

as they were formerly. The South-West is so great that the appointment of a South-West Commissioner should be warranted.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Sutton is capable of directing the work in the wheat belt, because he still has his trained specialists and the Chapman and Merredin State farms.

Mr. Lambert: The need must be growing less every year.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We still have the same expert advice for the South-West. Mr. Wickens, officer in charge of the fruit industry, is in the department and is one of our most efficient officers. In future, perhaps, the development of the South-West may justify the appointment of a highly-trained officer, but at present the staff is as efficient as formerly.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I sincerely hope that the expectations of the Minister with regard to the position to which Mr. Sutton has been appointed will be fulfilled. I still hold strongly to the view I expressed earlier in the evening. The Minister, of course, would not have made the appointment unless he had felt sure that it would prove successful; but as one who has had some years of experience as a Minister, I might be permitted to advise the Minister for Agriculture that he will have to be very watchful and careful to see that Mr. Sutton, in his new position, does not develop into a routine officer handling files and papers in the office in Perth. I know the Minister has no desire that this should happen, but I fear that, as a result of the numerous head office duties Mr. Sutton has to perform, it is almost inevitable that the permanent head of the department will become head of the city office handling files and so forth, and the benefit of his technical knowledge will be lost to the State.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.36 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 15th November, 1921.

	Page
Question: Commonwealth Bank Notes, State Taxation	1649
Leave of Absence	1649
Assent to Bill	1649
Bills: Wheat Marketing, Assembly's Message	1649
Gold Buyers, 2a., Com.	1650
Public Works Committee, 1a.	1653
Constitution Act Amendment, 2a., referred to Select Committee	1653
Stallions, 2a., Com., report	1655
Stamp, 2a.	1657

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

QUESTION—COMMONWEALTH BANK NOTES, STATE TAXATION.

Hon. J. EWING (for Hon. A. Lovekin) asked the Minister for Education: Does the Commonwealth Bank pay tax to the State on its note issue?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: No.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Ewing leave of absence for twelve consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (South-West) on the ground of ill-health.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the State Children Act Amendment Bill.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to make amendments Nos. 2, 3, 5 to 9 inclusive, that it had declined to make No. 4, and had made No. 1 with modifications, now considered.

In-Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Council's requested amendment—Clause 5, Subclause 1, paragraph (b): After the word "advances" insert "not exceeding three shillings per bushel," and add the words "and may charge the wheat acquired under this Act and the proceeds with the repayment of advances";

Assembly's modifications: 1, Omit the proposed words "not exceeding three shillings

per bushel." 2, After the word "charges," in line 4 of paragraph (b) of the clause, insert the following: "but so far as advances are required for the interim payment to the vendors of wheat the amount of such advances shall not exceed a sum equal to 3s. per bushel net to the vendors." Paragraph (b) of Sub-clause 1 of Clause 5, as amended by the Legislative Assembly on consideration of the request of the Legislative Council: (b) May arrange with any bank for financial accommodation and on behalf of the Crown guarantee the repayment of advances and may charge the wheat acquired under this Act and the proceeds with the repayment of advances with interest and bank charges, but so far as advances are required for the interim payment to the vendors of wheat the amount of such advances shall not exceed a sum equal to three shillings per bushel net to the vendors.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Legislative Assembly has made seven of the nine amendments requested by the Council, and has, I think, carried out the desires of the Council in regard to No. 8 but has rejected amendment No. 9. With regard to the modification of the Assembly to amendment No. 1, if the amount that can be borrowed for the purpose of making the advance to the settler is limited to 3s., the actual advance to the settler would have to be 3s. less charges—a matter of about 8d. I think it was the intention of the House that the settler should get about 3s. I move—

That the Assembly's modification be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the modification agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 13: Strike out the words "Provided that such price shall not exceed seven shillings a bushel":

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have nothing to add to what I said when the matter was debated by us before. I am of opinion that it is wrong to limit the amount to 7s. We have looked at the matter from a practical point of view. It is not likely to do anyone an injury, because there is not much chance of 7s. being realised. In view of that, I do not propose to take the risk of losing the Bill and face the certainty of delay by pressing this amendment. Delay now would be dangerous. It is desired to start receiving wheat on the 20th of this month and it is important that the Bill should be passed in time for that. In view of the fact that the retention of the words would hardly have any practical effect so far as this season is concerned, I move—

That the Council's request be not pressed.

