

a report is received from the Public Service Commissioner for the Government to consider whether it is desirable to retire him. The Government, out of ordinary courtesy, might have awaited the receipt of the Public Service Commissioner's report to find out whether he is in favour of Mr. Dowley's retirement. If he is all of us might not agree with him; I, for one, would not. Those who know Mr. Dowley and have met him frequently say that he is quite capable of carrying out his duties. We seldom hear of his decisions being upset by superior courts, nor do we hear any complaints as to the manner in which he discharges his duties. He is a highly educated man and is respected by the community generally. The position would be that Mr. Fairbairn would be on the retired list and Mr. Dowley would be on the retired list, and that we would be paying their successors. There would thus be three competent men, I presume that the new man would also be a competent man, one at full pay and the other two on the pension list. I do not wish to delay the House in the matter, but it does seem to me, just looking at it from the financial point of view, that we cannot afford these luxuries, even if there are other men in the service coming on who want promotion. We are told that the civil servants themselves object; indeed there must be a great feeling of uncertainty amongst our public servants, and a feeling that there is very little reward to look for. On the very day that they attain the retiring age they are liable to be shot out on very short notice indeed. This certainly is not encouraging, and, as I said before, we cannot afford these luxuries. I do trust that, even at this late hour, the Government may hold their hand and allow us to keep our faithful servants who are carrying out so well their duty to the State.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 4th August, 1914.

	Page.
Papers presented ..	792
Questions: Fremantle Hospital Finances ..	792
Building Allotments, North Perth ..	793
Police Constable Campbell ..	793
Bills: Nyabing-Pingrup Railway, 3R. ..	794
Cottesloe Municipal Rates Valuation, 3R. ..	794
Kukerin-Lake Grace Railway, Com. ..	794
Road Closure, 1R. ..	794
Busselton-Margaret River Railway, Com. ..	795
Licensing Act Amendment, 2R. ..	795
Plant Diseases, 2R. ..	797
Osborne Park Tramways Purchase, Com. ..	802
Land and Income Tax, 2R., Com. ..	802
Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ..	802
Adjournment, Non-contentious matters ..	804

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Railways: 1, Returns in accordance with Sections 54 and 83 of The Government Railways Act, 1904, for the quarter ended 30th June, 1914. 2, Return of receipts and expenditure of Government Tramways for the quarter ended 30th June, 1914.

By the Minister of Education: 1, Addition to Regulation No. 22 of the Education Department.

By the Minister for Works: 1, Approval of uniform general by-laws adopted by the municipalities of Coolgardie, Leonora, and Narrogin. 2, Additional By-law of Yalgoo road board (fees for tents).

By the Minister for Lands: 1, Return showing Areas and Revenues of University Lands. (Ordered on motion by Mr. B. J. Stubbs.)

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HOSPITAL, FINANCES.

Mr. CARPENTER (without notice) asked the Honorary Minister: Has his attention been called to a paragraph in this morning's newspaper touching upon the paucity of financial assistance received by the Fremantle hospital from the Government, and intimating that the chairman of the board had resigned as a protest against the action of the

Government and the public in withholding their support from that institution?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) replied: Yes, I read the paragraph this morning, but cannot credit that it is a correct report of what took place. In 1913 the Fremantle hospital received £1,235 more than it received 2½ years ago. I think the Fremantle hospital has been treated just as well as, if not better than, other public hospitals in the State.

QUESTION—BUILDING ALLOTMENTS, NORTH PERTH.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Did an applicant apply for a re-subdivision and ask for permission to take in the right-of-way behind Beaufort-street between 7th and 8th Avenues, Maylands? 2, If so, on what date was the application lodged? 3, Did the local authority approve of same? 4, If so, on what date was approval given? 5, Were the purchasers of blocks adjoining right of-way consulted? 6, If not, why not? 7, Will he amend the Local Government Act in the direction of defining the area of building allotments, and the minimum area of open air space devoted exclusively for the use of the occupants?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, 11th June, 1912; 3, Yes. 4, 11th June, 1912. 5, Yes; all those who had an equitable interest approved of same. 6, Answered by No. 5. 7, It is considered that the provisions of the Amending Roads Act, 1912, contain sufficient provision to safeguard the interests of the ratepayers.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it does not. The local authorities do as they like.

