

that we have lost two-thirds of our crops in certain districts of Western Australia for the want of essential drainage. The producers have borne the cost for manure, ploughing, putting in the crop, harvesting and garnering and yet for the want of essential drainage, they lose two-thirds of the crop every year. Is that point stressed by the Agricultural Department? Have our officers paid attention to that aspect? I regret that there is no item provided in the Estimates for agricultural drainage. Two years ago that point was stressed here and the necessity for stressing the point remains to-day. We cannot afford to continue along these lines and we cannot afford to continue losing two-thirds of our crop every year. The Government should pay serious attention to these essential requirements of the South-West.

Progress reported.

BILL—PERTH HEBREW CONGREGATION LANDS.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Message received notifying that the Council had agreed to the Assembly's request for modification.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 8th November at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 8th November, 1921.

	Page
Select Committee, Wyndham Meat Works and State Shipping Service, extension of time ...	1525
Questions: Nornalup district	
Straits Settlements Government and Hon. J. Scaddan ...	1525
Agricultural Halls, subsidies ...	1525
Railways, appointment of assistant engineer...	1526
Motions: Education Commission Report ...	1529
Government's financial proposals ...	1533
Bills: Permanent Reserve (Point Walker), Recom. Building Societies, Assembly's Message ...	1529
Constitution Acts Amendment, 2a. ...	1535
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2a., Com. ...	1536
Mining Act Amendment, 2a. ...	1539
Gold Buyers, 2a. ...	1541
Stallions, 2a. ...	1542

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

SELECT COMMITTEE — WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS AND STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, the time for bringing up the committee's report extended to the 22nd November.

QUESTION—NORNALUP DISTRICT.

Hon. J. DUFFELL asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay upon the Table of the House the report recently furnished by the Conservator of Forests, the Surveyor General, Mr. Surveyor Camm, and Mr. W. A. Saw on the Nornalup district?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION laid upon the Table the report referred to.

QUESTION—STRAITS SETTLEMENTS GOVERNMENT AND HON. J. SCADDAN.

Hon. A. SANDERSON asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay on the Table the correspondence referred to in the file relating to the invitation by the Straits Settlements Government to the Hon. J. Scaddan, laid on the Table on the 20th instant?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION laid upon the Table the correspondence referred to.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL HALLS, SUBSIDIES.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Minister for Education: 1, Was it the rule some years ago that, when a community in the agricultural areas were desirous of erecting a hall, the Government provided a subsidy of £1 for each £1 subscribed by the community?

2, Is this rule still in existence? 3, If not, when was it abrogated? 4, Have the Government subscribed any sums for agricultural halls since the date of such abrogation? 5, If so, how much and to whom? 6, In how many cases have applications for advances been made and refused?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, At the outbreak of war in August, 1914, the Government of the day decided that all luxuries, even though they verged on necessities like agricultural halls, must stand in abeyance until the war was over. 4, Yes. 5, List attached.

Grants made to Agricultural Halls.

Name of Hall.	Date of Application.	Amount Paid.	Date of Payment.
		£ s. d.	
Baandee, North, Agricultural Hall ...	25-7-13	169 11 4	14-8-14
Bellevue Mechanics' Institute ...	27-2-15	29 7 0	20-5-15
Benjabbering Agricultural Hall ...	24-6-14	86 0 0	19-1-15
Bobalong Agricultural Hall ...	12-11-12	55 0 0	21-9-14
Highbury Agricultural Hall ...	22-6-14	31 0 0	18-7-14
Holyoake Agricultural Hall ...	8-6-14	196 0 0	6-3-15
Jandakot Agricultural Hall ...	8-15	25 0 0	15-9-14
Kwolyin Agricultural Hall ...	3-8-14	76 0 0	5-12-14
Minnevale Agricultural Hall ...	29-7-14	114 0 0	18-8-14
Mt. Malcolm Agricultural Hall ...	16-11-14	80 0 0	18-5-15
Nannup Agricultural Hall ...	1-9-14	105 0 0	9-11-14
Nannup Agricultural Hall ...	8-11-15	43 10 0	14-12-15
Wyalmouring (Oak Park) Agricultural Hall ...	25-4-14	184 0 0	23-9-14
Redcliffe Public Hall ...	7-11-11	250 0 0	21-6-15
Rushy Pool Agricultural Hall ...	16-4-14	123 0 0	20-8-14
Wattle Grove Public Hall ...	21-5-14	69 0 0	25-8-14
Collie - Cardiff Agricultural Hall ...	8-9-15	156 0 0	23-9-15
Jarrardale Mechanics' Institute ...	23-7-16	14 0 0	4-9-16
Kukeria Public Hall ...	19-8-15	50 0 0	24-1-16
Lakeside Mechanics' Institute ...	21-12-15	84 0 0	4-1-16
Lakeside Mechanics' Institute ...	30-9-16	42 16 0	15-6-17
Lakeside Mechanics' Institute ...	7-7-15	50 0 0	2-2-16
Lakeside Mechanics' Institute ...	4-7-16	50 0 0	1-2-17
Westonia Miners and Mechanics' Institute ...	21-3-16	58 10 0	4-4-16
Wooroloo Public Hall ...	29-9-15	25 0 0	18-10-15
Ida H. Workers' Hall ...	9-6-15	50 0 0	17-4-16
Kukeria Public Hall ...	9-6-15	50 0 0	18-7-16
Kurrawang Institute ...	21-12-15	84 0 0	4-1-16
Yallingup Agricultural Hall ...	30-9-16	42 10 0	15-6-17
Yallingup Agricultural Hall ...	1-9-16	75 0 0	25-9-16
Calligirl Agricultural Hall ...	8-12-14	50 0 0	23-3-17
Mingenew Agricultural Hall ...	12-6-16	100 0 0	21-5-16
Smith's Mill Agricultural Hall ...	7-12-17	150 0 0	18-6-18
Yalup Brook Agricultural Hall ...	11-6-17	16 0 0	1-8-17
Yalup Brook Agricultural Hall ...	14-8-17	77 0 0	22-1-17
Yalup Brook Agricultural Hall ...	14-8-17	12 0 0	11-6-18
Allanson Public Hall ...	18-7-18	50 0 0	1-1-20
Boscobel Agricultural Hall ...	10-9-18	50 0 0	13-5-20
Coolup, Central, Agricultural Hall ...	11-8-14	125 0 0	30-6-20
Capel Agricultural Hall ...	23-1-11	40 0 0	17-3-16
Capel Agricultural Hall ...	23-1-11	40 0 0	30-6-20

* £16 paid by Department to reduce the Bank overdraft to £210.

Grants made to Agricultural Halls—continued.

Name of Hall.	Date of Application.	Amount Paid.	Date of Payment.
		£ s. d.	
Doodlakine Agricultural Hall ...	28-8-12	150 0 0	16-4-20
Hutt Agricultural Hall ...	11-1-19	30 0 0	2-10-19
Ogilvie Agricultural Hall ...	8-5-16	50 0 0	29-10-19
Upper, Preston, Agricultural Hall ...	25-8-18	20 0 0	8-5-20
Serpentine Agricultural Hall ...	23-7-13	50 0 0	21-6-20
Tenterden Agricultural Hall ...	6-12-20	25 0 0	8-5-21
Tunney Agricultural Hall ...	21-2-20	50 0 0	8-7-20
Yuna Agricultural Hall ...	19-11-19	40 0 0	8-5-20
Burracoppin Agricultural Hall ...	18-3-18	50 0 0	8-5-20
Clifton Agricultural Hall ...	27-9-11	210 15 1	15-2-21
Dandaup North Agricultural Hall ...	3-5-21	65 0 0	2-6-21
Dwellingup Agricultural Hall ...	22-4-20	30 0 0	30-6-20
Grass Valley Agricultural Hall ...	8-5-12	100 0 0	8-20
Karragullen Agricultural Hall ...	6-7-14	150 0 0	22-9-20
Pingelly East (Nakder Memorial Hall) ...	9-10-14	100 0 0	22-12-20
Warren River Agricultural Hall ...	10-5-20	50 0 0	10-3-21
Cherry Tree Pool (School and Hall) ...	16-3-14	40 0 0	6-8-20
	20-10-19	69 0 0	17-11-20

† Building destroyed by fire; used as a school.

‡ Department advanced the sum of £175 for the purchase of this building; £75 to be refunded by the Committee. Up to date there is still an amount of £15 owing by the Committee.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT ENGINEER.

Hon. A. H. PANTON asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay on the Table of the House the papers in connection with the appointment of the assistant engineer of the chief mechanical branch of the Railways?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION laid upon the Table the papers referred to.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (POINT WALTER).

Re-committal.

On motion by Hon. R. J. LYNN, Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering the proviso to Clause 2.

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

Clause 2—Authority to lease:

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Under the proviso the area to be leased must be at least 100 yards from the foreshore. I move an amendment—

That "yards" be struck out and "feet" inserted in lieu.

