

enter into this business, he could rely upon getting the unanimous support of members on the Opposition side of the House. I am surprised at the time of the House being taken up with such a Bill, seeing that it confers privileges upon certain individuals and is opposed to the interests of the State.

Hon. P. Collier: The Bill was introduced in another place in the hope of getting it through quickly.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is so. I know the people who engineered this business are anxious to get it through.

Hon. P. Collier: Fancy a private Bill taking precedence over Government Bills on a Government business day!

Hon. M. F. TROY: In Australia lately more concessions have been given to companies and more opportunities have been provided for exploitation by individuals than was ever done before. Prior to the war public opinion was tending towards a recognition that the State should undertake the work of a trustee company, but in the turmoil of war and its aftermath people have not got back to that frame of mind. The fact to-day is that big business is ruling the Commonwealth, and little by little all democratic legislation is being wiped out, and democratic institutions are being handicapped. This is merely in accordance with the spirit of the times. Our duty here is to see that we do not give certain people an opportunity to further exploit avenues which properly should be available to the Treasurer. We should see that the people of Western Australia benefit by work of this nature being undertaken by the State. For these reasons I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Mr. Lambert, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 2nd November, 1922.

URGENCY MOTION—STOCK DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS.

The PRESIDENT: I have received notice from Mr. Holmes that he wishes to move the adjournment of the House on a matter of urgency. The hon. member writes—

In speaking in the House at the last sitting I made reference to the Stock Department, and the Minister for Education, in replying, stated that he had since spoken to the Chief Inspector of Stock and that what I had stated was not correct. I have since interviewed the Chief Inspector, who informed me that he had told one Minister that I ought to have my head read. It is under these circumstances that I wish to bring the matter before the House and make a personal explanation.

Under Standing Order 58, four members will have to indicate their support before Mr. Holmes may proceed.

Four members having risen,

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may proceed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.34]: Before the hon. member speaks, may I be permitted to say that the statement I made to the House last night was that I had been informed by the Chief Inspector of Stock through the Minister for Agriculture. I did not say that I had spoken to the Chief Inspector.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.35]: Since handing in that notice, Sir, I have seen the Leader of the House, who informed me that it was not he who spoke to the Chief Inspector of Stock, but the Minister for Agriculture. The reason I desire to ventilate this matter is that for some time past we have been endeavouring to convince the Government that the country is being run by the heads of departments, and that inspectors are harassing and annoying the public. Yesterday, when alluding to the Stock Department, I referred to what had been done on the lower Murchison. It is ridiculous to issue a regulation insisting on sheep being dipped for tick in a locality where tick has never been known to exist. In reply to that the Minister told the House that he had consulted the Minister of Agriculture, who in turn had spoken to the Chief Inspector of Stock, and that the Chief Inspector had stated that what I told the House was wrong; the regulation applied to Geraldton, south to Mingenew and only 30 miles from the coast. The Minister on that occasion used more generous terms than he usually employs, and added—for the first time in his life I think—that I would not accuse anybody wrongly, for which I thank him. This morning, in order that the villain might still pursue the facts, I called on the Chief Inspector of Stock and asked to see the regulation referred to. He asked me what I wanted it for. I said I wanted to see the areas which had been defined, and continued, "You told the Min-

	PAGE
Urgency Motion: Stock Department Regulation	1348
Motion: Standing Orders, Notices of Amendments	1349
Bills: Dairy Cattle Improvement, 2s.	1350
Licensing Act Amendment, 2s.	1355
Light and Air Act Amendment	1356

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

ister the area was Geraldton south to Mingenew and 30 miles from the coast." He said, "I told the Minister that you ought to have your head read." If that is what we have come to in this country, if members of Parliament in pursuit of business, not their own but that of their constituents, are to be told to have their heads read, I do not think more proof is required that it is the inspectors and heads of departments who are running this country. This regulation has been receiving my attention for the past 12 months. A year ago I found myself at the head of a list of prosecutions to be enforced at Mingenew by the officer of police because none of us appearing on the list had complied with the dipping regulation. I told the officer, "When you commence prosecuting, sue me first and I will fight you." I came down to Perth and saw the Chief Inspector and told him the same thing. I said, "You have sprung this on us at a time of the year when we cannot comply with the request."