QUESTION—POLICE CONSTABLE CAMPBELL.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the Colonial Secretary (Hon. J. M. Drew) stated on oath at the Captain Hare inquiry that the Government did not refuse to appoint Constable Campbell to the Police Benefit

Fund Board? 2, How does he reconcile that sworn statement with his own that Cabinet refused to appoint Campbell? 3, Is it a fact that two elections were held for this board prior to 1912? Is it also correct that police officers had to sign their names on the ballot paper and forward to Captain Hare? 4, Did members of the present Government denounce this method of election and alter the same as soon as they came into power? 5, Did Commissioner Connell, in a file alluded to by the Hare select committee, ask that Campbell's appointment to the board be delayed? 6, Has Campbell completed nearly 19 years service in the department without a mark against him? 7, Did Commissioner Connell exert his influence to prevent Campbell's appointment to the board. If not, will he state, in view of the five elections held, why Campbell was not appointed?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Colonial Secretary stated before the select committee, when referring to the first ballot held in connection with the newly-constituted Police Benefit Fund Board, that the Government did not refuse to accept Campbell's election, but that they delayed the appointment, and that afterwards Campbell was transferred and could not be appointed. The Minister, in reply to a question, explained that the cause of the delay, was a matter touching a confidential file, in connection with which the Government were making certain investigations. 2, The reply given to the House on 22nd July, that "Cabinet considered it inadvisable to make the appointment," is not inconsistent with the foregoing statement. It was possible for Campbell to have promptly removed the cause of delay, but he did not choose to do so. Constable Campbell's transfer from Perth to Wickiepin, in the interests of the service, made it inadvisable, apart altogether from the unsatisfactory attitude which he had adopted, that he should be appointed to a board which is required to sit regularly in Perth. The specific reasons for the transfer were that Constable Campbell drafted a document in terms calculated to have a detrimental

effect on the discipline of the force; and he followed this up by declining, while in charge of the Leederville police station, to furnish the Registrar of Pensions with a report on an applicant for an old age pension. His transfer was effected as soon as possible after a suitable vacancy occurred. 3, Yes. 4, Yes. 5, No. 6, Campbell has nearly completed nineteen years' service. He has not been convicted of any act of misconduct against the discipline of the force, but the files show that for some years he has been in the habit of writing officially in an insubordinate tone, and in April last he wrote a report unwarrantably accusing a superior officer of making false and deceitful statements. For this conduct he was given the option of either withdrawing, apologising and expressing regret or of being removed from the force, and he accepted the former alternative. Two inspectors have made the following entry in his record sheet:—"Constable Campbell is undoubtedly efficient, but spoils his career by his antagonism to all authority and discipline." 7, No. There were five ballots. Of these, three were taken under a previous Administration. In the first two the nominations are not disclosed on the file, the papers being still under seal in the ballot-box. In the third ballot a majority of votes were cast in favour of Constable Campbell, but a majority of the contributors were not in favour of a change in the existing system. In the fourth ballot, Sergeant Moore and Constable Campbell were elected. In the fifth, Campbell's nomination was not accepted for reasons already stated, and Sergeant Leen was elected in his stead.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why fine him £20 a year?

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Nyabing-Pingrup Railway.
- 2, Cottesloe Municipal Rates Validation.

Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL.—ROAD CLOSURE.

Received from the Legislative Council, and read a first time.

BILL—KUKERIN-LAKE GRACE RAILWAY.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Authority to construct:

Mr. S. STUBBS: The Minister for Works assured the Lake Grace settlers that the line would be practically completed in July. I take it this line will be given preference in order of construction over the Nyabing-Pingrup line, the Bill for which has just been read a third time. Some 8,000 acres of wheat has been planted at Lake Grace in anticipation of the Minister's promise being carried into effect, and it will be utterly impossible for the settlers to profitably carry that wheat 31 miles, as they will have to do if the railway is not ready in time. I hope, therefore, the Minister will repeat his assurance that the line will be sufficiently far advanced in time to enable the grain to be handled.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It has already been made clear that the Lake Grace line will take precedence, for the reason that the settlers there have been in the district for a longer period, and have made developments far ahead of those in the other district. Preference is given to those who have the most produce to cart, and who have suffered the most disabilities in the past. I told the settlers at Pingrup that, if there were no difficulties in the way, the rails should be out in their district about July next; if, therefore, things go along quietly I have every reason to hope that that promise will be fulfilled. There is no doubt that both lines will be ready to be started somewhere about that time, but the Lake Grace line will, as I have said, have the preference.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 7—agreed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.

BILL—BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY.

In Committee.