Question put and passed; the Council's request not pressed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported, and the report adopted.

BILL—GOLD BUYERS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th November.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [4.41]: The object of this Bill is to make it extremely difficult for persons to dispose of bullion or gold matter. To carry out to the full the details of the Bill will make it extremely difficult for anyone to handle any gold illicitly. One cannot be indifferent to the evils of illicit trading. This is one of the things to which every honest man must object. Nevertheless, there are men who are genuinely in the business as assayers, and who buy clean-ups from smelting plants and so forth, who view this Bill with disfavour as a reflection upon those engaged in the industry. The reason for their objection is that they will have to comply with the whole of the conditions set out here, whilst those who are conducting an illicit trade will be permitted to evade all these restrictions and carry on as they have probably done before. When we were discussing the machinery Bill, several members objected to so many of the clauses referring to the prescribed form in this, that, or the other respect, because it did not convey to them what the clauses meant. I have perused the Gold Buyers' Bill carefully, and find that it also provides that many things must be in such and such a prescribed form. It refers to notices being in the prescribed form, and to certain conditions, forms and fees being in the prescribed form. It also refers to particulars being given in the prescribed form, to certain declarations being made in the prescribed form, to certain things being done in the prescribed form, to assays being made in the prescribed manner, and to certificates being issued in the prescribed way. It winds up by referring to "any such matters as may be prescribed." There are no fewer than 34 "prescriptions" mentioned in the Bill. The bona fide trader, when he gets this Bill, will not know until the details of these prescribed forms are laid down what position he will be in. That aspect is considerably resented by the prospectors and tributors of the State. Whilst I support the Bill, I say candidly that unless some uniform legislation is submitted throughout the Commonwealth, it would appear that the trade is to be driven into the hands of two or three men who will sell the gold in the Eastern States where they are not subject to the restrictions such as are set out in the Bill. It will mean that while gold is obtained here and disposed of elsewhere, Western Australia will not get the credit of having produced it. Notwithstanding that the Bill is so hemmed in with restrictions, all that is required to complete it will be to provide that men dealing in gold shall have their photographs and their finger prints taken. That will complete all possible restrictions to be imposed upon this class of individual. There are a few matters regarding which I desire to have some information. Clause 5 provides that no one shall buy gold

unless he is the holder of a gold buyer's license, and it is further provided that no person, except a bank, shall hold a gold buyer's license. That practically gives the banks a monopoly over the purchase of gold. Will the Leader of the House give members information as to what position the Royal Mint will be in regarding the purchase of gold? The Bill provides that the purchase of gold shall be exclusively in the hands of the banks. The Mint was established for the purpose, among other things, of buying gold and no such restriction as that suggested was contemplated in those days. As the banks have the right to purchase gold, one would naturally understand that they would be anxious to get the business from the biggest producers, like the mining companies. What provision is there, in those circumstances, to compel the banks to buy small quantities. In other lines of business, whilst traders are prepared to deal with men who have large parcels, they are not so anxious to transact business with others in a small way. In presenting that phase of the question I have in mind the leaseholder and the prospector, both men in a small way who may have to dispose of small parcels of gold. If such leaseholder or prospector has to go to the banks to transact his business, it must be remembered that the hours during which the banks are open are not convenient for him.

The Minister for Education: To whom does he dispose of his gold now?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He goes to the firms who are smelting and assaying and puts through a crushing.

The Minister for Education: No one outside the banks has a license.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It frequently happens that these men are able to put through small parcels with other crushings when they are being put through the batteries. It is far more convenient to the prospector and leaseholder in the backblocks to transact business in that way, rather than to go to the banks, because, in many cases, there are no banks or agencies for banks in the centres to which I refer. I would like to know whether the conditions governing the disposal of gold to the banks, will prevent the individual from securing, through the Gold Producers' Association, the gold bonus or premium that is obtained by members of that organisation on the sale of their gold. Under the Bill, the individual will be permitted to sell direct to the bank. We do not know what the conditions governing that sale will be, and I want to be assured that the man with a small parcel will be protected and will be able to secure his fair dues.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: If such a man sells to the bank, will he not get his fair dues?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There are over 30 provisions here for matters to be dealt with in the prescribed manner and we do not know exactly what the conditions will be governing this aspect. There is another phase of the question, as regards specimens. No gold or gold matter can be disposed of to anyone

