from the balance left from that ? There is practically no balance. The fact remains that these liabilities to the Crown must be deferred again and again, with the fact ever present in the minds of these people that the money is payable on demand. That life is a dog's life to be leading everlastingly. I have had some experience of farming, and whenever I have visited this district I have found these people, men and women, toiling and fighting a battle which, to my mind, is simpley appalling.

Mr. O'Loghlen : My constituents too are fighting that battle.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : The hon. member's constituents are on a feather bed compared with the people in the outlying districts.

Mr. O'Loghlen : They are in debt all their lives and the seasons make no difference to them.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : With all due respect to the hon. member's constituents, it is probably due to their improvidence.

Mr. O'Loghlen : That is ungenerous.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : I do not wish to cast any unkind reflection on any section of the community. I hope hon. members will dispel from their minds any party bias.

Mr. O'Loghlen : You set the example.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : I have endeavoured to compare the condition of the people in the South with that of the people who are endeavouring to make homes for themselves under such adverse circumstances. In my own district there are undoubtedly some improvident people. I question whether I myself have not been improvident. When money was plentiful and I could borrow freely, I borrowed, with the result that I had to pay the piper later on, and I question whether 75 per cent. of the people are not in the same boat. All of us, probably, have more or less over-speculated. I only wish it were possible to take hon. members to these drier areas, to witness how these people are toiling. Take one small section within seven miles of Mr. Lewis's homestead. Thirteen condensers were being worked there and they were worked in the day time, mostly by the wives of the settlers. I do not want hon. members to stand up directly and say that I have been crying stinking fish: I have merely given the true facts of the position. I claim that such people who battle and fight to make homes for themselves in country like this are deserving of every consideration which it is possible for any administration to extend to them. As regards this circular, there is no doubt every intention to find out the best means of tiding these people over their difficulties, but the fact remains that there is nothing definite in the proposals. The proposals do not provide any relief; what is suggested is of a temporary nature and very temporary at that. It will still leave the settler with the fact on his mind that these amounts are payable on demand, and, as is stated in paragraph 3 of the circular—

> Should you be unable to pay all your liabilities in full, you should make such an arrangement as indicated for the distribution of your crop proceeds. There are many cases in which the settler himself can arrange with his creditors to do this. There are also cases in which he cannot do so, and for the assistance of these latter settlers the hon. the Minister for Agriculture has instructed Mr. George L. Sutton, Commissioner for the wheat belt, to take an assignment of settlers' crops and make an equitable distribution. He will have discretionary powers to make alterations in the terms of assignment should such a deviation be considered necessary in the interests of the parties concerned.

Mr. Allen : It is going to wind them up.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : The circular continues—

> He will, further, have the power, without giving the reasons for so doing, to reject an application from a settler or renounce any assignment made.

This brings about a most undesirable position. These powers are too autocratic.

Mr. Lander : Have they ever been abused ?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : They have never been abused that I am aware of, and I believe it is not the intention of the Government to unduly press these people, but the fact remains that the Government have the power to absolutely extinguish these settlers.

Mr. Bolton : Should not they have that power ?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : The object is a worthy one and much good work has been put in by the Seed Wheat Board, but I claim it is insufficient. We want something on a more definite basis. We want some length of time in which these settlers can pay up their instalments. If a good long term is given these people

in which to pay up their total liabilities due to the Crown, I feel sure that, by their thrift and industry and by the forbearance of the merchant and by the storekeeper; they will be able to place themselves on a sound footing. It is only a matter of time. The Minister has said that he cannot see his way clear to reclassify the country or relieve settlers of liabilities on the results of past seasons, but that he must have something more reliable on which to work. Is it not a fact that relief is given to these people by neglecting to enforce the payment of their rents? If it is absolutely necessary to do that, is not the State losing and is not there an accumulation of liability to the Crown? Can these accumulations be paid in a few moments? Will not the State lose on them for a period? That being so, let the payments be extended over a long period, so as to make it easier for the settlers. There is every justification for extending consideration to these people. We have it on the authority of the Commissioner for the Wheat Belt in the address which he delivered to an audience in Perth the other day regarding the settlement in the eastern areas—

> Whilst the drought was at its worst a visit was paid to the portion affected, and as a result of this visit I came to the conclusion that if the season then being experienced was an abnormally dry one, as is generally admitted, then the settlers when once established would be in quite a sound position, if thorough methods were adopted. Here and there, were crops which, despite the drought, were flourishing. During the drought considerable hardships were experienced by the brave men and braver women in that area.

That is my case. I claim that if special consideration is given to these people we will find that the words of the commissioner will be borne out in fact.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member take his seat. I want to advise hon. members, when framing their motions in future, to frame them in a manner which will allow of the discussion they desire. This motion does not permit the hon. member to enter into the subjects which he has entered into during the course of his speech. His remarks more strictly apply to the motion moved by the hon. member for Katanning. I do not want to prevent the hon. member from making the best of his opportunity, but by the wording of his motion he has restricted himself very considerably.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will attribute that to my want of experience in the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall always be prepared to help the hon. member and the Clerks will do likewise.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: May I proceed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may proceed but so far as possible I hope he will restrict his remarks to the motion. I understand that it will be very difficult for the hon. member to discuss the matters he wishes to discuss on a motion of this character, but in order to allow him to present the case he desires, I shall be as lenient as it is reasonable to be.

Mr. Bolton: The hon. member is opening up a big field of discussion.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I regret the circumstances, but my desire is to show the condition of these people, and to demonstrate that the appointment of a select committee is essential, and I do not know how I am to justify the motion unless I proceed at some length with the discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can discuss the causes which require the appointment of a select committee.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The causes are plain. One cause is to be found in the past two seasons, and while pointing out the different causes I want to show that these people merit special consideration.

Mr. Bolton: The causes warrant the appointment of a select committee?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Undoubtedly the causes warrant the appointment of a select committee. While these people are faced now with their present liabilities due to the Crown, there is a continuous increase in their liabilities due not only to the Crown but to private creditors. Therefore, I claim that the time has arrived when some special means must be

devised to tide these worthy people over their difficulties. Among other difficulties we must not lose sight of the question of water supplies. That back country is of such a nature that only the stoutest hearts can subsist there. I have been amongst the people and have witnessed the difficulties they experience to secure sufficient water for daily consumption. In one instance a settler had to go 13 miles to a soak, and it may be knowledge to some members to hear that it was difficult to fill an ordinary 50 or 60-gallon hogshead from that soak. I claim that the people who labour under such difficulties, insufferable difficulties one might say, and who take on this battle to make homes for themselves——

Mr. O'Loghlen: How much have the Government spent in water supplies?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The present and the previous Government have done an immense amount in this direction, particularly the Wilson Administration, who no doubt spent considerably more than the present Government.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Particularly the present Government.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Credit is due to both Governments. Much work has been done in the direction of water conservation but this is a country which does not lend itself kindly to the conservation of water, and hence the difficulties of settlement are intensified. If hon. members have any doubt as to the seriousness of the position and as to whether these people are entitled to the very special consideration I claim for them, let them take a trip through this country during the latter months of the year, and they will find out for themselves that these people are labouring under great difficulties. I would like to say that the position of the leaseholder as regards the payment of his liabilities is a sound one. There is ample security. The leases are taken up on what might be called an instalment purchase system. If we give extended time for the payment of these liabilities the State will merely lose the interest on the rent, and I venture to say that these people are ready to do all that it is possible for men and women to do, to battle with the difficulties with which they are faced.

[*The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Male) took the Chair.*]

Mr. Bolton: Is there any prospect of them improving their position?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: There is every prospect. Years ago, when I was a Government land agent, I held the view that the back country should be given to people, so long as they settled on it and developed it, for at least five years free from rent. We were told then that the State could not bear the expense of settlement without deriving some revenue in the way of rents. I claim that the indirect benefit the State will receive from assisting that back country will more than justify the step.

Mr. Thomas: The State cannot live by indirect benefits.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The State has been asked to alleviate other people by granting them considerable assistance, and I claim that these people are entitled to it. In fact, the position is different with them, as they are developing country which is not easy to develop, and country which, I feel sure, as I have already indicated, should have much sympathetic consideration. Let me point out to hon. members that if these people have to leave their homes, and if the present state of affairs is continued it must force probably the bulk of them to give up the work, these people would be cast on to what is already a poor labour market.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You really think that?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I do, and many of these men and women would probably have to leave the country. I claim that the State cannot afford to lose men and women of that class, and there are hundreds of them. I say that if we take the whole of the agricultural settlement from Mullewa in the north to Ongerup in the south, we will find 75 per cent. of these people in an impecunious position.

Mr. Underwood: You need not go as far as Mullewa to find impecuniosity.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I know more about this than the hon. member; when a reflection is cast upon the people like that, and I know from the way in which the interjection was made that it was, I question whether those people are not worth a dozen or two of those who make the reflection. I hope that hon. members will treat this motion from a non-party point of view. It is one which commands the fullest consideration and the fullest sympathy of this House. All that is asked for at the present time by the people in this dry area is time in which to meet these payments to the Crown, and the placing of them on a definite basis.

The Attorney General: If that is so you do not want an inquiry.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I claim that this circular letter from the Seed Wheat Board, dated the 31st July, 1913, is a conclusive and final decision after much consideration. All these liabilities due to the Crown should be placed on a definite basis, and not left as they are to-day, payable on demand. The security is there, and what I would like hon. members to realise is that extension of time for payment does not affect the position of the State so very much, because, in any case, the Seed Wheat Board will have to give the people from day to day extensions, but by doing that the board materially weakens the position of these people from the credit point of view.

Mr. Thomas: Will they go on borrowing more?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: They do not ask for more; they ask for breathing time to pay these liabilities.

Mr. Thomas: Oliver Twist!

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: There is a bit more of Oliver Twist about the hon. member; he may be a good man at pills, but politics are another question.

Mr. Thomas: There is something of Micawber about the farmers year after year.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I have much pleasure in moving the motion standing in my name.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth): It gives me great pleasure to pat the hon. member for Toodyay on the back with regard to this motion. Some time ago I visited various parts—Mount Marshall and other places—where settlers are hard pushed, and I consider the hon. member is justified in bringing on this motion. I hope he will get a select committee appointed to go into the question. I realise that it is going to be an arduous matter for the select committee to make this inquiry. On that land I say there are some of the finest people in Australasia, women and men, and as for awarding Victoria crosses, I say that some of the women in the back blocks, in view of the great hardships they have gone through during the dry season, deserve all the consideration that this House can give them. I have seen some of the sufferings that men, women, and children have had to put up with. I do not speak so sympathetically about the men as I do of the women, as the men can often get away into town to attend a banquet, but the wife is left out there with the family. Most hon. members know what is, in many instances, the cause of new settlers being hard pressed. In the first instance we know it is the dry season, and the carriage of water has been a serious item to many men in the back blocks in the past season. In many of the dams put down there has been no water until this year, and when we know that some of these back settlers have had to cart water as far as 15 miles we realise the position of those who go out with only what the banks lend and a few pounds of their own.