The Melville Road Board, controlling the reserve, are unanimously of opinion that a distance of 100 feet will fully protect the rights of the people. They have a lease prepared for a term of five years. The

document contains a clause giving the Cabinet power to refuse to renew that lease. So, if any injustice at all be done by the leasing of a site 100 feet from the foreshore, it can be remedied after the expiration of the five years lease. It is believed by the members of the board that the proposed building will not be gone on with if it has to be 100 yards from the foreshore. The board has spent considerable money on the reserve during the last two years, large crowds of people visit the place almost every night in summer time, and, of course, on all holidays, and it is considered essential that further accommodation for the public should be provided. In view of their long experience of the conditions at the reserve, the members of the board are well qualified to say whether any injustice is likely to be done by the amendment. As I have said, they are of opinion that unless the building can be erected at a point just beyond the 100 feet mark from the foreshore, it will not be erected at all.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: It seems a very short distance.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: If the Committee decide that the building must be 100 yards back, it might just as well be decided that it shall be 500 yards back, for any site 100 yards from the foreshore would be utterly impracticable.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I hope hon. members will not agree to the amendment. When last the Bill was before us, the Committee were unanimously of opinion that for at least 100 yards from the water the foreshore should be reserved for the people. No fresh information has been produced in support of the amendment. The hon. member says that unless the building can be erected at a point 100 feet from the foreshore it will not be erected at all. However that may be, it cannot be denied that there is plenty of room for such a building 100 yards from the foreshore. Of course, a site 100 yards back would not be nearly so valuable to the lessee as the site he desires, only 100 feet from the water. There is no good reason why the proposed refreshment room should not be as far back from the water as are the two buildings already there. The refreshment rooms already established at Point Walter had to be built more than 100 yards from the foreshore, and any other building should have to go a similar distance. If the public want a glass of spot lager or a cup of tea, it is not too much to ask them to walk 100 yards to get it. I told the Chairman of the Melville Road Board I intended to oppose this matter because I held the opinion that we should not take any part of the foreshore away from the people. If the concession is given in this case it will have to be given in other cases. It is not so much a matter of convenience to the public with the Road Board, as it is a desire on the part of the

board to get £2 a week rent from the land in question.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: When the matter was previously before the House I suggested that in making the limit 100 yards we were going too far. I do not know if Mr. Baglin is concerned so much about the rights of the people, or about the interests of one or two parties who have already established refreshment rooms at Point Walter. The rights of the people must be considered. I fail to see that these rights will be interfered with in any way by the amendment. If the limit is placed at 100 yards it will certainly mean the building will have to go back two or three hundred yards because of the contour of the country. For this reason the Melville Road Board object to the proviso that has been added to the Bill. It is true the board hope to make revenue out of the land, but all the money so derived will be spent on the reserve for the benefit of the people. I cannot see why the board should be precluded from obtaining revenue in this way. Unless the site is a favourable one they cannot hope to get that revenue. I have the assurance of the Chairman and Secretary of the Road Board that the members of the board are unanimous in this matter, and I intend to support the amendment.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The distance of 100 feet is too short. We should preserve the foreshore of the river to the utmost extent for the public who use it to-day, and for the public who will want to use it in the future. Buildings should not be erected so close to the foreshore as to be within 100 feet of it. That would leave but little room for children or their parents to make use of the shore along the river.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot support the amendment. The interests of the people must be considered. Some time in the future, no doubt, roadways will be built from Perth to Fremantle running along both sides of the river, and if it is rendered possible for a person to put up a building 100 feet from the foreshore at this point it may break the continuity of the road at that place. We should be making a great mistake if we passed the amendment. Once the site is granted vested interests may make it difficult to take it away again.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: It is usual to reserve a width of a chain along the foreshore of the river. In the present instance a chain and a half would be reserved. This ought to be quite sufficient. After hearing all sides of the question I intend to support the amendment, because in my opinion sufficient reserve would be left for the public.

Hon. R. J. LYNN. Some years ago Point Walter was all sand, but to-day it is a beautiful spot. The Melville Road Board are spending hundreds of pounds in water alone, and have incurred a liability of approximately £30,000 in the construction of a tramway to Point Walter. The reserve is bril-

liantly lighted, and there is ample provision for the comfort and convenience of the people. The interest and sinking fund on the outlay upon the trams is not being paid to-day owing to the high cost of maintaining the reserve. Because of that fact the Board should be enabled to make some revenue out of the reserve and be assisted in this way to still further improve the area.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I oppose the amendment. While I agree with Mr. Lynn that the Melville Road Board has done much to improve Point Walter, which, in my opinion, is now the most popular resort along the river frontage, the board is now endeavouring to undo the good it did in the past. I was at this particular spot on the occasion of the annual inspection. At that time, it was proposed to put a dance hall on the site. I informed the representatives of the road board that my vote would never be given in favour of the granting of a permit for a building to be erected on such a site. There is a small margin of beach and land running up to the steep hillside at Point Walter and the point where the building is proposed to be erected is the best spot at Point Walter, with shallow water fronting it, enabling children to paddle out for some distance. There is not a great breadth of beach and the Committee should not take away any of the foreshore available now. When I gained my first sight of Sydney harbour a little while ago, I was astonished to note how the beauty of the harbour had been spoilt by the buildings going down to the water's edge. That sight proved to me the necessity for retaining as much as possible of the Swan river frontage. I hope the question of finance will not enter into the discussion and that members will decide by their vote on the amendment, that the question will be determined in the interests of the people as a whole, and not in the interests of the road board so that it may receive another £100 a year. I admit the road board is actuated from the best of motives. The board asked me to support this particular amendment. I will not vote in favour of any such amendment which will take away the rights of the people along the river frontage. I understand it is now proposed to wedge the building in between the shade trees as far as possible, but probably, if the building should be erected, some of the trees will have to come down. If the people of Fremantle and East Fremantle, in particular, knew what was going on, there would be a hue and cry in protest against the proposed action. I regret the road board has taken up this attitude, making it practically one of finance.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I oppose the amendment. Ever since I have been in the House, I have opposed such proposals as the one under consideration. Last year there was such a Bill dealing with Rottneest and fortunately the Government dropped it. If members agree to the proposal under discussion, we will have the same thing coming

before us in connection with other parts of the river frontages, such as Crawley and Keane's Point. There is a considerable amount of opposition to the existing bowling greens, lawn tennis courts, croquet lawns, and so on, because of the fact that large portions of reserves are fenced off for these pleasure resorts. Ratepayers cannot gain admittance because they are told the reserves are full. I am aware that if the ratepayers liked to insist upon their rights they could gain admission to the bowling greens and so on, but most people do not like to push their rights to that extent. It would be a sad mistake to allow river frontages to be given away as it is proposed to do at Point Walter. It may not be generally known that the water frontages along the river have been taken away by Act of Parliament, and at present, any road board desiring to make a road may fill in a chain along the foreshore and thus the river frontage reverts to the public.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: If the amendment were made to provide for a distance of three chains back, I would support it. The amendment involves a greater question than the simple one we are considering. The Committee would be wise to consider what would be a reasonable depth of foreshore to protect in the interests of the public. I maintain that three chains would be the best width to protect and I would support a proposal of that sort. It may not be in our time, but in the future there will be beautiful drives and plantations around the river and if an alignment of three chains were stipulated people would know that that was the line of demarcation laid down.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The Leader of the House said that he did not know whether I was concerned about the interests of the present lessees or about the public. There was no warrant for such an imputation and the Minister's statement came to me as a surprise. I am not a bit concerned about the present lessees—one I know casually, but I do not know the other at all. I am concerned about the interests of the public. It would be to the public inconvenience rather than to the convenience of the public, to erect the building as proposed, particularly seeing that it is the best position at Point Walter for children and their parents. As soon as boats arrive at Point Walter, there is a rush for this particular spot by people anxious to get picked positions. If the Bill is agreed to as it stands there is no likelihood of people refusing to erect refreshment rooms. The question before the Committee is simple. Is it better to force the building on to the hill or to force the women and children there? From the standpoint of finance, it means £2 a week to the Melville Road Board. I am satisfied that refreshment rooms will be built and that people will not say that because they cannot get this particular spot, they will not build refreshment rooms at all. In these circumstances

the road board will not be deprived of the whole of the £100 per year which is involved.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I will vote against the amendment. The distance between the water and the hill should be reserved for the people. I understand from the speeches that have been delivered, that the building would take away practically the only decent bit of ground, merely to enable refreshment rooms to be erected. I consider that if the Bill is passed as it stands, there will be a refreshment room erected on the hill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill reported without further amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

MOTION—EDUCATION COMMISSION REPORT.

Debate resumed from 11th October on the following motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom:—

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Royal Commission on Education laid on the Table of the House, is unsatisfactory.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [5.14] I rise to offer a few remarks on the report that has been presented to Parliament by the Royal Commission on Education. I am not aware of the necessity for its having been appointed at all. I understand some criticism was levelled against the Government and, to clear up what was said against them, they appointed the Royal Commission. Whether the Commission has whitewashed them or not, I am not prepared to say, because the report is of a general nature. However, we are on a question which means more to us than anything else in this State, namely the future education of our children. Any time we devote to this question will be time well spent. If we look around us we find that the education systems of the older nations of the world are well in advance of ours and it behoves us to get a move on and endeavour to bring our system up to date. The Commission covered a very wide range. The chief reason for the appointment of the Commission was to ascertain whether the State was getting an adequate return for the money expended. There was no direct answer to any of the questions put to the Commission, though indirect answers were given. The first question reads, "Is the State obtaining adequate value for its expenditure on education?" The answer, so far as I can find, is—

Having made full inquiry, as indicated in this report, the Commission is convinced that the education estimates cannot be regarded as affording opportunity for reducing to any material extent the total expenditure of the State.