The Minister for Education: Do you know the date of the regulation?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It was about this time last year when the notice was sent out. I told the Chief Inspector, "We cannot comply with it this year, but if you will withhold the summons, I will comply with the regulation next year." That of course meant the present year. In accordance with the arrangement I have complied with the regulation—silly and absurd though it is. At considerable expense I have connected up my dam with galvanised piping, which I bought in Perth, and prepared a dam to dip the sheep in. The dam is almost empty and the water is required for the sheep, but I am going to dip the sheep as I promised to do. I have adopted this attitude so that it cannot be said—as has often been said and as Mr. Willmott remarked yesterday—that I have been guilty of bringing my own affairs into this House. I am not going to do that; I am dealing with a matter affecting other people. The area provided in the regulation takes in the whole of the South-West division, extending from 50 miles north of Mullewa right through the Murchison and south to the other side of Esperance; yet the Minister for Agriculture through the Leader of this House, has told us that the Chief Inspector of Stock informed him the regulation was to be confined to a little area around Geraldton and within 30 miles of the coast. I have seen the regulation; it covers the whole of the South-West division. Yet the Minister for Education is put up by his colleague on the advice of the Chief Inspector of Stock to tell the House that what I stated was not in accordance with fact. Dr. Saw stood up and spoke in support of the inspectors. I do not think he would be so ready to do it to-day. There is only one other point I wish to make. This morning Mr. Weir shifted his ground and stated that it was perhaps not necessary to dip in this area for tick, but it was necessary to dip in order to improve the wool. Every one who knows anything about wool is

aware that everyone having a bale of wool to-day is trying to claim that it comes from the Murchison, because the Murchison is producing the light clean wool which buyers want and which is bringing the highest average price of perhaps any wool in Australia. Yet the Chief Inspector of Stock claims that it is necessary to dip in order to improve the condition of the wool. Mr. Mills told me half an hour ago that Mr. McCallum, the Government wool expert—this is where the experts come in—showed him some wool this week that had been ruined through dipping. The people who were forced to dip presumably did not understand the process and made the solution too strong, and the result was that the wool could be easily torn asunder.

Hon. J. Cornell: I was under the impression that dipping was done for tick alone.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have been long enough in public life to know that when I stand here and make a statement I must be prepared to prove it. I am here to claim that the statements I made yesterday are in accordance with fact.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.44]: Obviously I am not in a position to reply to Mr. Holmes's remarks and I would not think of attempting to reply without submitting his statements to the Minister in charge of the department and obtaining a reply from the Chief Inspector of Stock. I assure the hon. member that I shall see that the matter is thoroughly investigated and that the facts are made known.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North—in reply) [4.45]: In view of the assurance of the Minister that this matter will be inquired into, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS.

Notices of Amendments.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.47]: I move—

That the report of the Standing Orders Committee be adopted, and that the proposed standing order be approved and added to the Standing Orders now in force.

The new Standing Order is the result of a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee held yesterday. If it is adopted by this House, it will have to go to the Governor for approval before it can be added to our Standing Orders. The new Standing Order does not go as far as I myself would like it to go, for I think members should have the right to give notice of amendments at any time. However, there are two sides to the question, and many difficulties have to be met, and we may at any rate try this Standing Order for a start. It reads as follows:—

186a. Notices of amendments to a Bill when in Committee will not be receivable at the Table until the Bill has been read a

second time. In special cases, however, with the authority of the President, they may be printed as an addendum to the Notice Paper before the second reading debate is concluded.

The PRESIDENT [4.49]: Before putting the motion to the House I would like to point out that the proposed Standing Order casts a good deal of responsibility on the President, and also that the rule of the British House of Commons hitherto has been that no amendments can be tabled to any Bill until it has passed its second reading.

Hon. J. Duffell: There are nearly 700 members in the House of Commons, and only 30 here.

The PRESIDENT: I cannot hear what the hon. member says, but I expect it is pretty good. There are obvious reasons against the proposed Standing Order. The second reading of a Bill is put forward in order that the spirit of the Bill may be discussed, and its principle either adopted or rejected. Amendments put up in advance of the second reading might to some extent influence hon. members in regard to the principle of the Bill before they have really gone into the subject. In the circumstances there are probably some objections, and no doubt some of those objections have weighed with an experienced body like the House of Commons, so that up to the present that body, according to "May," have not allowed any amendments to be tabled before the second reading. However, I have no desire to stop anything that will in any way facilitate the business of the House; and if we can get ahead of the House of Commons in this matter I shall have much pleasure in doing what I can towards at all events giving the proposed Standing Order a trial. But in the circumstances hon. members will see that the Standing Order casts a heavy responsibility on the President, and I will ask them to use their discretion and to hesitate to request the tabling beforehand of amendments which are in any way unreasonable.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.51]: The responsibility is not one which I think should be cast on you, Mr. President. After 10 years' experience in this place and 10 years' in another place, it seems to me that the system in vogue works well. As for the necessity for getting ahead of things, to which you, Sir, made an allusion, there is plenty of opportunity to get ahead of things in this House without amending the Standing Orders and throwing additional responsibility on your shoulders. If I have the opportunity I shall vote against the adoption of the proposed Standing Order.