Mr. Harper: In some cases they cart water 30 miles.

Mr. LANDER: I am speaking of cases within my own experience in saying 15 miles. Another great drawback to these settlers is the cost of stores. We all know that the farmer has to pay considerably more for stores in a new settlement than what has to be paid in the old districts. At Mount Marshall a man 15 miles from the station, in getting his supplies up included among them a side of bacon. He travelled 15 miles for it, and it was not there, and he had to go 15 miles back, that is 30 miles. He went again; it was not there—stolen! When we come to enumerate circumstances like this we

must admit it is pretty hard lines on a struggling settler who has hardly got a pound to his name. Last evening we had some hon. members talking about motor-cars, but in the back blocks they would find more Shanks's ponies. Another hardship is the loss of stock. These poor beggars have taken horses out in really good condition, and have taken food with them, but in the dry season the food has not been sufficient, and many of them have lost valuable horses, more than town people realise. Another matter I want to refer to is the injudicious way in which money has been advanced, not only by the present, but by other Governments. People, instead of battling for themselves and securing land on a line, have left the line knowing full well that they would not have a railway for twelve months or longer, and they have spent all the money that should have been sufficient to keep them for two or three years. I know one instance where the Government advanced £1 an acre for clearing; the man let the clearing for 12s. 6d. an acre, and what did he do with the 7s. 6d.? Had a real good time in Perth.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Mr. Thomas: Was that all it cost him?

Mr. LANDER: He paid 12s. 6d. an acre for the clearing, and had the balance for a good time. If that man had done as any wise man would have done, he would have kept that 7s. 6d. to help him through the dull times. Another item which is a drawback to new settlers is the injudicious manner in which they have been farming. Mr. Sutton and other experts have illustrated to new settlers the necessity for fallowing land, but one might just as well put a poultice on a post as they will not take any notice of expert advice, and this has been a means of getting farmers in the new districts into straitened circumstances. The hon. member for Toodyay (Mr. A. N. Piesse) referred to the circular issued by the Seed Wheat Board. There is not the least doubt why the Seed Wheat Board sent out this circular. In some instances £100 worth of seed wheat has been disposed of by what I call the fraudulent man on the land; he has obtained it for this season and next season, and what has he done with it? Sold it. In some instances horse-feed has been sent to the settlers and they have sold a portion of that horse-feed. Those are no doubt some of the causes which place outback settlers in the position they are in to-day, but I do not mean to say that there are many of that class on the land. My opinion, from what I saw on the land, is, as I said before, that they are people, especially the women, who are a credit to Australasia, or a credit to the world, judging by the noble manner in which those women have stood by their husbands. I hope the motion will be carried, for the purpose of trying to ascertain some means by which these settlers can be assisted further. It might be difficult to do that, but possibly they may be given deferred payment of the interest which has now accumulated.

On motion by Mr. Heitmann debate adjourned.

## MOTION—NORTH-WEST DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. GARDINER (Roebourne) moved—

*That in the opinion of this House, and in view of the immense area and vast undeveloped resources of the North-West, it is desirable that a special department should be created to control and develop that portion of the State.*

He said: In submitting this motion as to the desirability of creating a special department to deal with the affairs affecting the North-West portion of the State, I am hoping that the matter will be taken seriously, and that the Government will deal with it promptly. This ought to become one of the most important questions which has engaged the attention of the Government since they have occupied the Treasury benches, and if they deal with it according to its importance they will, for the first time in the history of the State, be taking a practical step or an initiative step towards doing something in developing what, to my mind, is the greatest asset this State possesses. Unfortunately for we people in that

part of the State there are few, either inside or outside this House, who realise the wonderful possibilities which exist in that great territory. The general impression appears to be that it is an inhospitable country which offers no possibilities other than the raising of a few sheep and cattle. This opinion which has been spread broadcast has had the tendency to retard the progress of the North-West and no one in the past has thought it worth while to suggest a bold policy of development. True, spasmodic attempts have been made to ascertain the conditions which obtain in the North-West, and experts and others have been sent through the country to report, and invariably, in fact I may say in all instances, the reports have contained glowing accounts of what might be done with the expenditure of a little money. Unfortunately, however, after those reports have been read, and probably placed on the Table of the House, they have been pigeon-holed, and nothing has been done to assist the people who are pioneering in that part of the State. We have now arrived at a stage in our history when we must view the development of the North-West from a national standpoint. It must be obvious that this vast and rich territory which we have in the North is likely to become a menace to Australia if it is allowed to remain unpopulated. It has been pointed out that this portion of our State, as well as the Northern Territory, constitute what has been termed the front door of Australia, and it must be patent to everyone that there are those who will not see that country remain undeveloped and unused, and if we do not do something towards assisting the people who are there and towards opening up and developing the innumerable resources which the country can boast of, we may have the spectacle of others doing it for us. So far as I can see there is an immediate necessity to create a special department, and to appoint a responsible Minister at the head who will concentrate the whole of his energy and ability on dealing with the problems which undoubtedly exist there. Under the present system we in the North can never hope for better treatment than we are receiving to-day, or than we have received up till recently, inasmuch as there are six or seven different Ministers concontrolling the North-West, each having small interests to watch, and whilst human nature is human nature they will only listen to those who clamour loudly at their office doorsteps for consideration. We in the North are so far removed from the seat of Government that, although we may have genuine grievances we are not able to bring them directly under the notice of Ministers.

Mr. O'Loghlen : We are in the same position in the South-West.

Mr. GARDINER : I think the hon. member for Forrest has done very well. I consider that the fact that such an immense territory is represented by only four members in this House, militates against it getting that consideration which it undoubtedly needs. We are as it were crying in the wilderness. There are only four of us, and no matter how we may raise our voices, we are not powerful enough to insist on the Government giving us that to which we are justly entitled.

Mr. Turvey : Other members are ready to support you.

Mr. GARDINER : But the fact remains that there are very few members here who have the slightest conception of the conditions which exist in the North-West. A few of them have had the opportunity of travelling through that country and learning something of its unlimited resources, the great possibilities that lie before it, and its ability to carry a large population. In natural fertility there are places which are far richer than many that are at the present time carrying a large and prosperous population. There is country there suitable for the growth of almost anything, yet we do not appear to have realised that fact because we have not attempted to produce anything more than is absolutely necessary for the requirements of the few who are there, and the Government have helped only to an extent which they could not refuse. The history of that country would make interesting reading, but it

is not my intention to deliver a long dissertation in that direction. So far as mining is concerned, I believe the first chapter of practical mining was supplied by that portion of the State; I refer to the rush to Kimberley which took place in 1885. Subsequently there was the Pilbarra goldfield where a great number of prospectors went and where much gold was found. That field seemed to promise well for the future, but fortunately for Western Australia, although perhaps unfortunately for the Pilbarra goldfield, when that field appeared to be in a flourishing condition the goldfields in the eastern portion of Western Australia were discovered, and the world was stirred by the immense wealth which was being obtained, and the fortunes which were to be made. The result was that the pioneer prospectors of the North-West left to seek their fortunes in the newer fields. There was then a big exodus, ever since when, mining has not been carried on to the extent that it was thought would be the case at the inception of that goldfield. In recent years, however, some of the miners have returned, and they have beyond all doubt demonstrated the fact that almost every mineral known to modern science exists in that part of the State. It has been proved that tin, copper, tantalite, and many other metals abound there in great quantities, but the facilities at hand are so inadequate that the metals cannot be worked profitably. The reports of prospectors have been confirmed by the geologists who have been sent to the North-West by various Governments. They have established the fact that copper exists in enormous quantities from one end of the territory to the other, and that the whole country is practically permeated with copper. The Whim Well copper mine employs a great number of men, and according to the reports of the geologists, Mr. Gibb Maitland, Mr. Woodward, and Mr. Blatchford, there are copper fields even better than that at Whim Creek. Unfortunately, however, the means at hand to permit of development are so meagre that to-day those fields are practically unworked. In the Kimberley district there is one of the richest iron deposits in Australasia, and probably one of the richest in the world. I refer to the deposits at Yampi Creek where there are millions of tons of native iron. There are also at this spot natural facilities which would permit of the iron being exported. The deposits are fronting deep water where any ship could come in and load without difficulty. I venture to assert in any other part of the world hundreds, if not thousands, of men would be employed in country of this description. If this and the other minerals of the North-West were given the attention they deserve, the North-West would hold its own with any other part of Australia and would carry a great and prosperous population. So far as the pastoral country is concerned, it is unnecessary for me to refer to it at any length. It is known that there exists in the North-West some of the richest pastoral country in Western Australia, and the exports of wool and cattle from those parts prove the accuracy of my statement. The Government at the same time derive a great revenue from the pastoral lands in the shape of rents imposed on leasehold properties. According to the *Statistical Abstract* the total received from pastoral leases last year was something like £69,000, and the bulk of that came from land which is situated in that portion of the State always referred to as the North-West. Some time ago, too, the late Government sent the Commissioner for Tropical Agriculture to the North-West to make investigations and he reported in glowing terms on what it was possible to do in that part of the State.

Mr. O'Loghlen: What is he doing now?

Mr. GARDINER: I do not know, but I know that the Government paid him a fairly large salary and in not one instance was his advice acted upon. This gentleman pointed out that with a scheme of irrigation it would be possible to grow almost anything that was associated with the tropics.

Mr. McDonald: He also advocated cheap labour.

