

fruit, and paid £24,688 to the growers. I may inform the Minister for Railways, who is greatly interested in fruit juices, that the department have 27 fruit stalls, and others are contemplated. At those stalls 98 juice extractors are being operated, and the number is being added to. The Victorian Railways were the first to introduce fruit-juice extractors into Australia. The campaign to encourage the drinking of more fruit is proving beneficial to the growers and to the railways. The principal fruit-drink stall is located at the Flinders-street station. During the year 1928-29, 840,900 drinks were sold, an average of over 16,000 a week. The total number of drinks sold by all fruit and fruit-drink stalls during the same period was 1,535,380. We talk of the advantages of the "Eat more fruit" policy, but the Railway Department of Victoria carry it into effect, and the growers are much indebted to the department for all that has been done. I appreciate the action of the Western Australian Railways in displaying, without charge, posters advertising the sale of fruit as supplied by the growers to the department. I hope the Commissioner, and those associated with him, who are keenly anxious to do all in their power, will extend the good work. I hope the Minister, who is full of enthusiasm, and has ideas, will lend his encouragement, and thereby assist the growers to obtain a better market and a better distribution of fruit throughout the country districts. Any reference to these Estimates would be incomplete if I did not touch upon the supply of electric current. I should like an assurance from the Premier, through the Minister, that consideration will be given this session to the people in the outer suburban districts who need electric current for power purposes.

The Premier: I will give an assurance to consider it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I thank the Premier. Knowing his sincerity, I will not regard that as other than a serious promise. It would be bad if a statement like that were made with any other object than to convey to the public a real intention. Western Australia should get into step with other States in the matter of supplying current to its producers. When in company with the present Minister for Lands I visited Austria, we were impressed with the fact that the country was criss-crossed with electric cables. The same thing applies to

other European countries. In Sweden it is even more manifest, whilst in Norway, a comparatively small country with a population of less than 2½ millions, electricity is used in every possible way. As the Minister for Railways has said on different occasions, there is no cheaper power than electric current, and a wise Government will use every opportunity to produce a low-priced power. That power can be produced by means of our own Colliery coal. We should thus give to those concerned in the production of our primary requirements the type of power they need, and provide additional work for those who are engaged in the coal mining industry and generally add to the prosperity of all concerned.

Progress reported.

BILL—STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Council, and read a first time.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 11th October, 1930.

Bills:		PAGE
Industries Assistance Act Amendment, 2R.	...	959
Education Act Amendment, 1R.	...	970
Anatomy, 2R.	...	971
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R.	...	977
Bees, 2R., Com.	...	986

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

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.36]: Ever since I have been a member of this House, the question of continuing the Industries

Assistance Board has been discussed session after session. One has passed the matter by in the hope that the institution would work itself out. I had not intended to speak on the present occasion, and would not have done so but for the illuminating figures and earnest address presented to the Chamber by Mr. Seddon. I am sure every member is grateful to Mr. Seddon for the care and attention displayed in the preparation of details bearing on the subject. Accepting Mr. Seddon's figures as correct, the total amount advanced by the Industries Assistance Board is £2,424,306, and the total repayments are £2,115,108. Analysing the figures closely, I have come to the conclusion that the Industries Assistance Board are practically an insurance branch of the Government, ensuring repayment to the Government of various amounts due to them. This is plain from the headings of repayments shown in the schedule which is submitted. Probably the most important fact is that what are called land rents have been repaid. We have to bear in mind that loan money is granted for the purpose of paying land rent, or really the purchase price of lands, and that the amount has gone into Consolidated Revenue. And that is not the only instance where loan money has been paid into Consolidated Revenue. Seeing the period which has elapsed since the organisation of the board, it must be acknowledged that the time has arrived for terminating the institution, especially as regards settlers who have been on the board from the beginning, and have not made good despite the consideration extended to them. Another fact to which attention should be drawn is that amounts written off as lost are still debited with interest. After the second reading has been passed, I shall seriously consider supporting the amendment foreshadowed by Mr. Seddon. If people who have had the benefit of the Industries Assistance Board during good and bad years are not now in a position to make good, they never will be. The sooner that is realised, the better. Another important phase is the amount allocated to the assistance of various industries. I venture to say that if the Council of Industrial Development or some similar body had been in existence to advise the various Governments, many of the advances would never have been made. The total of such advances at the 30th June, 1929, was £416,236, and during the financial year 1928-29 a sum of £21,869 had been

allocated. The Avon Butter and Bacon Factory have an advance of £12,958. The Calyx Porcelain Company have several advances—one of £7,800 and another of over £1,800.

Hon. A. Lovekin: All blue ducks!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I am afraid so. We all have great sympathy with people who try to establish industries here, and we recognise that they are up against a difficult proposition. The Calyx Company, for instance, established themselves here to manufacture lines in respect of which they would be able to overtake the entire Western Australian demand in a few weeks. To ship the products to the other States is practically an impossibility. I venture to say that it would be cheaper to crate and pack crockery in England and ship it thence to Melbourne than to crate and pack it here in Western Australia and ship it from Fremantle to Melbourne. Crating and packing, which are an art in themselves, involve high costs. The position is altogether different as regards the Albany Woollen Mills, as the packing and transit of woollen goods represent an almost infinitesimal item compared with crockery. It is unfair to ask either a Minister or the Cabinet to submit to being appealed to as has been the case for these industries. No matter what the political complexion of any Government may be, they will be sympathetic towards people endeavouring to establish secondary industries in Western Australia. If such people are able to put a case before Cabinet, the Cabinet will in the first instance be sympathetic. However, the time for sentiment has gone by, and hard facts have to be faced. Before any other advances are made to assist in the establishment of an industry here, the matter should be referred to some special board possessed of technical knowledge and experience, so that the future may be safeguarded. Many of us remember the wonderful stories that were told about lime deposits at Lake Clifton. A railway was constructed to those deposits, and the whole thing ended in a myth. Then there is the advance to the Manganesse Company, £122,074. Everyone knows that the company promised to develop a manganese deposit, and that the stuff was to be shipped almost immediately. Up to the present I doubt whether any manganese has been shipped from Geraldton. The amount of the advance in this instance is very large indeed. All of us are anxious to foster secondary industries, but it must be done on a busi-

ness-like economic basis. Again, take the Western Australian Meat Export Company of Fremantle, who had an advance of £137,219. Very little is heard about the company nowadays. It is a case of Kathleen Ma-vourneen as regards repayment of these advances totalling some £416,000. That is one of the reasons why, after the second reading has been carried, I shall seriously consider supporting Mr. Seddon's proposed amendment. The time is ripe for closing up many of these accounts, so that we may find out exactly where we stand. The crediting of interest on advances which have been lost means creating a fictitious value. What is the use of deluding ourselves in that fashion? It is an unreasonable and unfair method of keeping Government accounts. While supporting the second reading, I await to hear some definite and tangible reasons why the Industries Assistance Board should not be closed down.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [4.45]: All who give the matter consideration will admit that it is necessary this Bill should pass in order that the Industries Assistance Board may continue to function and complete the work it has in hand. But to my mind it is necessary for another reason also. There has never been such distress amongst the farming community of Western Australia as there is at the present time, and unless some form of special assistance be rendered to enable them to tide over the crisis through which they are passing, undoubtedly they will be unable to carry on. In 1914, when the board was initiated, we had a severe drought. But at that time the farmer could see the end of his troubles. Prices were all right, whereas to-day they are all wrong. Those prices have reached a lower level than at any other stage in the history of Western Australia or of the Commonwealth. Consequently it may be a question of the life or death of the industry. If the industry is injured, Australia will be injured. Other businesses and trade within the State will suffer. And, more than that, we depend on wheat and wool in order to bring about the restoration of the finances of the Commonwealth. In the Industries Assistance Act we have a measure which provides all the machinery required for dealing with the situation. It has been preserved for 16 years. During that long period it has been enacted and re-enacted year after year. I see no reason why it

should not now be re-enacted without any amendment. There has been a suggestion that it should be amended in order to make it impotent for future use. That would be a grave mistake.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Did not your Government propose to do that last year?

Hon. J. M. DREW: No. It was threatened last year that the board would have to come to an end. But the circumstances now are quite different. I did state, even in the House, that it was not intended to continue the Industries Assistance Act very much longer. But at that time there was not the depression that exists to-day; the price of wheat had not fallen to its present level.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Now that we have the depression, we have not the money to advance.

Hon. J. M. DREW: It may be said we have not the money to advance to farmers. In my opinion the farmers should have the very first consideration. It is essential that they should be assisted, since the industry in which they are engaged is of vital importance to the State. The Premier, some weeks ago, announced that he intended—I presume with the consent of the Loan Council—to raise money in London for the purpose of assisting agricultural development in this State. He said he had come to the conclusion that he would not have much difficulty in floating a loan for that purpose. If that loan is floated it will be necessary to have the machinery in order that the money should be distributed to the farmers. The machinery provided in the Act is all that is needed. The Agricultural Bank will not serve the purpose, for it will deal only with its clients. But there are numerous farmers who are not under the Agricultural Bank at all, who have been dealing with private institutions, yet who are just as much entitled to assistance as are any other farmers. It is necessary to render them aid. Consequently it would be a mistake to amend this Act in such a way as to prevent the Government from assisting needy farmers as I have suggested. Undoubtedly the Act has proved of great benefit to the State. It has enabled over 3,000 farmers to remain on the land and continue their production. Had there been no such legislation, many of the holdings would have had to be abandoned, and a great setback would have been given to the agricultural industry in Western Australia. Up to the 31st March last, over 12 mil-

lions of money had been loaned through the Industries Assistance Board, and the total losses written off amounted to only £767,448, while the total production of the farmers assisted amounted to over £12,000,000. I was somewhat surprised to hear Sir William Lathlain's criticisms of this measure, and especially his reference to the fact that the Government pay the land rents of the farmers out of loan moneys provided for the purpose of assisting the farmers. The hon. member should realise that if those farmers were dealing with a private bank that bank would insist, before making further advances, that the lands rents should be paid. Also the hon. member, dealing with former Governments, said that if the Council of Industrial Development had been in existence many of the loans granted by the board would not have been granted.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: I was referring to industrial loans.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Yes, I am referring to industrial loans. But the Council of Industrial Development was in existence when the Collier Government came into office, and I think for many years previously. In any case, no such loan was granted by the board except on the recommendation of that council.

Hon. H. Seddon: Was the Council of Industrial Development in existence many years prior to the Collier Government?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I understand it was. Two years ago Sir William Lathlain was most enthusiastic in his encomiums on this legislation. His remarks, which he made on the 26th September, 1928, and which are reported on page 943 of "Hansard" of that session, are worth quoting. He said—

I also will support the Bill. During a recent visit to New South Wales I met Sir Robert Gibson, Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank, and in a long discussion regarding the prospects of Western Australia. . . . I was conversant with the fact that under the operations of the board up to that time nearly ten millions of money had been advanced—

I think that in all some 12 millions have been advanced. The hon. member continued—

and considerably over £8,000,000 had been repaid. When I drew the attention of Sir Robert to this wonderful repayment, he was astounded.

I think he would be more astounded still if the figures were brought up to date and

submitted to his notice. I trust Sir William Lathlain will not depart from the attitude he took up on that occasion.

Hon. H. Seddon: That was two years ago.

Hon. J. M. DREW: And there is ever so much more reason now to support the continuance of this Act unamended.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Two years ago we had a very different state of affairs.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I intend to support the Bill without any amendment, unless it be an amendment in harmony with, not in opposition to, my remarks.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [453]: The Industries Assistance Board was established in 1914 or 1915 as the result of the then drought, the first and only drought we have had in our agricultural areas. I find the board has loaned in all £2,424,000, and has had to write off £767,500 as losses. The writing off of that £767,500 leaves probably 13¼ millions owing to the board. We have presented to us each year an annual report by the board. Every year when the money is passed, we have been led to believe that the board has been anxious to wind up its operations. Each year the Minister has indicated that probably that would be the last year we would have a Bill for the continuance of the Act. But that, like too many statements made to us, has not been carried out. We find that even in the report of the board for 1929, the latest report we have before us, the board recommended that its activities should be closed down on the 30th June, 1930. But instead of that recommendation of the board being carried out, we now have before us a Bill to carry it on, and to carry us into deeper water. From what the Minister has said, I notice that those remaining under the Act have been dwindling in number from year to year. Yet I find that in 1916, when there was a great number of farmers under the Act, the administration and inspection costs totalled £20,000, whereas in 1930 the amount was £41,200. Seemingly, as the number of persons assisted under the Act has been dwindling from year to year, so the emoluments of those supervising the operations of the Act have increased until they are now 100 per cent. greater than they were 14 years ago. The Minister says there are only 208 persons under the Act at

the present time. On that basis, if we work it out we find that the costs of inspection and administration amount to £200 per farmer. None of those assisted farmers can carry that cost. And I understand that cost is only 50 per cent. of the actual cost of inspection.