Question put and passed.

BILL—DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT.

Second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.52] in moving the

second reading said: This is a Bill which has been asked for by the Royal Agricultural Society, and by other bodies interested in the dairying industry, for some time past. It is a companion Bill, really, to the one of which the second reading was carried yesterday. That Bill deals with dairying as a manufacturing industry. This Bill deals with the cattle herd.

Whilst I am satisfied that there is great necessity for this Bill, it seems surprising that there should be that necessity. It seems surprising that people do not carry out, without legislation, the things which this Bill is intended to compel them to carry out. I understand that at present the average production per cow in this State is approximately 110lbs. of butter fat per annum; and how people can hope to carry on the dairying industry profitably with a return of that kind, passes my comprehension. The difference between the average yield per cow and what might easily be obtained, what is obtained from a first class herd, is so extraordinary that one is appalled to think so many people carry on the industry here in the way they do. I do not know how people can feed cows and milk them and look after them for a return of 110 lbs. of butter fat per cow, equal to, say, £10 per annum. The Department of Agriculture take the view that by the passing of this Bill it should be rendered possible in a comparatively short time to increase the average yield from 110 lbs. to 240 lbs. per head. That looks like a very big increase, but the estimate is certainly not optimistic when one considers that higher averages can be obtained by careful breeding. Such an increase would mean, at the present value of butter fat—say 2s. per lb.—increasing the return per cow from £10 to £24 per annum—a very substantial increase. The aim of the Bill is to secure the use of pure bred dairy bulls. The contention is that the bull may be regarded as at least one-half of the herd.

Hon. A. Burvill: Or more.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The figures which have been compiled from records in Australia and other parts of the world do certainly indicate that the pure bred bull is more than one half of the herd. With the use of a pure bred bull the yield per cow has been increased from 130lbs. to 540lbs. per annum in the course of four or five years. There we have an increase which to my mind would represent a very fair income to the man carrying on the business; and, of course, it costs no more to feed and care for good cows than to do the same for bad cows. The progeny of pure bulls have shown an average increase in production of 250 lbs. of butter fat per annum. Bearing in mind that our average in Western Australia is only 110 lbs. of butter fat per cow per annum, it must be realised that an increase of, not an increase to, 250 lbs. is really enormous. There is a case on record of a small herd of 12 cows which were producing £150 in value in 12 months, and through the introduction of

a pure bred bull the descendants of the original 12 cows, namely, five cows and seven heifers, in a few years produced an annual return of £320, or more than double the original amount. In that case, therefore, the pure bred bull proved himself to be more than half the herd. It is in view of these figures, which I believe represent a world wide experience, that I am astonished at the necessity for legislation of this kind.

Hon. J. Cornell: This legislation is not going to do much, either.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that. But these who have studied the question, and are interested in it, confidently believe that it will have considerable effect. Some figures have been placed in my hands in regard to the United States of America. The 48 States of the Union are divided into four batches of 12 States. The first 12 States, having an average of 51 per cent. pure sires, average 410 gallons of milk per cow per annum. The next batch, with 31 per cent. of pure sires, average 330 gallons of milk per cow per annum. The next 12, with an average of 19 per cent. of pure sires, average 260 gallons. The last 12, with an average of 12 per cent. of pure sires, average 200 gallons. Those figures were compiled only recently, and I believe them to be entirely reliable. Under this Bill all that it is proposed to do at the outset is to register the bulls, and a nominal fee of 5s. is charged for registration. The intention is that after a period of two years it shall be lawful to prohibit the use of bulls that are not of a sufficiently high standard.