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

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. WALKER—Kanowna) [4.50], in moving the second reading, said: I regret that this Bill has not come up from the printer. I believe, however, it is on its way. It is a Bill that scarcely needs to be put into type in order that hon. members may understand what it is. It will be within the memory of every hon. member that a little while ago I was requested by the leader of the Opposition to introduce this Bill.

Hon. Frank Wilson: When?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Some little time ago. In other words, I had the assurance of the leader of the Opposition that if the Bill were introduced his party would consider it upon the three elements of it that were suggested by a deputation which waited upon me. They did not pledge themselves to support every item that was there, but pledged themselves to refrain from introducing any new feature into the measure. The Bill, which I hope will be delivered to hon. members before I have concluded my brief speech on the matter, contains three features. The first is that it provides that all barmaids in employment and recognised as barmaids shall apply to be registered, and that a register shall be kept of them, if they have been employed three months prior to the time when the measure becomes law.

Mr. Monger: Will that be a fair way to treat them?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member will have a chance of giving his views upon that when the time comes. I am explaining now what the provisions of the measure are. I am not going to debate the clauses because that will be the proper function of the Committee

when the Bill arrives at the Committee stage. The Bill provides that all barmaids now existing, or existing three months prior to the measure becoming law, shall be registered, and that after the passing of the Bill no new barmaids shall be employed. It will practically, therefore, create a monopoly in that kind of service for those employed at the present time. The second proposal is that no one under the age of eighteen years shall be supplied with liquor in the hotels or at the bar counter. The last provision is that there shall be a referendum taken, under the Local Option provisions in regard to the hour of closing of hotels, and a large discretion will be given under the measure, as to the hour that shall be fixed for the closing of hotels.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about the area?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will cover the State of course, or the licensing districts; you can have your vote in the licensing districts.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You would not have two votes in the metropolitan area, I suppose?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Why two votes? You take whatever the licensing districts are. That, however, is a detail which can be discussed in Committee. The present legal hour for closing hotels, as everyone knows, is eleven o'clock. The question submitted to the voters will be "Do you desire that hotels shall close at six o'clock (as other businesses close), or at seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, or half-past eleven."

Mr. George: Or twelve.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We are fixing the longest hour at half an hour before midnight, on Saturday; we do not want them to run into Sunday morning. The voters, therefore, will have an opportunity of deciding what hours shall be fixed for the closing of hotels. These are all the points that are submitted in the Bill. Of course there are provisions for carrying out the vote, the registration of barmaids, and such things as may be considered to be machinery attendant upon the Bill. No new alterations to the Licensing Bill

beyond the scope I have indicated will be included in the proposal. I may say that it comes to me by way of a deputation from the united temperance bodies and churches in the State. I have every respect for this large section of the community, which represents a considerable share of the population. The deputation said that this was an instalment, a very small sort of hydropathic remedy, and was not intended to go the full length of temperance reform, but to meet what some may think are the necessities of the present situation. They imagine that all reforms must be carried out slowly and gradually, and that if you cannot have a whole loaf it is better to have half a loaf; and in that view they have submitted these measures to me and I have promised to submit them to the House. I made this definite promise, that I would not re-open the whole of the licensing law. Knowing how short the session was, and knowing too how debatable these temperance matters are, I set my face against discussing the whole question of licensing reform in the present session.

Mr. Foley: You could not prevent anyone moving a new clause if so desired.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I could not do that. Part of my understanding was that before I would consent to introduce the measure there should be an assurance given to me from all sections of the two Houses that there would be no going beyond the three definite elements of the measure in question. Unfortunately I have not had that assurance from either House.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have had it from this side.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have had the assurance of the leader of the Opposition only.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: As speaking for his party I agree. I understand there will be no attempt to go beyond the limits proposed by the opposition. I have not received that assurance from this side of the House,

nor have I received it from the Legislative Council. I have the assurance of a large number, some say a majority, in another place that they will not feel inclined to go beyond these proposals. Nevertheless I have no hesitation in submitting the measure to Parliament, and let Parliament take the consequences of whatever they do in the direction of either going on with the measure or causing me to drop it. I want it clearly and definitely to be understood that as I set my face against any proposals to go beyond this measure when I met the deputation, I do so now, and I do not consent to opening up the whole of the licensing question because it cannot properly be debated within the limited time at our disposal; and the reforms needed, I know to be needed, and which I heartily endorse, cannot be put into law at this fever pressure of the closing weeks of the last session of this Parliament, and more particularly shall I set my face against the introduction of new matter now because we are at a time when we have our thoughts diverted to matters of national importance that require our immediate attention and must take up the whole of our calm deliberations. Therefore I am more averse to dealing with matters that cannot be dealt with adequately at a time like this. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As to adjournment of Debate.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Where is the Bill, it is not here?