I hope no one suggested that the expenditure should be decreased for, although we have heard that suggestion from some members of this House, the consensus of opinion among the people of the State is that we should, if possible, spend more on the system. The Commission indicated directions in which money could be spent if we had the necessary means. I maintain that, no matter how hard up we are, if anything can be done to advance the education of our children, we should set about getting the necessary funds. We should never retard the progress of our future citizens by failing to give them an adequate education in their youth. The Commission suggested that the education system could be improved by spending more money on it, and it is up to the Government to find the money as speedily as possible. This is one thing which we cannot afford to neglect. The Commission in their report proceeded in a general way to point out some of the things which ought to be taught in our schools. They did not mention that anything should be cut out of the curriculum; they seemed to be satisfied with the present curriculum.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Were they satisfied with the plans and maps of Australia, from which the children are instructed?

Hon. T. MOORE: The Commission were evidently satisfied with the syllabus. I have consulted many teachers, tradesmen, professional and business men on this point and I am satisfied it is not the best curriculum which could be adopted. The Commission mention that in respect to the age of compulsory attendance we are up to the English requirements. In Britain, however, attendance is compulsory up to the age of 15 or 16 years. I hope the Government will take notice of this. I know from experience that when boys are allowed to leave school at the age of 14, many of the most brilliant lads are lost to us. Many teachers have besought parents to allow their boys to continue at school after the age of 14, but the reply has generally been, "We cannot afford to; they must go to work." That is a wrong system. Many youths, by the progress they have made at the age of 14, have given promise of turning out brilliant men, but they have been permitted to leave school and go to work and have deteriorated, and in a few years it is surprising how much they have forgotten.

Hon. J. A. Greig: If the boys were brilliant they would win a scholarship.

Hon. T. MOORE: All our boys cannot win scholarships. There are some schools the teachers of which are not sufficiently highly qualified to coach a boy to win a scholarship. We have third class and fourth class teachers

and it is almost impossible for them to bring boys to the stage when they can win scholarships.

Hon. H. Stewart: There is a system of Government selection without examination.

Hon. T. MOORE: The fact remains that brilliant men have been lost to the State because parents could not afford to keep their boys at school after they had passed the compulsory age. If boys are permitted to leave on attaining the age of 14, we should see that some of the evening hours are devoted to study. The Commonwealth take charge of the boys and insist upon them undergoing military training during so many hours a year. I do not approve of this. If the time spent in military training were devoted to education, our boys would be much better fitted to carry on against any foe who might seek to dispossess them of Australia in future. As it is, we are giving them military instruction which will probably be obsolete when the next war occurs. The time is simply being wasted and I am pleased to know that the youths are objecting to it. I hope that the parents also will object to it. We had sufficient proof during the recent war that our citizen force men were no more fitted for military work than were the men from the mines and the timber mills who had never seen a citizen force, and these previously untrained men accomplished more in the field. If the time now devoted to military training were given to educating boys, I believe that much better results would accrue. If the Government cannot see their way clear to extend the compulsory age to 15 or 16, as in Great Britain, I hope they will find means to provide evening classes for them. After looking through the curriculum of the State schools and discussing it with those who thoroughly understand it, I am of opinion that too much time is devoted to such work as nature study. The children are taken out to roam over the hills looking for a particular kind of grub or herb and it is the opinion of a good many teachers that much of this time is wasted. We want to instruct our children how to build up a nation in Australia. Australia is a big, rough, wild country and much building is necessary, but we find our boys rushing into professions. They want to be bookkeepers, typists, and so on, and very few offer to enter trades. Thoughtful teachers—and not all our teachers are thoughtful—say that if the primary schools devoted more time to geometry and mechanical drawing, the boys would cultivate a liking for the trades. At present it is left to the discretion of the teachers to decide how much time is devoted to mechanical drawing and geometry. Knowing that there is so much building to be done in this young country, this is the particular class of work on which the primary schools should concentrate.

Hon. J. A. Greig: But the trade unions will not allow the boys to be employed.

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member does not understand the trade unions or he would know that all the Trades Hall agitators, as he calls them, stand for the advancement of education. If we could inculcate into the minds of the boys that they should fit themselves to take a hand in the building up of the country—

Hon. H. Stewart: The country, not the towns.

Hon. T. MOORE: And also the towns. No country can exist without the towns. The older countries have towns as large as ours.

Hon. H. Stewart: But not in proportion.

Hon. T. MOORE: We have many secondary industries to build up, yet many of our artisans have to be brought from overseas. This is a disgrace to us and while it continues we have nothing to be proud of as regards the education system which makes this sort of thing possible. We should get the boys to concentrate on these subjects instead of instructing them in the technical schools in the use of the saw, plane and hammer before they have any idea of what they have to build. They are put on to handle tools before they have any instruction in the theory of building. We should endeavour to cultivate among our youths a desire to fit themselves to build up our industries so that it will not be necessary to go outside of Australia for experts of any kind. There are very few tradesmen who can read a plan, notwithstanding that it is a very simple thing. The Australian tradesman is far behind the man from overseas in this regard. In the schools of Great Britain four hours every week is devoted to mechanical drawing and geometry. In Germany the same thing obtains; the British and German systems are very similar in this respect, and any tradesman from those countries can read a plan. Young people starting housekeeping decide to build a house. They look at the plan and agree that it is satisfactory. When the place is partly built they discover that a window or a door is not where it was wanted, simply owing to the fact that they have not been taught to read a plan. We should teach our boys to understand plans of machinery as well as of buildings, instead of spending so much time on other subjects which are not necessary. If this were done we would obtain better results from the money we are spending. The report of the Commission appears to me to unduly emphasise the need for agriculture. The impression seems to prevail that this State will be built up primarily by agriculture. Seeing that the State produces almost everything that nature can provide, are we going to be always growers of wheat and wool? I think the Commission were wrong in this respect. If we merely use our broad acres to produce wheat and wool, Western Australia will never be a great

State. We have to manufacture as well as produce. We are producing fairly well now.

Hon. H. Stewart: But we have to populate the State.

Hon. T. MOORE: The secondary industries must be built up, and I want to see the young Australian so educated that he will be able to take an intelligent and practical part in the building up of our industries in order that there will be no need to bring artisans from overseas to do the work for us.

Hon. J. A. Greig: The overseas men were not taught at school.

Hon. T. MOORE: They were taught the theory in schools. Great Britain devotes four hours per week to the teaching of such theory, and we find that men so taught are absolutely the best men when they arrive here.

Hon. H. Stewart: Only as regards something new, and then only until the Australian has seen how it is done.

Hon. T. MOORE: I want to have the Australian taught at school, and not have him wait until somebody is brought from overseas to educate him in that particular work, thus causing the Australian to play second fiddle. The Commission has not dealt largely with the systems in vogue in other parts of the world. We know, however, that we have learnt much from the Germans. We know that their educational system is better than ours. When attaining the fifth standard, a boy or a girl in Germany is picked for some particular trade or profession. At that stage of the child's life the teachers who have charge of him or her decide, in consultation with the parents, what his or her trade or profession shall be. That strikes me as rather a good system. The teachers observe that the pupil has a tendency in a particular direction, and that tendency they seek to develop. It is easy to understand how such an education system has enabled the German nation to get on. We do not wish to see the Germans equipped with a better system of education than ours. I contend that their system is infinitely better, and I contend also that we must follow on their lines, somewhat as we did in the war. We found during the war that the Germans produced something or other, and then in a week or two we followed with a copy; and we were fairly good copyists.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We improved as well.

Hon. T. MOORE: I acknowledge that. However, the German system of education has much to recommend it. The Commission's report points out how Britain discovered during the war that it was necessary to alter her system of educating her children. Then it was that the practice of teaching British children beyond the age of 14 was introduced. The report quotes the British Royal Commission on education as stating—

The nation cannot afford to let its adolescent population from 14 to 18 years of age remain untrained.

It was with a remark to the same effect that I started out. Anybody who takes notice of

a boy who has left school at the age of 14 must be aware that that boy, as a rule, fritters away the best years of his life. After a few years' absence from school, such a boy cannot even write a decent letter; his spelling and his English are absolutely lost to him by the time he is 20 years of age, if he has been put to hard work. If we hold the opinion that Western Australia is only to be built up by agriculture, then of course we need only look for youths to do plenty of hard work. We can easily teach our boys to become hewers of wood and drawers of water. But if we hope to see them become something better, hope to see them in a position to compete successfully with the people overseas, with the advanced nations, we must alter our education system. I am pleased that the Commission have afforded us an opportunity of discussing the question. Let me draw attention to the fact that many of the school books are being continually changed. Wherever one goes, particularly among people who are not well off, one hears complaints of the endless changing of school books. Goodness knows how many changes have been made since I left school, but the education authorities seem to be back beyond of where they were when I passed out of the sixth standard. We used to have the "Victorian Royal Readers." Having looked at the readers in use to-day, the "Oxford" and "Temple" readers, I am of opinion that they are not nearly so good as the "Royal" readers of 20 or 30 years ago. They are not nearly so extensive in point of vocabulary, and in other respects they are inferior to the reading books of a quarter of a century ago. According to reports from the United States, where big publishing houses are at work, the books in American schools are changed as ladies change their fashions—not with the idea of getting something better for the scholar, but with the idea of benefiting the publisher. We have heard of such things as "graft" in America. I do not suggest there is anything of the kind in this State, but it is just possible that "graft" may creep in here if we allow the present continual changing of school books to go on unchecked. Where a man is in a position to recommend a change, "graft" may creep in; the publisher may say to such a man, "Introduce this book of mine, and something will be given to you." We want to obviate the very possibility of anything of that sort. After all our experience in teaching, surely we can standardise a book for 10 years. Against that proposal it may be argued that after one child has used a book, the book will be rather drity. However, there are many mothers who teach their children to be clean. At the end of the term, when one boy passes out of a standard and his brother passes in, the book will generally be found clean and serviceable. In that way books are handed on from one child to another. I hope the Minister will enlighten us as to how all these changes that are complained of have come

about, who has recommended them, and why they have been so continuous.