Mr. GARDINER: Probably he did, but this fact remains that in the North-West tropical agriculture can be carried on in

a sufficiently remunerative way to permit of adequate wages being paid. According to reports, therefore, we have a country which is richer than we know of, and which, according to Mr. Despeissis, is admirably suited for cultivation of tropical produce. Then there is the pearling industry which the member for Kimberley (Mr. Male) referred to the other evening, and the exports of which he said were worth half a million, to say nothing of the value of the pearls, because it is almost impossible to arrive at a reasonable estimate of their value. These industries to which I have referred would in themselves provide sufficient work for a Minister, and what I desire to emphasise is that we have a country which has been proved by experts to contain all classes of minerals, which contains rich pastoral land, which is suitable for tropical agriculture, which contains valuable pearling grounds, and yet it carries a population which would be considered only fair for an ordinary sized suburb. Whose fault is this? Is it the fault of the country that such a huge territory should be carrying such a meagre population? If any one will take the trouble to read the reports which have been prepared about the North-West it will be found that it certainly is not the fault of that country. Then it must be the fault of someone, and it behoves the Government to set to work and ascertain why almost half a million square miles of rich territory have been permitted for so long to remain unused. I say half a million square miles advisedly because what is generally termed the North-West comprises one-half of Western Australia, and we know that the State covers an area of nearly a million square miles. Something must be done. A department must be created for the reason that there are so many things to be attended to, so many reforms necessary, so much work to do in the way of development and in the way of attracting population to that country. The creation of a separate department is absolutely warranted in order to bring about the desired effect. There are very many improvements to be instituted. For instance, transport is one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with. There are on the Ashburton to-day men who are paying £7 and £8 per ton to have copper and lead ores removed. Imagine the value of that ore. It has to be mined at a high rate of wages, £7 per ton is paid for the transport, and then there is lighterage and freight to be provided. Notwithstanding this high cost, these mines are being worked, if only in a desultory manner. If a Minister for the North-West were appointed he would have experts on the spot to advise him in all matters. According to modern science there are several types of tractors which would be admirably suited to the country. If there were a Minister for the North-West, it would be no time before he would have several of these tractors working in the North-West and assisting, not only the miners, but many others who are pioneering that rich and enormous territory. And there are numerous other questions which could be placed under the jurisdiction of a North-West department. For instance, there is the aborigines question. This alone would occupy the time of a Minister and his staff for a considerable period. If this question were placed in the hands of a Minister for the North-West, he would very soon remove the Aborigines Department from the state of chaos into which it has been brought by the present inspector, and that gentleman would pretty quickly get his walking ticket. Then there are the jetties. Past Governments, and even the present Government, have spent a great deal of money in providing facilities for the North-West, but for lack of local knowledge, for lack of familiarity with the conditions existing up there, they have not been in a position to say how best the money should be spent. For instance, Onslow, one of the most important ports on the coast, has no deep sea jetty, but has to depend entirely on lighterage. During a recent trip to the North-West I was on the State vessel when it was desired that she should land certain cargo and passengers at Onslow. However, on some lame excuse the lighter did not come out, and the State vessel had to proceed on and over-carry her cargo and people to the extreme inconvenience

of all concerned. In all probability those people inconvenienced would not use the State steamer again. Onslow is merely a distributing centre for an immense pastoral country, and a country which offers fairly reasonable mining possibilities. As I have said, there is no deep sea jetty at Onslow. Quite recently they had a drought up there, with the result that many thousands of stock were lost. If there had been a deep sea jetty at Onslow probably every head of that stock could have been shipped to other parts and saved, to the advantage alike of the owners of the stock and of the State generally. Even these questions, although individually they may seem small, form in the aggregate very good grounds for the establishment of a North-West department. There are so many reforms necessary that the only reasonable way of accomplishing them all is to appoint a separate department entirely distinct from all other departments, and let the Minister, or the Commissioner for the North-West, or whatever the head of the department might be entitled, let him apply the whole of his time and attention to doing something for that great country. I have submitted this motion with no desire to complain of the present Government in regard to their treatment of the North; they have done as well, if not a little better, than their predecessors in regard to catering for the people in the outback country. In one respect, at least, they have done more, for they have, at all events, assured us of a regular and up-to-date steamship service. Notwithstanding the criticism of my friends opposite, I venture to assert that 95 per cent. of the people of the North-West consider that the establishment of that service has been a boon to them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why, you cannot get fresh water on your crack steamer.

Mr. GARDINER: I have travelled on her and have not noticed any disability in that regard.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope we are not going to have the State steamers again.

Mr. GARDINER: No. I was merely referring to the steamship service.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a very dangerous subject to refer to, because one does not know where the reference will stop.

Mr. GARDINER: In any case, I have no desire to do more than refer to the steamers. There is another illustration which I will give to prove the impossibility of Ministers who do not understand conditions as they exist in the North administering the affairs of State as they should do.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Minister for Works understood all about it, He made a trip up there, I think.

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, but it is utterly impossible for any person in the brief space of six weeks to make himself conversant with the conditions as they exist in a country having such a wide variety of interests and covering such a great area. It is impossible in six weeks or even in six months to become acquainted with the conditions up there. It proves how easily a Minister may make a mistake. I will refer now to the leasing of the Balla Balla jetty. I have always understood that it was one of the planks of the policy of the Labour party to nationalise public utilities. I know they have spent a lot of money in putting this particular ideal into effect. Yet, when an opportunity came along for the Colonial Secretary to take over the Balla Balla jetty—last year's returns go to show that a greater amount of imports and exports passed over the jetty than ever before in a similar period—we find the Minister handing it over to one of the greatest combines that we have there, for a paltry rental of £150 a year. Nor is that the worst phase of the question, for if tenders had been called in a legitimate manner, £1,000 per annum would have been tendered for the jetty. Instead of this being done, the Chief Harbour Master wrote and asked Mr. Sleeman, the manager of the Whim Well Copper Mining Company, if he would care to renew the lease of the jetty, and the papers show——

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member moved a motion during this session to have those papers laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. GARDINER: That is so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. member cannot discuss it now, although, of course, he can refer to the contents of the papers.

Mr. GARDINER: The papers contain an invitation signed by the Chief Harbour Master and asking Mr. Sleeman if he would care to renew the lease of the jetty under the same conditions. Naturally Mr. Sleeman grasped the opportunity. He saw what a splendid thing it would be to have the most profitable jetty on the North-West coast handed over to him for £150 a year.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Does he not send the most of the traffic over that jetty?

Mr. GARDINER: Of course, practically the whole of the traffic belongs to Mr. Sleeman, inasmuch as he has an absolute monopoly, to the detriment of those people who are endeavouring to develop the country out back. The promoters of the Towranna company will be in a peculiar position during the next few weeks, when they will be carting their stuff from Port Sampson rather than the natural port, owing to the disabilities and inconvenience which they have to contend with as the result of the Government leasing the best jetty on the coast. In accordance with the policy of the Government, the Colonial Secretary should never have renewed the lease, but should have conducted the jetty under State control. If this could not be done, then, alternatively, tenders for the lease of the jetty should have been called in the ordinary way.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Can they not land their goods at Balla Balla?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, under the regulations, but the manager of the company who owns everything is in such a position that if a private individual desires to operate——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow a discussion on the contract. None of this discussion is covered by the motion. The hon. member may refer to the contract as a reason why a department should be created.

Mr. GARDINER: It is one of my reasons for moving that a department should be created, and in support of it I am proving lack of knowledge on the part of the Minister, and proving that he depended entirely on his officers, some of whom have never seen the country. These were my reasons.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The Minister reserved the right to cancel the econtract at three months' notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is discussing the merits of the contract. He can refer to the contract, but he must not discuss its merits on a motion of this character; otherwise we would have State steamers, State batteries, harbours and rivers, and everything else brought into the discussion.

Mr. GARDINER: But one of my objects in moving the motion was to refer to harbours and jetties, and all questions pertaining to the North.

Mr. Underwood: You ought to be able to get in something about the State steamships.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to disallow the hon. member referring to all the conditions existing in that country mentioned in the motion, but I am not going to allow him to discuss the details of contracts which are not contemplated in the motion at all. The hon. member can merely refer to these matters as a reason why the department should be created.

Mr. GARDINER: In any case. I think I have adduced sufficient proof to hon. members to convince them that it is necessary that something should be done in regard to the creation of this proposed department. I do not intend to speak at any greater length, seeing that you have ruled that some of the matters which I intended to touch upon do not come within the scope of my motion, and I will content myself with moving that motion.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): I second the motion.

On motion by Mr. B. J. Stubbs debate adjourned.

## BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Mr. HUDSON (Yilgarn), in moving the second reading, said: I desire to introduce a short measure to extend the scope of opportunity for the admission of legal practitioners in this State. As hon. members are well aware, the parent Act stipulates a number of qualifications which enable gentlemen possessing them to obtain the privileges given by the Legal Practitioners Act of 1893. From time to time those qualifications have been extended, and now I am asking the House to pass a measure to permit the associates of judges to be admitted as practitioners on certain conditions. The conditions are set out in the Bill and are that judges' associates, who have occupied that position for a period of 10 years, and have the certificate of the Barristers' Board that they are fit and proper persons to be admitted, and that they have passed the intermediate and final examinations now required of articled clerks, shall be entitled to practise as barristers and solicitors of the Supreme Court. The qualifications of associates are such as to warrant this measure. In the first place, these gentlemen are appointed by the judges, who require of them something more than an ordinary educational equipment, and during the course of their employment they have to attend on the judges, deal with legal practitioners, and generally the whole scope of their employment appertains to the law. In the course of their work they have opportunities of gaining legal knowledge, of assisting the judges in research, and of generally qualifying themselves to be legal practitioners. It is true that these gentlemen are in a sense public servants, and that they are in receipt of a salary which, I think, was increased last session from £200 to £250 per annum, but that is the limit of their chances in life, and I think we may safely extend the Act in order to give them an opportunity of entering the legal profession through the channel I have described. It would be to the advantage of the public service if these gentlemen had that ultimate goal in view, and applied themselves to their legal studies perhaps more assiduously than they otherwise would, inasmuch as during the course of their ten years' service as associates they would be of greater value to the public and to the department. I am sure the Attorney General will bear me out in that regard. Most hon. members will remember that in 1909 a somewhat similar Bill was carried through Parliament to allow gentlemen who had served as managing clerks for 10 years to be admitted after passing one of the examinations mentioned in the present Bill. I propose to go beyond that and to require the associates to pass both examinations, as well as serve with the judges for a period of 10 years. That I think is sufficient safeguard in the interests of the public and is a qualification such as should merit the passage of this Bill.

Mr. Green: Does the Barristers' Board approve of it?