Hon. J. Cornell: There are the Agricultural Bank's costs.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, I understand the Agricultural Bank pays fifty-fifty of the cost of inspection; consequently that cost, instead of being £200 per year, is actually £400 per year. So there is something wrong. The Minister says there are only 208 persons now under the Act. But if those 208 persons owe $1\frac{3}{4}$ millions, it works out at about £7,000 per farmer. Not many of our farmers are worth £7,000 to-day. It is questionable whether some of them are worth anything. I am raising these points in order that the Minister in his reply may clear them up. Another point to which I shall draw attention is this: while we were told in 1928 that it was proposed to wind up the board, and again in 1929 that it should be wound up in June, 1930, I find the advances in 1929 alone amounted to £131,009, while in 1930 they have amounted to £151,000. So while the board has been recommending that its activities be wound up, and while Ministers from year to year have been promising to do that, the board or the Minister or some other persons, have been making advances to the extent of £131,000 in 1929, and of £151,000 in 1930.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are having a send-off.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This board may be good to assist the Treasurer in balancing his ledger, because I find from the return that the Treasury charged the board interest last year to the extent of £132,000. At the same time the board made a loss of £113,000, so that ultimately the Treasurer will have to foot the bill for that £113,000. The Treasurer has debited the board with £132,000, and when debiting that amount against the board the Treasurer reduces the State's interest bill up to that amount. But the Treasury will never get the £132,000 that was debited against the board last year, because last year the board showed a net loss of £113,000. We have to grow wheat in this country and we have to grow it profitably

to save the State from insolvency. Assume we have a 48,000,000 bushel harvest—personally I think the yield will be more than that because I have never seen better crops anywhere for years past—and assume we get 2s. 6d. a bushel for the crop, it will mean that we shall have six millions sterling to distribute amongst the people of the State. Where would we be without that? I repeat that we have to grow wheat, but we must grow it profitably, and we can never do that by spoon feeding a lot of people who will not help themselves, and who are not worthy of Government support. Let me demonstrate what I mean. We have on Crown lands hundreds of people who have been assisted by the Government. Those people buy the land under lease conditions; they get it rent free for the first five years and the purchase payments extend over a period of 25 years, without interest. The Government then try to spoon feed them into prosperity. What happened in the case of the Midland Railway lands? The farmers there are solvent because they have had to stand on their own without any assistance. How did they buy their land? On entirely different conditions. They have to pay in cash 10 per cent. of the purchase price, and on what is owing, 4 per cent. per annum is added over the 15 years in which the balance has to be paid. Compound the interest at 4 per cent. over that period and see what the Midland settlers are paying for their land. They are doing more than living; they are making homes for themselves and are more or less prosperous, even to-day, because they have had to stand on their own. My experience is that if you put a man on his own and tell him he has to work out his own salvation, he will get somewhere, but he will never succeed when he has someone—the Government, for instance—behind him. My belief is that the day of the small farmer is gone; we have to get back to farming in a big way.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is what is being done in Canada.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: One big farm can employ a lot of men, pay them well, feed them well, and work them well. In that way better results can be obtained than by a lot of people who do not understand the business of engaging in farming and depending on Government support. Then we should have one or two tractors and quite a number of horses doing all the

work. The sooner we get back to horses the better will it be. Instead of individual farmers meeting every train, there will be one man with a motor vehicle to take all the mail, and all farm requirements. I have travelled through the country and I know that almost every farmer goes to every train in a car to get the mail. Perhaps the only mail he gets is a letter demanding payment which he is unable to make. Nevertheless, he is there to receive the mail. The solution of the difficulty is not to spoon-feed a lot of men who do not know the job. It would be far better if farmers in a big way employed a large number of men and so cut down overhead expenses. In that way we could put ourselves in the position of meeting the prices that we can get in the world's market to-day. I take my hat off to Sir Otto Niemeyer and other financial experts who have told us that we must concentrate on wool and wheat to get Australia out of its difficulties. Sir Otto Niemeyer did not mention anything else. It is our job to see that we grow both at a profit, and the only thing we can do is to see that wheat is grown profitably by those who understand the job. The Commonwealth will have to deal with the matter sooner or later, realising that the man on the land cannot carry the cities any longer. People in the cities and towns have awakened to the fact at last that they have been living on the agriculturists and the pastoralists, and their sympathy and their votes will swing to those two industries, because they now realise that it is those industries that will be the salvation of this country. If I know the politicians of Australia correctly, their votes will swing that way, perhaps to save their own skins, but incidentally they will save the country. Thus out of evil will come good.

Hon. E. H. Harris interjected.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The State Government can help by a reduction of the land tax. The primary producer has been carrying the load long enough. The Government might do so by a reduction of freights, but at the present time I do not advocate any reduction of freights. As we are engaged in trying to swing the railways into line, it is not the right time to interfere in the subject of reduction of freights. I disapprove entirely of the reduction of freight

on wool. It is a mere bagatelle; it amounts to nothing. It leaves a bad taste in the employee's mouth when you ask him to work longer hours and take less wages, and then you make a paltry reduction on wool freights. This is not the time to make such a reduction on wool freights.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Do you believe in increasing them?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I believe in letting the freights stand as they are until we can get the costs down, and until we can get coal at a cheaper price.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: You would stand by and let motor competition take business from the railways?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: As far as labour is concerned, that will adjust itself. At the present time men are working as they never worked before, and they are happy in their jobs and are doing well. That is, in the country, and it is due to the fact that as soon as an agitator appears on the scene, he requires a police escort to take him back.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Are the shearers working well?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and I hope those that are out have lost their jobs for ever. A lot of young men who were not able to make a living themselves out of wheat growing have made good shearers. They have done the job well and I hope they will continue to do so from year to year.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The big man always gets away with it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The history of the Empire is that it is the conservative man with big ideas who comes to the top and pulls the country out of its difficulty. In our case it will probably be the big wool grower and wheat grower who will save the situation by growing more wool and more wheat, which Sir Otto Niemeyer says we shall have to produce to save Australia. If the second reading goes to a vote, I shall vote against the Bill.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.12]: Viewing the position without bias, it is safe to say that there is no Act on the statute that has conferred more indirect gain on the State than the one we are discussing. It was promulgated during the most serious drought experienced by Western Australia, and at the outbreak of the Great War. The

Act was responsible for keeping on the land thousands who would have had to go off it, and it was instrumental in putting many men on the land who bore the heat and burden of the day during the years of the war. I understand that there are just under 200 clients still remaining on the board, and the province you, Sir, and I represent can claim to have a monopoly of them. There are varying reasons why these farmers are still on the board. The fact is that they have experienced two bad seasons—in the Esperance district I do not know how many bad seasons they have had—and the board simply has had to carry the farmers. I happen to have had considerable negotiations with the board at a time when I knew that no one was more anxious to wind up the affairs of the board than the members of the board themselves. As a matter of fact, I think that last year the board imposed many undue hardships on its clients in the anxiety to wind up the affairs of the board. It has been said that the Act contained all the machinery necessary to meet a set of circumstances unprecedented in the history of Western Australia and the Commonwealth generally. I agree with that, but in this, my first speech in the House this session, I wish to point out that the question that transcends all others at this juncture, even that of balancing the Budget, is how are we to keep the wheat growers on their farms, even though, as Mr. Holmes said, some of them have made a mess of it? If some of them have done so, it is better to keep them on their farms than to allow the properties to revert to nature. I am sorry that there has been so much procrastination regarding the obvious duty that devolves upon the State and commercial men generally, to keep the wheels of industry going. I hope it will not be a case of the patient dying while the experts stand around in an endeavour to diagnose the cause. If some definite arrangement is not made very soon, many deserving people will be placed in such a position that any such arrangement will be of little use to them. They will not have the means to carry on and keep cropping their properties. I hope it will not be many days before the Minister will be able to give us some idea whether or not we have the money available with which to tackle this problem. If the money cannot be provided at this juncture, let the Government say so in order that the

man on the land may know exactly where he stands. It is safe to say that many thousands of bags of wheat will not be taken to the sidings this year, because it will not pay the farmers to cart it. Many of them will not be in a position to harvest it at all.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is that owing to failures in some districts?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can tell the hon. member that, in the Southern Cross district, the more wheat one grows, the less can be obtained for it. Many farmers are up against the position that it will cost them about 12s. an acre to place the wheat at the railway siding, and in those circumstances they will probably consider whether it is worth while taking the crop off in view of the present-day prices. I am in accord with Mr. Holmes to some extent in his remarks regarding the Midland farmers, as compared with those operating in other parts of the State. The fact remains that all the farmers could not be accommodated in the Midland districts, and had to go to other parts of the State. The mere fact that the Midland farmer is in the position Mr. Holmes indicated, postulates that he has been in an infinitely better position than those who had to open up much of the country in other parts of the State. We can go through the different wheat-growing areas and discover just as successful men outside the Midland areas. Those men outside had nothing to start off with, while many of the Midland farmers were in a more fortunate position.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: And there is a much lower rainfall in other parts, too.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Midland areas and the country west of Kellerberrin are in a much better position than other districts throughout the State. I shall not detain the House any longer, but I hope the Bill will be agreed to in its present form. I assert that, if it were possible to wind up the affairs of the Industries Assistance Board, the trustees would have done so long ago, because they are sick and tired of the onerous duties that the administration of the board involves. To amend the legislation at this juncture would be most unwise.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.20]: Mr. Drew was correct when he said that if at any time the farmers required the Industries Assistance Board, it is the present. I am inclined to agree with

him to the extent of supporting the second reading of the Bill. Before doing so, I want to make it clear that the loss of £750,000, to which reference has been made, has been due almost entirely to what Mr. Holmes has pointed out. Many men have been placed on farms who had no business to go there; they had had no training at all. Apparently, successive Governments have held the opinion that any man can be a farmer. When those men had nothing else to do, the Government said to them, "Go and get 1,000 acres of land. We will lend you the necessary money, and will make farmers of you." My experience of farming is that it is a highly skilful business, requiring a lot of knowledge in order to conduct the work properly. It is impossible for a man without experience to be successful as a farmer. If the matter were investigated, we would find that, to a large extent, the loss of £750,000 has been incurred because of the adoption of that policy. In my young days, farming existed along the lines Mr. Holmes has referred to, and that system of farming exists at the present time in some quarters.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They did not produce much in those days.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: They produced all that was required.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: That would not represent much in these days.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: In addition, they employed a good many men. Those farm hands learnt by experience and at the expense of their employers. The most successful farmers in subsequent days were those who left their work on other people's farms and secured properties for themselves. I have in mind a number of men who worked for other people for several years and saw the mistakes and errors their employers made, or appreciated how well they managed their farms. After having some years of experience, those men were able to leave the services of their employers and become successful farmers themselves. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill on the understanding that whoever is responsible for putting men on the land in future, will see to it that only men of experience will be allowed to take up land and receive financial assistance from the Government. I understand the Premier is arranging for a new settlement of dairy farmers at Nornalup. If there is a skilful business, it is that of dairy farming. Some people have an idea that dairy farming is quite

simple, but if any hon. member were to talk to dairy farmers in Holland or in other countries where the industry is carried on with noted success, he would be told that dairy farming is a highly skilful business, requiring experience before a person should be allowed to embark upon it. In view of that fact, I hope the Premier, when he does have the land cleared at Nornalup, will take the precaution of seeing that the men who are put on the dairy farms will be experienced and have a chance of success, particularly if State funds are to be advanced to the settlers there. On condition that care is taken in the selection of men who are to be put on the land in future, I am prepared to support the Bill on this occasion. Had the present been a more prosperous time for the State, I should have agreed with others who contend that this legislation should be dispensed with.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.24]: Before the Bill goes to a division, if it is to meet such a fate, I would remind hon. members that the Industries Assistance Board was originally established on account of the drought in 1914, and because of the difficulties that farmers were immediately confronted with owing to what was referred to as the "Bath blight." The Government of the day decided that there was too much speculation in land. Prior to 1914, many settlers took up land, cleared it and secured wonderfully good crops. There was a rush for new propositions. The people who had bought the land were able to sell their holdings readily and take up other land, on which the process was repeated. The Government of the day came to the conclusion that there was altogether too much speculation in agricultural holdings and decided to curb the activities of what they regarded as land speculators and land grabbers. The then Minister for Lands, Mr. Bath, and those associated with him, were determined to stop it and issued a regulation the effect of which was that so long as he was Minister for Lands, there would be no transfer of land granted under such conditions.

Hon. J. M. Drew: And the same regulation is in force to-day.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes, to the shame of every succeeding Government, that regulation has never been repealed. Certainly the regulation has not been put into operation, but that was mainly because of the disasters that followed on the drought.