The Attorney General: It is on its way. Under the circumstances I cannot do other than give the hon. member the adjournment of the debate. The Bill should be here. It is the printer's delay.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I think we should have to adjourn the debate anyhow.

The Deputy Speaker: The second reading of the Bill cannot be passed without the Bill being here.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion passed, the debate adjourned.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath—Avon) [5-2] in moving the second reading said: This measure is to all intents and purposes the same as that which was introduced during the last session, with the amendments that were carried by the Legislative Assembly after discussion, and with two or three trivial amendments which were submitted by the Executive Council of the Fruit Growers' Association and accepted by me and embodied in the Bill. The only provision inserted in the Bill while going through this Chamber last session, and which has been dropped from this measure, is that one dealing with appeals, and the Crown Law authorities say that the provision is altogether unnecessary, that there is power already existing in our legislation for the right of appeal, and therefore it is only making an unnecessary provision by inserting such a clause in the measure. The Bill provides for very necessary amendments of what is known as the Insect Pests Act, 1895, amendments which experience in its administration have proved to be absolutely necessary for the prevention of disease in our orchards, and the further amendment of an alteration of the name of that measure to the more comprehensive and suggestive one of the Plant Diseases Bill. It was stated by an hon. member in another place that this Bill had been promised in the session of 1912, but I wish to state here that is altogether inaccurate. It is true that the officers charged with the administration of that particular branch of the Agricultural Department have for many years, in the time of my predecessor, Mr. Mitchell, and since, urged the necessity for an amendment of that measure, because it was found altogether inadequate, but I made no promise of the Bill in 1912 because I recognised that if the administration of Mr. Moody and his officers was to be effective it must have the hearty co-operation of the fruit growers of the State, because it is particularly designed to act in their interests, and, recognising

that fact, I was not prepared to introduce the measure until I had some assurance from the fruit growers that they approved of the provisions of the Bill, because that approval was essential to secure their co-operation to carry out its provisions. When I introduced the Bill last session I had every reason to believe the great body of the fruit growers were in accord with the Bill; that they were desirous of having it placed on the statute-book at the earliest opportunity. I had good reasons for that because at the various conferences the amendments which have been inserted in the measure had been asked for. It is true, not in one lot, but they had given their approval from time to time in the various conferences. It was on the information derived then, and the experience of the officers of the department in their actual work that the Bill was drafted. Unfortunately I find now that while the body of the fruit growers were desirous of the measure being put through, it appears the ex-president of the association had used his influence—certainly with a member of another place, and I believe, with members of this House, asking that they should oppose the Bill.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I did not hear that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I understood he had written to the member for Northam.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The ex-president of the association. I understood that, but certainly a member of another place has stated that he was written to, or approached, by the ex-president of the association and asked to oppose the Bill. Since then the Fruit Growers' Association, or the executive, appointed a committee to go through the measure as submitted last session. As I have already stated they suggested certain small amendments, and these were submitted to the executive council and approved, and a deputation representing the executive council waited on the Hon. Mr. Angwin, in my absence, and asked that the Bill be given effect to this session. I then pointed out that

we did not propose to submit a large number of measures, and that it was already too late if we were to assume that the opposition that was met with last session would again be brought forward and I was not prepared to introduce it. They assured me that they had made representations to those likely to be interested in this Chamber and in another place asking them to give the Bill a speedy passage through Parliament. Under these circumstances I agreed to submit the measure, and it is in accordance with that promise the measure is before members to-day. I explained the various provisions of this Bill at considerable length when I introduced the measure last session, therefore I do not propose to go over the same ground, but to briefly summarise the provisions of the measure. We take power to deal with abandoned orchards which are found to be a menace to the active commercial fruit-grower, because they harbour diseases, and they constitute a breeding ground from which diseases are disseminated through the orchards of the State. We also seek to secure power to enforce the collection and cleaning up of decayed and fallen fruit. We ask for power to enforce the stripping of non-commercial fruits which act as a carry over for the fruit fly, which is a menace to the soft fruit industry in many districts adjacent to Perth. We ask for power to prevent the use of and storage or carriage within the State of second-hand cases or bags, and we ask for power to enforce the destruction of prunings. This provision has been modified at the request of the Fruit Growers' Association, and we now provide that prunings in orchards should be burnt within fourteen days after notice has been served by an officer of the department, although those prunings may not be infested. This provision has been inserted to give the officers the necessary power to cope with the practice of dumping prunings on waste ground.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They have to give notice now, have they not?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. We also take a very necessary power,