The Minister for Education: They are much less frequent now.

Hon. T. MOORE: I know that wherever I go it is a continual complaint from parents and others in charge of children that they have to be constantly having school books. Moreover, I have it from teachers that very often, knowing that the parents are not in a position to purchase the books, they, the teachers themselves, buy the books for the children—which is very much to the credit of the teachers. One other feature of the report I desire to draw attention to, and that is the map. The map in question comprises only a portion of this State. I do not know whether those responsible for the map have arrived at the conclusion that the northern portion is going to be cut off from the southern portion of Western Australia; but, at all events, the map does not show the northern portion. In conclusion, I hope the Government will take up the education question with a thorough determination to go into that which is being taught rather than that which is being spent. Thus we shall achieve better results. I have always been deeply interested in the education of our rising generation, recognising that if Australia is ever to be a great nation, our children must be provided with educational facilities at least as good as those obtainable in any other part of the world.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [5.39]: I speak without preparation upon this motion. The main point to be considered, I take it, is whether or not the Commission's report is unsatisfactory, Sir Edward Wittenoom's motion alleging that it is unsatisfactory. Let me say here that I think that hon. member's long connection with the industries and commerce of this State, and also his administrative experience, entitle all that he says, especially on the subject of education, to the utmost respect. I heard his speech delivered, and I must say that there was in it a great deal of sound common sense. On the other hand, I am bound to admit that I cannot follow Sir Edward in all his conclusions. I rather think the hon. member's opinions upon education are somewhat behind the times. As to the personnel of the Commission, I do not believe in any departmental head from one State as a satisfactory means of arriving at a judgment upon the corresponding department in another State.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. E. DODD: I consider the Government were wrong when they decided to get the departmental head of the education system of New South Wales to report upon the system of education in this State. Having said that, let me add that I agree with a good many of the Commission's conclusions, more especially those having reference to technical education, although I have not gone into them as closely as I would have liked to do. It seems to me a good deal more might be

done in regard to technical education than is being done at the present time. In my opinion, a good deal of the money now being spent on our system of technical education represents money wasted. I am somewhat inclined to agree with Sir Edward Wittenoom when he says that the continuation classes are almost entirely a mistake. As regards the technical education curriculum, we find that numbers of our boys and girls are being educated for positions which they cannot hope to attain in this State. Quite a number of young fellows have been trained for certain professions or callings in this State, but have been obliged to go away to other States, or even other countries, in order to benefit from the education which they have received here. I know of scores of such cases in connection with technical education on the goldfields. Those young fellows are earning good salaries outside Western Australia, and incidentally giving other States the benefit of the education which they gained here. Here I am somewhat at issue with the last speaker. Instead of seeking to educate our youth technically for secondary industries which do not exist in Western Australia, we would do far better to educate our youth for the primary industries which do exist here. When once we get our primary industries going, the secondary industries will soon follow. As regards the youth of the metropolitan area and also of the goldfields, we have hundreds of boys growing up every year for whom neither the metropolitan area nor the goldfields can provide occupations. What is going to become of such boys? If we gave them the benefit of some agricultural or horticultural education, or education in regard to some other of our primary industries, it would be the means of enabling numbers of those lads to go out and make good. Some of them would fail, but I am sure that by far the larger number would make good. If the course I suggest were adopted, it would be very much more to the advantage of our boys than giving them certain portions of the present curriculum of the technical schools. With regard to orchard work, for instance, surely there are a number of orchards round and about Perth to which the boys could be taken to be taught pruning and tree planting and many other departments of the orchardist's work. To-day our boys learn nothing of the kind. They do learn shorthand and typewriting, in which few of them will find openings. I agree with Sir Edward Wittenoom when he states that more requires to be done in regard to agricultural education. When once we get our agricultural centres well established and our railways paying, then there will not be the slightest doubt about the secondary industries. Our schools will then be full and we shall be able to place some of the boys we are educating to-day. I believe in the school age of from 6 years to 14 years. We are doing as well as we possibly can for our children at the present time. I believe the Education Department are teaching them well, and there

is no doubt, in spite of the money we are spending, that we are still handicapped by reason of the want of school buildings, necessary halls and various supplies. The condition of the finances compels us to go slowly, but I should be sorry to see the education vote cut down. I attended a demonstration of school children at which the Minister for Education was also present a few days ago, the opening of the infants school at North Perth. There were some 900 scholars there and I am sure that that day must have been Heaven for the Minister after having been here for three or four days listening to the debate on the Wheat Marketing Bill. We saw the children going through various evolutions and we also saw interesting work being carried on in that school. If any member went around and saw the work that the school children were doing, he would not begrudge one penny of the vote that was being spent on the education of children between the ages of 6 and 14 years. I intend to oppose the motion of the hon. member, but I must say that he gave us a really good dose of common sense during the course of the speech that he made.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [5.50]: There is one point that I would like to emphasise while the motion is before the House, and it is in connection with the maps of Australia that are exhibited in the State schools. Only recently I visited a school in the South-West with the Minister for Education and saw a map of Australia which to me appeared to have been drawn on a piece of brown paper. While at Bunbury we visited a show which included the work of school children, and included in that work were exhibits describing a good deal of our country as a sandy desert. It is a standing disgrace to the Education Department that allows such maps to remain in the schools of the State. Quite recently there has been a good deal of criticism in regard to a Queensland and North-West article published in the London "Times," which referred to the northern part of our State as a desert. A section of the Press has stated that Lord Northcliffe was responsible for that article. So far as that gentleman is concerned there was published in the "Times" of the 3rd October the whole of the speech he made in Sydney in which he gave his impressions of Australia in detail. Lord Northcliffe had nothing whatever to do with the statement describing the northern part of Australia as a desert; the article was contributed by someone else. In my opinion the State itself is responsible for teaching our children that that part of our country is a desert. The particular area referred to is the second largest artesian basin in the Commonwealth. The Government have had their own surveyors east of that basin from Hall's Creek down to Wiluna, and those surveyors have declared water to be obtainable along that route at depths varying from 6ft. to 50ft.

Yet the State teaches its children that this is a great sandy desert. Once those children get such an idea into their minds nothing will shift it, at any rate not until they see the country for themselves. It is a disgrace that the Education Department should allow that kind of thing to continue. If the department cannot provide decent maps, the North-West Development League, which I represent, will make a present of a number of maps showing the possibilities of the North-West. Can anyone wonder at people outside of the State referring to Western Australia as a land of sin, sand, sorrow, and sore eyes, when we have the Education Department teaching our children that this is a great sandy desert. It contains some of the best land we have in the State, and when the cattle king of Australia, Sir Sydney Kidman, saw the plans of the Canning stock route he remarked "You do not mean to tell me that you have this well watered country unstocked. In Queensland we spend as much as £5,000 on one water supply." I hope my remarks will induce the Education Department to prepare up to date maps so that our children may be taught that this country is not a desert as they have been taught in the past.

On motion, by Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S FINANCIAL PROPOSALS.

Debate resumed from 11th October on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin:—

That the Government be requested to reconsider its financial proposals with a view to (a) bringing the expenditure within the ambit of the revenue, and (b) making provision for the extinction of the deficit within a reasonable time.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.52]: I do not propose to debate this motion at any great length because it seems to me that if the main proposal on which the hon. member's motion is founded is altogether fallacious, then there is no occasion to debate the other features of the motion. I intend therefore to apply myself merely to the main proposal of the hon. member, which was that the sum of £200,000 per annum could be saved on the education vote by excluding from the schools children under the age of 8 years. The hon. member stated that he arrived at that conclusion by reading an extract from page 15 of the report of the Royal Commission, and also from certain statements made to him by one of the members of the Commission. To my mind it is not a very satisfactory method of producing arguments before this House to make reference to conversations that people have had with others, and as the person concerned in this case, Mr. Pitchford, is unable to put his views before members. I can only say that on the morning after