As a result of that difficult period, the farmers could not secure further accommodation from the storekeepers, or from the Associated Banks, owing to the fact that if further financial assistance were rendered, and losses followed, in which event it would be necessary to seize the land, there was confronting the banks the Government's edict that the transfer of the land could not be secured. In those circumstances, it became increasingly difficult for storekeepers to secure accommodation from the banks, and it was impossible for many of the settlers to carry on and develop their holdings as they had been doing formerly. Then, on top of that, came the Great War. All the wheat grown by farmers was commandeered and the first price paid to them was 2s. 6d. per bushel. It was impossible for them to grow wheat profitably at that price and, in the circumstances, it became necessary for them to take full advantage of the provisions of the Industries Assistance Act. The farmers had to wait for 12 months before they secured any further advance, and even then the advance, which was payable at the end of the next year, was a trifling sum. In the meantime another crop had been put in. As the farmers could not secure assistance from the storekeepers, the machinery merchants, or the banks, they had to be carried by the Government. There was no other course open. For several years during the war period, the farmers were not able to turn the corner because of the dreadfully small price available for their product, and because of other circumstances that militated against successful farming. They suffered because of the small advances they were able to obtain under the system of the compulsory control of wheat. It was not until 1917 that they received a reasonable price for their wheat. In the interim the farmers had been endeavouring to hang on to their farms and to produce crops in order to feed Australia at a cheaper rate than was the rule in any other part of the world at that time. In view of those facts, it is rather hard to have to listen to statements made about men on the land who have not been able to turn the corner.

Hon. H. Seddon: They have had twelve years since those days.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: But there have also been many years of control. I can vouch for it that in many instances it was not the farmer's fault that he did not succeed. I agree with Mr. Holmes that

private methods would probably have been better than those that operated under the system of control by the board. The decisions arrived at have not always been wise. Many farmers have found themselves in difficulties because they were allowed to have only second-hand machinery, and the machinery was ruining them. Many of them had a self-sown crop of wheat growing in the following year because the harvester was unfit to take the crop off, but it was a harvester insisted upon by the board.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We had evidence that they had to take State implements.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That was a scheme to bolster up the State Implement Works, and the farmers had to pay the price for it. Many of the drills sent to the country were not satisfactory, but the individual had to take what was supplied to him. He had very little opportunity to control his own affairs. That was quite right in a way, but had the farmers been able to get finance from private sources, instead of the State trying to run everything for them, they would have been better off. The men on the Midland areas have had to deal with financial institutions; they have not been able to run to the Agricultural Bank or to the Industries Assistance Board, and where they have been thrown on their own resources, they have proved more self-reliant. There is a clamour in the Midland areas for the Government to take over the Midland railway, the idea being that the settlers might then be able to participate in some of the benefits that other settlers obtain from the Government. Many of the Midland settlers, however, prefer the control of private enterprise rather than that of Government boards and institutions. I endorse the remark of Mr. Cornell that, if present prices continue, it is questionable whether an enormous quantity of wheat will be carted. I have letters from people in outback areas who have grown wheat in anticipation that they would be given railway facilities. There is little likelihood of railway communication being provided. Those settlers have been growing wheat 30, 40, 50, and 60 miles from a railway. What hope have they of operating profitably under existing conditions?

Hon. H. Seddon: Would the Industries Assistance Board assist them in carting their wheat?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No, but it is their only chance of holding on. I cannot

advocate that they should be driven off their farms; at this juncture they should be helped. As the board are in existence, and as every obstacle has been placed in the way of private enterprise negotiating for the business of those settlers, I see nothing for it but to continue the board that those men might be kept on their holdings.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Sixty miles from a railway line!

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The board have helped many men by transferring them from one area to another.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But growing wheat 50 or 60 miles away?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We cannot say to those settlers, "Walk off your farms; you are ruined," especially after they have sunk their own money in those propositions. The board must continue to function until we find some better scheme for assisting those settlers. If they cannot grow wheat profitably, it would be better for them to grow oats and wool, rather than come to the city to be fed at the Blackboy camp. We must continue to help them, and they are quite willing to do their bit to pull the country out of its difficulty. They have been working for years without receiving any return for their labour, and they are prepared to continue to work for nothing.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: There are only 208 settlers on the board.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am not prepared to say whether the settlers to whom I have referred are on the board or under the Agricultural Bank.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Certainly not under the bank if they are that distance from a railway.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am satisfied that many of them are working through the Industries Assistance Board. It would be awful for those people if the Council turned down the only means open to them to secure assistance during the next few months.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Would either of those institutions finance a farmer who had to cart his wheat 50 miles?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: No.

Hon. H. J. Volland: I suppose they went on in anticipation of a railway being constructed.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. It has been the policy of the State to construct railways in order to assist the development of the agricultural areas. When the State began its developmental policy, an offer was

made by Mr. Teesdale Smith to build 1,000 miles of railway for £1,000,000. It is most unfortunate that the offer was not accepted. Had the Government been wise enough to accept it, instead of trying to build railways on the day labour system, the State would have secured the construction of lines much more cheaply than they were built subsequently.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why throw out railways into that country?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Because we have no waterways by which to carry the produce to the ports.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There are hundreds of thousands of acres in your own province that should be developed.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There are thousands of acres everywhere that could be developed, but the State undertook the construction of railways in order that the inland areas might be brought under production. There is no better way to convey the produce to the ports than by railway. So long as the Government allow people to settle inland, they cannot be permitted to be stranded. Not many years ago we were told that Goomalling was too far east to grow wheat, later we were told that Dowerin was too far east. Then it was said it would be utter madness to attempt to grow wheat at Merredin. All those districts are to-day within the safe belt.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But they are not 50 miles from a railway.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: When the settlers first went there, they were 50 miles from a railway. The pioneers have always been 50 miles ahead of the railways.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Take Lake Grace for example: some of the settlers there are 70 miles out.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes; that indicates the spirit of the pioneers, and we should encourage that spirit. We have adopted the policy of assisting settlers through the Industries Assistance Board, and unless some better substitute can be found, I shall not be one to say that the board should be abolished and the settlers left stranded.

HON. E. E. H. HALL (Central 75.41): I would not have delayed the vote on the Bill but that I desire to direct attention to some aspects that so far have not been mentioned. I am quite in accord with Sir Edward Wit-

tenoom and Mr. Holmes in the belief that not every man placed on a farm can prove a successful farmer. It is a well-known fact, but one that will bear repeating, that quite a number of settlers have failed to make good, not only because they are unsuitable to follow the calling of agriculturist, but also because they have been placed on blocks that never gave them a chance of making good. One swallow does not make a summer.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They were not forced on to those blocks.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: They went on those blocks on the advice of departmental experts.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They selected their own blocks.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Many of them were advised to take up certain blocks. I am definitely of opinion that there is not the co-ordination between the various departments associated with land settlement that there should be. Only the week before last, in company with the Minister for Lands, Mr. Drew and Mr. Kempton, I saw a block the classification of which was in dispute. When men are allowed by departmental experts to take up country and the head of the Agricultural Bank or the board states ten years later that they never had a chance, although they had been receiving assistance from the board throughout those years, I say there must be something lacking in the inspection, or that the system must be weak somewhere. Talk about a penny wise, pound foolish policy! It has been a farthing wise and thousands of pounds foolish policy in that co-ordinated inspections have not been made regularly. I speak with some experience covering the last eight years, because I have been in close touch with a number of settlers in the Victoria district. If those men were slipping back during good seasons when prices were payable, what in the name of fortune can we expect of them now? Mr. Holmes spoke about spoon-feeding. I think it is recognised that every section of the community has to some extent been spoon-fed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And ruined by it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Why single out the man who more than anyone else has suffered privations and hardships, and particularly accuse him of being spoon-fed? I was pleased to hear Mr Holmes' remarks about the Midland lands. He said, with

pleasure and pride, that there was quite a different tale to tell with respect to the settlement along that railway. I agree there are many men who, without Government assistance, have made good there. We must not forget, however, that even in the Midland lands there is a fly in the ointment. The pick of this land, viz., Yandanooka, is not all that it should be.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Because it is under Government control.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The hon. member, with his youthful impulsiveness, has robbed me of a remark I was about to make.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Great minds think alike.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It seems strange that Governments, with the best of intentions, sometimes fail to do things as well as they might be done. I would ask members to take heed of the note of warning sounded by Mr. Drew. This especially applies to Mr. Seddon. That hon. member made a thoughtful and informative speech on this Bill. We must see to it that this question is dealt with as soon as possible. The Government are taking a long time firmly to grip the situation. The signs are there so that he who runs may read. Something will have to be done, and, according to the experts, the sooner it is done the better for all.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do it now.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Yes. What are the Government doing? We have the Bees Bill in front of us and several other Bills, whilst we are all anxiously waiting to do something that will assure the people the Government realise the seriousness of the position.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What do you suggest?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Will the hon. member keep quiet for a moment? Members talk about voting out this Bill. Unless the position is realised, recognised, and acted upon, we shall have to bring down a new one. The position is undoubtedly serious. I do not care how much members may laugh at me, so long as they do not cry. We must do something to keep on the land the hundreds of our farmers who are in need of help. I am not referring only to those under the Industries Assistance Board, but we should do all we can to keep every farmer on his block. I have no desire to be unduly pessimistic, but I do want the Government to realise the position. I do not claim to be in possession of information that enables me to realise it more than they do, but I

would like a definite announcement that if they do realise it they intend at once to act in such a way as to meet the situation.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.48]: I would not have spoken on this Bill but for one aspect of it having presented itself to me from the remarks of Mr. Cornell and Mr. Hamersley. They have indicated there is a grave risk this year, owing to the low price of wheat, that many farmers will be unable to harvest their crops.

Hon. J. Cornell: They will not do so if they do not receive some help.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is a very grave outlook for the State, particularly in view of the estimates which have been made of the forthcoming harvest. If we hope to obtain the results that have been forecast, it is clearly essential that everything possible should be done to safeguard the harvesting of the crops which are so rapidly approaching the ripening stage. It occurred to me, when Mr. Cornell and Mr. Hamersley were speaking, that in the general interests of those who possess farms, particularly in isolated districts, it would be better to assist them to bag and stack their wheat rather than let it drop to the ground and become lost. The fear is entertained that even if it is possible to cart this wheat to a siding the price it will fetch will not pay for the cost of getting it there. Something could be done whereby in each of the centres that are affected in the way indicated a central depot could be established. The farmers could then work in a co-operative manner to the end that their wheat might be suitably and properly stacked, and assistance could be rendered to them through the Industries Assistance Board until such time as a more favourable market arrives.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Another State trading concern.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would not be another State trading concern. Is it not better to have the wheat harvested and stored than that it should go to waste?

Hon. J. Cornell: It is not a question of getting rid of it after it is harvested, but one of getting it harvested.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I take it the harvesting could be done if the necessary bags were forthcoming for the wheat. In their own interests the farmers should do what they can to get their wheat to the nearest siding. It may not pay them to sell the

wheat because of present prices, so it would be better that they should receive assistance in the direction of securing the necessary bags and in the arrangements that could be made for the stacking of the wheat until the market improves.

Hon. J. Cornell: If they are in a position financially to store it until the market improves, they are in a position to finance the transport of the wheat to the depot.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Their asset at present is of somewhat low value, but one is assured on various hands that a change will come about in that respect. The question should be faced at once, to see whether wheat, which otherwise would be wasted, can be saved. Bills of a similar nature to that before us have always been controversial. I used to think it would be wise to close down the Industries Assistance Board, but the present situation indicates there is some need to continue it, and that it would be desirable in the joint interests of the farming community and the State that the measure should be continued for a further period. I agree with a great deal that Mr. Holmes has said. He has spoken very pertinently on the points he dealt with. There are many misfits amongst those who are heavily indebted to the board. It might be worth while to have a close investigation, a closer one than has been made in the past, by the authorities, to see what could be done either to bring about a termination of the liabilities of these particular individuals or put them through a process of sifting.

Hon. J. Cornell: Misfits are found in all avocations, sometimes even at the bar.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We find them in all walks of life. There is no necessity to go on advancing moneys to those who are obviously incapable successfully of farming their land. That is a matter for close investigation by the departmental officials. In view of the remarks which have been made by Mr. Hamersley and Mr. Cornell, I hope the Minister will see that something is done to safeguard the position, and maintain the results we hope for from the coming harvest.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

BILL—EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

BILL—ANATOMY.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.58]: May I ask the indulgence of members and of yourself, Sir, to repair an omission on my part? Although I have spoken many times in this House since the session opened, I have failed to congratulate you on the honour His Majesty has conferred upon you. The intention was there, but a lapse of memory prevented my joining with other members in extending to you my congratulations. Although I am somewhat late in doing this, I hope you will accept the will for the intended deed. For many years I have taken great interest in research work in this State. I have spent a great deal of money upon it, and I am naturally loth to offer any opposition to a Bill of this character. Although anatomy in no way connotes research work directly, it has an indirect bearing upon it. The word anatomy is very largely misused. Most people think it refers to the body. Of course, it means nothing of the sort. It means the dissection or cutting up of a body, of any body, and does not refer to the body itself.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It should have been explained in the interpretation clauses.