Hon. J. Cornell: What about the strain?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no question of strain so long as it is a pure bred bull. There may be preference for one strain or another. The idea is to get rid of the mongrel bull and to introduce in its place pure bred bulls. The Bill comes into force, if it is passed, on the 1st January next, but for the first two years all that is required is registration. The Bill will apply only to those portions of the State which from time to time are gazetted as the result of an Order in Council. It is not intended to apply it except in places where it is considered necessary. Undoubtedly it would be applied in all districts where there are butter factories. There is no intention of appointing any additional inspectors under the Bill. The work will be carried out by the same officers and at the same time as they do their work in connection with the Dairy Industry Bill. It is intended under the Dairy Industry Bill that the inspectors shall follow the milk from the herd right through to the factory. It is in their advisory capacity in visiting the herds that they will carry out their duties under this particular Bill. Owners of bulls that are not considered satisfactory will after two years be obliged to substitute pure bred bulls for them. If they do not do this it will be competent to order that their bulls shall not be

used. In that event an appeal is provided for in the following terms:—

After the expiration of two years from the commencement of this Act registration may be refused if the bull is below a reasonable standard to be prescribed: Provided that if on application to the Department of Agriculture registration is refused, the owner may, within the time and in the manner prescribed, appeal from such refusal to an appeal board consisting of the dairy expert of the department, and two other members, being cattle breeders, to be appointed by the Minister. This seems to be a perfectly fair proposal. It has been contended that if effect is given to the clause at the end of two years there will be an insufficient number of pure bred and high class bulls for the purpose of our dairy herds. That view is not taken by the department. The officers say that at present there are over 200 pure bred registered bulls of different breeds in the State, and that if the Bill is passed it will have the effect of largely increasing that number on the expiration of two years. Provision is made that offences under the Act shall be reported to the Minister, and that no proceedings for such offences shall be taken without the consent in writing of the Minister. The Bill is a simple one and is for the purpose that I have stated. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [5.5]: I am hardly qualified, as a goldfields representative, to speak to the question, but after reading through the Bill I have come to the conclusion that it will not effect much good. The Minister has drawn a romantic picture of what should happen in the dairying industry if this Bill is passed. No intelligent dairy farmer would endeavour to carry on the industry with inferior stock.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are wrong; they do it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Dairy farmers do it if they lack intelligence, and they should be educated away from the suicidal policy that some of them are now adopting. Many dairy men are so handicapped financially that they cannot start out upon the class of stock that they would like to have. If the Agricultural Department would branch out on commonsense and systematic lines, causing dairy farmers to keep only pure bred bulls, they would be the means of bringing about a great return to the State. These bulls should be of the best milking strain. They should be so distributed about the country by the Agricultural Department bearing in mind climatic considerations as well as the particular country on which the stock must run. The industry cannot be built up to substantial proportions without the best of stock, and particularly of milking stock. There are two strains of bulls, the beef strain and the milking strain. I do not think the Agricultural Department has given that consideration to the industry which is warranted, and must be given if it is to be successful in competition with the

other States. We must proceed along practical lines of this nature. In the pastoral industry it was recognised at an early stage that the best sheep or cattle alone should be bred. The pioneers in that industry started off with sheep of the best strain. In the case of the dairy farmer he has not been able to go in for the best strains. I take my hat off to Mr. Wm. Padbury, who has conferred incalculable benefit upon the dairying industry of Western Australia. If the Government would give some assistance to the Agricultural Department by enabling it to follow out the best methods, there would be no necessity for this Bill. The objects that we most desire in connection with the dairying industry will not be attained by the mere registration of bulls. The man who desires to be permanently engaged in this industry must keep stock that will give him the best returns.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.10]: I support the second reading of the Bill. It is a step in the right direction. It should, however, not be made to apply to the whole State. The area that will be affected from time to time will be defined by the Governor in Council presumably on the advice of the Stock Department. We cannot altogether refer to what has been done in other countries. Western Australia covers a tremendous area, and has every variety of climate. I entirely agree as to the necessity for bulls of a proper milking strain being put into our dairy herds. It would be a calamity, however, to have a milking strain imported into our beef herds. This might happen if things are left to regulation, and matters are allowed to pass out of our control. There are many people in the country, dabbling in dairying, who are quite prepared to go along in the same old way, but if the industry is to prosper those people must be forced to comply with the new conditions. Many people overlook the fact that a mongrel bull or cow takes as much looking after, eats as much feed, and is as much trouble as a thoroughbred animal.