but to a bank. What will be the position of a man who may have a valuable specimen of gold? It may be worth £5, but as a specimen, it may be worth £25. If the Bill is passed, he will not be able to dispose of it to the man who is prepared to give £25 for it. I will suggest later on that with the consent of the warden in writing—he is the main factor in the issuing of licenses—the person who may have found the specimen or have it in his possession for sale, shall be permitted to dispose of it. Then again, what will be the position of persons holding a valuable collection of gold-bearing ore? I would like some assurance from the Leader of the House that the interests of such persons will be safeguarded. Clause 5, subclause 2, sets out that no person shall assay or smelt gold unless he is the holder of a license as a gold assayer. Gold assayers may be numerous, but I think gold smelter would be a proper term to apply to those referred to in that subclause. Further on the Bill provides that the assayer, on receiving his certificate from the Government, shall cause a sign to be hung above his door, with letters not smaller than two inches in length, indicating that he is an assayer, certificated by the Government. This is an abuse of the word. A man may not know any more about assaying than the man in the moon, but the Bill provides that if the warden is satisfied as to the good character of the applicant, he may issue a certificate to him. One can find many more who are of very good character and, as such, could be the holders of licenses from the Government, but they may not know anything about assaying. I have yet to learn that the issue of such certificates will afford any proof as to the individual's qualifications. When we have new fields opened up from time to time, mining men and investors are attracted. Mining men qualified to express an opinion, visit the new fields and are vested with certain powers and authority. They go to the fields on behalf of the investors in other parts of the world. In many cases, they take an option over a lease and take out 50 or 60 samples of ore. They look around for a reliable man to whom they can give the samples, with a view to ascertaining what results they will give, without any desire to indicate to the investing or speculative public what those results may be. If such an individual were to see the sign "Certificated assayer, Western Australian Government," that would be sufficient to attract him, and he would submit the samples for assay and report. As a result of the reports of such assayers, some flotation might take place, which would be the means of taking the public down. Men may have certificates issued to them who possess no qualifications at all. That reminds me that Mark Twain, when asked what a mine was, said that, so far as he could see, "a mine was a hole in the ground and the manager was a liar." It may so happen that some certificated assayers may come under the same category as that indicated by Mark Twain. The Government in their wisdom

erected the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie, and young men have been induced to go through that institution to qualify as assayers. Their certificate is not to be recognised, but the issue of a certificate under the Bill is to be dependent on the question of good character, to the detriment of those who are qualified. Paragraph (b) of Clause 7 sets out that the premises where the applicant intends to assay or smelt gold or carry on business as a dealer in gold matter, have to be suitably situated, and suitable for such purposes, and the warden has to be satisfied that there is not on such premises, any facility, means, or appliances for buying, selling, assaying, smelting or handling gold illicitly. What are the appliances necessary for the buying of gold? So long as a person has a pair of scales to weigh the gold and a cheque book, that should be sufficient. That being so, I do not know why it is necessary to have any such provision in the Bill. As to the sale of gold, if a person has scales to weigh the gold and a cash book or a pocket sufficient to accommodate the product and the sale, that should be sufficient.

The PRESIDENT: I think these matters of detail might well be dealt with in Committee. I do not wish to cramp the hon. member's search for knowledge. Unless it has some bearing on the general subject, may I ask him to deal with these matters in Committee.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, Mr. President; my search for knowledge in these directions is so that the Leader of the House may enlighten me, and thus, perhaps, assist in obviating the necessity for giving notice of amendments to be placed upon the Notice Paper. When they are dealing with plumbers and electricians, I understand the Government issue certificates to those men. They see that men are duly qualified plumbers before they are allowed to do any work in connection with the sewerage system and that qualification applies to other things as well. Clause 17, subclause 6, provides that no person, except the owner or manager of a smelting furnace suitable for the extraction of gold and of a capacity of not less than 20 tons of ore per day, shall hold a license as a dealer in gold matter, and also a gold assayer's license. I claim there is no smelting furnace for the extraction of gold of a capacity of 20 tons per day in Western Australia, and if the Leader of the House or any other hon. member knows of one, I shall be pleased to know where it is. We have roasting furnaces of that capacity such as are used in mines for the roasting of ore, and I consider that if there are no furnaces of that size in the State, these provisions are likely to hamper those carrying on the bona fide business of smelters. I submit that that should be a roasting furnace and not a smelting furnace. Twenty tons is undoubtedly too high; if we reduced it to one-half or one-quarter, that would be about the capacity necessary to meet the requirements of the Bill. Clause 19 provides for regula-