Mr. Lovekin made his speech, Mr. Pitchford waited upon me, and assured me that his views were entirely opposed to those advanced by Mr. Lovekin. He said it would be an utterly ridiculous proposition to exclude from our schools children under the age of 8 years, and he did not in any way agree with the statement that by excluding those children the amount of money mentioned would be saved. There is nothing so far as I can see in the report of the Commission which would suggest that by excluding these children the sum of £340,000 per annum would be saved. That was the sum originally suggested by Mr. Lovekin. I have had a careful estimate made of the saving that would result from excluding children under the age of 8 years, and the estimated number of schools which would be closed if all children under 8 were excluded is 84.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And all in the country.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, and incidentally such a course would deprive a great many children over the age of 8 years of all school facilities.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That would necessarily follow.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member's proposal would exclude 576 country children over 8 years of age from any school facilities. The estimated saving of the closing of these schools would be £18,213, made up as follows: salaries £17,236, cleaning £420, and travelling allowances £557. Then the estimated saving that would be effected in schools other than schools closed by the exclusion of all children under 8 years of age would be £54,370, a total, instead of £340,000—which was the basis on which the hon. member worked—of £72,000. Obviously if we are going to exclude from our schools about one-fourth of the total number of children, we cannot expect to save three-fourths of the expenditure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You say a fourth of the children only represents £54,000.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Plus £18,213, and the children excluded would be really those who cost the least.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Does not the report show that the smaller schools cost the most per capita?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Obviously in the small schools where there are, say, only ten children we have to pay the school teacher's salary and all the rest of it. In this case it is shown that 84 schools would be closed at a cost of £18,213. The per capita expenditure would be a little over £20 per child as against the State average of a little over £7. Even then it does not amount to anything like the sum suggested by the hon. member. Then the hon. member went on to say that he did not even want to save the £200,000 to which he had reduced his figures, but that he wanted to apply £50,000 of that to giving additional education to children over 14 years of age. So that if we carry out the hon. member's suggestion and exclude all children under 8, and

put aside £50,000 for the benefit of children over 14, the actual saving would be about £25,000 per annum, at a cost of practically destroying all the educational facilities in the country districts. Without hesitation, too, I say that the matter would not stop there. The next step would be the abandonment of holdings on the part of the farmers and the consequent enormous diminution in the country's production. As Minister for Education I know from the correspondence that I receive that there are very few who are prepared to go where they cannot get educational advantages for their children. I am glad that that is so. Close the schools, and that will be the first step. The next step is the abandonment of the holdings by a large number of settlers. Then there is the question of policy of excluding children under 8 years of age. I know of no educational authority in the world who would support that policy. I am sorry that Mr. Lovekin, Sir Edward Wittenoom and other critics of the Education Department were not present at the function to which Mr. Dodd referred, and in which, at all events during the first portion of the programme, all the children taking part were under 8 years of age. I ask the hon. member what class of children is calculated to make the best citizens, those trained during the period between 6 years and 8 years of age, or those left for that time to the tender mercies of the streets, as very many of them would be of which set of children are likely to make the best citizens?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I did not refer to the ages.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, I am speaking to Mr. Lovekin's proposal. As far back as 1900 there were 625,000 children under 5 years of age enrolled in England. In 1906 in France there were 652,000 children enrolled between the ages of 2 and 6. In 1905 there were 258 children between 3 years and 6 years of age enrolled in Melbourne. There are few countries in the world doing what we are doing.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They are not schools; they are creches.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so, kindergartens and that kind of thing, which are just as expensive as schools. In England compulsory education is provided for children under six years of age. Not many countries in the world are doing what we are doing in prohibiting the entrance to schools of children under 6 years of age. It is a pity that we should do it. It is done purely in the interests of economy from two or three aspects. First, the difficulty and expenses of providing the additional buildings necessary have played an important part in that decision.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is in the interest of the children where they have good homes.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In such instances they are not generally sent to school so early.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Let us have creches, but do not call it education.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is education. I wonder if the hon. member has visited our State schools, if he is familiar with the methods followed in our infant classes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes, I am.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Well, can the hon. member suggest any improvement? Because if so the department will be very glad to consider it. Educational authorities from all parts of the world who have visited our infant schools have very little to suggest by way of improvement. The hon. member said that in order to make up schools we sent to them 1,060 children under the age of six years. That is quite incorrect. In this State no child under six years of age goes to school in order to make up a school. Such children are at school only when their attendance makes no difference in respect of the cost of that school.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I did not put it quite that way.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member said that in order to make up schools we were sending to those schools 1,060 children under six years of age. That is not so. We certainly go farther than they do in most other States in the matter of providing educational facilities for small communities. We still keep a school going on attendance of eight; but in counting attendance we take only the children above the compulsory school age. Then, if there are sufficient children of that age to warrant the school being maintained, we do not object to parents sending along children of under the compulsory age, because it does not add to the cost of the school, and there is no reason why the little ones should not be sent along. But in the larger centres this would mean greatly increased attendances, necessitating additional buildings and additional teachers, and so those small children are prevented from attending. Personally, I think it is a mistake. Although a considerably increased expenditure would be involved, yet I think in the end it would be fully justified.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why not take them from the cradle to the grave?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not quite follow the hon. member. In putting forward the motion the hon. member said that a certain action on the part of the Government might save £200,000 per annum. If it can be shown that such action would be altogether ill advised and would not save anything, I think that the most satisfactory method of disposing of the motion.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But you are only reducing the amount.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am eliminating it altogether. I say there is no amount to be saved. The motion is based on the assertion that a certain amount, some £400,000, can be saved in different di-

rections, and that £200,000 can be saved by excluding children of under eight years of age. If I have satisfied the House that not more than £25,000 could be so saved, and that by doing what the hon. member suggests, we shall close up 80 or 90 schools in country districts, and it will have the effect of causing the settlers in the districts to abandon their holdings, to the distinct prejudice of the development of the resources of the country, then I take it the hon. member's motion is disposed of.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I showed that £670,000 could be saved, and you now reduce it by £175,000.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will have the right to reply.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not propose to deal with the other matters raised by the hon. member. His motion is based on certain things, and I think I have satisfied the House that it is undesirable to do what he suggests, and that even if we were to do it, the saving which he suggests would be effected would not be effected at all.

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

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.8] in moving the second reading said: In the session of 1919 a Bill was introduced for the purpose of amending the Constitution Acts in five different directions. That Bill passed through another place, but was rejected in the Council, chiefly for the reason that it made provision for an alteration in the qualification of the electors to the Legislative Council. The debate on that Bill was directed chiefly to Clause 3, dealing with the question I refer to. At that time a Bill was introduced dealing with one of the amendments of the Constitution, having relation to the life of Parliament, and since then another Bill has been brought down covering one of the clauses of the Bill of 1919 and removing the disability against women sitting in Parliament. The object of the Bill before us is to embody in our legislation another clause which was in that rejected Bill of 1919, namely the clause relating to the method of dealing with money Bills. The Bill is presented as the result of an agreement between the Standing Orders Committees of both Houses. At the present time there seems to be a good deal of difference of opinion as to what are money Bills and what are not money Bills. During last session this House passed two or three Bills, one of them the Stallions Bill, which when it reached another place was thrown out on the ground that it was a money Bill and therefore could not be introduced in the Council.

Hon. A. H. Panton: So, too, with the Nurses Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This Bill provides that Bills appropriating revenues or moneys or imposing taxation shall not originate in the Council, but that a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys or to impose taxation by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for services under the Bill. That would make it clear that Bills such as those to which I have referred could originate in the Council and be dealt with. The succeeding subclauses of Clause 2, the only important clause in the Bill, set out what the Council may do and cannot do in regard to money Bills. That is in accordance with present practice. The fact that we cannot originate money Bills does not create the only difficulty in this connection. It is a difficulty that the Council cannot originate Bills imposing fees for registration or for services under the Act, because it means that a great many Bills which might otherwise be introduced in the Council early in the session and dealt with by another place when we are dealing with their Bills, cannot be touched. However, that is a minor point. The main point is the right of the Council to amend Bills, and until we have a measure of this kind on the statute book, we are likely to get into serious difficulties. By the mere inclusion in a Bill of some provision in regard to the collection of fees, that Bill may be regarded as a money Bill and our rights in the matter of amendments nullified, although in its original intention it is not a money Bill at all. The Bill we are now considering will remove all possibility of difference of opinion between the two Houses and make it clear what is a money Bill and what is not a money Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: The circumstances under which the Factories and Shops Act was passed last session will be fresh in the minds of hon. members. The Bill reached this House somewhat late in the session, and it was only with great difficulty and by virtue of long sittings that it was passed before the session concluded. There was, however, a large number of amendments made, and I do not

think it is at all surprising that one or two anomalies crept into the Act, the chief of these being in regard to the late shopping night. The Bill as originally framed did not provide for the abolition of the late shopping night. It was referred to a select committee in another place, and on the recommendation of that committee, the Bill was amended so as to provide for the abolition of the late shopping night. Then the Bill came to this House. Whilst this House cordially approved of the abolition of the late shopping night for the metropolitan area, it was considered that in the country districts the late shopping night should be maintained until the people in those districts themselves thought otherwise; and so a further amendment was made in the Bill. That amendment as made by this House is open to an interpretation that the House did not intend. The chief purpose of the Bill at present before us is to make quite clear the intentions of the House in regard to the late shopping nights in the country districts. Generally speaking, the Act of last session has operated quite satisfactorily. I do not know that there has been much complaint about it from any quarter. The number of shops registered has been 4,053, and the number of factories registered 1,468. Undoubtedly a very much larger number would have been registered had it not been for the limited number of inspectors. The view taken by the Government—I think this has been endorsed by the House—is that it was intended to greatly augment the number of inspectors, and whilst it is recognised that the initial work is heavy, that is, the work of getting the whole of the shops and factories in the State registered, it is better that the work should proceed step by step and in district by district in accordance with the capacity of the present staff, rather than that a big staff should be appointed and the whole job done at once. The work is going on, and under the card system the whole of the registrations will gradually be completed, and when completed it will be possible for the present staff to cope with the work.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Are the 4,050 registrations only a part of the registrations?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. There will be a great many more registrations effected in the State as the work goes on. With the present staff—it would have been unwise to largely augment it—it has been impossible to cover the whole State. Generally speaking, the Act of last session may be said to be working satisfactorily. The Bill is essentially one to be dealt with in Committee. I have no doubt, however, that it will save time if I briefly explain the objects of the different clauses. When Section 4 of the Act was before the House last session, under paragraph 3 of the definition of factories, it was provided—

Any building, premises, or place where steam or other mechanical power or appliances exceeding one horse power is used in preparing, working at, or manufacturing goods or packing them for transit.