and this is one of the most important in my opinion, to encourage owners, as well as occupiers, as the responsible persons, where notices are served to prevent action under the measure. These represent the alterations made in the original measure. I feel that sufficient has been said by those engaged in the industry who are most affected to emphasise the necessity of the measure. I am anxious that as far as possible we should afford this protection, and enable those who year by year are courageously and scientifically fighting the disease to render that assistance to the department which will enable them to bring the neglectful grower up to the mark. It may be urged that some of the powers are drastic, but members will realise that it is only by securing such powers that the officers of the department will be able to act, and the mere fact that we seek to secure what members may regard as arbitrary powers should be taken into mind coincident with the fact that the Government are not desirous of unduly harassing, and are not desirous of inflicting injustice on them, but are actuated by the one motive of helping to protect and encourage the industry which has become so important a part of the primary production, and Mr. Moody and his officers will assist the growers with advice and assistance to promote the industry, believing it to be such an important part in the development of Western Australia. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam) [5-15]: It would have been much better for the Minister to have postponed the consideration of the second reading stage of the Bill. It will be recognised that the measure is of some concern to the fruit-growers of the State, who represent an important industry. All members desire to afford the fruitgrowers every possible measure of protection, but we have to do what is fair by all the people engaged in the industry. The Minister has told us that there is some divided opinion even amongst the fruitgrowers themselves on this question, and if we postpone the Committee stage until,

say, next week, we might have the opportunity of securing an expression of the views of the fruitgrowers in regard to the various clauses.

The Minister for Lands: They have had it before them and they have asked us to push it through.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I can understand that a section of the fruitgrowers have asked for certain amendments, but the question is whether they have seen the Bill as it is before the House now.

The Minister for Lands: It has been before their committee and their executive council. They are in conference now and they are quite satisfied with the action which has been taken.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Of course we take the Minister's word, but I remember discussing the matter with a fruitgrower recently and I know that the Bill as printed had not been in his hands, because he then suggested some amendments which he thought ought to be made. The Minister has told us that the right of appeal is provided under some other Act, but we ought to know which Act that is.

The Minister for Lands: The Crown Law Department have informed me that there is that provision.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister is satisfied, I know, with that assurance but he should be in a position to inform us under which Act the appeal can be made.

The Minister for Lands: In the ordinary procedure.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But under what Act? It would be a simple matter for the Minister to ask the Crown Law Department, because we know that sometimes we have found that they are not right. The question of appeal is important and we should be clear that it is provided for before we agree to the Bill. We must be careful not to go too far even at the request of the fruitgrowers who sat in conference. We know that the fruitgrower has received encouragement and we also know that while many grow fruit commercially, others grow it for their own use, and we should see in the framing of legislation that even the small grower is sufficiently

protected. From what I can see of the proposed amendments they aim at the non-commercial grower. I agree that the small man can be a serious menace to the man who grows for commercial purposes because of the fact that his orchard is not sufficiently valuable to encourage him to go to any expense to keep out disease. The Minister has touched upon the question of the fruit fly, which of course is a troublesome pest. One fruitgrower suggested to me recently that in some districts it would be advisable to make it impossible to grow figs, because they were a late fruit and carried over the fly very readily. We recognise that the fly is here and eradication as far as possible has to be faced, but we have not only the fruit fly. There are other diseases and the House should agree to legislation which will have the effect which we all desire. The grower should not only be protected from the spread of disease, but I think he should be protected, if it is possible in a Bill of this kind, from unscrupulous nurserymen who sell trees that are not true to name. I have had some experience in this matter and I know on account of the action of some of these nurserymen that the loss to the State has been considerable. Trees which were supposed to bear fruit which was suitable for export were found after years of trouble to give a fruit which was quite unsuitable for that purpose. That kind of thing should be prevented by Act of Parliament. The Minister will no doubt say that the grower has his remedy against the nurseryman, but it will be readily understood that if the grower did attempt to recover from the nurseryman, he would have a very hard task. Considerable loss has been occasioned to the State through this kind of unscrupulous dealing. There is a provision in the Bill which I think will work a hardship. It is proposed to forbid the growing of young trees near an orchard. I think the Minister will find that in one case there are thousands of young trees near an orchard that has been planted for some years. I would like to know what the Minister proposes to do in cases of that sort. I can quite understand

it is advisable that young trees should be as far distant as possible from old and diseased trees, but we want to meet cases as they stand to-day. Then again there will have to be a provision to make it impossible for nurserymen to plant trees near a boundary fence over which there may be growing a valuable orchard. It will have to be determined that the grower of the orchard is to be protected against the nurseryman. I have no objection to the proposals as contained in the Bill, and in Committee we can deal with the several matters to which I have referred. I hope the Committee stage will be delayed until next week in order that all concerned may have an opportunity of expressing an opinion of the various provisions.