Mr. HUDSON: I will deal with that presently. It is not my usual custom, when dealing with measures in this House, to refer to legislation in other States, but on this occasion I would point out that there is somewhat of an anomaly in this State, inasmuch as other States do allow of the admission of associates under certain conditions less strenuous than those prescribed in this Bill. The measure is such a simple one, and requires so little explanation, that I am sure hon. members will accept it in its present form. I do not anticipate any objection, because I can see no reason for objection. I therefore move—

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

Mr. DWYER (Perth): I have great pleasure in indorsing this Bill. I feel that a man who has devoted 10 years in a judge's chambers must acquire during that period of time a very fair knowledge of the practical side of his profession, provided, of course, he applies himself to acquiring that knowledge with any assiduity. If, in addition to that, he has also passed the intermediate and final examinations set for articled clerks, the public will have every assurance that after

passing those examinations he is qualified to practise his profession and give legal advice. At the present time the usual method of entering the legal profession is this: A young fellow after matriculating becomes articled to a solicitor, he spends five years in that solicitor's office, and during that period he passes the intermediate and final examinations. The only alteration proposed by the Bill is that instead of spending five years in a solicitor's office the associate may spend 10 years in attendance on a judge in the capacity of associate. During the course of 10 years he sees the pleadings in a multitudinous number of cases and sees how they are drawn, he is in constant attendance on the judge during chamber applications, and every day that the court is sitting, or the judge is in chambers, his associate is acquiring a sound and practical training in his profession. Therefore, I do not see that there can be any reason to object to the passing of this Bill. The hon. member who introduced the measure said that it was the practise in other States to give judges' associates an opportunity of becoming fully-fledged members of the legal profession. I do not know exactly what obtains in other States, but I do know, as regards South Australia, that a judge's associate or assistant or acting associate, who has served for five years in that capacity, is entitled to practise his profession, provided he passes the necessary examinations. I understand that the same rule obtains in other States of the Commonwealth, and I think we ought to consider this position. that a judge's associate in South Australia, who gets admitted under the rules obtaining there, after being five years an associate and passing the necessary examination, can come to this State and, without any other qualification than a purely formal residence of six months, become entitled to practise. Is it not penalising associates in this State to say that we will not give them the same privileges which would be allowed to them were they in South Australia? If it is good enough to admit in this State South Australian judges' associates, surely it is also good enough to admit a Western Australian judge's associate. I think the same argument holds true as regards the associates in other States of the Commonwealth, the practise of which I am not so intimate with. There is one hiatus in the principal Act which I intend to bring before the notice of members at the Committee stage, and which I hope will be filled in. I refer to the refusal under the conditions in the original Act to admit New Zealand practitioners. The reasons for the refusal to admit New Zealand practitioners are simply these: In New Zealand one may become a legal practitioner without being obliged to serve articles and from that point of view I would impress upon the House that the same thing holds true as regards the admission of barristers from England and Ireland. They are admitted to practise in this State without the necessity of being articled to a solicitor, or gaining a single day's experience in the office of a practitioner. If we admit English and Irish members of the Inns of Court, who have simply passed their examinations and been admitted, why should we not admit members of the legal profession from the sister Dominion of New Zealand, who undergo the training required there, pass their examinations and are admitted to practise in New Zealand? What is good for one should be good enough for another. If English and Irish barristers are admitted to practise without undergoing any term of articles, but simply on a six months residential qualification, surely those admitted in the sister Dominion of New Zealand should also be given an opportunity of practising their profession. As the law now stands a New Zealand practitioner cannot be admitted to practise here unless he undergoes five years' articles in a solicitor's office, or, if possessing a law degree, undergoes three years' articles. In view of the fact that we are in close relationship with New Zealand, I do not think that this embargo should be allowed to exist. However, I hold that it is not altogether a proper thing for one who simply passes an examination and has no practical experience of his profes-

sion, to be at once allowed to practise, give legal advice and undertake the conduct of legal proceedings. Therefore, I intend to move as regards the New Zealand practitioners that they should be obliged to spend five or seven years in the office of a legal practitioner in this State. In other words, in addition to the New Zealand qualification, which can be obtained without undergoing any articles, they would be required to undergo training in the office of some practitioner in Western Australia for a term of five or seven years. I am not yet decided as to which term I shall propose; I will leave that to the sense of the Committee later on.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. DWYER: Before tea I was dealing with the question of the principal Act as regards New Zealand practitioners. I stated that one reason against their admission was the matter of qualification. In New Zealand the only qualifications required are examination qualifications. As regards these, I find from a copy of regulations made by their Supreme Court that the examinations are conducted by the University of New Zealand and are in the following subjects: jurisprudence, constitutional history, Roman law, international law and conflict of laws, English law, contracts and torts, real and personal property, evidence, criminal code, and the practice and procedure of the court. It seems to me that after an examination in these subjects, and in view of the fact that the papers are set by the University, a man would be fairly well grounded in the principles of law, and the only objection which might be taken is his want of knowledge of their practical application. If, in addition to passing examinations in these subjects, he also serves in the office of a practitioner, no exception should then be taken to his admission here. A second reason appears to be that it may interfere with our reciprocal rights with other places. In so far as New Zealand is concerned, the Dominion admits practitioners from this State and from the other States.

Mr. Hudson: Does it admit them from this State?

Mr. DWYER: Yes, but New Zealand practitioners are not admitted here, and I cannot say whether they are admitted in the Eastern States, the principal ground being the want of service under articles, and against that there is this fact, that under the Colonial Solicitors Act of the Imperial Parliament they can be admitted to practise in England. The mere fact of their admission in England entitles them to be admitted here by virtue of the qualification of mere residence. I think, therefore, that I have given sufficient facts to show there is no reason whatsoever why New Zealand practitioners should not be admitted here, provided they comply with what I think is a very necessary requirement in any legal practitioner, namely, the acquiring of practical experience in the office of some practitioner already established in practice. It may, of course, be urged and no doubt it could be urged, that barristers of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England and Ireland are admitted here, and it is not necessary that these gentlemen should have spent any time under articles to a solicitor. That is our law at the present time, but there is no doubt the fact remains that in England and Ireland a barrister as a rule does not get any practice to speak of until he has been admitted for five or six years, and during that time he devotes his energies to acquiring a knowledge of his profession apart from the mere academic learning or instruction he has received in the course of reading for his examinations. I do not wish to depart from this subject without referring in a slight measure to a want very apparent in Western Australia at the present time. It might be remedied, and I address through you, Mr. Speaker, these few remarks to the Attorney General in his capacity as head of the legal profession in this State and also as a member of the University senate. Some provision should be made whereby our articled clerks and would-be practitioners under this Bill now before the House, and also under the amending Act of a few years ago, might

have an opportunity of attending lectures at the University and also having the examinations supervised by that body, and if possible later on have a law degree conferred upon them on their complying with the statutes of the University. To this end it would be necessary to appoint some lectureships in law, and I think if these were appointed the fees of the students who would attend the lectures would pay——

The Attorney General: The University is free.

Mr. DWYER: I am reminded that all students have free lectures at the University, and in view of that fact it should be made compulsory for every articled clerk to attend, and the examinations should be entirely under the supervision of the University. By these means we would be assured, at any rate so far as a theoretical knowledge of the law, and a sound knowledge of the principles go, that the legal education of our budding practitioners would be well attended to, and the practical part of their work would be acquired in the ordinary course of their office experience. In conclusion I would like to say that this Bill has my hearty concurrence, and I trust that it will obtain speedy passage through this House, and that the Attorney General will endeavour to see that some new system of legal education is instituted—it is a subject altogether neglected at the present time—so that judges' associates as well as articled clerks shall have an opportunity of acquiring a more thorough knowledge of the principles of the law than is possible at the present time under the existing system.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): The debate up to now has taken a very wide range, and from the proposal of the mover of this Bill one would imagine that we were circumscribed to one definite proposed reformation, if it may be called a reformation; but under the one purpose of the Bill, or under the plea of that one purpose, we have had introduced into the discussion remarks as to the relative merits of the preparations for the bar in New Zealand and in the other States of the Commonwealth, and our own supposed disadvantages and furthermore we have had introduced into it a discussion on the University and the preparation for legal practitioners which that institution ought to provide or is expected to provide in future. These subjects relating to the general term legal practitioners are mostly irrelevant to the measure before us. There can be no doubt that we do desire ultimately to have in our University a Chair of Law, and we desire, as has been proposed, to have lectures on law. It is intended that law students shall be provided with a course there, and ultimately shall be able to take their degrees, but all that seems to me to argue against the necessity for this measure at the present time. I admit that we ought to hasten on with the advancement of our University in this one respect, and to allow all who desire to become proficient in the study of law, and to take the degrees that can be taken, so that all may enter the legal profession who will devote the time and study with that object in view. But I object to this measure, because it does not make any general reformation or propose any extension of privileges which may be availed of generally. It has the objectionable feature of being a law intended to serve one person and one person only. There is only one associate at present under the roof of the Supreme Court——

Mr. Underwood: Well, why not for even one?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am quite aware that wherever one single injustice exists we should remedy it, but even the member for Pilbara must admit that it is unwise to continually legislate for individuals, because we do not know where the matter will end. There may be next week another individual in some other position on the legal ladder who wants a door by means of which to enter into the legal profession and we should have to come down next week with another Bill for the same purpose, and so we shall have nothing but continuous piecemeal legislation; I object to that type of legislation. If we are going to amend the principal Act let us do it on a wide scale so that we shall leave out no

exceptions; in other words let us now once and for all effect all the requirements that may be deemed necessary. This Bill, however, does not do that. One cannot piece it off. Already we have had one suggested amendment, and I can conceive half a dozen others, so that we should get a patchwork measure altogether impracticable and deformed when completed. I object to that kind of legislation, more particularly as the individual referred to is under no particular hardship.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Who is the legislation for?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: One of the judge's associates. I do not know that he desires his name mentioned.

Mr. Hudson: I deny that it is a one-man Bill; it is your assertion.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I know it to be so, and I venture to say, if the hon. member would be frank enough to admit it, that he has been approached by one particular individual.

Mr. Hudson: Do you suggest that my interjection was not truthful?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I suggest that the interjection was not wholly truthful.