HON. A. LOVEKIN: I have had some experience of this particular matter. When I left school I intended going in for medicine, and spent over a year at St. Thomas's Hospital, London. Whilst there I learned what anatomy meant. A little learning is said to be a dangerous thing; but still a little knowledge is better than no knowledge at all, especially to those who have some idea of concentration, which satisfies us how little it is we really do know of almost any subject that can be mentioned. Because of the little knowledge I possess on this subject, I have looked into the Bill. In introducing the measure the Minister told us this Bill was the Victorian Act; the marginal notes to the Bill tell us that such and such a clause is section so and so of the Victorian Act. I beg to point out to the Minister that the Bill is nothing of the sort. If he had said that it was what was the Victorian Act, he would have been right; but when he says it is the Victorian Act, meaning the present Victorian Act, he is quite wrong, because the Victorian Act of

which this Bill is almost a word for word copy, was amended in 1886, and further amended and consolidated in 1901. If hon. members will turn to the Bill and then turn to the British Act of 1831-2, they will see that, except in three points, the British Act of 1831-2 and this Bill of 1930 are almost identical. The British Act was placed on the statute-book at a time when sheep stealing meant hanging, and when the shooting of a hare meant transportation. We must compare the two ages with the two measures, and then we shall see that if we adopt the Bill as it stands we are getting back all but 100 years to a past age. There are three differences between this Bill and the British Act. One is in the Title. The Title of the British Act is "To regulate schools of anatomy," whereas the Bill is "To authorise the practice of anatomy"—two different things, as I shall show presently. Another difference is that in the British Act the salary of the inspector is provided for in a section, while this Bill contains no provision for the payment of any inspector. Presumably the inspector under the Bill will have to live on air. The third difference is as regards the taking of bodies from hospitals, a matter to which I need not refer at the present moment. The Bill is copied from the Victorian Act of 1855. That Victorian measure was repealed in 1886, and the 1886 Act and amendments were afterwards consolidated in the Act of 1901. So that we have a British Act of 100 years ago presented to us here to-day. I suggest to the House that the Bill is not one which should be passed in its present form. The Minister was not properly instructed regarding the Bill, or he might have told us why it was that an Act passed in South Australia in 1884, many years after the British Act, was not taken into account for the purposes of this Bill. He might also have told us why a New South Wales Act of 1901 was not taken into account in framing the Bill. Those Acts of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australian contain important alterations which ought to be in this Bill but do not find a place in it. I shall not labour the question, or speak to it as long as I had intended, because I propose that we should try to do our job by referring the Bill to a select committee. In another place the Bill was passed practically without comment. This is a House of review, and I take it we

ought not to allow a measure which is 100 years old to be repeated here to-day without being looked into and discussed. When the second reading is passed, I shall propose that the Bill be referred to a select committee, so that we may see why certain provisions of the Acts of other States on the same subject have failed to be incorporated in the Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Could you refer briefly to some of the differences between this Bill and those other Acts?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am going to do so. The Title of the British Act and of the Acts of the other States is "To regulate schools of anatomy." The Title of this Bill says it is "To authorise the practice of anatomy." In each of the other States certain precautions are taken that the anatomy shall be practised on sound lines and without risk to the public. The permission to obtain bodies is given not to individuals, as here, but to the schools of anatomy. Under Clause 3 of the Bill a body may be given to an individual—to a youth, to a medical student. If the Bill is scanned it will be seen that there is no provision whatever for any supervision over or check upon the dissection of human bodies by these individuals. We must provide such. Certainly the Bill says that the Governor may appoint inspectors, but when we look down the Bill to see what the inspector has to do, we find that he has merely to make a quarterly return to the Government Statistician of every deceased person's body which has been removed for anatomical examination. His only other duty is to inspect, whenever he thinks fit, any place at which dissection takes place. There is no control or supervision. Knowing what I do about the matter, I say there must be control and strict supervision over the dissection. If left uncontrolled, the process is highly dangerous. At St. Thomas Hospital in London a body would be brought in from, say, a workhouse. The body would be taken to the hospital morgue, and the first thing done would be to shave it and subject it to antiseptic treatment. An antiseptic pigment would be pumped by force into the veins and arteries, thus making the body fit for handling. After that, it would be put into what was called the pickle tub; really it was preserved

to arrest decomposition. A student who wanted a part of the body would get it after this pickling process, which rendered it perfectly safe to handle for the work of dissection. The work of dissection in most cases took not hours but days. To have a decomposing body handled by students would be extremely risky. The students were protected by this method. Under the Bill there is no protection of any kind. I am told by Dr. Gray that the University authorities have agreed to set aside a room for the purpose of dissection. I suggest that the setting apart of a room is not sufficient protection either for the students or for the public. The Bill makes no provision whatever for disinfecting the body and making immune to risk for anyone handling it. It is quite possible—though I do not say it would be done—for a youth, a student, to get from the hospital a part of a body which might be highly infectious and to take it away to dissect. There is no specific place to which he is bound to take it. Some safeguard in that respect must be provided, because otherwise there might be dissemination of disease among the public as well as something inimical to the student's safety. We must provide some place where bodies can be properly handled and made safe for dissection purposes. That is not so under the Bill. Another point is that the Bill simply connotes the creation of another Government department. It says that the Governor may—not establish schools of anatomy, which could make regulations and provide all these safeguards—but may appoint inspectors. There is no provision for the salaries of the inspectors. Nobody would take it for a moment that the Governor would appoint an inspector and ask him to do any work without payment. Therefore we must have a new department. For an inspectorship in a business such as this, we would hardly expect the Governor to appoint an office boy, but rather a highly skilled man, who, when he has got installed in his job would probably want a typist and an office boy, an assistant or two, and various accessories. Later on the Bill gives power to appoint more inspectors. I do not think this is the time when the House should be a party to opening a door to the creation of new departments. This is a time when we are all trying to save. I was told last night that

at present the number of dental students here is five. I do not know whether that is correct: there may be more. However, last year 152 unclaimed bodies, bodies of friendless persons, were buried by the State. If there are only about five dental students here, a couple of bodies would be quite enough for them to practise on. So that we should have here what they had in England, not a dearth of bodies but a surfeit of bodies, more bodies than wanted. At the time the British Act was framed, hon. members will recollect, barbers and surgeons were members of the same guild. The barbers were the dominating partners in the guild. In 1745 the surgeons seceded, and the barbers, being the predominant partners, took the pole and the guild hall. The pole, as hon. members know, has a red streak around it, this being the emblem of the bandage used in blood-letting or bleeding. Having seceded, the surgeons began to make great progress. They left the barbers far behind.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The surgeons use the little red lamp now.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Thereupon the difficulty of the surgeons was to obtain bodies to practise on.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Before tea I was attempting to give the House some information as to the reason for this Act of the British Parliament of 1831. I explained the secession of the surgeons from the barbers. When the surgeons began to make progress, naturally they wanted some bodies to practise on. There were then no bodies to be had legally. Demand, of course, created supply, and a class of persons arose called the resurrectionists, or body-snatchers. They devised a special implement with which to open coffins in newly made graves in which there were corpses not too far gone. Those persons took out those corpses and sold them for £8 or £10 each to a school of anatomy. That became more or less a scandal and there was a good deal of public comment about it. To put a stop to the practice, the authorities had gratings made and placed over new graves in churchyards.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: You don't suppose we are going to do that sort of thing under the Bill?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know what you may do. You may do the very same thing. If you were more enlightened than those people, you would get a Bill more enlightened than is this one. However, the gratings checked the practice. Still, bodies had to be obtained, and another class of persons grew up, who used to inveigle people into their houses, suffocate them and sell their bodies. They suffocated their victims to avoid any marks of violence on their bodies. I think it was in 1829 that two of those body snatchers, Burke and Hare, were caught. Hare turned King's evidence, and Burke was convicted of 15 separate murders, of suffocating his victims and selling their corpses. He was hanged. Then the surgeons came to the conclusions it was time something should be done to prevent that sort of thing, and allow them to get bodies legally. So they framed this English Act and got it passed. It was an age when most people were very callous of human life, of human feelings, and of human sufferings. Yet to-day we have this Bill, a copy of that old English Act, brought down, and we are asked to pass it. I suggest we require to look at it through the eyes of to-day before we agree to it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That Act was passed in England after the Burke and Hare period.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, it was in consequence of the discoveries then made. This Act has been abused in Australia. This was the early Victorian Act. I am told by a gentleman who was at the Melbourne University at the time, that on one occasion a girl went to see her mother at the hospital at about half-past five in the evening. The mother was very ill, and died an hour or so after her daughter left. The girl went again next morning to see her dead mother and to make arrangements for the funeral, but found that the body had been taken to the morgue for dissection purposes. An attempt was made to rescue the body, but it was learnt that already it had been mutilated and partially dissected. The authorities justified this action—as they might do under this Bill—by saying that as the near relative did not object within 12 hours of the death—which is also provided here—there was justification for the taking of the body and using it for dissection pur-

poses. I am told there was quite a commotion over it and that the newspapers of the day put up the heading "Legalised Body-Snatching." When in South Australia a year afterwards an Anatomy Act was passed, the authorities deliberately excluded from the measure hospitals as one of the sources from which bodies could be obtained. That was in consequence of that one occurrence in Victoria. It may have been an isolated case, and there may be some exaggeration about the story, but it could occur again under this Bill, and such a thing ought not to be possible. A provision in the Bill which we might well examine is that which prescribes that if a deceased person during his life has not objected to dissection, or if after his death a near relative has not objected within 12 hours, the body may be used for dissection purposes. And there is no redress. And after such a body has been dissected, the only further provision in the Bill is that it shall be placed in a shell or decent coffin and buried in some consecrated ground belonging to the religious persuasion of the deceased person or of his relatives; there is no provision for any funeral or for any notice to the relatives. I remember that when I was at St. Thomas's Hospital, the remains of dissections were thrown into shells and taken out and buried in what were called pauper's graves, without let or hindrance, and without notice to anybody. I suggest that where the relatives are known to the authorities, before a body is taken for dissection purposes those relatives should be notified. It is intended by the Bill that they should be notified; but the provision in the Bill is that Clause 7 shall be posted up in a conspicuous place in the hall of the hospital or institution for people to read when coming in to see a sick patient. But when people are going into a hospital to see sick patients they do not stop to read notices on boards, and indeed do not bother about notices at all. I suggest that in this year of 1930 a fair thing would be to say that the authorities, the nurses, doctors, or anybody else attending a person who dies, and knowing of his relatives, should draw the attention of those relatives to the notice before permitting the body to be used for dissecting purposes. However, I do not wish to weary the House on this subject, because I understand no objection will be raised to referring the Bill to a select committee, who could consider necessary amendments. I

understand that those supporting the Bill from the British Medical Association's point of view did not realise that this was a copy of the English Act of 1831, and not a copy of the Act in operation in Victoria when they were going through their medical courses. I think we can improve the Bill and certainly make it conform rather to the ideals of the present day than to those of 1831. So, after the second reading has been agreed to, I will move that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

HON. G. A. KEMPTON (Central) [7.40]: When first the Bill was brought down, I understood it to be a reprint of the Victorian Act, which was practically a reprint of the English Act, and that all the other Anatomy Acts in the several States of Australia were taken from the latest English Act. But, according to Mr. Lovekin, this Bill is a reprint of one of the earlier Victorian Acts, which in turn was a reprint of the earlier English Act. If hon. members think it wise to send this Bill to a select committee, I will agree, because we cannot be too careful in the framing of such a measure. At the same time I think the Bill carries quite a lot of safeguards. There is no possibility of its giving rise to the body snatchers referred to by Mr. Lovekin. Nor is it a Bill that will cost the Government anything to administer. I understand the Medical Department, under Dr. Atkinson, will police the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not in the Bill.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: But it can be placed in the Bill in Committee. However, the Minister when moving the second reading made it clear that the administration of the Bill would not cost the Government anything, and that no new department would be created.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Why not let the University police the Bill, as in other States?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: That may come a little later, but the present intention is for the Medical Department to police the Bill. Again, the University has agreed to set aside a room for the purposes of dissection. So that will not cost the Government anything, for the equipment will be provided by the University and those outside who will require bodies for dissection. There certainly is a very great need for the Bill. The Western Australian branch of the British Medical

