

HON. F. WHITCOMBE suggested that the object of Mr. Haynes would be best served by the insertion of the words "or future enactments," as an alternative to striking the clause out.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The meaning of the words "may" and "shall" depended on the context of the clause, and to introduce a new meaning would be altogether dangerous.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 20—agreed to.

First Schedule—agreed to.

Second Schedule:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that there be added to the second schedule the following paragraph, to stand as paragraph 1:—

That in all cases where on any summary conviction under this Ordinance of any person, not being a convict, the sum adjudged by one justice to be paid shall exceed £10, or by two or more justices shall exceed £20, or the imprisonment, whether adjudged by one or more justice or justices, shall exceed one calendar month, any person who shall think himself aggrieved by such conviction may appeal to the next court of general or quarter sessions, which shall be holden not less than twenty days after the day of such conviction at Perth, in the said colony, unless such conviction shall take place within one hundred miles of Albany, in the said colony, in which case any appeal from such conviction shall be to the next court of general or quarter sessions, holden not less than ten days after the day of such conviction at Albany aforesaid.

A number of Acts had been passed in the last fifty years; and he moved the insertion of the new paragraph simply for the purpose of reference to past Acts. Paragraph 1 was in the old schedule, and he wanted to make the present schedule the same as that in the present Act. He understood it would be unnecessary to introduce this paragraph into future Acts; but it was necessary to keep it in this Bill, for the purpose of reference to past Acts.

Put and passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5.10 p.m., until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th September, 1898.

Question: Kalgoorlie Gold-Mining Lease No. 3364 (Ivanhoe Venture Company), Alluvial Dispute and Removal of Ore—Question: Petition of Right by Mr. M. F. A. Canning—Ivanhoe Venture G.M. Company, Select Committee's Report—Motion: Tick in East Kimberley, Quarantine and Inoculation; debate continued; Divisions (5)—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION: KALGOORLIE GOLD-MINING LEASE NO. 3364 (IVANHOE VENTURE COMPANY), ALLUVIAL DISPUTE AND REMOVAL OF ORE.

MR. VOSPER asked the Attorney General,—1, Whether he was aware that Michael Burke, Edward Burns, and James Millar, on or about April 24th last, entered upon Gold-Mining Lease 3364, Kalgoorlie, and pegged out an alluvial claim under section 36 of the Goldfields Act. 2, Whether the manager of the lease, or any other person authorised by the Ivanhoe Venture Syndicate, within forty-eight hours, or at any time after service of notice by the claimholders in accordance with Regulation 103, marked off or delineated any alleged reef or lode on the claim pegged out. 3, Whether Burke and party were summoned for trespass to the warden's court, on or about May 27th, after having worked their claim for several weeks. 4, Whether upon the warden intimating that he was against Burke and party, a special case was arranged to be stated on certain points to the Supreme Court. 5, Whether the warden delayed the transmission of the special case to the Supreme Court until the month of August, although the case was originally heard on or about May 27th. 6, Whether, on or about August 4th, an injunction was granted against Burke and party working their claim on the application of the syndicate, while a similar application by the claim-holders against the syndicate was refused. 7,

Whether in the interval between the original hearing and the answer to the special case by His Honour Mr. Justice Hensman, the syndicate extracted and bagged the washdirt now in dispute. 8, Whether on August 23rd Mr. Justice Hensman decided the special case in favour of the claim-holders on all points answered, one being unanswered, because immaterial in view of the answers to the rest, the Judge declaring that the action was not maintainable by the syndicate against the claim-holders. 9, Whether the syndicate continued to work Burke and party's claim after the publication of the said decision by the Supreme Court. 10, Whether in consequence of this conduct on the part of the syndicate Burke and party were granted an interim injunction on August 29th, to restrain the syndicate from further working in their claim. 11, Whether up to the present anything had been done to give effect to the judgment of the Supreme Court on the special case, as delivered on August 23rd. 12, Whether the judgment on the special case had been transmitted to the warden; and whether it was transmitted on August 25th. 13, If so transmitted, why an order had not been made accordingly. 14, Whether any steps would be taken to insure the compliance of the warden with the provisions of section 62 of the Goldfields Act, requiring him to give judgment in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court. 15, Whether he was aware that Burke and party had been called upon to show cause before the warden why they should not be committed for contempt of court, for disobeying the warden's injunction, after the delivery of the decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the action brought by the syndicate against Burke and party upon which the injunction was based. 16, Generally, what steps would be taken by the Government to insure the decisions of the higher court being observed by the magistracy.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather) replied:—1, No. 2, 3, Am not aware. 4 to 13, inclusive, I do not know. 14, This department has no jurisdiction over the warden. 15, I do not know. 16, I do not know of any case calling for any action.