Hon. A. Burvill: Much more so.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Kimberley cattle have been roaming in the East Kimberleys for the last 25 or 30 years, breeding and in-breeding, and to-day we can see the results of the bulls that the Duraek Bros. brought out from Ireland 25 years ago. We can imagine what the results would have been if a better class of cows and bulls had been brought together. The old strain, however, is still visible in the cattle. If we could apply the Bill to the dairy industry in the South-West and some other measure to the beef industry in the North, we would get more satisfactory results. The Bill deals with the whole State, whereas dairying is conducted mostly in the South-West. According to Mr. Miles, in the future it will be undertaken in the Kimberleys as well. In those days we will have dairying extending from Esperance in the South to Kimberley in the North. It will then become a question as to which is the

more profitable, dairy cattle or beef cattle. If we go in for all dairy cattle and no beef cattle, what will we do for meat? There is another clause in the Bill which creates some doubt in my mind. I refer to Clause 14, which says—

No matter or thing done by any inspector in good faith for the purpose of executing this Act shall subject such inspector or the Crown to any liability in respect thereof. No action shall be brought against any inspector for or on account of any matter or thing done or committed by him in the execution, or intended execution, of his duty or office under this Act, unless such action is commenced within six months after the cause of action arises.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is an old friend returned to us.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and it confirms what some of us believe, namely, that legislation is passing out of the hands of Parliament. Nestles, a much-abused company, took action for the improvement of some of their herds in Australia and they introduced the shorthorn milking strain on their station in Queensland. The shorthorn cattle that we know are beef cattle and give very little milk. In the East Kimberleys we have been developing the beef so much that our managers say the cows give practically no milk. The development is all going to beef and there is no milk for the calves, with the result that each year there is a tremendous mortality among the young calves. Nestles tried to overcome that difficulty in Queensland and, though I may be referred to as a pessimist and other things on some occasions, I would like to inform the House that the company with which I am associated went to considerable expense two or three years ago to import into the Kimberleys bulls of the shorthorn milking strain in order to get back into the beef cows sufficient milk to carry the calves on until they could look after themselves. If people are prepared to improve matters and do what is right in connection with the industry, we should not require this Bill to be enforced throughout the whole State. We know what happened in connection with the Vermin Act. Originally there was an Act applying to the large areas in the North. It was entirely suitable for those areas but later on a Minister for Agriculture brought forward a Bill to amend the Act and provide that every river, creek, pool, trough and tank should be fenced off from rabbits. Such a provision was quite all right for 1,000-acre paddocks where a man could open the gate, water his team of plough horses and close the gate, and so on. I tried to picture, however, the 40 windmills erected on a station, each providing water for filling troughs and tanks. I pictured a man stationed at each tank for 24 hours at a stretch, day in and day out, waiting for the sheep to come for a drink, and I showed that, in all prob-

ability, when he opened the gates there would be a wild race between the rabbits and the sheep to see which could get in first. The absurdity of the whole thing was made apparent and the result was that we amended the Bill to make it apply to certain areas of the State, leaving the original Act intact as it applied to the North. It may be that we may evolve something from the Bill which will meet both cases. I have spoken at an early stage so that the Minister may see that there is need to conserve the interests of the dairying industry and also of the beef and cattle industry in the far North. With these few remarks I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [5.20]: The Bill is one of great importance to the dairying industry and it is badly wanted. Mr. Cornell said that he considered the Minister was romancing when he quoted figures regarding the industry, but I can assure him they were quite correct.

Hon. J. Cornell: I said it sounded like a romance.

Hon. A. BURVILL: There are two great needs of the dairying industry—feed and breed. We cannot legislate to make a man keep only sufficient cows for the feed he has got, but we can legislate to force him to improve the breed of his cattle. It is easily done through the bull. We do not require to legislate for the cows. If we have a good milking strain in the bull, the dairy herd must improve. No matter how inferior the herd may be, the cows are bound to breed upwards. The milking strain of cattle is bound to improve as time goes on, with a judicious alteration of the bull. If a dairyman wishes to avoid in-breeding in the herds, he wants to get rid of his bull from time to time, either by selling it or exchanging it with a neighbour. We need to improve our dairy herds and a good type of bull is required to achieve that improvement. Mr. Cornell said he thought the farmers should have sufficient sense to do that for themselves. If he had lived in a dairying district, especially in Western Australia, although the same thing applies in the Eastern States, he would find that they do not always do it.

Hon. J. Cornell: I have always found that a farmer* is all right if you stroke him properly.

Hon. A. BURVILL: A case came under my notice recently where a shorthorn bull came from the Albany district and took first prize at the Royal Show. The charge for the service of that animal was only 10s. 6d. and I know for a fact that a man who had cows, although he lived practically next door, would not go to that stock-owner but went to another man where he could get service from a cheap bull at 5s. If that man could have got a mongrel bull for nothing, he would have gone there. That is the position with many of our dairymen.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Then those men are bad farmers.