Association, with Dr. Baldwin Gill as president and Dr. Crisp as secretary, has been looking for the Bill for the last five years. Also the Perth Dental Hospital has been looking for the Bill. I understand it is quite impossible to have a Chair of Medicine at the University until we have an Anatomy Act, and that it is equally impossible without such an Act for dental students to go through their examinations in a way that will render them equal in status to the students of the other States. Only the other day I called on the superintendent of the Perth Dental Hospital and he gave me a lot of figures and information showing the necessity for the Bill. Mr. Lovekin said there were about five students at the Perth Dental Hospital. According to the superintendent of the hospital the average number is something like 22. Certainly he has less at present because the want of this Act has been so felt that quite a number of students have had to go to the other States or to other parts of the world to take their complete course. It is positively wrong when we have students here that we should force them to go to other parts of the world and spend a great deal of money in taking a full course, while we have men like Mr. Poock who is highly qualified and is able to teach students all that it is possible for them to be taught, and when we have surgeons and medical men also willing to take on that work. The Perth Dental Hospital, I suppose, will be the first to use this Act. It will not be used by the medical people until they have a Chair of Medicine, but the dentists certainly want it at present and the 22 students would be able to go through their course if this Act were in force. It is impossible for the Perth Dental Hospital to become affiliated with the university until there is an Anatomy Act. That is definitely laid down. There is another great hardship, namely, that the dental students who go through their course in Western Australia cannot practice in any other State of Australia, and it is impossible for us to have reciprocity with the other States until we pass this measure. I should like to give a few figures in connection with the Perth Dental Hospital to show how important it is that this measure should be in existence. The hospital was formed in 1927, the Government providing £500 for its formation and the Dental Board another £500. There is now a subsidy of £900 from the Government and the balance is made up from fees

paid by those who attend that hospital and who cannot pay the larger fees charged by ordinary practitioners. The greatest number of patients the hospital has had in any one month has been 487. Those people have been saved a great deal of suffering and there has been a great difference to the health of the community. The Bill will enable those who wish to take a complete course in dentistry to take it in Western Australia, and it will mean that we will produce professional men whose knowledge will be equal to that of anyone who has passed through an institution in any other part of the world. I shall not say anything more in connection with the Bill, because I am quite in accord with Mr. Lovekin that it should be sent to a select committee. If members will then be satisfied that when the Bill comes before them again all proper safeguards have been provided. I support the second reading.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) [7.50]: Until we have a Chair of Medicine at the University this Bill can operate only so far as dental surgery is concerned. The authority continued in the measure is said to be needed by the students of dentistry. It has been contended by Mr. Kempton that no matter what the qualifications of the students may be, unless they have a practical knowledge of anatomy they cannot receive recognition in the Eastern States; in other words they must go to the Eastern States in order to have the finishing touches applied. That is so, but is the present an opportune time to introduce legislation of this character? The Bill will increase the cost of Government; there is no doubt about that in my mind. Almost every Bill of this character that is introduced does so, and this one, in my opinion, might well be postponed to a more favourable epoch in the history of the State. We are retrenching in important branches of the Education Department and surely it is not a fitting time to launch out in other directions. If the Act is to be operated so as to minimise the abuses to which Mr. Lovekin has referred, and abuses to which he has not referred—I contend that the Bill facilitates abuses by reason of its defects—then it will involve some cost. It must be diligently administered and that will mean the expenditure of money. What amount of money I do not know. It certainly will mean the creation of another spending department in

the Government. Not only that, but I understand, despite what Mr. Kempton has said, that dissecting rooms are to be built by the Odontological Society. We have that on the authority of the ex-Minister for Health. The Odontological Society is not affiliated with the University, and until it is so affiliated it cannot have dissecting rooms at the University. That is a fact. I understand.

Hon. G. A. Kempton: It can be affiliated if this Act is passed.

Hon. J. M. DREW: We have also been informed by a supporter of the Bill that the Government will be asked to provide a block of land in the city. The Odontological Society will finance the erection of the building on the strength of the title deeds of the land, and I am positively certain that in the end the Government will have to find the bulk of the money. Past experience inclines me to the belief, as I have already indicated, that the Government will have to find the greater part of the cost. In 1926 I piloted a Bill through this Chamber to enable the Odontological Society to spend money in opening a dental hospital which was required to provide a training ground for apprentices. The society undertook to treat the poorer section of the community if the Government agreed to grant them a subsidy, and indigents were to be treated free of charge. In consideration of that the Government agreed to pay the secretary a subsidy of £900 a year, and I am given to understand that the society has been receiving that sum of money annually ever since. In addition to that, the Collier Government agreed to grant a pound for pound subsidy on the capital cost of altering premises in Murray-street and for providing necessary equipment.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What did that cost?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I think it was £350. A few weeks ago I saw a paragraph in the daily papers to the effect that the Dental Board had approached the Government for an increased subsidy and that the request had been refused. It was then stated that the services for the poor people would be curtailed, if I remember correctly, to ordinary tooth-pulling. If that is the case, and I believe it is, we have gone back to the stage before 1926, because in that year when I introduced the Bill, there were two dentists attached to the staff of the Perth Hospital extracting teeth for poor people free of charge. We must be very careful not to

increase the cost of Government at the behest of any organisation. In this connection I should like to know whether the Odontological Society has lived up to the promise made in 1926.

Hon. G. A. Kempton: They have.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am glad to hear the hon. member say so, but I am going to give instances so that the hon. member may brush up his memory. In my second reading speech on the Bill in 1926, I based my statements on information supplied to me by the Medical and Health Department and I took those statements as absolutely correct. For the information of hon. members I will read what I then said—

Country people whose circumstances are such as to enable them to come within the financial limits which must necessarily be imposed—for instance, those who are not in a position to afford dental treatment—will be able to benefit by its operations.

That was the hope I held out for country people.

It is recognised, however, that country people who are in poor financial circumstances, cannot come to Perth to receive the necessary attention. The Odontological Society has circularised all its country members, and has arranged that they should attend to such cases free of charge, the Dental Hospital supplying these country dental practitioners, as may be necessary, with material to carry on this free work.

I should like to know whether country people have derived any benefit, whether those promises I made in good faith have been carried out or not.

Hon. G. A. Kempton: They certainly have been carried out and very fully.

Hon. J. M. DREW: When Minister for Education I endeavoured to get this treatment extended to poor children attending country schools and I got nowhere. Perhaps the Leader of the House when replying will be able to shed some light on this point. Moreover, the Bill before us is full of defects. Many have been pointed out by Mr. Lovekin, and I will give an additional one. It is the most concise measure—I believe in conciseness—ever introduced, dealing with one of the most important subjects that could come before the House. The Bill is naked where it should be clothed with everything to safeguard the community against abuses likely to arise. Take Clause 3. A youth may get a license to practice anatomy, provided he is attending any school of anatomy. That is all right because he has

to practice anatomy in the course of his profession. But under Clause 11 a student can receive or possess bodies for anatomical examination. He can of his own volition go to a house and take possession of a corpse so long as he gets it from the person who has authority to deliver it up. A youth can take possession of the body. There is nothing to prevent him from dissecting it according to his own sweet will, so long as it is done in a place agreed to by the Minister. The inspector has power to visit such places but no power whatever to act; he visits and reports. The individual can commit only one or other of the offences named in the Bill. I may be told that these phases will be dealt with by regulations, but regulations cannot override the Act. There must be some basis in the Bill for regulations to be made, and there is no such provision. The clause should certainly be amended in order to assure that students shall act only on the authority of a professor or one or other of the qualified persons mentioned in Clause 3. The Bill will be necessary if we have a Chair of Medicine at the University, but it seems to me there is not sufficient justification for the measure now. It will merely add another branch to the Medical and Health Department, and that branch will have to be supplied with an adequate staff. According to the Bill as it stands, I should say that a small staff would be necessary, perhaps one man only. I think that, under this legislation, he would fall at his first hurdle. That is my interpretation of the measure. I have never before perused such inefficient legislation. That may be a reflection upon those who drafted the legislation in the days of George III., when this legislation was first passed. The Bill is certainly not up to date, nor is it in keeping with our idea of what legislation should be. In addition, there is every probability of the Government being pressed for the block of land, and, on top of that, for payment of a big subsidy. There is this probability at a time when on top of £64,000 that is granted for the relief of unfortunate women and children, a sum of £187,000 extra has to be found to cope with difficulties caused by the growth of unemployment. This, too, at a period when hospitals are unable to meet the demands put upon them, and when we are approaching a time when many children in the country districts will have to join correspondence classes because the State will not be able

to finance the erection of new schools. It seems to me that consideration of the Bill could be postponed, or it could be placed at the bottom of the Notice Paper, to be numbered among the slaughtered innocents at the end of the session. If necessary after the lapse of 12 months or more, when, I am convinced, the position of the State and of the Commonwealth generally will be more satisfactory, and when in all probability the University will be able to establish a Chair of Medicine, the Bill could be revived, sent to a select committee, and in due course placed on the statute-book in better form.

On motion by the Minister for Country Water Supplies, debate adjourned.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [8.5] in moving the second reading said: In every civilised country in the world the question of transportation is indissolubly linked with the country's progress. Of recent years this public question has assumed an aspect so complex that the best brains of the world have grappled with it in search of a solution of the problem. The factor largely responsible for the creation of this complexity is the motor vehicle. During the Great War, when the cost of a service was a matter of secondary consideration, the motor vehicle attained a status of considerable importance. After the termination of the War many of those vehicles drifted into the hands of private owners, and before our pre-war standards of control could be amended to suit the altered conditions, the new arrival became firmly established. As soon as the different countries realised the proportions the transport problem was likely to assume as a result of the advent of the motor vehicle, efforts were made to bring it within the bounds of true economics; but it is significant to say that in no case have the efforts brought to bear proved effectual in solving the problem from the points of view of the motor vehicle itself and the people's assets in existing forms of transportation.

In this State it can now be seen that an acute problem has developed enor-

mously since the initiation of the main roads policy in 1925. In the Main Roads Act of 1925 the position of the railway system in the roads scheme was, to some extent, overlooked and no provision was made to protect the railways in the event of vehicular competition arising from the perfection of the roads system. At that time it was believed that the heavy expenditure in providing good roads would prove beneficial to the revenue of the Railway Department, and no thoughts were entertained that good road facilities would be taken advantage of by the motor vehicle to trespass on railway traffic. Ostensibly the roads were to feed the railways and they were to occupy a secondary place in the transportation system of the State.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You built the roads the wrong way; you built them parallel to the railways.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Quite so. Instead of plying peacefully and fulfilling its destined service to the railways, the vehicular traffic has exploited the advantages laid down by openly intruding upon the rightful activities of the railways, and as a result of that over-running of its ambit, the general taxpayer has had to find many thousands to prop up the railways to make good the loss in unprofitable freights and so ensure the continuance of industry.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Reduce your railway costs.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Therefore, besides finding the money to finance the laying down and subsequent maintenance charges of good roads, the general taxpayer is in the incongruous and unhappy position of being required to meet the yearly deficits, which now amount to vast sums. In the last four years, the State has spent £1,943,383 of its own money on roads, and nearly three-sevenths of that total has been provided by the State from Loan Funds. That expenditure has left an annual burden of £203,000 for the maintenance and improvement of roads, and for interest and sinking fund payments. Alongside that expenditure, the State has £23,615,500 invested in the railways, and its permanent way and works necessitate an annual expenditure of

£800,784, added to which there is the annual interest bill of £590,797. Broadly speaking, the problem of modern transportation has certain elements common to all countries. There are, however, other matters peculiar to each part of the world, and even in Australia, peculiar to each State. In the matter of legislation, then, it is only natural to find a corollary in the laws framed by different countries to meet the situation, plus, of course, certain provisions to cover local conditions. Practically every nation of note throughout the world has sought for means of co-ordinating the services of the different agencies engaged in transport work. Canada, Australia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Sweden, the United States of America—to mention but a few—have passed laws towards this desirable end, only to find that amendments were necessary as fresh aspects of the problem presented themselves. In the Southern Hemisphere, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand have, by legislative enactments, endeavoured to weld the opposing factors into homogeneity without real effect, and now the Governments of those places are seeking further powers from Parliament to bring about the results they have been striving for so long. It is in South Africa, the Eastern States of Australia, and New Zealand that the closest parallels to our own position may be found. In each of those parts certain elements exist that are to be found in Western Australia as well. The countries are similar in that they are going through—to a greater or lesser extent—the stage of development. In each the major form of transport—the railways—belongs to the State, and the city tramway systems are owned either by the State or Municipalities. It will then be worth while considering what steps are being taken in those parts to bring about the essential feature of co-ordination. In South Africa recently, an Act was passed under which a board was created to control motor transport throughout the Union. The board has power to control motor passenger vehicles and motor goods vehicles operating for reward in proclaimed areas and on proclaimed routes. The Act also provides for certain exemptions, such as the carriage of primary and perishable products from the farm to the nearest railway station or town, and specifically provides that a license will not be granted by the board if other trans-

portation facilities are available. In general effect, the Act is designed to prevent competition with the State railways.

In June last assent was given in New South Wales to a Transportation Act which is in many respects similar to the South African Act, inasmuch as it specifically provides for the protection of the railways from motor competition. The Act sets up a Trust and that Trust, before granting a licence for a vehicle to go on a road to carry for hire or reward, shall obtain reports from the Railway Commissioners. If when that has been done, the Board or Trust decides to grant a license, it may impose such conditions as to fares or charges as, in the opinion of the Trust, are sufficient to prevent undue competition or overlapping of services. The Trust has also absolute authority to grant, or to refuse, any license applied for. In Victoria various efforts have from time to time been made to prevent competition with the railways and tramways. The Victorian Commissioner for Railways went so far as to notify his clients that unless they consigned all of their requirements by rail, he would decline to carry any, or alternatively, would charge extra freight on the goods he did consign. Apparently that method has not met with complete success because at the end of July a Bill was introduced and it has now been dealt with by the Victorian Parliament. In that Bill provision is made for the creation of a Department of Transport under a Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Railways is named as being the first Minister for Transport. The Victorian Bill further states that the Department of Transport shall comprise—(a) a Railways Branch, (b) a Tramways Branch, and (c) a Road Transport Branch. It also provides that a motor freight vehicle means any motor vehicle used or intended to be used for carrying goods for hire or reward or in the course of trade, but it permits certain exemptions in the matter of primary produce, perishables, etc.