Mr. Hudson: Then I think, Mr. Speaker, that that had better be withdrawn.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will admit that others who may be in the same position as this particular gentleman in the future, and who happen to be situated just as he is now, might take advantage of this measure, but it is perfectly true that this Bill is at the initiation of one particular individual, and that it is now intended to cover his particular case. That is a true statement of the facts, and I say that to legislate in that form is not wise; it is not statesmanship, if I may use an expression which is far-reaching in a case of this kind. This individual is under no greater disadvantage at present than other law students have to encounter. There is in the administration of the principal Act a liberality and a fairness of administration which might include this particular person; that is to say he, if he so desires, might article himself for five years to a legal practitioner of the requisite standing, he might pass through all the studies that are necessary, he could be allowed by the board to receive remuneration, and in every way he could be assisted by the administration of the Act at the present time to enter into the profession without this legislation, which is not necessary. He is not debarred from entering the profession if this Bill never passes. The only thing about the measure is that he would have an exceptional way of getting through. I fully bear out what has been expressed by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer) as to the difficulties law students at the present time are subjected to in their studies. They have no university to attend and no lecturers; they have, as it were, to work their own way uphill to the best of their abilities. A few helping hands are given to them, and what assistance is afforded to them is done gratuitously by members of the profession who devote their time and their talents to aiding them in a kindly manner. But these students have to go through that difficulty, they have to face that; they have to serve their time and study as best they may in their own manner and method. Why should we make special laws for some who are not of that type? These people are articled for five years. They have to serve that time and go through the routine, and that service in articles is rather irksome. I had experience of it, and it was in a good office where I had kindly treatment and consideration afforded to me in every direction; but for some young men the time they have to serve and the work they have to do, the trials that beset them on every path represent a burden that they bear, and which entitles them eventually to wear the crown; but here we are making it easy for one who happens to be a judge's associate.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How does it feel to wear the crown now that you have got it? Is it more irksome than the articles?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is more irksome sometimes than pleasant. I want to know why we need this exceptional legislation? It would be unfair to

other articled clerks who are studying, to open this door into the profession. I know there are those who say there ought to be no barriers at all.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Why not let the examination be the barrier without the articles?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, because the examination is not all. The hon. member could never learn to swim by reading books on swimming; he must go into the water and learn to use the stroke. It is experience and time that fit him ultimately to be a swimmer.

Mr. Heitmann: The hon. member would never learn to tax costs by reading books.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Book learning is absolutely necessary, of course, and as the hon. member for Perth puts it, one must have a grounding in the principles of law and understand what is to be taught with regard to each branch of the profession, but to apply what one has learned requires experience and coming into contact with the actual work and doing it, and it is that benefit which is obtained by serving articles. I know that the hon. member who introduced the measure told us that the associates are men who are in constant touch with the practice, they are constantly of service to the judge and clients, and they come into contact with almost every phase of practical law; but that is one of the reasons why we ought not to have this Bill at the present moment; because it is the policy of judges of the Supreme Court, so far as they can, to get actually trained and experienced practitioners to be their associates, not to have those untrained in the profession.

Mr. Hudson: At £200 a year?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have raised the salary, I am pleased to say, since I have been in office; I have given them some consideration in that respect. Apart from that, however, I want hon. members to understand that the policy of the judges is as I have said, and it is a wise policy. They want associates who know something about the law; they do not want apprentices.

Mr. Lander: It all depends upon the sweating wages they are offering; £200 a year.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I know you won't get it on that. The hon. member for Perth has really pointed out the reason. There are practitioners coming here from the other States, and they come here from other parts of the British dominions, but they cannot be at once admitted to the Bar of this State. They must be here six months even if they come from the most exalted station of the British Bar in Ireland or England; they must be here six months before they can be entered on the roll. During that time there are courses open to them; they can enter as managing clerks in solicitors' offices, or they can become, as sometimes happens, associates, and they spend their six months, as the law necessitates, in acting as associates to judges, and £200 a year is perhaps enough to keep them whilst they are waiting. I have made the salary £250 a year, but they begin at £200 and have a chance to rise if they stay there long enough.

Mr. Hudson: Ten years.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No person ought to remain an associate for ten years. The object is not to encourage practitioners to remain associates, as it would weaken their character, enterprise, and usefulness in life. The idea of a person fully qualified to practise at the Bar, equipped in every respect, being content to serve all his life as a judge's associate at £200 or £250 a year!

Mr. Hudson: The Attorney General is the only one who has put up the argument that such men should accept the position of associate.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: What I say is perfectly consistent; the judges desire to have qualified men to assist them, not men taken on at the first rung of the ladder who are learning lessons all the way through. In order for an associate to be of value in that position he ought to know something of the law and be already fully equipped. But it is only a convenience; it was never intended that men should stay there when fully qualified. There are plenty of those who

are waiting here to qualify from other parts, and others who are waiting to get a chance to start in the profession themselves, who are glad to get a little extra experience by becoming judges' associates.

Mr. Hudson: They get experience there.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not denying that a large share of experience is to be gained by anyone in the position of a judge's associate. They are very often quite capable men; but are we to make that position one special qualification for entering into the legal profession? I say, should not that position be reserved for those who want that extra drill, as it were, before entering into practice themselves, or who are waiting here to qualify? Why should we make it a school in order to qualify persons to enable them to enter the legal profession? That is the objection to this measure. Hon. members must not forget that there is one particular person who is studying, anxious to enter the profession, who has had some slight experience but is not qualified, and who is seeking to obtain his qualification whilst serving a sort of apprenticeship as a judge's associate. I am sure that the position is an anomaly, and it was never intended in the principal Act. If that person wants to enter that profession the doors are open to him, just as they are open to every member of this House who wants to commence the study of the law. I do not believe in making this exception. The danger further is this: the profession in this part of the world has attained a certain standard. A person admitted to the Bar in Western Australia can go to England, Victoria, New South Wales, in fact, any of the British Dominioins, and be admitted to the Bar there.

Mr. Lander: Right off?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, not any more than he can here. There must be a certain amount of time allowed for a person to prove his bona fides. He must be citizenised, if I may express it so, but so far as his qualifications are concerned, he takes them with him to whatever part of the British Dominions he goes. New Zealand cannot do that. That country is debarred in some parts of the world owing to just such legislation of this kind. She has deprived herself of that reciprocity which establishes equality.

Mr. Hudson: I wish you would be specific and give us a reference to that.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is so that New Zealanders cannot be everywhere admitted.

Mr. Hudson: Yes, but you gave the cause just now.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I said it was owing to legislation of this kind; I did not say by this legislation. The hon. member need not be so captious. It is by this particular legislation or by this lessening of the prestige or the standing or the fitness of the profession that New Zealand has debarred herself from admission to certain portions of the British Empire. It is not desirable that we should introduce that state of affairs in Western Australia. It is the present position here that we enjoy the privilege that we can go to any of the British Dominions and stand upon an equality with the members of the profession there.

Mr. S. Stubbs: It is a good standard too.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Undoubtedly. I am proud of the standing of our profession here. I think my friend the member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) will admit that the examinations here and the test in Western Australia stand equal to any in the world. It is more difficult to get through the preliminary preparation here so far as examinations are concerned than it is in any part of the British Dominions. We have nothing to be ashamed of, so why should we lessen any of these qualifications.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is a close corporation.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Undoubtedly it is.

Mr. Lander: No preference to unionists there.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Quite so. These objections should never come from unionists. The hon. member is not a member of the profession.

Mr. Lander: I thought there was no unionism amongst members of the legal profession.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The lawyers were the first——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney General must address the Chair.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With all due respect to you, Sir, I was doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman was addressing the member for East Perth.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was not addressing him, I was saying that the hon. member was not a member of the profession and I was saying it through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will take the hon. member's word. I would not have called him to order if I had thought that he was addressing the Chair.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly I was addressing the Chair, but I had not my face to the Chair. It is an impossibility——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I want to tell the hon. member that it is a new practice to address a person by turning one's back upon that person.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is no law in our Parliament, no Standing Order and no regulation that tells me that I must keep my eyes fixed on you whilst I am addressing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will please resume his seat. I have never urged that the hon. gentleman must keep his eyes upon me whilst addressing the Chair; that is not necessary, but the hon. member will recognise that one can hardly address a person by turning one's back upon that person. I leave it to the hon. member's own sense of what is right and proper to say whether that is so.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With all due deference, it is impossible for one to stand in the same position or keep his eyes on one spot. The object of addressing the Chair is to direct remarks through you, and in the course of doing that, I may turn my eyes to wheresoever it is necessary in order to glean information or to force an impression upon my hearers. It is the House, through you, that is always spoken to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I only desire to say that the hon. member's own sense of what is fair and respectful will cause him to agree that the proper thing to do when addressing the Speaker is to address the Chair by facing towards it. The hon. member, however, is not addressing the Chair when he is speaking with his back to the Chair.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not want to take up the time of the House on a matter that could be debated, or I should move to dissent from your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not given a ruling.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I hope I shall never be lacking in that respect which is due to the position you hold and for the office you represent, but with all due deference to you, it is impossible for one, in the course of a speech, to listen to interruptions from any portion of this Chamber, without turning to see whence the interruptions come, or turning, as happened with me just now, to listen more intently to what was being said. I did not catch the interjection when it was first made, and I turned my face to the interrupter, so as to get the full sense of what he said. That was the object of my turning my back to the Chair. There is no desire to show disrespect to you. It was for the purpose of gathering whether the interruption was relevant and needed attention or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to accept the hon. member's assurance that no disrespect was meant to the Chair. I have not ruled that the hon. member must keep his eyes upon me when addressing the Chair but I leave it to his sense of what is proper and respectful conduct whether he shall face the Chair and direct his remarks to the Chair or turn his back on the Speaker.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then I will resume what I was saying. I was saying that it was not wise to open the door to those who want to enter the legal profession to give to some particular individuals an opportunity which was

not given to the students of law generally. The present practice and the desire of the judges was to be served by their associates who have themselves passed into the profession. They very naturally prefer that and if I am divulging no secret, I may say that they resolved amongst themselves to as far as practicable carry that out. There have been one or two exceptions and this is one where associates are not members of the legal profession, and yet I know it to be distinctly a policy of theirs not to encourage members of the profession to seek to continue all through their lives as associates. They look upon that particular period as one of mere expediency, a stepping stone or the opportunity to be introduced generally into the State and to other members of the profession. They by no means look upon it as a profession or an employment of a permanent nature. Neither does the person for whom this Bill is intended look upon it as a permanent profession. This person evidently desires to get out of this associateship; he wants to get into another groove, another atmosphere, and he wants to qualify for that while he is an associate and he wants that easy method of doing it instead of having to go through the proper ordeal. That is hardly a fair thing to the others, and it is not a fair thing to the profession. If we commence on legislation of this kind, there is no telling where we ought to stop, and the result may be that we shall so lower the standing of the profession, that we shall not receive reciprocal treatment in other parts of the world. When I got to this stage, before our conservation, Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted about unionism, and I was going to say that no doubt the legal profession is a union; it is a combination of those who have certain attainments, who are certified as having gone through a certain course of study, and who are supposed, by virtue of the examinations they have passed to have given evidence of their knowledge of the subjects with which they are expected to deal, and I can see nothing wrong whatever in that form of union which is more a protection to the public than it is an advantage to the members of the profession. Surely the public should have some guarantee of this when they seek legal advice. They go to a person who has gone through the routine to enable him to give that advice, and surely you would no more think of allowing every person to obtain his living by giving legal advice or conducting a legal action without holding due qualifications, than you would permit quacks to fulfil all the duties of the medical profession. It is on these grounds and also on the ground that such a measure is liable to injure the profession in the eyes of the neighbouring States and other parts of the British possessions that I have to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON (in reply): A good deal of extraneous matter has been introduced into this debate, and with all due respect to you, Sir, those who have spoken have gone quite beyond the Bill. The member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer) made a speech relating to an amendment he proposed to move in Committee, and which I will have an opportunity of dealing with later. With regard to the observations of the Attorney General, I feel sure that the House were pleased to hear a dissertation on the legal profession generally, but possibly some members are in the same difficulty as I myself am in failing to grasp any particular argument against the Bill. His observations were so elastic, or at any rate so elusive, that it was difficult for anyone to grasp what it was in the Bill which he objected to. I did notice, however, that he attempted to make a point in regard to reciprocity. He suggested the possibility of practitioners of this State who may be admitted under the qualification submitted in the Bill, being excluded from other States. In 1909 the hon. member supported a measure which amended the parent Act in the direction of the admission of managing clerks who had served a period of ten years in solicitors' offices. This is where I take exception to the attitude of the Attorney General—that whilst he makes wide statements of an extremely general character, he gives no specific reasons or arguments, or references, to