The words "exceeding one horse power" were inserted. I think they were inserted under a misapprehension. It was suggested that people in private houses, who might be using a small electric motor, for instance, would be brought under the provisions of the Act. That was not so. Paragraph (f) of the exemptions in the same clause provides—

Any building, premises, or place in which any person, not being of the Chinese or other Asiatic race, is engaged in any trade operation or process mentioned in paragraphs 1 to 8, inclusive, of this definition at home, that is to say, in private premises used as a dwelling or in any adjacent building or structure appropriated to the use of the household, and in which no steam or other mechanical power in excess of one horse power is used in aid of the manufacturing process carried on there, and where the only persons engaged do not exceed four and are members of the same family, and dwelling.

There was ample exemption without the words being put in, but the insertion of the words "exceeding one horse power" had the effect of excluding from the necessity of registration something like 90 factories, which, under the provisions of the Act had been registered and which undoubtedly ought to be registered. These factories are those places in which there was mechanical power or there were appliances of one horse power.

Hon. H. Stewart: What kind of factories?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Tailoring factories in different places where such small machinery was employed.

Hon. J. Duffell: Electric motors driving machines.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. It was undoubtedly desired that these should be included in the definition of "factories."

Hon. H. Stewart: Surely they could come in under the first subsection of the definition of factory.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Not necessarily.

Hon. H. Stewart: They could.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They would if the requisite number of people was employed. The effect of the Act was that 90 factories which had been registered under the old Act could no longer be required to register under the new Act. It is proposed to strike out the words "exceeding one horse power" in order that these factories might again be brought under registration. But the exemption in regard to paragraph (f) applying to private houses, etc., will still continue. Clause 3 relates to Section 26 of the present Act and will have the effect of bringing that section into conformity with Subsection 4 of Section 133. At present by delaying registration the owner of a factory, if he delays until after the 31st March, the 30th June, or the 30th September, would be liable for either three-quarters, one-half, or one-quarter of the registration fee to be paid. The proposal is to put him on the same footing

as the shopkeeper. If he registers during the first half of the year he pays the year's fee, and if he registers during the second half he pays one half of the year's fee. That is an equitable arrangement, and is not nearly so cumbersome as is provided under the present Act. Clause 4, dealing with Section 40, is merely to correct an obvious error. Subsection 2 of Section 40 reads—

If in any case where such exemption has been granted, the Minister if not satisfied that the extra hours worked or to be worked were not bona fide for the purpose of meeting an unforeseen pressure of work or circumstances of an extraordinary nature, he shall give notice in writing of such dissatisfaction

Obviously the second "not" is a printer's error, and should be struck out. Also, the word "he," two lines further down is superfluous. Clause 5 relates to Section 42 of the existing Act. It defines Boxing Day as a public holiday.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: As an additional holiday?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Not entirely.

Hon. H. Stewart: It is.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Section 4 of the existing Act defines Boxing Day as a public holiday, but under Section 42 women and boys engaged in factories need not be granted a full pay holiday on that day, although the practice of paying on Boxing Day is in general operation. It is not providing a general holiday, but merely recognising one that is generally recognised at the present time.

Hon. H. Stewart: Providing for an extra day's pay.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Eight Hours' Day is now generally known as Labour Day, and is observed on the 1st May or the following Monday. In the past, Eight Hours' Day has been celebrated on the coast on the 21st October, and on the goldfields in May. This alteration has been made since the Act was passed last session, and the proposal to strike out "Eight Hours' Day" and insert "Labour Day" is in conformity with the alteration that has already been made. Under Section 42 of the Act, women and boys employed in a factory are entitled to a holiday on the King's birthday, the 3rd June. Members have suggested that in the earlier portion of the section an additional holiday is provided, but that is not the case. The holiday has been provided that has always been recognised as a holiday. Under this section it may be said that the holiday has been taken away. A number of awards and agreements provide for a holiday on Foundation Day, that is the 1st June, and not on the King's birthday, which is two days later. The provisions of Subclause 2 of Clause 5 will entitle women and boys to have a holiday on full pay on one of these two days but not on both. As the Act stands it would compel the full day's holiday to be given on the King's Birthday, and an Arbitration

Court award might compel the employers to give a full day's holiday on Foundation Day. In that way we would get a result which was not intended. It was not intended that the two paid holidays should be provided for at the one time. Under this amendment only the one paid holiday will be provided. Under Section 53 a boy under 14 or a girl under 15 is prohibited from employment in any factory. It is proposed to extend that prohibition to shops and warehouses under Clause 6. Clause 7 is for the same purpose, adding shops and warehouses immediately after "factory" wherever the words occur in Section 62.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Clause 6 makes a different alteration to that. It provides that where a person is employed prior to the passing of the Act he shall continue in such employment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It amends Section 53, which reads—

No occupier of a factory shall employ therein any child.

By the insertion therein of the words "shop or warehouse" after "factory"; and by the addition of the following proviso—

Provided that in any case any child was at any time heretofore lawfully employed in a factory, shop, or warehouse, and continued to be so employed at or immediately prior to the commencement of this Act or the coming into operation of this proviso, nothing in this section shall prevent the employment of such child in the same factory, shop, or warehouse by the same employer.

That is merely to cover the case of those already employed.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That was wiped out last session.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think so. Clause 7 relates to Section 62 of the Act and inserts "shop or warehouse" after "factory" in each case. Clause 8 is an amendment of Section 101. Its purpose is to enable a short name or title to be assigned to a shop district which comprises two or more electoral districts, such as the Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Brownhill-Ivanhoe, or Hannans electoral districts, which comprise one shop district. Clause 9 amends Section 102 relating to the closing time of shops. The effect of the proposal will be that the late shopping night will be retained in the country districts in the event of an affirmative vote at the poll under Section 106. Under existing provisions we have a state of affairs which Parliament certainly did not intend, that was, that when the Wednesday half-holiday was provided for, the late shopping night was automatically abolished. That would be the way the existing Act would read, but it is intended to make it clear that the late shopping night would be retained in any country district in the event of an affirmative vote at a poll under Section 106.

Hon. J. Duffell: Did you say Wednesday afternoon was a holiday and the late shopping night was abolished?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is as the Act reads at present. It is the interpretation which has been given to the Act, although it has not been carried into effect in that way.

Hon. H. Stewart: It has been used as an argument against voting at a referendum.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is so. Under Section 106, on an affirmative vote being given, Saturday will be the late shopping night, and Wednesday the half holiday in the district affected, and if the vote is in the negative Saturday will be the half holiday and Friday the late shopping night. That was undoubtedly what the House intended. Clause 10 enables registered small shops to remain open until 9 p.m. in districts where the late shopping night is observed. The Bill as it left the Legislative Assembly did not contemplate the late shopping night, and consequently the closing hour for small shops was fixed at 8 p.m. This House re-established the late shopping night in the country districts but omitted to make provision for the small shops in the late shopping districts to remain open until 9 p.m. Clause 11 amends Section 104. The clause renders it necessary for the shopkeeper to be eligible for registration as the keeper of a small shop. That is the intention and policy of the Act, because the Act sets out the class of persons who may be registered as keepers of small shops. The intention was that the keeper of these shops should be registered. As the Act stands, it might be held that a person, deemed to be a proper person to be registered and who obtained his registration, might sell out to some other person who would not be eligible for registration. The clause will make it clear that the registration applies to the individual and not to the shop. Clause 12 amends Section 106. The clause is necessary in consequence of the amendment to Section 102, to preserve to country districts the late shopping night, in the event of an affirmative vote at a poll taken under Section 106. This proposal amplifies the effect of a negative vote under Section 106 on the half holiday question and, in such an event, establishes Saturday as the half holiday whilst it also preserves the late shopping night in districts where it operates under Section 102. It removes the right of a majority of the shopkeepers to nullify the effect of a poll of the electors. The Act provides that a choice may be made by the majority of the shopkeepers but it was never intended that the decision of the majority should have the result of nullifying the decision arrived at as the result of the poll of the electors. If the poll decides upon a certain course, the majority of the shopkeepers cannot set it aside. That was the intention of Parliament. Subclause 3 of Clause 12 is designed to bring the provisions relating to the procedure for taking of polls into conformity with the Electoral Act and to per-