The Victorian Department of Transport is to have absolute power to grant or not to grant, as it thinks fit, an application made by the owner of a motor freight vehicle for a license, and when an application is made for such a license the applicant must name the route or routes upon which he desires to operate. Before a

license can be granted, the department must be satisfied regarding the condition of the roads, and further it is made clear that only in the event of there not being sufficient other facilities for the transport of goods will a license be granted. In addition, when a license is granted, the route over which the vehicle may do business is named in the license, and a penalty is provided if the vehicle is driven on any other route. The Victorian Act also gives power to the Commissioner to operate motor freight vehicles on such routes as the Governor thinks fit. Briefly, the Victorian Act, like the measures of South Africa and New Zealand, is designed to prohibit competition with railways and other established means of transportation. Queensland, where the transport problem has been the means of inflicting severe losses on the State-owned railway system, has passed a Bill which practically prohibits the operation of motor vehicles where railway communication is established, or allows it to operate upon payment of fees far heavier than those proposed in the Bill before this House. In that State the Heavy Vehicles Act, as amended in November last, is administered by the Secretary for Public Lands or other Minister who may be specifically charged with its administration. The Act gives the Minister authority, by notification in the "Gazette," to establish and declare traffic routes over which vehicles may be licensed to carry goods for hire or reward. Such routes shall be those which would not be in competition with the State railways, and it is further provided that special license fees, which may be prescribed by regulation, shall be paid before a license is granted to go on to those routes.

The regulations under the Queensland Act were approved in December last. They provide for the extra fees being paid on what is described as the percentage overhang, "overhang" meaning that portion of the vehicle measured from the centre of the back axle to the rearmost portion of the vehicle. The minimum fee for a 45 per cent. overhang and under is 11s. 3d. per power weight load for pneumatic vehicles, and that fee ascends to 37s. 6d. per power weight load if metal tyres are used. Higher fees are prescribed for a greater percentage overhang. Calculations have been made which show that on the Queensland basis a vehicle in this State using

pneumatic tyres would pay between three and four times the fee now paid by a vehicle in this State, and if it had a 55 per cent. overhang the fee would be approximately four to five times the fee paid for a similar vehicle in this State. In the enactments by the Legislatures of the parts mentioned, there are two considerations which continually recur, that is, the need for the prevention of wasteful competition and the overlapping of services. Those important ends can be achieved only by the passing of legislation which will empower the Government to put into effect a system of sound economic control. There is abundant proof that such control is necessary in this State. For a number of years the State has been experiencing wasteful competition and overlapping of services to such an extent that the whole community, as always happens in such cases, has to face a formidable bill of costs. Therefore the general form of legislation which the other Australian States, and other countries of the world, have found it necessary to pass, is equally necessary in Western Australia.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The present Minister for Railways built a tramway to Claremont.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: The bald statement that wasteful competition and overlapping of transport services are rampant here is not in itself sufficient proof that these evils exist, and my duty is to substantiate the statement. Naturally in a measure such as the one before the House, the question of the value to the State of its railways and tramways must be regarded as of paramount importance. The work those systems are performing clearly ranks them far and away ahead of all other transport means. The railways and the tramways are the major forms of transportation and, as such, any success achieved or reverse suffered by them will in turn be reflected in the finances of the State. The railway system at the present time consists of 4,111 miles of line, on which over £23,500,000 of the people's money has been spent. The spending of that money has given the State highways of traffic for its passengers and goods to pass over, and out of the earnings received for their carriage, the Commissioner has to keep the lines in order and find the money to pay the interest on the loan indebtedness.

It will thus be seen that the railway- not only provide the road-beds on which they run, but are charged with the interest on the construction of such road-beds. Unfortunately, those rigid conditions are not enforced on vehicles which ply in opposition to the railways. The needs of the agricultural communities have been effectively met by the Railway Department. Let me amplify that statement by saying that the needs of the whole of the State are so catered for. Should any member doubt that statement a casual glance at Appendix J of any of the annual reports of the Commissioner should convince him that the claim is justified. That appendix discloses that for the year ended the 30th June last over 3,500,000 tons of goods and live stock were transported over the railways for an average freight rate of 1.67d. per ton per mile. It is true that the railways for last year showed a loss of £404,489 in their working, but if the year 1928 be taken, when the railways showed a profit, it will be seen that the average freight rate was only 1.76d. per ton per mile. In the enormous tonnage quoted, practically every item of raw material used by the various industries throughout the State was carried at remarkably low rates. In addition, the primary producer has received most considerate treatment in the shape of lenient tariffs. The goods described in Appendix J form by far the greatest part of the railway haulages. It is therefore a matter for wonder that the railways can carry such tonnages at the rates charged. The reason lies in the system the railways adopt in charging what the traffic will bear. That system is a survival from the days when the railways held a monopoly in the transport world. Under the system the loss experienced in carrying the low-priced commodities should be made up by the profit derived from the carriage of high-priced goods, but unfortunately the advent of the motor vehicle has deprived the railways of most of the good-paying traffic.

The inroads of the motor lorry, which is attracted only by the higher-rated goods in the railway tariff, has now reached a stage when the economic structure built up by the railways is in danger of being swept away. The effect of such a disaster to the manufacturer and the primary producer in particular, and the State in general, can readily be imagined. It is clearly the duty of Par-

liament to protect not only the great railway asset, which has been built up with the moneys of the people, but also to protect those industries on which the State depends so largely for its well-being. Similarly in the transportation of passengers, the railways have to accept the heaviest part of the burden. The bulk of the passenger business, naturally, lies in the metropolitan-suburban area. Within that area all classes of travellers have to be catered for and their demands for special treatment dealt with. School children, apprentices, students at the University and commercial colleges, juniors in business, and many others find sympathetic treatment in the matter of fares. In fact, 70 per cent. of the suburban season ticket traffic is carried at concession rates. On the other hand, the only season ticket concession granted by the buses is half-rate for school children, while the railway rate for school children under 18 years of age is quarter fare.

Again, how many free passes do the bus owners issue to maimed ex-soldiers, or blind and indigent persons against the formidable free list of the railways? It is almost safe to say that not one of those unfortunates is carried free by bus proprietors. Coming to the metropolitan tramways an almost parallel case is met. The amount of loan moneys spent in building up the tramway system totals £1,094,157, and after paying working expenses and interest last year the meagre return of only .3 per cent. was received. Fifty-seven miles of track are operated, which conveys an idea of the extent of the services rendered and the asset at stake in the elucidation of the problem of transportation. Like the railways, the Tramways Department build and maintain their own road-bed, and find the money to pay the interest on capital. The maintenance charges on tracks alone for the year just closed amounted to £11,048, but in addition the tramways were called upon to pay £9,200 to various local authorities for the right to run through the streets. It will therefore be seen that in the shape of license fees, or running rights, in which maintenance of track may justly be included, the tramways paid out a total amount of £20,248. That expenditure works out at 1.35d. per car mile run, and is more than two and a half times greater than is paid by the Metropolitan Bus Company for their running rights on the Perth-Fremantle-road. Those figures are worth remembering in the con-

sideration of the Bill. In the matter of fares, the Tramway charge is considerably lower, on the average, than that of the buses, a fact borne out by the small net return on the capital invested. In addition, concessions to school children and workmen play a big part in lowering the average tram fare received. There is no doubt, therefore, that the Railways and Tramways are operating in the interests of the whole community, and their services entitle them to that amount of Parliamentary protection which will enable them to operate efficiently and economically.

Other important phases of transportation are the overlapping of services and wasteful competition. They are somewhat distinct questions when looked at from the point of view of those availing themselves of means of transportation. The overlapping of services and wasteful competition are rampant in this State. So far as the metropolitan area is concerned, those grave faults must be apparent even to the uninitiated. Tangible proof of that is contained in recent Press articles from the pen of the Town Planning Commissioner. He said—

• Only 3.1 per cent. of the trams feed the railways between Fremantle and Perth, and in that distance 69.7 per cent. of the tram lines were in competition with the buses, while the buses competed with 77 per cent. of the railway services.

Coming from one who is entirely disinterested in the matter, apart from his own professional viewpoint, that statement must give rise to grave concern at a moment when the State is endeavouring to husband its financial resources. It is more than a truism to say that waste in any form must ultimately be paid for, and what more flagrant instance of waste could be pointed to than in the remarks of the Town Planning Commissioner? What the total cost of wasteful competition is would be hard to determine, but the Railway Department set their losses in passenger traffic within the suburban area at between £50,000 and £60,000 per annum. From time to time pseudo-economists have arisen in our midst and proclaimed that if the people demand this multiplicity of services they should have them, since they would ultimately have to pay for them. But the time appears to have arrived when they are no longer able to pay for them, and it now becomes a case when they should be protected from themselves.

In the matter of the transport of goods the case is equally unsatisfactory. The appendix already quoted in the Commissioner of Railways' annual report shows that approximately 92 per cent. of the tonnage carried enjoys the benefit of low rates. It is on the remaining 8 per cent. that the department hope to balance its ledger and at one time the hope could be realised; but the advent of the motor lorry into country transport work is fast robbing the railways of their due reward. Any right-thinking person will agree that a concern which sets itself out to assist an industry is entitled to expect reasonable consideration from that industry once it becomes established. So far as our railways are concerned, however, such a desirable result does not accrue to it. To illustrate my point let me take a concrete case—the case of wool haulage. For years past succeeding Governments have been encouraging the farmers to improve their properties to a point where they could embark on mixed farming operations. It was clearly seen that without superphosphates the feed necessary for carrying stock could not be grown, consequently low railway rates were struck for the carriage of that commodity. To-day the majority of our farms are well stocked and naturally the Railway Department looks for the reward of its past efforts by being given the wool to transport after it is shorn. Unfortunately a great many farmers have failed in their moral obligations by giving their wool to motor lorry owners.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Quite true.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Yet those same people have unblushingly taken advantage of the low freights on their superphosphates for years, and fail to see that an apparent saving of a few shillings per ton on wool may eventually land them in a substantial loss if the freight rates on manures are advanced. But that is only one case out of many. Other people beside the farmer are equally culpable. Many of our traders in the country fall into the same common error. A small saving in cartage, unfortunately, too often blinds them of the fact that the ultimate effect of continued railway losses due to unfair competition must in time recoil on their heads if the spending power of the farmer is curtailed through a rise in rates on agricultural produce. The Government do not advocate that a monopoly in transport should be created. They

believe in the economic axiom that a measure of competition is healthy in any industry, but insists that such competition should be based on equitable lines. The Railway Department is perforce a common carrier, and can be compelled to transport goods at rates specified in its published schedule. On the other hand, the motor lorry is interested only in the carriage of goods which show a profit on each transaction. That is not competition but specialisation, and it is one of the factors which has assisted in bringing about the financial stringency which exists to-day.

To meet the difficulties which have arisen the Government have framed a Bill which will be found in many respects similar to the Queensland Act. In it, it is proposed that the owner of a vehicle who desires to ply for hire or reward along certain roads shall, in addition to the fees prescribed in the Act, pay 7s. 6d. for each power-load-weight. The present fee for an A.E.C. truck, P.L.W. 108, is £13, and it is suggested that it should be increased to £53 10s. The fee in Queensland is £60 15s. An International, 147 P.L.W., now pays £22, and it is proposed that £77 2s. 6d. should be paid in respect to it. The Queensland fee for a similar truck is £82 13s. 9d. A Republic, 170 P.L.W., is now charged £29 10s., and it is thought that a more reasonable fee would be £93 5s., as against the Queensland charge of £95 12s. 6d. Following the Queensland lead, it is provided that the extra license fees received shall be paid into a special trust account, and be used in the maintenance of the roads named in the Bill. Under the Bill certain vehicles will be exempted from the payment of the additional fees, and in that regard it is proposed that exemptions shall apply to vehicles used—

(a) for carrying the produce of farms or timber mills or farming or timber requisites between any farm or timber mill and the railway station or town nearest to such farm or timber mill;

(b) solely for carrying the produce of any garden, orchard or dairy farm from the place where the same is produced to the nearest railway station, town or market place, and for carrying to such garden, orchard, or dairy farm any requisites not intended for sale;

(c) solely for carrying the ore from mines and mining requisites within any prescribed mining district;

(d) solely for carrying produce and goods between the station property of any person engaged in the pastoral industry between such

property and the railway station or town nearest to such property;

(e) by the Crown or a local authority for its own purposes.

Those exemptions will restrict the payment of the additional fees to those motor trucks which are in open competition with the railways. At present they are carrying only remunerative goods and are refusing to lift the bread and dripping lines such as wheat, superphosphates, coal, timber, etc., which they leave to the railways. In their operations motor vehicles are causing heavy damage to roads and a mass of evidence to substantiate that fact will be submitted if hon. members so desire. In that regard the important feature of the Bill is that those causing the most damage to the roads should be required to pay additional fees to the maintenance account. It is not unfair to call upon vehicles smashing up the roads in pursuance of private gain to pay increased fees. The destruction arising from the traffic of those vehicles has increased considerably the cost of maintenance to the general taxpayer; and the Government believe it is only reasonable, instead of distributing the cost over all taxpayers, that the owners of vehicles plying for hire in heavy and profitable transport work should pay something more than the owner of a vehicle which uses the roads occasionally. Such heavy vehicles wreak considerable damage to the roads, and there is no earthly reason why the owners of them should smilingly enjoy favoured treatment in culpability, and pass the increased cost of maintenance above ordinary wear and tear on to the general taxpayer. It will be noticed from the map that the roads named in the Bill are those main roads leading into the metropolitan area and to the ports of Geraldton, Bunbury, Busselton, and Albany. Those are the roads over which the continuous heavy traffic in competition with the railways takes place, and the existing fees are entirely inadequate for the vehicles engaged in the use of those roads.