Hon. A. BURVILL: There are farmers in my district who, although they can purchase a good bull at a reasonable price, will persist in attempting to keep their own bull, thereby avoiding the trouble of taking their cows to a good bull. It is time this practice of utilising the services of mongrel bulls was put a stop to in the interests of the State and of the dairymen themselves. These inferior bulls are running about the country and breaking through fences, with the result that people have to put up with trouble in connection with their cows and they are getting stock which they do not want.

Hon. J. Cornell: Every farmer who has a couple of cows wants a bull, and that should be prohibited.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I do not think Mr. Cornell is right in that statement. As long as good bulls are kept in the district, it should be all right. In the district I know, there are very few bulls and a fair charge is made. If we pass legislation like that under review people will be forced to keep a good type of bull and it is only right that they should be made to do so. Mr. Cornell referred to the State helping the dairy farmers in this direction. I was in the Gippsland district in the early days and I do not know that the State did very much towards helping the settlers there. I wish to give the Agricultural Department of Western Australia credit for what they have done in the Albany district. A State farm is established there and they raise bulls at a reasonable price. They charge £5 for an animal that is three months old. Anyone who cannot afford to pay that price has no right to continue in the dairying industry. I do not believe in the State going to all this trouble merely to give their stock away.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: But is that not State enterprise?

Hon. A. BURVILL: We need not touch on the State enterprise aspect. If the State continues along the present lines, we shall be able to produce stock at a reasonable price. A fair number of bulls from the State farm have been sold in the Albany district. I know a man who bought a Jersey bull and used it for a number of years. He then wished to exchange it. If the present Bill had been in force he would have been able to sell it at a reasonable price. As it was, the price he was offered was not more than it would bring as fat cattle. The whole trouble was that many people had the idea that any sort of bull would do. The result of all this was that that particular bull was sent to the butcher and that was the end of a very good animal, which had a lot of good service in him at that time. Notwithstanding what Mr. Cornell says, there are a lot of people in the dairying industry who do not look after their own interests.

Hon. J. Cornell: Is it not a fact that poverty is keeping the dairying industry back?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I do not agree that it is altogether poverty. If we had good bulls they could be kept at a reasonable figure to meet the requirements of those connected with the industry. It costs just as much to look after and feed a poor cow that gives half a gallon of milk, or a mongrel bull, as it does to look after a good cow that gives two gallons of milk, or a good bull.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Can every dairyman afford to keep a bull that is up to standard?