mit of the appointment of presiding officers, poll clerks, etc., by the returning officer, in lieu of by the Governor as at present. Returning officers and the deputies must, however, be appointed by the Governor. Provision is also made so that the machinery under the Electoral Act may be utilised for the taking of polls under the Bill. Clause 14 requires hairdressers' shops to close on a public holiday. Under the existing section, it is provided that such shops may remain open from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. on a holiday which is observed on a Monday, but they are not required to close at all on any public holiday. By passing the Bill, this proposal will bring the hairdressers' shops into line with other shops regarding the day on which they shall close at 1 p.m. in any district. Under the existing section, hairdressers' shops must close at 1 p.m. on Saturday in all districts. That is not desirable. The intention is that the shops shall close at 1 p.m. on days when all other shops close at 1 p.m. and in districts where the late shopping night is on Saturday and the half holiday on Wednesday, these shops shall close at 1 p.m. on Wednesday. Each of these errors crept into the Act through the frequent amendments when it was before Parliament last year. On that occasion the Bill was amended in the Assembly and then sent to this Chamber where it was re-altered and these matters were omitted from the section. Subclause 3 of Clause 14 extends the privilege of the late shopping night to hairdressers' shops in those districts where the late night operates. Under the existing section such shops may not open after 6 p.m. on any night. Clause 15 amends Section 117 and will permit of butchers' shops remaining open from 6 a.m. to 9 a.m. on a public holiday which is observed on a Monday. At the present time they must close during the whole of every holiday. The present system has been found inconvenient where hospitals, public institutions and hotels are concerned. If the public holiday occurs on any other day than Monday, it does not matter so much because there is then no public holiday on the day immediately preceding the day on which the butchers' shops are closed. Clause 16 is merely a correction of an error in Section 125 and substitutes the word "to" for the word "and." Clause 17 amends Section 129. The keeping of a record of working hours in shops of a description not mentioned in the fourth schedule is necessitated by the restoration of the late night in country districts. Had the late night not been restored, it would not have been necessary, because the total hours during which the shops would have been open, would have been sufficient record of the time. Clause 18 amends Section 133. Subsection 5 of Section 133 exempts from the payment of a registration fee, certain premises which are entitled to be licensed under the Licensing Act. The Aus-

tralian Wine Licenses were not exempt under the measure passed last year and it was obviously the intention that they should be. The paragraph dealing with that matter said—

No fee shall be payable for the registration of any premises in respect of which a publican's general license, wayside house license, Australian wine and beer license or hotel license is held.

The words "Australian wine license" were omitted and are now inserted. Clause 19 provides an amendment of the fourth schedule and is consequential on the amendment contained in Clause 18. Clause 20 provides for a new ballot paper which has been recommended by the Chief Electoral Officer. It is thought that the new ballot paper is likely to be less confusing than the existing one. It provides for the insertion of a cross in the square opposite the question, in lieu of striking out "yes" or "no." It will be noticed that practically all these amendments are merely intended to carry out the wishes of Parliament regarding the late shopping night, and the necessity for those amendments has been brought about by the amendments made by both Houses which resulted in these errors creeping in. I move—

That the Bill be, now read a second time.

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.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.55]: During the closing hours of last session a Mining Act Amendment Bill was passed dealing with two matters, one relating to tributing and the other to prospecting for oil. The Act so far as it applies to tributers has not worked satisfactorily. Practically all the leaseholders declined to let tributaries under that Act. Personally, I cannot follow the arguments of those who say that, in declining to let tributaries, leaseholders defied the law of the country. There is no obligation upon a leaseholder to let a tribute, for the leaseholder holds his lease under certain conditions and I think it rests with him to say whether he will let the lease on tribute or not. At the same time, it is obviously to the disadvantage of the country that the laws relating to tributing should be such that the two parties cannot come to an amicable agreement, thus debarring the lease from being worked to the best advantage. Realising the deadlock, the Government did not

feel disposed to ask Parliament to amend a law of which no trial had been given, unless the matter was thoroughly investigated. For that purpose, a Royal Commission was appointed and it was fully representative of the three interests involved. The interests of the State were considered. The interests of the State undoubtedly demand that the mines shall be worked to the best advantage to employ the largest number of men and to produce the greatest amount of wealth. The leaseholders' interests were considered and also the interests of the tributers. The Commission suggested certain amendments and they are embodied in the Bill. The chief objection raised by the leaseholders to the provision of last year's Bill was that regarding tributaries when let under what is known as the block system, the term of the tribute should not be less than six months, and that the tribute could be renewed, if the tributer so desired, until the block was worked out. Objections were raised to this proposal. The first one was that it would be almost impossible for a company to sell the lease to anyone willing to work it because it might find itself tied up through the tributaries which had been let. The Royal Commission went carefully into this matter and they recommended a compromise which is embodied in Clause 4 of the Bill. Section 26 to which the mining companies objected is repealed, and a section is inserted in lieu reading as follows—

No tribute agreement shall be made for a lesser period than six months, but by mutual consent such agreement may be entered into for a longer period, and every tribute agreement shall continue in force for the period stated therein, and thereafter until determined by six months' notice by the lessee, unless such agreement shall become liable to cancellation under section thirty-three.

I think that is a very reasonable and proper compromise. It means that the company does not tie up the lease if it wants to sell. The purchaser can give six months' notice of cancellation of the tribute. On the other hand, a tribute party after working for some considerable time without much result, may light on some rich body of ore. Under the Act they might be quickly dispossessed of their tribute. Under the new provision, they would be free for another six months at any rate.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It would come hard on a party who struck it rich when their six months' lease had been in existence for five and a half months.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In that case if the lease were cancelled they would have another six months to run. That provision is suitable to both parties. There is another feature of the Bill which was questioned. It refers to the deductions set out in Section 27 of the 1920 Act. Particular objection was taken to paragraphs (a), (c), and (d). It is proposed to omit the paragraphs and insert two new paragraphs

to stand as (a) and (e). Paragraph (a) of Section 27 reads—

That no tribute shall be payable unless the tributers engaged in the actual working of the ground have earned per man per week a sum equal to the ruling rate of wages as prescribed for the time being by any current industrial agreement or award in force in the district, after paying the costs, charges, and expenses of mining, treatment, and realisation. For the purpose of this subsection, in calculating the sum any tributer may have earned in any week, any wages or emoluments he may have received outside the working of the tribute shall be included in the aforesaid sum. In calculating such expenses, wages to employees shall be at the ruling rate in the district for the hours of labour actually spent in working the tribute.

In lieu of that paragraph the Commission proposed and the Bill includes the following:—

That no tribute shall be payable unless those tributers engaged in the actual working of the ground have earned at the rate of £3 10s. per man per week for the period worked by them respectively after paying the cost and expenses of mining, treatment, and realisation, and such expenses shall be exclusive of their own wages. In calculating such deductions, the wages to employees shall be at the ruling rate in the district for the hours of labour actually spent in working the tribute area.

The difference is not a very important one, and it has been agreed to by both parties. Paragraph (c) of Section 27 provides:—

That the tribute to be payable to the lessee or owner of the mine shall not exceed a percentage, to be fixed by the agreement, of the net proceeds of the sale of the product, after deducting the costs, charges, and expenses of mining, treatment and realisation.

The alternative clause proposed reads:—

That the tribute to be payable to the lessee or owner of the mine shall not exceed a percentage to be fixed by the agreement, of the gross proceeds of the sale of the product, after deducting the cost of treatment and realisation.

Section 28 provides that an appeal might be made to the warden to alter the conditions of a tribute agreement. That was strongly objected to by the mining companies and the Commission recommended that that section be eliminated. The necessity for it is not very great, because the warden has to approve of a tribute agreement before it can be registered, and while it is desirable that there should be means of redress in the event of any breach of a tribute agreement, it seems rather unreasonable that anyone should be entitled to appeal against the conditions of an agreement which has been voluntarily entered into.

Hon. H. Stewart: They were prevented from withdrawing from it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so. It is intended to strike out that section. Section 31 of the Act reads:—

Where any dispute as to the ground held under tribute, or as to the product won from such ground, occurs between the lessee of any mine and a tributer, such dispute shall be determined by the warden on the complaint of either party, and the decision of the warden shall be final and conclusive, and without appeal.

That was objected to by the mining companies and the Commission recommended the amendment provided in Clause 7, which reads—

Section thirty-one of the said Act is amended, by omitting the words “and the decision of the warden shall be final and conclusive and without appeal,” and inserting in place thereof the words “under the provisions of Part X. of the principal Act.”

This means that there may be an appeal to the warden and to the ordinary courts from the warden's decision if either party desires to make such appeal. Clause 2 of the Bill makes provision for the registration of sleeping partners in tributes and also provides a penalty in the event of failure to register. The penalty is expressed in the second paragraph of the clause which states—

Any moneys paid as a share or part of a share of, or commission on the profits of a party to a tribute agreement to any person who has not complied with the requirements of the section, may be recovered back from him by the person who may have paid the same.

The Bill from Clause 1 to Clause 9, inclusive, embodies the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Clause 10 was inserted in the Legislative Assembly at the instance, I believe, of one of the members of the Royal Commission, but I think I am justified in saying that it does not represent the views of a majority of the Commission, and strong exception has been taken to it. It provides that in all contracts between a tributer and the owner of a treatment plant, it shall be obligatory on the part of the owner of the plant when the ore is purchased on assay value to account for all ores received by him from the tributer on the basis of not less than 90 per centum extraction of the assayed value of the ore. It is against the 90 per cent. extraction that the leaseholders raise objection. They say that the percentage paid for ranges from 85 to 90 per cent. according to the ore milled at the treatment plants. In many mines the practice of paying on 85 per cent. has been in force for several years. I do not propose to discuss at length the objections advanced to this clause; they can be considered when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. The second paragraph of Clause 10 reads—

The owner of the treatment plant shall also account for and pay to the tributer not less than fifty per centum of any pre-

mium received by such owner on the sale of the gold obtained from the ore treated.