tions to be observed by those holding licenses, and that any person transacting business shall not enter or leave the licensed premises except by the front door. Assume that we had licensed premises on the corner of Harvest-terrace and Hay-street and a door facing each street, which would be the front door? The clause does not even specify the principal door. Would it be necessary to have the building so constructed that there was only one means of entry and exit? A journalist, after writing an article about a gold buyer, might be very pleased to find that there was a back door, and he would hardly be likely to hesitate about using it if it was the easiest way out. There are other occasions when it is convenient to have a back door. This measure, however, provides that the front door and the front door only shall be used. It might be an admirable clause to add to the Licensing Act, particularly with respect to Sunday trading, but I would like the Minister to explain the need for including it in this Bill. Clause 21 provides for every licensee who wilfully makes a false entry a penalty of imprisonment for six months with or without hard labour, or a fine of not more than £100. These penalties are extremely high. When we were dealing with the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill, no such penalties were provided for. A penalty of £20 should be ample for making a false entry.

The Minister for Education: This is the maximum penalty.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But the maximum in the other measure was £20. This penalty is altogether too severe. Clause 26 contains provision for smelting and sale by registered holders of miners' rights and leaseholders and the issuing of certificates of registration, but the Minister may, under another clause, put his blue pencil through the license at any moment, and there is no obligation upon him to notify the prospector that his license has been cancelled. The prospector has a right to be notified of such cancellation. A penalty is provided for persons who sell gold without being in possession of a certificate, and protection should be afforded by notifying the cancellation of any such certificate. Clause 52 empowers the magistrate at any stage of the proceedings to authorise any person to inspect a mine and break and take away samples and treat and assay them. If a man is accused of having wrongfully dealt in gold, the warden may authorise inspection and sampling in this way. When the Tributing Commission was sitting, evidence was tendered regarding the system adopted by those putting a crushing through a plant in the way of taking check samples and umpires' samples. I strongly urge the inclusion of a similar provision here, so that when the warden authorises the taking of samples, the accused shall have the right to be present, and have a sample taken for himself, and that an umpire's sample should also be taken. This right should be

preserved to a man who is accused of a serious offence. The Bill is capable of improvement in the directions I have indicated, and I shall await with interest the reply of the Leader of the House to the points I have raised.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Licenses:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 2 "assayer" be struck out and the word "smelter" inserted in lieu.

The man who holds a license will be known as a gold smelter, and if certificates are issued as suggested, the difficulty I outlined during the second-reading debate will be overcome.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Gold assayer is defined in the interpretation clause as a person who has such qualifications as are prescribed, and who assays or smelts gold.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But we do not know what their qualifications will be.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That will be provided for by regulation. No provision is made for a gold smelter.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Smelting and roasting are entirely different processes. We should provide for a roasting furnace and not for a smelting furnace.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am inclined to agree with Mr. Harris. This is a drastic measure; it is practically the work of the Chamber of Mines. The Government are merely the instrument for carrying into effect the mandate of that body.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect on the Government in that way.

The Minister for Education: The Government have adopted the Victorian Act practically word for word.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We know that the agitation has been going on for years to get this measure, and no other organisation has been considered. The measure is far-reaching in its ramifications, but in my opinion it will be defeated, not by the man underground but by the man on top—the official. In the anxiety to go to this extremity we shall be doing away with the man who assays samples and who does not smelt gold. Many men on the Eastern Goldfields do not assay, but only smelt gold. The genuine assayer does not object to the Bill; but, naturally, he does not want his livelihood taken away.