The Minister for Lands: The fruit-growers have gone through it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There can be no hurry for a week.

The Minister for Lands: I told them I could not introduce it if I thought it was likely to be discussed or objected to.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister knows that they could give him no guarantee. However, I do not wish to embarrass the Minister. I am only concerned about getting a reasonable measure through. I will support the second reading.

Mr. TURVEY (Swan) [5-26]: I am surprised at the member for Northam asking that the matter should be delayed, when we remember that another place last session took the opportunity of offering as an excuse for the rejection of the Bill its late introduction into that House. Possibly if a delay occurs now we will have the Legislative Council offering the same excuse. I am pleased to hear from the member for Northam his denial that he did receive any request from any representative of the Fruit-growers' Association to oppose the Bill that was introduced last session. Mr. Colebatch referring to the measure in another place last session said he was swayed by the opinion of the people outside the House.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We are discussing this Bill now.

Mr. TURVEY: This Bill is practically the same as that of last session. There are only one or two minor amendments. When one considers the importance of the measure to the fruitgrowers the amendments which have been introduced are very small. One hon. member in another place said distinctly last session when supporting a motion that it should be read that day six months, that he had been requested to do so by the Fruitgrowers' Association. I have yet to learn that the Fruitgrowers' Association requested any member either of this House or another place to oppose the Bill as it was introduced last session. I hope the member for Northam, together with his colleagues here and in another place, will tell the people of the State who were the representatives of the Fruit-growers' Association who asked for the defeat of the Bill last session. I am satisfied the fruitgrowers throughout the State welcome the introduction of the measure. It is a well known fact that we have in many fruit-growing districts unfortunate people, possibly terming themselves orchardists but who are nothing but a menace to the established orchardists of this State. They take up holdings, plant a few trees, and then sadly neglect them. In the Swan electorate there are many neglected orchards, and so far the inspectors have not the power to do what they would like and what the fruitgrowers would like them to do. When this Bill is placed on the statute-book the inspectors will have that power. At present the neglected and abandoned orchards to which I refer are nothing but breeding grounds for all the pests that infest orchards. When one considers the importance of the fruit growing industry, it is time this House took some action to save the industry from being utterly wiped out. It is not generally recognised by the people what havoc the pest known as the fruit fly plays in the industry. I know of orchards from which not a case of fruit can be sent to the market because of the havoc wrought by this particular pest, and until we can cope with the orchardists who are so neglectful as not to take any interest in their own

holdings or to show any care for their neighbours, we will never remedy it. About 25,000 acres in Western Australia is planted with various kinds of fruit trees, exclusive of the acreage under vines, and the total value of the crop amounts to about £300,000 a year. Therefore, it will be realised that this is an industry worth caring for. The orchardists of Western Australia have gained a reputation on the London and Continental markets, and it is one of which they might be proud, but if they are to maintain their reputation and the high prices they have been obtaining, it is essential in the interests of the industry that every precaution should be taken to protect the genuine orchardist, the man who is there to make a living and not the man who has taken it up solely as a pastime, or the man who has a week-end orchard in the hills. These are the men who are a menace to the industry; many of them seem to think it is sufficient to cultivate their orchards once a year and prune possibly every two years. I am glad that provision is made in the Bill to enforce the proper destruction of the prunings and the collection of decayed and fallen fruits. In the past this has been one of the methods by which many of the pests have been introduced and have been allowed to breed and spread through the orchards. Provision is also made to deal with second-hand fruit cases. It has been proved that many a clean orchard has had a pest such as the fruit fly introduced through the medium of second-hand cases, and I am glad the Minister seeks in this measure to prevent their use except under very stringent conditions. The fruit case industry is one which might well receive the consideration of the Government in connection with their timber industry, and possibly in connection with the State sawmills. I would like the Minister to give a trial to some of our local timbers for the manufacture of fruit cases. Speaking to one of the biggest exporters of fruit from this State, he assured me that for export the case he would prefer is that made of jarrah or red gum.

Mr. Lander : What about karri ?