justify his allegations. That Bill was passed in 1909 which allowed managing clerks who had served 10 years with solicitors, and passed one examination, to be admitted in this State; and some of them have been so admitted. Does the Attorney General assert that these gentlemen who have been so admitted will not be admitted on that qualification in any of the other States? I venture to say he is not prepared to make that assertion. If it be that they are entitled to be admitted elsewhere, that the principles of reciprocity are not disturbed by the passage of that Bill, then neither can they be disturbed in this direction. I interjected when the hon. gentleman was speaking in regard to this being a one-man Bill. It was surprising to me to find that whilst the Attorney General suggested that it is a one-man Bill, and that because it is a one-man Bill, and because, perhaps, it would be justifiable at some future time to admit that one man, we should adopt a policy of procrastination, and not pass this measure until such time as the University shall have established a law school, and this individual, assuming that there is one individual, should have an opportunity of attending lectures and passing his examination and being admitted. I do not think that an appeal from the Attorney General for the law's delays, and for procrastination, is any argument to lead to the defeat of this measure. However, it becomes wearisome to deal with these extraneous subjects. If we get back to the Bill we can analyse it and see how far the Attorney General's arguments apply. He admitted that a gentleman who spent 10 years in the position of judge's associate could not but gain a vast experience in law. He said it was a position which a new practitioner, coming to Western Australia from any other part of the world, would seek for the purpose of gaining information, and one which a man already admitted would seek in order to improve his qualifications and experience. If that be so, surely a man who occupies that position for 10 years shall have gained some degree of knowledge, acquired a legal education which would justify his admission without further examination. But the Bill provides that the person who has secured this qualification of having served 10 years as judge's associate must also pass the two examinations prescribed for articled clerks. Yet the Attorney General suggested that the proposal meant a disadvantage to articled clerks. I put it to the Attorney General that by a comparison of the two qualifications we find, on the one hand that an articled clerk has to serve five years with a solicitor and pass two examinations, while on the other hand a judge's associate, under the Bill, is required to serve 10 years with a judge of the Supreme Court, and pass similar examinations. I submit that the arguments of the Attorney General against the Bill should not appeal to hon. members, and that the second reading should be carried.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. DWYER moved—

*That the following be added as a new clause:—"Section 14 of the principal Act is amended (a) by inserting after the word 'years' at the end of paragraph (e) the word 'or'; (b) by adding a paragraph as follows:—(f) 'being a barrister or solicitor of the Supreme Court of New Zealand—(i.) has for a period of not less than three years prior to admission to practice in New Zealand been engaged in the office of a barrister or solicitor of the Supreme Court of New Zealand, exclusively in acquiring a practical knowledge of law and (ii.) has for a period of not less than five years at any time subsequent to his admission to practice in New Zealand been engaged in Western Australia as a law clerk in the office of a practitioner of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, and (iii.) has obtained from the Barristers' Board (whose certificate shall be final) a certificate that he is a*

*fit and proper person to be admitted as practitioner.'"*

The law as it at present stood was that any person could be admitted who had actually served under articles of clerkship to a solicitor or attorney, and passed an examination to test the qualification of candidates. Any person could be admitted as a solicitor here who was entitled to practice in the superior courts of law in those of His Majesty's colonies or dependencies where, in the opinion of the board, the system of jurisprudence was founded on, or assimilated to, the common law and principles of equity as administered in England. In New Zealand all these conditions held good, except that in regard to articled clerks, and in substitution for that he suggestel that a New Zealand practitioner ought to be admitted here provided he had for three years been acquiring a practical knowledge of law in his own Dominion, and for a subsequent period of five years had been in the office of a practitioner of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, while, lastly, the candidate must obtain from the Barristers' Board a certificate that he was a fit and proper person to be admitted as a practitioner of the Supreme Court of Western Australia.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Will you support that, Mr. Attorney?

The Attorney General: No, it is one man law again.

Mr. DWYER: It was to be frankly admitted that the amendment had reference to a gentleman who was a managing law clerk at the present time. A new Zealand solicitor, that gentleman had been in this State for 17 years. Although that gentleman was a very able man, owing to the existing conditions of our law he could not be admitted. At the present time the gentleman in question was holding a highly responsible position in one of the biggest offices in Perth.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Has he served his articles in New Zealand?

Mr. DWYER: The serving of articles was not required in New Zealand. If 10 years as a judge's associate was sufficient, surely eight years of actual practice in New Zealand, together with the experience gained in Western Australia, was sufficient also.

Mr. Nanson: When was the law passed in New Zealand which absolves the serving of articles?

Mr. DWYER: In 1882. It was to be remembered that New Zealand solicitors were admitted in England.

Mr. HUDSON: The amendment could not be accepted. Admittedly, it was designed in the interests of an individual who had been a managing clerk in this State for some 17 years. In 1909 an opportunity had been provided for such gentlemen who desired to be admitted. If the gentleman in question had not taken advantage of that opportunity, it was scarcely advisable that Parliament should specially create another opportunity for him. The amendment raised a further question. In this State we admitted practitioners from all the other States and from New Zealand, but the amendment sought to require in a New Zealand solicitor a further qualification not required in those coming from the other States of Australia. It would not be proper to discriminate between New Zealand and the Australian States. There was really nothing in our present law which excluded New Zealand solicitors. The amendment provided for a definite qualification. He had put it to the Committee that a qualification of ten years' service was equivalent to articles, and the same examination had to be passed, but in this instance a provision was proposed which was not analogous to the present qualification either in this State or in other States, and it was discriminating between other States of Australia and New Zealand. For that reason he opposed the amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment was objectionable on the same ground as the Bill; it was intended to serve only one particular individual. It was pleasing to find that the hon. member in charge of the Bill saw the enormity of his own argument when it cropped up again in the shape of an amendment by another hon. member.

Mr. Hudson: I did not make any such admission.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member had said that the argument when used against his measure was absurd, but when used against this amendment it was sound. The amendment was to serve one particular individual; it would be creating invidious and perhaps harmful distinctions, and, therefore it was not wise for the Committee to adopt it. No hardship which could not be overcome was imposed on this particular individual. There was already in existence a law which said that any person who had served ten years as managing clerk should be admitted on passing the final examination.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why did this individual not pass?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was the point. If the person to be served by this amendment had been 17 years in this country and for ten of those years had been in the service of one of the most prominent legal firms in the State, what was to prevent him, having already studied the law and passed the necessary examinations in New Zealand, sitting for his final examination and being admitted like other managing clerks? Why in his case dispense with a qualification which was insisted upon in the case of other managing clerks?

Mr. DWYER: The opposition of the member for Yilgarn to the amendment was surprising. One might have expected the support of the hon. member because the amendment had more reason behind it than the other provisions in the Bill. Admittedly this amendment was meant to benefit one man, but that person who was debarred under the present law had exactly the same qualifications and the same right to practise in this State as Mr. M. L. Moss, K.C., and Messrs. George and Purkiss, except that they had obtained admission at a time when New Zealand practitioners were admitted to practise in this State. If those gentleman had been admitted, why should we not admit this particular person. If the Bill was passed it was fair that it should include this amendment. The proposed new clause contained an express safeguard, inasmuch as it provided that any New Zealand practitioner seeking admission here must serve five years in the office of a Western Australian practitioner.

The Attorney General: That is the greatest possible insult to New Zealand.

Mr. DWYER: But New Zealand practitioners were altogether refused admission now. The Attorney General had asked why this particular individual should not sit for the final examination, as other managing clerks did. When people reached about 40 years of age their power of memorising was impaired, and after they had had their noses to the grindstone all day they found it very difficult to acquire in a few hours at night the knowledge necessary in order to pass difficult examinations. He would emphasise the point that as the qualifications of Mr. M. L. Moss were exactly the same as those of the gentleman he was referring to, there should be no difficulty about admitting the latter also.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: When rogues fell out honest men came into their own. When doctors differed who was to decide? And when bright members of the legal fraternity were at variance on a question of this sort, how were lay members to come to a decision? In the circumstances it would be wise to defer consideration of this question until it could be more fully gone into in order to ascertain what was behind it, and who was the person whom the member for Perth wished to benefit.

Mr. Dwyer: I have been perfectly frank, and I have no objection to disclosing his name.

The Attorney General: He is perfectly respectable.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: All members of the legal profession were perfectly respectable.

Mr. Taylor: That is why they are afraid of him.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: After listening to the Attorney General's stupendous argument against this measure, and his outburst of indignation about being called to order by the Speaker——

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in referring to what took place in the House or to the action of the Speaker.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The reference was only made in order to show how warm had been the Attorney General's opposition to the Bill. One fully expected the hon. member to call for a division in order to defeat the measure. There was something that required a deeper insight than the Committee had at the present time, and he was so convinced by the arguments of the Attorney General against the proposed new clause that he considered members should have more time to go into the question.

The Premier: It is an attack on the jury system.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was an attack on a close corporation which the Attorney General was endeavouring to maintain, and the hon. member in charge of the measure was endeavouring to smash up to some extent. The socialistic member for Perth was going one better and trying to open the door a little wider, and the democratic member for Yilgarn was opposing him. He objected to legislation being passed in such circumstances. It would be wise to allow a little time in order that we might gain more light and knowledge from parties outside the Chamber and do no injustice to any man. Without having inside knowledge it was difficult to see how an associate would have the same knowledge as a man who served his articles in a lawyer's office, or how the gentleman to be benefited by the amendment could have quite the same knowledge he would have had if he had passed his examination. Why should he object to pass the examination if he was qualified to do so? Legislation had been widened to admit managing clerks after passing a certain examination. If this gentleman had been a managing clerk for 17 years——

Mr. Dwyer: Not all that time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Was he afraid of the final examination?