Hon. H. STEWART: I read the clause as referring to the assaying of gold, as "gold" is defined by the Bill, but not to the assaying

of gold ore. Under this clause, I believe, any assayer could carry on his business without having to put up on his business premises a sign reading "Licensed assayer of gold." If there is any doubt about the matter, the clause should be postponed. To me Sub-clause 2 seems all right.

Progress reported.

BILL—PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debated resumed from the 8th November.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.22]: This is a short Bill, but, as Mr. Sanderson might say, one of first-class importance. The measure affects the rights and privileges of this Chamber. Hon. members are well aware that the Constitutions of the British Dominions have followed very closely upon the lines of the British Constitution itself. In Great Britain, where there are two Houses of Parliament, the lower or popular Chamber has retained the control of the purse as against attempted encroachments on the part of the House of Lords. But when the Constitution of this State was framed, the position was not well considered, since we provided for an elective Upper House, a feature differentiating the Houses of Parliament here from the Houses of Parliament of Great Britain. As time has gone on, it has been felt that the provisions under our Constitution are still more unsuitable in this regard. Since Federation the great majority of the people of this State are untaxable, except indirectly through the Commonwealth; and, accordingly, this House rather than the Lower House represents the real taxpayers of the country, or at all events those who have to carry the heaviest burden of taxation. Therefore, having to pay the piper, as it were, it is only reasonable that we should have some voice in calling the tune. Following the procedure of other countries, another Chamber has from time to time attempted to make encroachments upon the privileges and rights of this House. In this Bill, from my point of view, a further attempt is being made to limit our powers. As things stand to-day in regard to money Bills, although the other Chamber must initiate such measures, the two Chambers have, to all intents and purposes, exactly the same rights in respect of them. It is true that the Legislative Council may not amend what is known as a money Bill; but we can suggest amendments, which is substantially the same thing. An amendment having been suggested by us, if another Chamber does not see fit to agree to it, we can press our sug-

gested amendment; and if the pressure has not the desired effect, we can then, as a last resource, seek a conference and discuss the matter with a view to doing what is best in the interests of the country. But if we pass the present measure we shall do away with those rights and substitute for them what will be a mere shadow. Instead of the right to suggest amendments, we are to be given the right to amend; but there is taken away from us, by Subclause 5 of Clause 2, the right to repeat, or press, or insist upon, any amendment we may make. I can conceive that great harm will result to the State from such a provision. Suppose we amended an important clause in a money Bill. Thereupon the Bill would return to another Chamber, and the amendment might not be agreed to there. Then, upon the Bill coming back to this Chamber again, we should be in the unfortunate position of having either to waive our amendment or throw out the Bill altogether. I contend that with regard to money Bills—seeing that we are really the representatives of the people who pay the large measure of tax—we should have at least equal rights with another Chamber, save perhaps the right of initiating such measures, which I do not think matters much. But we ought to have the same rights in regard to money Bills as we have in regard to all other Bills. In respect of all other Bills we have power to make an amendment, to press that amendment, and, if the pressure is not yielded to, then to seek a conference.

Hon. T. Moore: We have too much power.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No.

Hon. T. Moore: Yes; for the people we represent.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A reference to the returns will show that this House represents the bulk of the people who pay the taxes of this country. There are in this country tens of thousands of people who pay certainly no direct tax whatever to the revenues of this State.

Hon. T. Moore: Not many to-day.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A good many. A reference to the electoral rolls and the taxation returns will show the hon. member that that is so. We have come to this Chamber endowed with a certain inheritance, as it were, from our predecessors in this House, an inheritance of rights and privileges. I consider that we ought not to sacrifice or yield those rights and privileges even to the smallest degree unless there is good and valid cause for it. I object to the Bill as it stands. Since it is a technical Bill, a measure which needs better consideration than we can give it in Committee of this House, I propose, when the second reading has been agreed to, as I take it will be the case, to suggest a reference to a select committee. This being a constitutional matter, and a matter upon which you yourself, Mr. President, have great knowledge and experience, I shall venture to suggest, if I may take the liberty of doing so, that you, Sir, will be good enough to allow