Mr. TURVEY : Karri is not grown in the district to which I refer. I regard this gentleman as one of the most practical orchardists in the State, and a man whose statement can be relied on. He favours jarrah and red gum cases for export purposes. This being so, probably the Government could make some use of the waste timber at the sawmills. At any rate I would like the Government to give it a trial. There is a prejudice in many quarters against local timbers for this purpose, but the fruit growing industry is a big one, and it will grow very much bigger and become one of the most important industries in the State. As it increases in importance, so will the number of fruit cases required increase, and so will it be all the more necessary for the Government to take action in this direction. The Fruit Commissioner, Mr. Moody, and his staff of officers, are deserving of the thanks of the people for the efficient manner in which they coped with the recent outbreak of codlin moth at Katanning. Codlin moth is an orchard pest which is prevalent in the Eastern States. It has been known in Western Australia on previous occasions and has been definitely stamped out. The recent outbreak at Katanning was looked upon as a very serious one. Many orchardists were greatly alarmed, but Mr. Moody and his expert officers took very prompt and decisive action, and they have completely checked the spread of codlin moth. The most dreaded pest which the orchardists of this State have to complain of at the present time is the fruit fly, and I believe the passing of this measure will in a great degree help to bring about the eradication of this pest. The hon. member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) said while believing it is necessary to protect the man engaged in the orchard industry for commercial purposes, some protection should be given to the small man or the man who likes to sit under his own vine or fig tree. I agree with the hon. member to a certain extent, but unfortunately we find this individual too careless. He may enjoy the shade of his fig tree, but so far from attempting to keep it clean and

prevent it from becoming a menace to surrounding orchards, we find him only too delinquent. I regard, not the small orchardist but the man who has a few fruit trees around his house in a horticultural district, as the man who who requires watching most closely. The man engaged in the industry as a commercial pursuit, is as a rule, only too careful to keep his orchard clean. He knows only too well what it means if he neglects his orchard or allows his trees to become diseased. Consequently, as he has to make a living from his orchard, he exercises every precaution to keep it as free from disease as he possibly can. But the man who has one or two trees about his house very often takes little or no care, and in the horticultural districts it is the man with a few trees and not for commercial purposes, who is the most dangerous so far as the industry is concerned. I recognise with the hon. member for Northam, that there are certain slight modifications required in this Bill, but, taking the measure as a whole, it is one which will be welcomed by fruit-growers from one end of the State to the other. Too long have they been suffering owing to the absence of such a measure as this. Too long have they been allowed to suffer from the consequences of the careless individual who takes absolutely no interest in his orchard. So far as other industries are concerned every precaution is taken to protect them. Unfortunately, in the horticultural industry, little or no precaution has been taken beyond that already adopted by the inspectors who in the past have not had sufficient power. This Bill will give them the power they desire. I think Mr. Moody has under him a staff of very competent and efficient inspectors, and once they are given the power embodied in this Bill, I believe they will see that the individuals who have been so careless in the past are brought to book, and when this is done it will have a beneficial effect on the industry of this State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time. . .

BILL—OSBORNE PARK TRAMWAYS PURCHASE.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, and reported without amendment.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Report adopted.

BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Ivanhoe) [5·45] in moving the second reading said: The Bill which is now submitted to hon. members is exactly on all fours with the Act already on the statute book. It is necessary to introduce this measure in accordance with Land and Income Tax Assessment Act. There is really no difference whatever between the existing Act and this Bill, which merely re-imposes the tax for the year ending on the 30th June, 1915. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [5·46]: On the assurance of the Premier that this Bill is a copy of last years' Bill, which I believe it is—

The Premier: Yes, exactly.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not see that any exception can be taken to it, because the Government must have this Bill in order to levy the taxes. Therefore, I do not propose to offer any objection to it at all.

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—REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister—North-East Fremantle) [5·50]