Hon. A. BURVILL: Decidedly, and it is not necessary for every dairyman to keep such a bull, provided there are some in the district. The trouble is that people who cannot really afford to keep a bull persist in going in for the mongrel type. If good bulls were procured and fair charges were made, it would be quite all right. As to the regulations I would like the Leader of the House to give us some idea as to what areas are to be stipulated when the law is being enforced. I would like to have further information regarding Clauses 2 and 6. It seems to me that hardship may be worked in connection with the registration of bulls.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will be able to go into those matters when in Committee.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I would like the Minister to give us some explanation regarding Clause 11 which deals with bulls which are condemned. It seems to me to be rather vague. Clause 3 does not seem to be altogether right. A man has to appeal if a bull be condemned, and he has to pay in £3. If he is a poor man he is likely to have a good deal of expense, even though he win his appeal, before he gets his money back. On that point I will move an amendment in Committee. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.31]: This is a very important measure, and I am glad it has been brought down. There are in country districts large numbers of ill bred bulls; indeed, they are to be seen even on exhibition at agricultural shows. The progeny of those bulls are everywhere to be found. The heifer born of an ill bred bull will go on breeding for a number of years. It is a great pity that the mongrel bull is allowed to exist. Frequently, the local people know that the bulls in the district are ill bred, but out of sheer good nature towards the owners, put up with the animals. As a rule, those bulls will be found running on the roads. They get into good herds and spoil good animals. It has been said that, as a rule, the dairyman knows his business and uses a good bull. But that is the source of much of our trouble. The dairyman desires nothing beyond milk. Probably he has a fine herd of selected cows, but he is not worrying about their progeny. All that he requires is any cheap bull, his sole care being to bring the cows again into milk.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: What would a high standard bull cost?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There are plenty of them available at £10. I know men who have imported high class stud-book animals from the Eastern States, but do not attempt to keep the progeny for sale, the reason being that they cannot get so much as £5 for a young bull, so many people are content to use the inferior animal merely because of the cheaper service. It is convenient, but the result is that many growers of high class animals will not trouble to save the young bulls, because of the more costly fencing required to confine them from the general herd. Moreover, as I say, it is quite unusual to get anything like a reasonable price for a good bull. I know of a herd of 70 selected milking cows with a good imported bull; yet the young bulls from that herd are never saved, because as I say, it is not worth while. The mongrel animal is sufficient for the average dairyman, who cares only to get his cow into milk gain. That applies to a large number of dairies. The cow calves, and the dairyman does not care what becomes of the calf, so long as the cow comes into milk again. The female calves grow up and carry on the breeding of future herds, although the sire was nothing more than a mongrel. I welcome the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.36]: I know little or nothing about the Bill. My ignorance on the subject has been more fully brought home to me by the speech of the Minister. I have always been of opinion that it was the cow that gave the milk. However, from what the Minister said, it appears it is the bull which provides the milk. There may be some explanation, but I have not heard it. Perhaps Dr. Saw can supply it. Also, from what Mr. Holmes says, it has been made clear that it is the bull which provides the beef.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: For the next generation.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There may be more in it than I thought. I have read that there might well be improvement in the bulls in the North; because the objection in London to Australian meat is that the quarters are short, as against Argentine beef, which has long quarters and can be more profitably cut up. However, this is a subject upon which I cannot speak dogmatically. There must be more in the Bill than I quite appreciate. Still, I express my gratification that the fees to be charged are prescribed in the Bill. I hope the Government will adopt this plan in future. I wish to see no more Bills which do not prescribe in a schedule the fees, if any, to be charged. In future I shall object strongly to power being given to any department to prescribe fees. If the people are to pay fees or taxes, it is for Parliament to determine those fees and taxes.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [5.40]: Bearing in mind your recent remarks regarding the use and purpose of a second reading debate, and also the lucid explanation by the Minister, it is really quite unnecessary to occupy the time of the House in a detailed discussion of the clauses seriatim. But on reading the provisions of this Bill one must be forced to the conclusion that the Bill is a step in the right direction. Looking back to the original measure, one is convinced that it was a reflex of much evidence taken and carefully weighed by the Royal Commissioners appointed for that purpose. In their task they have shown much acumen, much foresight, much knowledge of prevailing conditions, and of the conditions that are likely to prevail in the near future. I should like to foreshadow what might be done at the Committee stage in respect of several of the clauses. Naturally, it is the intention of the Legislature to see that enactments do not fall too heavily upon any particular section or body, so that the proposed reform may not become oppressive. Paragraph (b) of Clause 21 provides for running water and fixed washhand basins in bedrooms. I do not know that that is really a requirement of those staying in hotels. It calls for the exercise of very little imagination to understand that in some hotels it would be very distasteful to use such a convenience. I do not wish to cast reflections upon even imaginary persons, but from what we have all seen, some people are very careless in the use of certain utilities, and if this provision be allowed to remain in the Bill it is probable that we shall be defeating what was originally intended by the framer of that provision and, instead of having something at once hygienic and useful, we shall have something which will be a menace to the health of the community. In Clause 9, assessments of fees on returns of liquor purchased, there is, I think, the danger that there might be a duplication of fees. However, I have no doubt we shall have an assurance from the Minister on that point. Regarding the provisions for the reduction of licenses, having conjointly the provision of a three-fifths majority, Mr. Seddon introduced some extraneous matter. I am ready to believe that Mr. Seddon was really sincere in what he said, but I do not see that it is necessary to go back to the time and period of the slave trade and the corn laws. Does the hon. member really wish us to believe that we have not yet shaken off the shackles of 1436? Does he think we have not benefited by all the experience of men like Wilberforce? Does he think that we are living in the atmosphere of 1789, or does he think that he is living in it? Surely not. Can we compare the environment and circumstances that dominated those reforms with the circumstances existing to-day? Is it not sufficient to say that we should benefit by

the experience of the past and refuse to subscribe to a three-fifths majority not only for the particular purpose set out in the Bill, but for all social reforms?

Hon. H. Seddon: You are introducing a dangerous precedent.