me to nominate you as one of the members of that select committee. I shall vote for the second reading, and then move in the direction which I have indicated.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
(Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply)
[5.30]: I merely rise to say that I have no objection whatever to the course suggested by Mr. Lovekin, and that it will be particularly acceptable to me if you, Mr. President, will consent to assist us on this committee. The Bill is very necessary, because it is a matter of great inconvenience that a Bill should be deemed to be a money Bill merely through the insertion of one or two clauses imposing fees or requiring payment for services under the Bill. Moreover, at present we are denied the introduction into this Chamber of many Bills which we might conveniently deal with in the early part of the session. There may be some objection to Subclause 5 of Clause 2, as suggested by the hon. member. However, I hope the House will pass the second reading and let the Bill go to a select committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Referred to Select Committee.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That you do now leave the Chair in order that the Bill may be considered in Committee.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will move an amendment that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

The PRESIDENT: It is usual for the mover of such a motion to nominate the members of the committee. If I be permitted I will suggest that while under exceptional circumstances I might be in order in serving on a select committee, yet when it comes to the acceptance or rejection or alteration of a Bill, it would, I think, be far better if I were left off the committee and summoned as a witness.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Then, in accordance with direction, I move an amendment—

That the Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of Mr. Colebatch, Mr. Kirwan, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Nicholson, and the mover, and that the committee report this day week.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill is before us as the outcome of a recommendation by a joint select committee. A select committee of this House in considering the Bill would, I think, be only going over the ground already traversed by the joint select committee of both Houses.

Hon. J. A. Greig: How long is it since that committee sat?

Hon. J. CORNELL: About five years. However, the position to-day is the same as it was then. The only debatable point in

Subclause 5 of Clause 2, namely, the surrender of the right to press, must eventually be settled by this House, irrespective of any select committee. Little or no exception can be taken to the subclause, inasmuch as it follows the practice as between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There may be other matters.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The whole thing has been threshed out by a joint select committee. Subclause 5 of Clause 2 was arrived at by way of a compromise. It would be a good thing if the Bill were passed, because the procedure between the two Houses would work more smoothly than heretofore. I cannot see the necessity for sending the Bill to a select committee.

Amendment put and passed.

BILL—STALLIONS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 8th November.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.40]: The necessity for the Bill was realised at the outbreak of war, when the Commonwealth Government, desiring to acquire a large number of horses for the Australian Imperial Forces, appointed a board to travel all over Australia. That board discovered a great many animals totally unfit for the service. It was owing to the representations of the military authorities that the several States passed legislation prohibiting the use of certain stallions. This is the only State in which such legislation has not yet been passed, with the result that it is likely to be made a dumping ground for unsuitable stallions not able to obtain certificates in other States. Many have been sent here already, and purchasers have acquired them only to discover later that they are not getting the desired results. In some districts will be found first-class animals, but in others there is nothing but rubbish. To-day it is no uncommon thing in country districts to find horses being sold at £3 per head. Of course, it does not pay to continue breeding such animals. They consume food which is just as capable of building up good animals. The Bill probably will not do all that is necessary, because it does not propose to control the use of all sires. Private individuals will still be permitted to use any animals they like for their own purposes. At a later date it may be found desirable to exercise control over stallions privately used, since many of them are totally unsuitable. Some of our stations are not completely fenced, and in consequence stallions of unsuitable class are permitted to roam, and indiscriminate breeding is going on over very wide areas. The Government have a horse breeding establishment at Jigalong station, where there are some 300 animals. It has been the policy on that station that no colts shall be