The present practice, I understand, is to pay to the tributers 40 per centum of the premium. This matter was considered by the Commission and a majority of the Commission decided that 40 per centum was a fair thing. I understand that, in the case of the Perseverance Mine, the suggested alteration from 40 to 50 per centum would mean something like £700 a month. It is contended that under the present arrangement the tributers do very well and that generally they are satisfied with the 40 per cent. However, it is suggested that the percentage should be 50. This is a matter which can be dealt with in Committee. I felt it necessary to make these references to Clause 10, because the Bill apart from that embodies, I believe in their entirety, the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Clause 10 embodies the views of one member of the Commission and, of course, his views are entitled to respect, and can be considered on their merits. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, debate adjourned.

BILL—GOLD BUYERS.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.7] in moving the second reading, said: The existing provisions relating to purchase and sale of gold are contained in Part IX. of Mining Act, 1904. It is considered that these provisions have not been effective in the prevention of gold stealing and the object of this Bill is to tighten up those provisions and if possible prevent the abuse which I believe is very prevalent, and which is undoubtedly contrary not only to the best interests of the mining industry, but also to public morality. The Bill is an adaptation of the Victorian Act of 1915. It prohibits the purchase of gold except by a licensed buyer; the assaying or smelting of gold except by a licensed assayer; the purchase of gold matter except by the holder of a license to deal in gold matter, gold matter being defined to mean copper plates, slags, battery refuse, concentrates, precipitates, sands, slimes, etc., and also rich specimens of gold ore. Gold buyers' licenses are issued by the Minister; other licenses by the warden's court. Only banks can acquire buyers licenses except that special gold buyers licenses may be issued in sparsely populated or remote places on application by a bank, or after notice to the banks. The intention is that the banks should be the sole gold buyers, but where there are no banks, the banks may suggest agents to act, or failing such suggestion the Government may appoint gold buyers in the district.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is there any price fixed that the banks shall pay?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I see no necessity for that. The Minister is not affected; and provision is made for the issue of licenses for crushing batteries and treatment works. Provision is made to regulate dealings in gold, the keeping of gold entry books, etc. Provision is also made for the smelting and sale of their own gold by registered holders of miners' rights. The Minister may issue licenses to purchase wrought gold, to be exercised subject to prescribed conditions. The purchase of gold by jewellers from the Mint, or a bank is provided for. The Governor may by Order in Council exempt any defined portions of the State from the operation of all or any of the provisions of this Act; but any such order may in like manner be varied or revoked. The Bill is practically similar to the Victorian Act of 1915. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—STALLIONS.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.12] in moving the second reading said: Either last session or the session before, this House passed a Bill for the registration of stallions. It was sent to another place but was not considered there, as it was held that because it imposed certain fees for certificates or for registration, it was a money Bill which could not originate in the Legislative Council. The Bill has this session been passed by another place and sent up to us, not in quite the same form in which we passed it last year, but I will explain the differences. The necessity for legislation of this kind has been recognised for a long time. In 1918 the acting Prime Minister advised that the Minister for Defence had drawn attention to the fact that the standard of horses in Australia was deteriorating and was now very low, one of the chief causes for this low standard being the use of unsuitable stallions. He suggested the elimination of these by direct legislation, and a conference was convened by the Minister for Defence, at which the following resolutions, referring to stallions, were passed:—

That this conference recognises the urgent necessity for taking immediate steps towards placing the horse-breeding industry on a more satisfactory footing, with a view to improving the type of horses raised in Australia.

That the first step to be taken is to provide for the elimination of unfit stallions, i.e., stallions affected with hereditary unsoundness or defective in type or conformation.

That this result can only be achieved by legislation, and that if such legislation be not within the powers of the Commonwealth

Parliament, steps should be taken to procure the enactment of uniform measures by the Parliaments of the States.

These resolutions were submitted to the Pastoralists' Association, whose members were entirely in accord with them. Early this year the Prime Minister forwarded a communication asking whether the Government were prepared to introduce legislation to give effect to the proposals referred to, and an undertaking was given in this regard. The Royal Agricultural Society and the agricultural societies all over the State have been urging legislation of this kind for some time. The Stallions Bill, as submitted last session, provided for administration by a board. I do not know whether any strong exception was taken to the provision by members of this House; at any rate they passed the Bill in that form, but objection was taken to it in other quarters. It was desired that the administration should be brought under Government control. This Bill is practically on all-fours with the Bill submitted to and passed by this House last session, with the exception that it takes the administration out of the hands of the proposed board and places it in the hands of the Government. Clause 3 sets out the method of obtaining a certificate under this measure. Clause 4 provides for the appointment of officers to assist in administration. Clause 5 provides for the appointment of examining authorities for the examination of stallions, and lays down the powers and duties of such examining authorities. Clause 6 deals with the inspection and examination of stallions annually at places as directed by the inspectors, and provides for assistance to be rendered by owners in order to enable the examining authority to perform its duty. Clause 7 has reference to the obligation of the examining authority to report to the inspector, and the necessary directions in regard to the issue of certificates. Clause 8 provides that there shall be two certificates—a season certificate and a life certificate—and lays down the date by which owners must have their horses examined annually. Provision is also made in the clause for power to order a re-examination of any stallion, notwithstanding that a certificate may have been issued. The clause also gives power for enforcement of the payment of the necessary fees. Clause 9 refers to the keeping of a register of certificated stallions, and for the gazetting annually of a list of all such certificated stallions. Clause 10 forbids the owner of any uncertificated stallion to allow such stallion to travel for stud purposes. Clause 11 lays down that in the case of a refusal to issue a certificate, an appeal may be lodged against such refusal. The clause also lays down the necessary formula for the conducting of the inquiry in regard to such appeal, and directs that the Minister shall decide as to what portion of the fee lodged with the appeal shall be forfeited. Clause 12 provides penalties for contravention of any of the provisions of the measure. Clause 13 fixes the onus of proof in any pro-

secution for the utilisation of uncertificated stallions for stud purposes. Clause 14 provides for the making of regulations in regard to the requirements of the measure. Clause 15 gives power to exempt, if it is thought necessary, any portion of the State from the operation of the Bill. Clause 16 gives power for reciprocal treatment in the case of other parts of the King's Dominions recognising certificates under this measure. Clause 17 is for the appropriation of revenue for the purpose of carrying out the necessary administration. In view of the fact that with the exception of that one particular as regards the authority that is to administer the measure—the Government having been substituted for the board—the whole of the provisions of the Bill were agreed to by this House last session, I do not think it necessary to say anything further. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.19 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 8th November, 1921.

	Page
Obituary, Mr. John Storey, letter in reply ...	1543
Bills: Public Works Committee, 2a.	1543
Dredging License, 2a.	1557
Architects, Com.	1570

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

OBITUARY—MR. JOHN STOREY.

Letter in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a letter as follows:—

Sydney, 19th October, 1921. On behalf of myself and colleagues, I desire to acknowledge with sincere thanks the receipt of your telegram of 6th instant conveying the terms of a resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia expressing regret at the death of our respected Leader, the late Premier, Mr. John Storey. The mark of respect accorded our late colleague by the immediate sus-

pension of the sitting of the Chamber was indeed a tribute to his memory which was much appreciated in this State. Yours faithfully, James Dooley, Premier.

BILL—PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 25th October.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.37]: I welcome the introduction of this Bill and I trust it will be acceptable to the members of this House as well as to the members of another place. A Bill on somewhat similar lines was introduced by the Scaddan Government in 1911 and it met with defeat in another place. Also, a similar Bill was introduced in 1912 and it met with the same fate. There is a slight difference in some of the details between the Bill under review and the Bills of 1911 and 1912. Whereas the present Bill proposes to leave to the Assembly and Council entirely the election of members of the committee, the measure of 1911 provided that the chairman should be elected by the Governor-in-Council, and that three members should be elected by the Assembly and one by the Council. That provision was varied somewhat in the Bill of 1912, in that it was proposed that a member of the Executive Council—really a Minister of the Crown—should act as chairman of the committee and that three members should be elected by the Assembly and one by the Council. Although the present Bill differs from its predecessors in these respects, I have no fault to find with the differentiation. I believe it is well to leave entirely to the members of both Houses the election of the whole five members of the committee. It is well, I think, that the chairman should not be a member of the Executive Council. It is desirable that the members should be entirely free from the influence which would be associated with a Minister occupying the position of chairman of the committee. It will enable members of the committee to be more independent, entirely responsible to the House, and free from any Ministerial influence whatsoever. This Bill differs also in that the members of the committee are to perform the work without fee. I do not agree with this principle. Though there is great financial stringency, and it is incumbent upon Parliament to carefully scrutinise every avenue of expenditure, I consider that if the members who comprise this committee are worth their salt at all, if they devote the time and attention to the work and perform their duties in the manner in which they ought to be performed, the comparatively small sum involved in the payment of fees should not weigh in the balance.

Mr. Teesdale: The public would go mad.

Hon. P. COLLIER: My experience has been that when men act in an honorary capacity, generally speaking, we get honorary service in return. If the committee do their work thoroughly, they will be engaged most