Mr. Dwyer: No.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Perhaps he should be asked to pass it.

The Premier: This is the easiest way.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There might be a danger, although he would be the last in the world to oppose anyone having full freedom to enter the profession. He had served in the Arbitration Court and had there met the member for Yilgarn. Both were advocating the side of the employers, and perhaps he (Mr. Wilson) should have some claim to be admitted.

Mr. Hudson: You have to get a certificate from the Barristers' Board that you are a fit and proper person.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member had been transferred from one of the other States or the board might not have passed him. The different views advanced by different members of the legal profession were confusing and it would be unwise to rush the Bill through without further inquiry. He asked therefore that progress be reported

Progress reported.

## BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): In moving the second reading of this measure I will say at the outset that the only object I have in view is that of effecting an improvement in regard to the public health of this State. I anticipate that there may be members in this Chamber who will remark that they do not appreciate the value of this Bill when it proposes to abolish the habit of expectorating in public places. I can readily believe that there are members who have no appreciation of the important bearing which careless spitting has to different diseases. I have gone into the matter of public health to the best of my ability and opportunities for eight or nine years, and I have come to the conclusion that if Parliament will pass a measure having for its object the prevention of expectoration in public places several diseases common in our statistical returns will decrease appreciably in a very short period. I refer more particularly to the disease of tuberculosis. My efforts for some time past have been in the direction of improving our statistics in regard to this

disease in Western Australia. There was a time when I considered that this matter could be left safely and entirely in the hands of the medical profession, but I am convinced that there is more importance to be attached to a movement in the direction of prevention which is not carried out to any very great extent by medical practitioners, or at all events by private practitioners, than there is to the treatment and cure of this disease. From the various works on this subject, I feel that I can prove to hon. members that tuberculosis of the lungs is almost entirely caused by one person suffering from the disease carelessly spitting and in this way causing others to become affected. This is the case beyond all shadow of doubt. In any work on the question of consumption, whatever phase is studied, it will be found that the first matter of importance is to instruct the patient in regard to the sputum, and while in Western Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth there are regulations giving power to local boards, municipal councils, roads boards, etcetera, to prevent expectoration or make it a punishable offence, this has been done more from the aesthetic standpoint than any other. Even from that standpoint members with any appreciation for the finer feelings can reasonably ask the general community to refrain from the beastly habit of expectoration which is so largely indulged in in our city and in our public places. It is hardly possible to walk through the streets of Perth at any time during the day or night without seeing people, devoid of any discrimination or any care whatever, expectorating on the footpaths and the roads, to say nothing of this habit being practised in halls and public places of every description. In railway carriages, too, I have often shuddered to think what contamination must result from the carriage over our railways of people suffering from consumption. Hon. members might say, "We are prepared to support you in your efforts to prevent infected people from expectorating, but it is not fair to ask the general public to abide by such a law." I point out that it is impossible to pass legislation which will affect only diseased persons and not apply to healthy persons. Besides, the question would arise, "When would you decide that a person was infected?" Even among the medical profession there is a great difference of opinion as to the period from the inception of the disease to the time when it can be correctly diagnosed, but at all events there is unanimity among the medical profession, and those interested in public health matters that in the habit of spitting lies almost the only means of infection as regards this disease. I have read a bulletin issued by one of the United States local boards of health, in which it is stated that 99 per cent. of the cases are caused through infection from sputum. I could quote many eminent men who have studied this question for years, and who are unanimous in the opinion that to reduce the number of cases of tuberculosis to a minimum the first thing to do is to educate the people in regard to the infection by spitting. I have also asked a number of medical men in Perth, well known men who have been here for a number of years, for their opinion of the Bill, and 18 or 19 who replied to my questions almost to a man stated that undoubtedly the practice of spitting was the cause of the spreading of a great number of infectious diseases. I have asked men like Dr. Trethowan, a man well known in this city, and he, without any hesitation, said there was a great danger from expectoration, not only in regard to consumption, but other diseases also. With the permision of hon. members I will read his letter which states—

> In answer to your letter of 19th instant, this has been considered by the W.A. Branch of the British Medical Association and in due course you will receive their opinion. Personally, I consider the habit of expectoration in public places a filthy and reprehensible one; and that it might readily conduce to the spread of disease. Anyone suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis and from diseases such as diphtheria

whooping cough, and catarrh of the throat and nose might readily affect others in this way, especially in dry weather. The sputum dries up and the contained germs blown about with the dust and so inhaled tends to infect healthy people. Apart from this public decency requires that the habit should be checked and if legislation can affect this, all the better.

One and all of the letters I have received are of the same character. Another medical man in Perth who has studied the question of tuberculosis a good deal, a medical man who was at one time in charge, I believe, of one of the most up-to-date sanatoriums in England, or at any rate was in a high position in such a hospital, contends that the sputum of diseased persons is almost entirely responsible for the infection of others. I am aware that some hon. members of this Chamber and some members of the general community have not always faith in the medical profession, and are inclined to believe those in that profession are actuated a good deal by the power of £ s. d.; but in this case it can be said they are doing nothing but moving in the direction of endeavouring to prevent this disease. The branch of the British Medical Association in Western Australia has forwarded the following communication, dated the 22nd August, 1913, to me:—

> Dear Sir, At a general meeting of this Association held on Wednesday evening, Dr. Officer brought before the meeting the letter which you wrote to him with reference to the Bill that you have introduced. The following motion was carried unanimously, namely:—"That in the opinion of this meeting 'spitting' is an uncleanly and objectionable habit, and that any legislation likely to limit it in public places has the support of this Association. It undoubtedly tends to spread phthisis and other diseases."

Another medical man in this city, a personal friend of mine, and a man who at one time had charge of the Perth Public Hospital for a considerable number of years, informed me he could emphatically say that from experiment and investigation there could be not the slightest possible shadow of doubt that very much of the infection in regard to this disease could be laid at the door of the sputum of persons already suffering. He said he had often noticed people in Perth expectorating on the footpaths or roadways, people whom he knew to be suffering from tuberculosis, and he dreaded to think what the results might be. I recognise that I am looked upon in this House somewhat as a fanatic in regard to this particular matter. Whether it be so or not, no one can gainsay the statement that it is a serious question and that sufficient importance is not attached to it by this House and by the people in general, including local bodies, and we seem to forget that nearly 4,000 persons die every year in Australia from this one ailment. We should also remember that tuberculosis, as well as other diseases, can be checked by preventative measures on the part of local bodies and the organised medical departments of the different States. Through efforts in this direction, certain diseases are happily decreasing in Australia, and they are being decreased only by preventative measures put into operation by the health boards and the medical departments in the various States. As a matter of fact, one could point to the fact that the only disease, so far as I know, of which the cause has not yet been discovered, and in connection with which deaths are rapidly increasing in Australia, is that dreaded disease cancer. Three years ago in Australia we had no fewer than about 2,800 persons succumb to cancer. As I have said, the cause of that disease has not yet been discovered, and last year, owing to the fact that we had not discovered the cause and could take no preventative measures, I think we lost approximately 3,320 lives. It only goes to show that those diseases of which the germs are known to the medical profession can be prevented if united effort is made on the part of the people and on the part of governing bodies. Particularly must action come from the Parliament of this and the other States. I have had some experience myself and from a little study of the question one recognises the danger

of the beastly practice of expectoration. I remember a few years ago two young fellows who came from my own district. Their ages were 28 and 30 years respectively. They left the Fingal mine, where I think the trouble first began, and went to Phillips River. Later on they came back to Perth, one of them bringing his comrade with him. I discovered them after they had been here some weeks and I induced the one who was ill to go to a sanatorium. I had discovered them in a room in a city lodging-house of the kind which, I suppose, hon. members are acquainted with, badly ventilated and with the hygienic conditions generally not good. I thought at the time it was very possible indeed for one of the men to have contracted the disease from the other. However, they went to the sanatorium at Coolgardie and three months afterwards the younger of the two was buried, while twelve months later the other was buried, but in the interim he had gone on to a farm in Western Australia and worked with another man. He had thought that by going on to a farm and working in the fresh air in a good healthy occupation he would throw the disease off, and it was not recognised by him or the man he was with that there was any extreme danger, or that any particular precautions should be taken, with the result that when he came to Perth and I met him in the City, he was within six or seven weeks of death. Unfortunately, owing to the ignorance existing between these two, the other man has now taken the disease, and I believe that had there been more knowledge on this question, and had the people been educated to know what precautions to take, two of these lives would have been saved, and there would be none of the hardships and suffering that are undergone both by the patients and members of their families. I could point to many cases, even at the present time, in endeavouring to impress upon hon. members the necessity for doing everything that is possible in the direction of the prevention of this particular disease. I have four cases on my hands now of men from the mines. Somehow or another I seem to get the majority of them. The four of them are simply unable to work. They worked in the mines as long as they could, longer than they should have by far, working because they had wives and families to keep, and felt they could not leave. They come here to Perth, and in this civilised country and in these civilised days I have seen some of these unfortunate individuals refused a bed in the sanatorium at Coolgardie because we say we have not room. A Christian country and we have not room even for a consumptive to lie down and die! There are a number of these cases. Hon. members might think that these are extravagant cases, but everyone in this Chamber must know of some case; if they do not know of a case at present, they know of a family where probably one after another has succumbed to this dread disease. One might well ask who will be the next in this Chamber to go, and one can with some degree of confidence say that had the people been educated in regard to the danger of careless spitting, an hon. member of this Chamber would not now be lying in the hospital. Perhaps it will be said that this, too, is a strong statement. It might be, but I feel that when we are losing in Australia 4,000 of our citizens every year, and when one recognises the long years of suffering in the aggregate among those people, when one refers to the economic side and sees the time lost by those patients, often imposing a burden on their people or a burden on the State, then surely one must realise that we are justified in taking every possible step in order that we might prevent this disease. I know that some hon. members of this Chamber will not take very much notice of a Bill of this description. They have heard about tuberculosis and have seen people suffering from it, but consider they should not trouble about it because that is the duty of medical men; but it is the duty of members of this Chamber to prevent the disease if we possibly can. More can be done to prevent it by the education of the people generally than by the medical men. It is in the hands of the people themselves, and particularly in the hands

of the patients; and in order to educate the people so that we may prevent some of this disease, I ask for legislation which will make careless spitting, especially in public places, an offence against the Health Act. It may be said that this is impracticable, and an hon. member of this Chamber asked me a little while ago whether I expected to carry a measure of this kind. It seemed to him that this habit of spitting had become so common on the part of people that they had come to the stage of thinking that it was necessary.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is a necessity sometimes.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is never a necessity to spit in such a way as to be a danger to the general community.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How about anyone having bronchitis?