in moving the second reading said: This Bill has been before hon. members for several days, and they will have observed that it merely proposes certain amendments of the principal Act. The Bill makes provision that the Governor may by Order-in-Council vest in the Registrar General powers which are now exercised by the Governor-in-Council, for the appointment of deputy and district registrars to act for the Registrar General in various parts of the State. As hon. members are aware, many persons are appointed to act as registrars who are not connected with the public service; and these persons occasionally change their residence, and therefore it is necessary that on the occurrence of such an event someone should be immediately appointed to carry out the duties of the registrar. It has been found that inconvenience has been occasioned owing to the length of time which necessarily elapses before an appointment can be made by the Governor-in-Council, and there have been complaints in regard to the carrying out of the Act by deputy registrars before their appointment had been regularised by the approval of the Governor-in-Council. Sometimes, in such instances, deputy registrars have to sign legal documents, and, their appointments not having received the approval of the Governor-in-Council, the signing of documents by such deputy registrars is illegal. The present Bill proposes to overcome that difficulty by vesting in the Registrar General, by order of the Governor-in-Council, the necessary power of appointment. Then the Bill proposes to increase the time allowed for the registration of births from 14 days to 60 days. At present there is some difficulty in regard to the length of time allowed for registration. A child may be registered prior to baptism, and then when the child is baptised the parents may feel inclined to add a further name, and consequently they are compelled to have the registration altered in order that this may coincide with the baptismal names. The difficulty will be overcome by allowing 60 days for the purpose of registra-

tion instead of 14. Further, the Bill provides, with regard to registration of deaths, to do away with the necessity for making a declaration which arises under the existing Act if the time limit of 14 days has expired. In this large State it happens occasionally that people die hundreds of miles from the office of any registrar, and difficulty is experienced in registering the death within the period of 14 days. Therefore, it is thought advisable that the registrar, if he is satisfied with all the particulars placed before him, may dispense with any declaration on the subject. Then there are one or two amendments of minor importance, really of typographical errors. Again, the Bill proposes an alteration whereby a person who refuses to register may be not merely penalised in accordance with the existing Act for such failure, but also compelled to make the registration, the court being empowered to order that registration shall take place. Under the Act as it stands to-day, a person failing to register can be brought before the court and penalised, but there is no power to order such a person to carry out the registration; and the present Bill provides that the court may order him to carry out the registration, and a penalty attaches for failure to obey the order. The last clause of the Bill refers to the Adoption of Children Act, 1896, and provides that the person adopting a child may add his name to that of the child adopted. This will afford a chance of tracing the child. You, Sir, for example might adopt a child of the name of Thomson and perhaps the name of Holman might then be conferred on the child instead of Thomson; and under the Bill the power would be conferred on you of having the name Holman added to the registration name of Thomson, and thus facilities would be given for tracing the child. Hon. members will see that the Bill merely proposes to remove certain small difficulties experienced in connection with the administration of existing Acts. It has already been approved by another place, and I trust hon. members of this House

will pass it without amendment. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex) [5-56]: After the lucid explanation of this measure by the Honorary Minister, I think members will agree to expedite the passage of the Bill through Committee. The Bill seems to have many desirable features, which have been concisely laid before the House by the Honorary Minister, and not the least desirable of these features is that to which the hon. gentleman referred last. Another place has passed the measure, and therefore it ought to be all that is good. I will assist the Honorary Minister to pass the measure through Committee without amendment, as he has requested.

In Committee.

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

ADJOURNMENT—NON-CONTENTIOUS MATTERS.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan—Ivanhoe) [5-59]: In moving the adjournment of the House, may I explain that those items which we have postponed, we have postponed deliberately, for the reason that we thought it inadvisable at this juncture to introduce controversial matters? The Government have restricted themselves to bringing forward matters which are essential, and with respect to which there is no disagreement between parties. I move—

That the House do now adjourn.
Question passed.

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 5th August, 1914.

	Page
Ministerial Statement, War between Britain and Germany	804
Standing Orders Suspension	804
Bills: Supply (Temporary Advances) £230,830, 2s., 6d., 3s.	804
Osborne Park Tramways Purchase, 1s.	805
Registrations of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Act Amendment, returned	805
Land and Income Tax, all stages	805
Busselton-Margaret River Railway, 1s.	805
Kutur-in-Lake Grace Railway, 1s.	805
Adjournment, Urgent Legislation	806
Motion, Loyalty to King and Empire	807

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4-30 p.m., and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—WAR BETWEEN BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4-56]: It is my intention to ask the House to deal only with the Supply Bill and with the Land and Income Tax Bill to-day. The Empire is confronted with a war of vast magnitude, and I do not think it would be seemly to ask hon. gentlemen to give their attention to ordinary legislation.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4-57]: I move—
That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill (Temporary Advances) £230,830, and the Land and Income Tax Bill to pass all their stages at the present sitting.

The PRESIDENT: I find that there is present an absolute majority of the Council, which is necessary for the purpose of this motion.

Question put and passed.

BILL—SUPPLY (TEMPORARY ADVANCES), £230,830.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4-58]: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I wish to point out that it is not a Supply Bill in