gelded before reaching three years of age. It is incredible to think that all the animals there are allowed to roam at large, practically from one end of the State to the other. There is nothing to prevent them going everywhere. A very mixed breed of horses is allowed to roam about. It was the theory that hacks or horses bred for police purposes, if left to a greater age, would have a better crest, but I think most members who know anything of horses are aware of the fact that if they are left until they are three years of age, many of them drift miles away from a station, and as they are absolutely cross-bred animals, they will be of very little service at the neighbouring stations to which they may roam. There are people who get hold of sires of that kind; they buy them fairly cheaply and when they acquire them they do not bother to geld them at all. In some of our farming areas such horses are owned by people, and fences do not stop those horses from roaming. They get into neighbouring paddocks and cause an immense amount of mischief from time to time. There is no redress, but the passing of the Bill will have the effect of improving the position, seeing that a matter of this kind will be under the direct control of the Chief Inspector of Stock. It will be possible to find those people who are using such animals and keeping them to the detriment of stock. The tendency of the Bill will be to improve the breed of horses throughout the State. I welcome the Bill and I hope that if the Commonwealth Government find it necessary in the future to inquire for horses they will be able to secure a better class of animal than they were able to get in the past. Mongrels are being bred throughout the length and breadth of the State, and the Bill will have the effect of preventing a continuance of that kind of thing. I support the second reading.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN (West) [5.50]: I intend to support the measure because it is essential that it should be on the Statute Book; but it lacks provision in the direction of the encouragement of breeding within the State. What happens to-day? Let me remind hon. members what the position is so far as the Western Australian Turf Club, and the Western Australian Trotting Association are concerned. Neither of those bodies gives any encouragement in the direction of importing good pedigreed stock. We know, of course, that pedigreed animals are expensive to purchase, and unless inducements are offered we are not likely to have that kind of stock brought to the State for breeding purposes. Let me quote what has happened in connection with the Western Australian Derby. That race, in my opinion, should be confined to animals bred within the State, and a Bill of the kind we are discussing should make it compulsory for the Turf Club and the Trotting Association to confine the race to horses bred within the State. Mr. Hamersley expressed the desire

that the Bill should be passed for the purpose of improving the breed of the horses within the State. I contend we should go further and encourage people to import pedigreed animals to bring about that desired end.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Do you mean to imply that decent stock is not imported?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I contend that no encouragement is given to people to purchase decent stock. The Derby, as I have pointed out, is not confined to horses bred in Western Australia, and I consider that a Bill of this kind should contain such a provision; we should make it compulsory that that event for both galloping and trotting horses should be conducted in the interests of horses bred in the State.

Hon. J. Cornell: That would be an innovation.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: It might be, but it is necessary. Our best course to pursue would be to dictate certain terms to the Turf Club and to the Trotting Association, so as to compel those bodies to limit the candidates for that event to Western Australian bred horses. Until a year ago the Trotting Association conducted its Derby in the interests of locally bred horses, but at the carnival held at Christmas, 1920, the Derby was made open to all three-year olds. That kind of thing discourages to some extent the breeding of good racing stock. It is an easy matter now for me, or for anyone else, to import a good two-year-old from one of the other States and bring it over here and qualify it for the Derby. What we want to do is to encourage the importation of pedigreed stallions so as to breed animals that may later compete against horses in the other States. At the present we have a trotting horse in this State called "Wallace Tracey" who has produced possibly some of the finest stock we have here. There is on the trotting track a locally bred horse that can do the mile in 2.25 and that horse is a cup candidate. But what can we expect to do locally if we are going to permit people to import yearlings or two-year olds and allow them later to compete with the locally bred horses. We should aim at producing our own racing stock and we should compel that to be done in a measure such as the one before us at the present time.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.57]: It seems such a little while since this measure was discussed here that it amounts almost to wasting time discussing it again. It is, however, a measure of great importance. So far back as 1907 representations were made to the then Government to introduce a measure of this kind. Nothing happened until 12 months ago, when it was submitted at the request of seven bodies, amongst them the Pastoralists' Association, the Royal Agricultural Society, and the Farmers' and Settlers' Association. The foremost of these bodies in