Mr. HEITMANN: If I am suffering from bronchitis, there is all the more need for me to be careful that my sputum does not affect others. It is only a fair thing to ask the general community and patients suffering from this disease that they should, so far as possible, give their assistance. I recognise that this is proposing a very far-reaching amendment of the Health Act, but I have tried and failed to find where I could safely draw the line.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Children would be liable if your Bill is carried.

Mr. HEITMANN: As a matter of fact, we are not going to hang anyone if they are caught at this business. I respect the interjection of the hon. member and can see the point, but I foresee no great difficulty with regard to children. It is not among children that spitting is so regular; it is mostly with adults, and, strange to say, we find it is a habit almost entirely followed by men. I would ask those who say it is impossible to do without spitting to say how often do they find women spitting in a public place. I must confess that I have never seen it in Perth, with one exception. If this Bill were imposing something on the general community that was impracticable, or any hardship on the community, I would not be so anxious to have it passed. I cannot remember the time when I expectorated other than into my handkerchief, or possibly a few times into the fire. As a matter of fact I have suffered from a slight attack of bronchitis, but I never found it necessary to follow the habit which I have been condemning. I feel that it can be avoided. We can see the seriousness of the action and we should make an effort thus to prevent the infection of other people. It will be said that this is all very well for consumptives, who are trained by their medical men; that is a fact. One of the first pieces of advice a medical man would give to a patient is that he should take care that sputum was not ejected in such a way as to be a danger to his family and people generally. But, as I have said, we cannot bring in a Bill to deal only with the affected parties. We cannot bring in a Bill to say that consumptives shall not expectorate, or that men suffering from catarrh of the throat or nose shall not expectorate. The Bill must apply to everyone in the State. I feel that can be done, and I feel that if the local bodies had taken an interest in this matter long ago, it might have been unnecessary to-day to bring in a Bill of this description. But it is surprising what little interest the local bodies take in the question of public health. I would like to read the remarks of one who is qualified to speak on a subject like this, and I feel sure the comments of this authority will impress hon. members as to the necessity for legislation of this kind. I have a copy of *The Practitioner*, a leading monthly medical journal, dated January, 1913. The whole issue is devoted to the question of tuberculosis.

Mr. Carpenter: Is it English?

Mr. HEITMANN: Yes. The articles published in this number are by men who are qualified to write and their articles must stand the criticism of the foremost authorities in England. The extract I propose to read is from an article by Theodore Acland, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., and it is on the education of the public in relation to the prevention of tuberculosis. It reads—

The end in view will best be accomplished by bringing clearly before the public—(1) The causes of the disease, and how much the individual can do to protect both himself and the community from becoming victim to the contagion. (2) The methods by which the contagion gains access to the body, and the conditions which lead to its becoming inoperative and powerless for harm. They need to be convinced that the actual causes of the disease are capable of being seen and handled, and that, apart from the tubercle bacillus, tuberculosis cannot originate *de novo*, or be spread. The two most obvious sources from which tuberculosis may be derived are :—(1) The expectoration of persons suffering from consumption. (2) Milk from cows infected with tubercle. Though there are other possible sources of the poison, they are either so rare or so purely accidental that it is doubtful whether human foresight with our present knowledge could take practical measures to combat them. Much has been done to check the disgusting habit of promiscuous expectoration in our streets and public places since the London County Council had the courage, at the request of the N.A.P.C., to make it an indictable offence: and the railway companies have given valuable assistance in the matter, so that now it may fairly be assumed that the great majority of the population appreciate, at any rate, the fact that the contagion of "consumption" is conveyed by the sputum from those who are affected to those who are susceptible, and in self-defence they desire to see the by-law carried out, and are willing to give their assistance. It is of the utmost importance that both communities and individuals alike should take to heart the lesson, that they must rely quite as much on what the individuals do for themselves as on that which is done for them. The public need to be impressed with the fact, that the consumptives themselves can do more than anyone else to prevent the spread of consumption, by preventing the secretions, which contain the poison, from becoming a source of danger to those about them. Thus it should be impressed on those who are actually suffering from the disease, how necessary it is for them to exercise scrupulous care about coughing and spitting, and to use some kind of sputum flask, such as is now obtainable at most of the hospitals and dispensaries.

Of course, he emphasises the absolute necessity of care being taken by patients suffering from this disease. He also points out the necessity for people themselves adopting cleaner habits in public places. Again, I want to say that whilst he emphasises most strongly the care which should be taken by a diseased person, it is a matter of impossibility, with our present health organisation, to locate sometimes even in the early stages, the disease of consumption. I have known quite a number of such instances. Not long ago I heard of a civil servant who was removed from his position in one of the departments for the sake of the safety of his fellow officers. This unfortunate man had some time previously seen a doctor, and when he interviewed me he asked me to get him a position in the country, as he thought possibly a change would do him good. I was the means of getting him admitted to the sanatorium and, as usual, had to provide some means for his wife and two children. A fortnight after that man came to me—and it had to be remembered that he had not seen a doctor for some time—he died. There are quite a number of cases of people who, though suffering from the disease, refuse to believe that it has secured a hold of them, and will not consult a medical man. The insidiousness of the disease is such that it takes so long to show itself, that when notice is taken of it the sufferer is in such a state of health that he is almost beyond hope, and then he is a menace to the public health generally. I have the kindest possible feeling in this matter in asking that care should be exercised on the part of the people. I have noticed members of this House indulging in the practice of expectorating, and I have even seen

town councillors offend in this direction. One would imagine that these people would think a little, and while I ask that the practice should be prevented, I do it with the full knowledge from my own experience that what the Bill proposes can be carried out, and in a few years I feel sure that 99 per cent. of the cases of tuberculosis would disappear. I am glad to say that in Australia, while we still have close upon 4,000 cases of consumption, and while there are yet 7,000 case of lung trouble that might be said to be serious, some of them being of the more rapid form of the disease, such as pneumonia, the figures are decreasing, and it is only through the adoption of preventive measures, and the work of the health bodies, local as well as governing, that this result has been obtained. I am sure that the people will make some effort in the direction of avoiding the habit of spitting, which is not clean and which is impolite, and if the measure is carried I feel sure that the effect will be gratifying, inasmuch as in a few years' time an appreciable decrease in lung troubles will be brought about. I move—

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

On motion by the Minister for Mines, debate adjourned.

## BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Mr. McDONALD (Gascoyne) in moving the second reading said: You, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will be pleased to hear, and hon. members also, that in moving the second reading of this Bill I wish to put up a record for brevity. The Bill is before hon. members and will explain itself. I merely wish to say that this is an amendment of the Land Act, 1898, and it has been found necessary, owing to the fact that whereas that Act provides, and specially mentions, the right of people holding miners' rights, woodcutters' licenses, and sandalwood cutters' licenses, to enter upon unimproved land held under pastoral lease in pursuit of their ordinary avocations, it is silent so far as the holders of licenses under the Game Act are concerned. Reference has been made to this matter half a dozen times in various debates, and it has been shown that an injustice is being done to the kangaroo shooters, of the North-West in particular, and that an anomaly exists in this regard. It is to remove that anomaly that I have introduced this measure. It has been pointed out also that kangaroos are an increasing pest in the pastoral areas, but owing to the silence of the Act referred to, it is necessary for kangaroo shooters to get permission from the manager or the owner of the station before they can go on those station properties and shoot the kangaroos and get their skins. There are instances on some of the stations of areas of 60,000 and even 100,000 acres, without a single head of stock belonging to the station. It has been found necessary at various times for an owner to reserve a portion of his area, so that in times of stress he may remove his stock from where the pastures are depleted to this virgin country. At the same time he exercises the right to preserve the game on that area. The kangaroo shooter taking out a license, say, in the town of Carnarvon, may have to travel 200 or 300 miles in a direct line before he finds any unoccupied country—Crown lands over which he may shoot. In the meantime kangaroos are increasing by thousands on the holdings between those unoccupied lands and the coast. They are undoubtedly a pest and a menace to the community. It was said jokingly a few years ago in Victoria and New South Wales, when they discovered the virtues of the rabbit as an exporting quantity, that the squatters were seriously considering the advisability of killing the sheep so as not to interfere with the rabbit. If the present system is persisted in in the North-West a similar state of things will undoubtedly be brought about up there. In the evidence adduced before the select committee appointed to inquire into the Game Bill which passed the House last session, a representative from Messrs. Wills & Company, who deal with the majority of the

skins, both from the South and the North, said that they handled some 200,000 skins each year. The idea of allowing any manager or owner of a station to preserve on his own land a pest is most inimical to the interests of Western Australia. Hoping, therefore, that this anomaly will be removed by the passing of this measure, I move—

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

On motion by Mr. Underwood debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 11th September, 1913.*



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

## BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Premier (for the Attorney General) and read a first time.

## RETURN—COAL CONSUMPTION ON RAILWAYS.

On motion by Mr. A. A. WILSON (Collie), ordered: "That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing the consumption of coal per mile per ton hauled over the Government railways for the years 1907-8, 1908-9, 1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12, 1912-13."

## BILL—MINES REGULATION.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Minister for Mines in Charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Classification of inspectors:

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

*That paragraph (c) be struck out.*

This paragraph provided for the appointment of workmen's inspectors, which provision would be detrimental to the mining industry and unfair to the mine-owners and managers, and would not be of advantage to the men working in the mine If more inspectors were required, it was open to the Government to appoint as many as they deemed necessary for the work, and he did not think that anyone having an interest in this great industry would object for one moment to as many inspectors being appointed as were considered necessary by the department to carry out the duty of watching the operations of the mines and seeing that they were controlled and worked with due regard for the safety of the men employed. He could not understand that any additional safety would accrue from the appointment as inspectors of men who were elected by the various unions. It would be just as reasonable to ask that inspectors elected by the Chamber of Mines or a gathering of mine managers should be appointed as to make provision for inspectors to be appointed on the nomination of the unions. What was wanted were independent and impartial men to stand between the employers and employees and see fair play and justice meted out to both parties. It had been argued on more than one occasion that this system was in vogue. It was stated by the Minister either by interjection or when moving the second reading that this system was in vogue in the coal-mining industry. In the Act of 1902 there was no reference to inspectors of this description.

Mr. Heitmann: It is a custom.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Perhaps so, but it was not in the Act. That measure contained nothing like the proposals embraced in this Bill. Under the Coal