Turning to motor buses, we find that in the Eastern States and in South Africa the transport Commissions or Trusts which have been set up will not license a bus to convey passengers over routes which would be in competition with other means of transport. Routes for buses in this State have already been prescribed and this Bill does not in itself make provision for cancelling or altering the routes. Neverthe-

less a time may arrive when a Government will be forced into the position of dealing with competition by taking drastic action in that direction. The Bill leaves bus matters as they are except that the owners of buses on routes which are prescribed as "continuous" will be required to pay an extra fee of 30s. per seat per annum—equal to £3—instead of 30s. in the case of vehicles with pneumatic tyres, and £4 instead of £2 for those using solid rubber tyres. Those extra fees will be payable only in the case of buses which come within two miles of the General Post Office at Perth or the Post Office at Fremantle; otherwise the fee will remain at 30s. A "continuous" route will be one over which buses are continuously running. There are routes over which buses make only a few trips in a day. Those are "non-continuous" routes, and the fee for them will remain as at present. In Victoria the fee for a bus coming within two miles of the General Post Office is £4 7s. 6d. per seat. The extra fees will be paid to a trust account, and used for the maintenance of the routes.

In his annual report for the year ended 30th June last, the Commissioner of Railways states—

For the second year in succession our passenger earnings dropped over £50,000. Compared with the year 1927-28—when the receipts from passenger traffic were £829,598—the falling off was no less than £109,461. Motor competition is almost wholly responsible for the decreased return.

Further on in his report the Commissioner complains—

Once again, I regret to say, it is found necessary to draw attention to the unfair competition we are meeting with from road motor traffic. It is safe to assume that a large proportion of the loss in working experienced this year can be attributed directly to this cause. The department have come in for a share of criticism for protesting against the inroads the motor vehicle is making into our traffic, but it is frequently found that those who launch such criticism against us are either biased or have an imperfect knowledge of the subject. All that the railway management ask is that the road vehicle—both passenger and goods—be forced to do the work of a common carrier as the railways do, or failing that, the department should be protected so that the eyes shall not be picked out of our remunerative traffic, leaving us the less profitable and unpayable lines. The matter has been dealt with so often in the reports of previous years that to recapitulate the arguments here would savour of redundancy. Still, the question is one of supreme importance, and sooner or later some form of con-

trol must be instituted if our financial results are to be improved. It would be a simple matter to frame a tariff which would place the road vehicle beyond the possibility of competition, but such a set of charges would do an irreparable amount of harm to both our primary and secondary industries. It is clearly realised that no Government would permit such a course; therefore it is, I claim, the bounden duty of Parliament to prescribe such measures as will protect efficiently the means of transport upon which the real welfare of the State depends. Very few people, seemingly, realise that virtually one-third of the State's indebtedness is represented by our railway system, and that a serious financial loss on such an important asset must find a reflex in the tightening of the purse strings of the oversea investor when further loans are required.

The buses have also taken a great deal of revenue from the tramways. For the year 1928-29 the tramways paid 3 per cent. to local authorities for running rights. That percentage amounted to £9,200. In addition £11,048 was spent on the maintenance of tracks and roadways: 3,188,087 car miles were run in 1928-29, and the average cost per car mile run was 1.4d. Against those figures it has been ascertained that the buses ran 5,804,000 miles, and paid £3,630 in seating fees during the year 1928-29, which averages .15d. per bus mile. That is indeed a very small contribution compared with the burden on the tramways. A Metro bus now pays a license fee of £81, and the Bill proposes to increase it to £123, or £42 extra for seating fees. Each bus runs per annum 40,000 miles, and the license fee works out at .5d. per mile, or 6d. for the run from Perth to Fremantle.

The Bill increases the license fee for the heavy Alpine taxi from £25 17s. 6d. to £34 17s. 6d. On a mileage of 40,000 miles per annum the present fee works out at .13d. per mile, or 1.56d. for the 12-mile run from Perth to Fremantle.

The cost of maintaining the Perth-Fremantle road averages £4,420 per annum, and the interest and sinking fund charges bring this up to a total of £10,702. The constant flow of traffic means extra maintenance expenditure and it is apparent that in the near future the congestion will necessitate the widening and other improvement of the road. Furthermore, the heavy cost of maintaining the Fremantle traffic bridge is ever increasing. In the year 1929-30 the sum of £2,280 was paid for seating fares by 30 large and 110 small buses plying on the Perth-Fremantle-road. At present the total amount of fees paid by all the buses running

in the State does not exceed £5,319; and if this Bill be approved, the extra fees should increase the revenue to about £9,000.

The Canning-road cost £124,000 or £16,000 per mile. There are five large and 12 small buses running on it, and the total amount received in license fees amounts to £265 a year. The interest and sinking fund charges on the cost of that road total £11,160. Of that amount half is charged to the metropolitan traffic fund—so that in other words the charge is £5,580—and the other half is charged to general revenue. Admittedly other vehicles use the roads between Perth and Fremantle, but it is considered that the time has arrived when buses continuously running in open competition with the tramways and railways should pay more for the continuous use of the roads.

The fees prescribed in the Bill for vehicles using solid rubber and metal tyres have been increased to 40 and 80 per cent. respectively, thus bringing the scale of charges into line with the fees payable in the Eastern States. In their investigations the engineers have found that certain solid tyres do twice as much damage to a road as pneumatic tyres. Metal tyres should not be allowed on the roads, but to keep them off would mean the imposition of a tremendously high charge.

There are also certain other amendments in the Bill which will improve the Act. Additional penalties are provided for certain offences, particularly for persons who without the consent of owners take control of motor vehicles. Such an amendment is most necessary. A slight alteration is proposed in the definition of certain roads mentioned by the Main Roads Board in connection with the traffic trust account. They were wrongly described, and the Bill corrects the mistake. Another amendment is in regard to licensing dates. At present if a man wants to license his vehicle on the 20th December, he pays the whole fee. It is now provided that a new vehicle may be licensed for the remaining three, six or nine months of the year, according to when the vehicle was purchased. That refers only to vehicles not previously licensed. If a vehicle is licensed after the 1st October, the fee will be three-quarters instead of the full fee for the year as at present.

Under the present Act the Commissioner of Police may refuse to grant a license in certain cases. In the Bill it is proposed that a person whose license has been taken away and who is refused another by the Com-

missioner, should have the right of appeal to a magistrate. The Bill also tightens up existing legislation in respect of drunken or drugged drivers. In the Act penalties are provided for the carrying of loads in excess of the weight declared when the license was taken out, but little if anything has been done to enforce the law. It is now intended to see that overloaded vehicles do not use the roads, and if necessary officers of the Main Roads Board will be appointed traffic inspectors to act in conjunction with members of the police force. Furthermore, the Commissioner of Police will also be requested to take action to prevent overloading insofar as the metropolitan area is concerned. To assist the supervision of supposed overloaded vehicles, inquiries are now being made as to the possibility of securing portable weighbridges so as to avoid the necessity of compelling vehicles to go to the nearest fixed weighbridge. Generally speaking the Bill represents an attempt to put railways, tramways, and motor vehicles on an equitable footing. If hon. members desire further particulars of the scope of the various clauses, I shall endeavour to satisfy them in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [8.59]: I feel sure that all members have been much enlightened by the full and explicit details furnished by the Leader of the House in connection with this measure. That it is one of importance goes without saying. In the past we have been used to believe in the idea of free trade to such an extent as has allowed us to run a little wild. To our dismay we now find that new inventions of mankind have produced certain classes of machines which compete more than favourably with, and can practically beat on their own ground, many of the provisions made by the State for the conveyance not only of passengers but also of goods. Motor vehicles, apparently, have come to stay, and, respecting our railways, those motor vehicles have come with a vengeance. In former years we believed the railway system was unassailable, and could defy all competition. Yet not only in Western Australia, but in every other country, Governments are faced with a very serious position. The Minister has explained very fully the condition of affairs in neighbouring States, and in South Africa and else-

where. Last year I directed the attention of the Government then in power to comments that had been made by the British railway companies. A little time earlier I had received some reports of those British railway companies, and they dealt with the conditions created by the competition of motor traffic. There the companies were seeking to overcome the difficulty by either establishing motor transport themselves, or by buying into existing motor transport companies. From later reports, I believe, that has not been altogether successful. I do not propose that the Government should do something of that sort here; I do not think it fair that they should. Every reasonable man must realise that the Government, as the custodian of the railways for the people, must do something to correct a condition which is threatening the very existence of the railways. If we do not do something we shall be cutting the ground from under our own feet, and destroying the one means of transport essential to the development of our State. Whilst one regrets cutting into private enterprise, still their comes a time when it is essential for the well being of the railways, in which we are all so deeply interested, that some corrective legislation should be applied. I think, therefore, this legislation which is now proposed will be beneficial, and probably achieve some measure of good in the direction indicated by the Minister. I should like the Minister to have some inquiry made in regard to a point to which I am about to refer. Clause 4 reads as follows:—

A section is inserted after Section 10 of the principal Act as follows:—“(10a. (1) Subject as hereinafter provided, every person using any vehicle for the carriage of goods upon any road mentioned in Part I of the Fifth Schedule to this Act, shall pay the additional license fees set out in Part II. of the said Schedule.

I direct attention to those words “for the carriage of goods.” There is in the Bill no definition of the meaning to be attributed to “goods.” I am going to ask the Minister what he means by “goods.” Should it apply to every kind of chattel, or is it only to apply to certain classes of goods, those articles we generally class as goods when travelling? For example, will it apply to wool? That, I presume from what he said, he means should be included in the term “goods.” But it is questionable whether it actually does apply. Again, would it apply to cattle, an import-

ant means of increasing the revenue of the Railway Department? I repeat would "goods" apply to cattle?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you think it would?

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: How would you apply "goods" to cattle?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Minister could apply it by inserting a definition in the Bill. In the Government Railways Act we get this definition of "goods"—

"Goods" means goods, produce, merchandise, parcels, luggage and chattels of any description, and includes minerals and live or dead animals.

That is what I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then what about goods.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Under the Railways Act, yes, but not under the Traffic Act.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then what are lambs?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think the Government would find they were the lambs when it came to a question of prosecution. The Minister would lodge a prosecution, only to find there was no definition of the meaning of "goods." Clearly, to make the Bill an effective measure, it is essential that there should be an unequivocal definition of the term "goods." There is only one place in the Bill where the term "goods" is referred to; and even in the Act the word occurs only in two places. But it is essential there should be in the Bill something said in regard to it, and probably the definition contained in the Government Railways Act should be incorporated in the Bill. If that is omitted, I am afraid the first prosecution that takes place will result in an amendment being made in the Act, as this Bill will then be.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would it be sufficient to insert after the word "goods" the words "as defined in the Railways Act"?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, because this is a measure that stands on its own feet.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is to prevent the definition in the Act being inserted in the Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is what I am drawing attention to. There should be in the Bill a definition of the term "goods,"

otherwise we shall be restricted to some meaning that will be very limited indeed. I do not even know that it would cover petrol in bulk.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: The point is worth looking into.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is indeed. I think the other amendments referred to by the Minister will be beneficial. But as to the proviso he alluded to, it occurred to me that in the proviso, where there are certain exemptions provided, there should be an exemption for those people in the country who convey their stock for show or exhibition purposes from one district to another; otherwise they would necessarily be forced to convey that prize stock to the nearest railway siding, and send it on by rail. I think there should be some exemption for those men. However, I will leave that to members interested in prize stock. I am glad to see what has been done in the Bill regarding drunken drivers, who are a constant source of danger on the road. We are none too early in tightening up our law in that respect, and the tighter it can be made, the better it will be for the community. Generally speaking, I think the Bill should be regarded with satisfaction by everybody in the State, as really they are all shareholders in our railways, and it is to their benefit that the railways should be made to pay. Of course, if they do not pay, we shall lose a service that is of great benefit to the country. I will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—BEES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th October.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East—in reply) [9.15]: In thanking hon. members for their favourable views on the Bill, I am able to say that, in deference to their wishes, consideration has been given to the suggestion that provision should be made for the registration of apiarists and I propose therefore to accept Mr. Fraser's amendment in that connection when the Bill is in committee. If the House thinks that

registration is desirable, the Minister for Agriculture considers that it should be required annually so that the department will have definite knowledge of the actual number of active beekeepers from year to year and he thinks, further, that there should be an annual registration charge of 1s. for each apiarist with 10 hives or less and 2s. 6d. for those with more than 10 hives. If registration be agreed to, I believe the Minister in another place will move for the imposition of the small registration fees proposed and later on the matter may arise again in this House by way of Message. In the circumstances, beyond accepting the principle of registration, I do not intend at this stage to seek the insertion of provision to meet the Minister's views. In reply to the comments of Mr. Stewart in reference to the proposed amendment to Clauses 4 and 9 which stand in the name of Mr. Lovekin, and his (Mr. Stewart's) inquiry why it should be necessary to make a proclamation under Clause 9 only, I find, on discussing the matter with the Crown Solicitor, that in drafting the Bill the powers in Clauses 4 and 9 were intentionally kept apart to avoid the possibility of confusion which might arise if both powers were included in the one clause. The Crown Solicitor gives his reasons for the separation of the proclaiming powers in the following minute—

1. The amendments proposed by Mr. Lovekin to Clauses 4 and 9 of the Bill are not intended to, nor will they affect in any way, the objects of the Bill.