Hon. G. POTTER: I do not think so. Let us have the courage of our convictions, and it surely should appeal to anyone that any social reform, any change that is going to disturb the liberty of the subject, which is sometimes spoken of so enthusiastically, in fact anything that is going to disturb the even tenor of our way through life, must be enacted by something more than a bare majority. Take the position of a Government. Surely a Government must be assured that before they can compel the public to subscribe to a reform, there must be a sufficiently strong expression of the will of the people behind them to ensure its being carried out. It has been said that at the time of a general election, when Parliament is elected, a bare majority is necessary. There is a limit to the duration of Parliament, and then the people are again given the opportunity to express their will, and again it is reflected in the Parliament they elect. But would hon. members wish a great social reform to be subjected to the slightest boil over of public opinion?

Hon. E. H. Harris: Will this issue be decided for ever?

Hon. G. POTTER: It is better to have this issue decided by a substantial majority, and then again, if public opinion is once more strongly expressed, it will be competent for that public opinion to make its voice heard in the democratic institution—the legislature. Much opposition has been shown by those who do not favour a three-fifths majority, to the taking of the poll at the time of a general election. Usually the plea advanced is that this is desired on the score of economy. That is a short-sighted policy because in my opinion such a procedure would destroy any attempt to economise, inasmuch as a great question like prohibition or any other question dealing with social reform would obscure the real issue at a general election. A general election is held to ascertain the will of the people, not on one particular point but in respect of the future of the country, something that can be handled from day to day. If a social reform were mixed up with a general Parliamentary election, then the real object of that election would undoubtedly be defeated.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you suggest it would be bad for the candidate?

Hon. G. POTTER: No, but to suggest such a thing would be bad for the intelligence of the person who proposed it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You would know which side of the fence the candidate was on.

Hon. G. POTTER: But there is nothing in sheep proof netting to prevent people from crawling underneath. Bearing in mind that to approve of the second reading of the Bill is really to subscribe to the general prin-

ciples of it, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House any further. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, debate adjourned.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Assembly with an amendment.

House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd November, 1922.

	FROM
Questions: Railways, Geraldton arrangements ...	1356
Industries Assistance, Loans ...	1356
Select Committee, Leschen case, extension of time:	
Breach of Privilege ...	1356
Privilege, Unauthorised Newspaper Comment ...	1356
Bills: Light and Air Act Amendment, 3a. ...	1363
Public Education Acts Amendment, 2a. ...	1363
Navigation Act Amendment, 2a., Com. ...	1365
Dog Act Amendment, Com. ...	1367

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, GERALDTON ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. MARSHALL (for Mr. Willecock) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What was the cost of the removal of the interlocking gear and installation of the new signalling apparatus at Geraldton? 2, What is the estimated saving per annum under the new system? 3, Is it considered that traffic can be handled without serious delays under the new system during the wheat season?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, Approximately £380. 2, £342 4s. 1d. 3, Yes.

QUESTION—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE, LOANS.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture: On the 5th October a resolution was carried at the instance of the member for Mount Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy), that a return be laid on the Table of the House showing the amount advanced by the Government to various institutions and organisations in the State. As

the information which is to be contained in that return is desired for the purpose of assisting in the discussion of the Estimates of some of the Government departments, will the Minister see that it is presented to the House not later than Tuesday next?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: While I will not make any specific promise in the direction indicated, I will give the hon. member my assurance that I will endeavour to see that it is done.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is four weeks since the motion was carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE—CARL LESCHEN CASE.

Extension of Time.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [4.35]: I move—

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee appointed to deal with the Leschen case be extended until the 7th November.

Breach of Privilege.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.36]: A paragraph appeared in the "West Australian" this morning with regard to the work of this committee. I would like to know whether the statements contained therein are correct or not. In the first place, it appears that there has been a declaration—I do not know by whom—as to the evidence that has been given before the select committee. The paragraph states that an important witness on the previous day had given such evidence as had exonerated Mr. Leschen. If that be so it appears that there should be no necessity to grant the committee any further extension of time. It is really a breach of privilege that any such statement should be made. It appears to me that the only persons who can exonerate or condemn Mr. Leschen will be the members of the select committee in their report to this House. To make a pronouncement on the evidence of one witness seems to me an unusual, not to say an extraordinary, attitude to adopt, and on that basis to find that Mr. Leschen has been exonerated. I should like to know from the chairman of the committee, whoever he may be, something in regard to this matter.

The Minister for Works: This is really a breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not in possession officially of any knowledge as to who is chairman of the select committee. I presume that, following the ordinary custom, the mover of the resolution appointing the select committee, Mr. Simons, would have been the chairman. Since I received the resignation of Mr. Simons yesterday, I do not know what has transpired. I do know that after the resignation was received, a resolution was moved appointing the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. Lutey) to the vacancy on the select commit-