the direction of agitating for the introduction of the Bill was the Royal Agricultural Society, and from 1907 to the present time that body has been urging Parliament to place such a measure on the Statute-book. I am not going to say that the Bill before us is quite satisfactory to that society. I know it is not, and that it does not go far enough. However, with a Bill of this nature I suppose it is as well to go slowly and not revolutionise horse breeding with a stroke of the pen, so to speak. There are objections in different country districts to the measure, but that objection mainly comes from those who have stallions which to my mind are unfit for breeding purposes. I admit that some of those stallions which are in an unsound condition were secured in the Eastern States in a bona fide way, and to put an Act on the Statute-book just now which would compel the destruction of those animals would mean a serious loss to the owners, who, in some cases, have paid high prices for the horses. Mr. Hamersley has referred to the question of improving the breed of horses. In my opinion there is nothing contained in the Bill to compel owners to stop using unsound stallions. Ours is not the first State to introduce legislation of this sort. Several of the other States have passed similar legislation, and in Great Britain and other countries there has been legislation in existence for a great many years, which has been of benefit to all concerned. Mr. Baglin said the Bill should contain something relative to the improvement of horse breeding in Western Australia. I agree with that to a certain extent, but not to the extent of passing legislation compelling racing clubs to hold races for locally bred horses. The W.A.T.C. and the trotting clubs should not require even a hint in this direction. Both these bodies say they are keen on improving the breed of horses in the State; but in my opinion, as a breeder of horses myself, they do not encourage people in this direction as much as they should. These racing bodies cater for breeders outside the State, and for people who pay big prices to bring horses here. It is just as possible to breed good horses in Western Australia as it is in other parts of the Commonwealth. There are some portions of the State such as parts of the South-West and the Midland country, which are unfit for the breeding of horses, owing to the lack of lime in the soil, but apart from this horses can be bred in Western Australia equal to any in the world. I do not object to the proposal that this legislation should be administered by the department instead of a board, and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—STAMP.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.7] in moving the second reading said: This is almost entirely a consolidating measure. The law at present is inconvenient and confusing for the reason that so many amendments have been passed since the first measure was enacted. The original Act was passed in 1882, and since then there have been nine amendments. Hon. members will, therefore, realise that it is quite time we had a consolidating measure. The Imperial Stamp laws were consolidated in 1891, and most of the Eastern States have also consolidated their Stamp Acts. In matters of this kind it is obviously important that the public should be able to ascertain readily what is required of them in connection with the stamping of documents. It cannot be expected that the ordinary individual can act with knowledge if he has to search through ten Acts of Parliament. The only increase in revenue that is provided under this Bill is a stamp duty of £1 on deeds of assignment under the Bankruptcy Act. At present these documents are exempt; that is the only alteration that is made in the direction of increasing revenue.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about hire purchase agreements?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that any alteration has been made in the charge. Provision is made empowering the Government to appoint a Commissioner of Stamps under the Colonial Treasurer. Mr. Owen has been tentatively appointed, having been appointed on the 20th May last; but there is really no provision for his appointment until this Bill is passed. It was necessary to appoint some one, because the Commissioner of Taxation who had administered the Act ceased to be Commissioner for Stamps. Part 2 of the Bill reproduces all existing provisions. Provision is made for the communication of information between the Taxation and the Stamp Departments. This is necessary owing to the amalgamation of the State and Federal Taxation Departments. Previously the Stamp Department was under the Taxation Department. Now that these separate institutions the Federal and State Taxation Departments, are one, it is necessary to provide for this exchange of information. Annuities are specially dealt with in the Bill instead of depending on the schedule relating to mortgages, but the duty is practically the same. It is not intended to increase the revenue through this source. The English provisions have been very largely adopted. Part 3 of the Bill also reproduces the existing Act, and Part 4 reproduces the existing law without any material alteration. Machinery clauses as to the collection of duty on contract notes have been inserted, but there again the rate is not altered. Charter parties and hire purchase agreements have been provided for. The idea of the measure is to

make it simple for any person to know exactly what stamp duty he is called upon to pay, and what stamps he must add to certain documents. It is purely a Committee Bill and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [6.10]: I agree with the Leader of the House that it is a great advantage to have the Stamp Acts consolidated. Whilst we are consolidating them I think there are many clauses of the Bill which will bear amendment. Such amendments can better be discussed in Committee. If the Committee stage is not taken to-day I will place on the Notice Paper a number of amendments of which I have a note here, and will not labour the matter further at present.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [6.12]: The general public will welcome a simpler measure than exists at present in connection with our stamp laws. It has been recognised, particularly in the commercial community, amongst those who have been in the habit of making frequent reference to the Stamp Act, that they have laboured under a great disadvantage for many years past owing to the number of amendments which have been made from time to time. I do not propose to offer any objection to the second reading of the Bill, but may have some suggestions to offer in Committee. There are various phases of the Bill to which members may give consideration at that stage, particularly with regard to the duty on transfers or conveyances. During the war a double duty was imposed, which was to hold good for a certain period, and I see that is being perpetuated by the present Bill. I merely draw the attention of members to this fact, and in the meantime accord my support to the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.