2. All that Mr. Lovekin desires apparently is a rearrangement whereby the power given to the Governor in Clause 9 to proclaim districts in which prescribed hives must be used shall be removed from Clause 9, and inserted in Clause 4, thus bringing all the powers of the Governor under the provisions of Clause 4.

3. There is an objection to the rearrangement proposed by Mr. Lovekin which I had in mind when drafting the Bill, and which prompted me to frame Clauses 4 and 9 in their present form. In paragraphs (a) and (b) of Clause 4 the words "infected area" are used, and under paragraph (a) the Governor may, by proclamation, declare "infected areas," whilst in Clause 9, subclause (2) the Governor may, by proclamation, declare "districts" in which prescribed hives must be used. Whilst the powers are retained in separate sections no confusion can possibly arise in the use of the terms, and the effect of the proclamations. If, however, the said powers are brought into one section, confusion may easily arise, particularly in the minds of laymen, as to the effect of a proclamation made under Clause 4. For example, a proclamation under paragraph (a) may erroneously be believed to have the effect

of a proclamation under paragraph (c) and vice versa.

I suggest therefore that it would be wiser to leave Clauses 4 and 9 as at present.

In order that the Bill may leave us in clear and unmistakable terms I agree with the Crown Solicitor that it would be inadvisable to complicate the proposed measure by the acceptance of Mr. Lovekin's amendments.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Minister for Country Water Supplies in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in the definition of "officer" the words "and includes the Government Apiculturist, or" be struck out.

I submit the amendment because this officer is already provided for in the Estimates. He is an officer of the Agricultural Department and therefore he can act if this Bill passes. There is no good reason, especially in these times of stress, why we should deliberately take an officer out of a department and give him a statutory appointment. As soon as he gets installed in that office, doubtless he will create a new department, and we know how such new departments extend. By striking out the words we save the risk of the creation of another department. We should all struggle to keep within the agreement arrived at at the Premiers' Conference that there should be no new expenditure except that which is immediately reproductive.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I have already given the assurance that one officer will be quite sufficient for a number of years and that it is necessary that the Government Apiculturist should be the officer to control this legislation. The clause will give him status in carrying out his work; if we merely appoint an officer under the Agricultural Department, it will not have the same effect. As an officer of the Agricultural Department he may have to await instructions from a superior officer and days may elapse. This

may prove serious in the event of a disease amongst bees spreading rapidly.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There is no need to include the apiculturist in the definition because he appears already on page 94 of the Estimates. He is all right there and I do not want him to come into the Bill and open the way for the creation of a new department.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why not provide in the Bill that he shall not receive any further remuneration?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The simplest way is to strike out these words from the definition.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Mr. Lovekin loses sight of the fact that even his amendment will not prevent the creation of a new department.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	9

Majority for .. 1

AYES.

Hon. F. W. Allsop	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. E. H. Harris	(Teller).
Hon. J. J. Holmes	

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller).

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—Proclamation of infected areas:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will not press the amendment that stands in my name on the Notice Paper. It seems to me a very specious argument put forward by the Crown Solicitor when he talks about distributing the work of the Governor to make proclamations. There is reference to it in Clause 4 and another reference in Clause 9. It would be much better drafting if the functions of the Governor were embodied in one clause, so that anyone perusing the Bill would know what the Governor could do. It makes no difference, except that it means so much extra verbiage.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Infected bees, etc., not to be kept or sold:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (a), after "combs," the word "honey" be inserted.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why is this necessary?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I have explained that it is necessary to deal with the honey as well as with the bees. There will be a consequential amendment following upon the one I have moved.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The consequential amendment will be made in paragraph (b).

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Power of entry and inspection:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is difficult to prove that an inspector, in ordering the destruction of a beekeeper's property, would act wilfully and without necessity. We should protect the rights of the beekeepers and before an officer does any actual damage, he should have the authority of the Director of Agriculture. I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (2) the following proviso be inserted:—"Provided that before any such removal or destruction takes place the authority and sanction of the Director of Agriculture shall first be obtained, and a certified copy thereof delivered to or sent by registered post to the beekeeper."

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: If the proviso be inserted, it will nullify the clause, the object of which is to enable an officer to act immediately when, because of disease, the destruction of a hive is necessary. If it is necessary for an officer to do what Mr. Lovekin suggests, what would be the position if the Director of Agriculture is away and cannot be interviewed for some days? If the proviso be agreed to, the Bill will be useless.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Surely the bee keeper should have some protection! Should the Director be absent, someone will act for him, and it is wrong that a more or less

irresponsible officer should be allowed to destroy property without someone taking full responsibility.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What if the bees are at Bridgetown? How long will it take to get there?

Hon. W. J. Mann: Three days.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the bees are diseased, then not much more harm can be done in that interval. The inspector may say the bees are diseased, whereas the owner may dispute the fact. Should he not have protection?

Hon. G. FRASER: The amendment will not afford the bee keeper any additional protection. The Director of Agriculture will probably know nothing about the diseases of bees and he will be guided by his bee expert.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In nearly every instance references are made to articles ordered to be "removed or destroyed." In Subclause (3) the words "removed or" are omitted and I think the subclause should be brought into conformity with the other clauses. I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause (3), after "ordered to be" the words "removed or" be inserted.

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

Clause 8—Beehives, etc., liable to spread disease to be disinfected or destroyed:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause provides that an inspector may direct the bee keeper within a specified time to destroy certain property. I suggest we provide that the destruction shall be within a "reasonable and specified time."

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What would be a reasonable time?

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: That is the point.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In one instance it might be an hour or two, in another a day or two.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How would you fix the reasonable time?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Each case would be determined on its merits.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It might be a week in one instance.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We should protect the rights of the people, but if the majority

of the Committee think it is all right, I shall not protest any further.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the Minister that the clause is inconsistent with the wording of earlier clauses, in which he found it necessary to insert the word "honey" after "bee combs."

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for drawing my attention to another of the unfortunate omissions, apparently, on the part of the Parliamentary Draftsman. I move an amendment—

That in lines 23, 30, and 33, after "bee combs," the word "honey" be inserted.

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

Clauses 9, 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Hives, etc., infested with wax moth:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move an amendment—

That after "combs" in line one the word "honey" be inserted.

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

Clauses 12, 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Offences and penalties:

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be inserted:—
"(e) Wilfully refuses or neglects to furnish to an inspector any information required by the inspector relating to any apiary, bees, bee combs, honey, hives and beekeeping appliances in the possession or under the control of such person."

Denial of this information might result in disaster to the industry. If disease were not localised, to suppress it would be difficult. In all industries there are found obstinate persons. Frank replies and disclosures are necessary in order that the industry may be properly safeguarded.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is proposed to give all these arbitrary powers to officers of the department and afford no protection to the owners of hives or bees.

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

Clause 15—Officers themselves may do necessary work:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: How does the Minister reconcile this clause with Clause 7, which is the clause in which I desired to insert a proviso? Under Clause 7, an inspector is given arbitrary powers. He will not be a trespasser, and he may enter and destroy what he likes. According to Clause 15, an officer, with the approval of the Director of Agriculture, may carry out necessary work at the expense of the person failing to comply. Under the other clause, he can do it himself without let or hindrance.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Under Clause 7 the inspector would be dealing with a person who was prepared to obey the law, clean his apiary, and deal with disease when it was pointed out to him. Clause 15 is designed to deal with the careless or refractory person.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Minister has evidently overlooked Clause 6 under which a bee keeper in whose apiary disease appears must report the matter in writing to the department, and take steps for its eradication. Mr. Lovekin's provision would not have been a fitting addendum to Clause 7. Reading Clause 15 with Clause 7, I think the officer must have the approval of the Director of Agriculture.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If an officer wants to do the things mentioned, he may do them and that will be the end of it. If he instructs the bee keeper to do them and he fails to comply, Clause 15 would then operate.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 16, 17—agreed to.

New Clause—Registration:

Hon. G. FRASER: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 4:—"Every bee-keeper shall register his apiary with the Director of Agriculture. Penalty for failure to register, five pounds."

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Can you move it in this Chamber?

Hon. G. FRASER: The Bill contains certain penalties.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may move it.

Hon. G. FRASER: Unless provision be made for registration, the measure will not be effective. Apiarists dependent upon the industry for a living will not object to re-

gistration. Objection is likely to be raised only by the individual who has a hive or two in his backyard.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: To make the proposed new clause uniform with other provisions of the Bill, I suggest the omission of the words "for failure to register."

The CHAIRMAN: I shall alter the amendment in that way.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think the new clause should go further. No date or time is stipulated for registration. A man against whom a complaint is made might express his intention of registering at some time in future. There should be a time limit.

Hon. G. FRASER: I thought when the Bill became law that would be provided for. I see that no time is laid down when people shall register. I dare say the Minister can offer a suggestion to overcome the difficulty.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: That can be done by regulation.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would prefer to see it embodied in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: A regulation could be framed to provide for the date of registration.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Is it permissible to pass a clause like this, providing for penalties?

The CHAIRMAN: According to the Constitution Act, the clause is in order.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have some land, and may be deemed to be a bee-keeper, because bees roam about my property. Must I register as a bee-keeper?

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: Are the bees being kept?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They are keeping themselves, but they are there nevertheless.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: A bee keeper is defined as a person who keeps bees, or a person who is in charge of bees, or one who allows bees to be kept on any land. If a farmer kept bees for himself, he would register, but if a manager looked after his farm and bees were kept on it, would both have to register? If another man allowed bees to remain on his land, although he did not keep them there, would he have to register?

Hon. G. FRASER: The clause provides for the registration of apiaries and these are defined in the Bill. It is not necessary to register the bee keeper.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I wish to avoid having to register, as I do not keep bees. I do allow the bees belonging to another man to remain on my land, and I want to know if I am obliged to register as a bee keeper?

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that no amount is set down as the cost of registration.

Hon. G. Fraser: I have not proposed a registration fee.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am advised that as President of the Kings Park Board I am the legal occupier of land, in this case, of land on which wild bees swarm. I am, therefore, liable to be called upon to register.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: I have here an opinion from the Crown Law Department to the effect that the definition of "bee keeper" requires that bees must be kept, that is to say, retained on the land of the bee keeper. Bees can only be kept or retained if they settle in some receptacle where they can be confined or controlled. Insofar as wild bees cannot be detained or controlled, it can hardly be contended that any person would be held to be a bee keeper who had wild bees on his property. It must be shown that the bees are kept on the land in such manner that they are under control.

Hon. G. Fraser: Whether this clause is passed or not, the definition of "bee keeper" is still retained in the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If a person can be defined as a bee keeper, as suggested by Mr. Hamersley and Mr. Lovekin, it may be necessary carefully to examine what this definition means. Wild bees usually live in hollow trees. If a person has bees on his property, he may be deemed to be a bee keeper within the definition of the Act, and may be bound to register.

Hon. G. Fraser: He registers only if he has an apiary.

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: Does Mr. Nicholson think any court would hold that wild bees can be regarded as within the keeping of any person?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That would depend upon the construction placed on the definition. An apiary means any place where bees or bee keepers' appliances are

kept. The definition could be made clear on the recommittal of the Bill.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th October, 1930.

	PAGE
Question: Shearers' strike	991
Privilege: Parliamentary officers	992
Bills: Education Act Amendment 3A.	992
Stipendiary Magistrates, report	992
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed	992
Railways, Tramways and Electricity Supply	992
State Batteries; Cave House	1005
Sale of Government Property Trust Account	1005
Lands and Surveys	1007

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

QUESTION—SHEARERS' STRIKE.

Police Precautions.

Mr. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Police: 1, Has there been any increase in the number of police stationed at Yalgoo, Mt. Magnet, Wubin, and Goomalling? 2, If so, what is the reason for the increase? 3, How many police are engaged in escorting men in connection with work in shearing sheds? 4, How many special constables have been sworn in since 1st September, 1930? 5, Who is paying for the services of the extra police? 6, If the State is paying, what has been the cost to date?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: 1, 2 and 3, The police have been sent to various centres on the Murchison to meet circumstances that have arisen in connection with the shearers' strike. 4, Special constables have been appointed by local magistrates under the powers conferred on them by Section 34 of the Police Act, 1892. 5 and 6, No payment has been made by the Government.