QUESTION: PETITION OF RIGHT BY MR. M. F. A. CANNING.

Mr. LEAKE asked the Premier,—1, Whether it was correct that Mr. M. F. A. Canning had presented a petition of right in respect of a certain claim for services rendered, and that the Government had refused to send the petition on to the Supreme Court for trial. 2, On what grounds the petition had been kept back from the Supreme Court.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: A petition of right has been presented by Mr. M. F. A. Canning. The Government have not refused to send the petition on to the Supreme Court for trial. The matter is under consideration.

IVANHOE VENTURE G.M. COMPANY: SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. MONGER brought up the report (with evidence) of the Select Committee on the Ivanhoe Venture Gold-Mining Company, in reference to the alluvial trouble and injury suffered therein.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed, with the evidence.

MOTION: TICK IN EAST KIMBERLEY, QUARANTINE AND INOCULATION.

Debate resumed on the motion of Mr. Higham (moved 31st August),—1, That as it appears inevitable that tick will sooner or later reach the various divisions of the colony, provision should be at once made for the inoculation of all cattle. 2, That in view of the urgent necessity for an increased supply of beef for our southern markets, cattle should be permitted to be brought from Wyndham to Fremantle and there held for slaughter within a rigidly quarantined area; and to render this scheme complete, an abattoir, with chilling compartments attached, should be at once provided. 3, Pending the erection of abattoirs and chilling chambers, cattle, after thorough inspection and being certified as clean by a stock inspector, be permitted to leave the quarantine area for immediate truckage to the eastern goldfields." Also on the amendment moved by the Hon. H.W. Venn, substituting (in effect) three other paragraphs; the Premier having also notified his intention to move amendments.

THE SPEAKER: The question is whether the member for Wellington (Hon. H.

W. Venn) will temporarily withdraw his amendment.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): I am quite willing to do so; and I presume the paragraphs in the motion, 1, 2, and 3, will be put separately, and not altogether.

THE SPEAKER: That depends on the House. If the House desires that they be taken separately, it can be done.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Would it not expedite business to have the motion amended first in the way I have proposed?

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): The question in that form is so complicated that the Speaker cannot put it, unless the member for Wellington withdraws his amendment.

THE SPEAKER: Now that the member for Wellington has consented to withdraw his amendment for the time, I do not think there is any difficulty in proceeding with the motion in the manner given notice of by the Premier. If the paragraphs are amended in the way desired, then the amendment of the member for Wellington can be put.

THE PREMIER: Or they can be taken seriatim.

THE SPEAKER: There would be a little difficulty in taking them seriatim, because the hon. member's amendment is to strike out the whole lot.

THE PREMIER: He may be willing to strike out each of them separately; and the result will be the same.

HON. H. W. VENN: I am quite willing to fall into whatever may be the most convenient way. I bow to the Speaker's decision as to the difficulty of dealing with the paragraphs seriatim. The object which I, and other members who think with me, have will be met by dealing in the first instance with the paragraphs altogether, and by passing or rejecting the motion as a whole, and leaving it to a future stage to propose the other set of ideas after one set has been disposed of.

THE PREMIER: It will be simple to take them seriatim, and when we come to No. 2 I will move the amendment which stands in my name, and on No. 3 I will move the other amendment, which no doubt will be agreed to before we come to the subsequent question.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle): I beg to move that paragraph 1 stand part of the question, namely:

(1) That, as it appears inevitable that tick will sooner or later reach the various divisions of this colony, provision should be at once made for the inoculation of all cattle.

HON. H. W. VENN: I presume that any member who has not spoken before will not be confined to the first paragraph; but can deal with the whole question.

THE SPEAKER: I think so.

Put and passed.

Paragraph 2:

(2) That, in view of the urgent necessity for an increased supply of beef for our southern markets, cattle should be permitted to be brought from Wyndham to Fremantle and there held for slaughter within a rigidly quarantined area; and, to render this scheme complete, an abattoir, with chilling compartments attached, should be at once provided.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move, as an amendment, that the following words after "area" in line 2 be struck out: "and, to render this scheme complete, an abattoir, with chilling compartments attached, should be at once provided."

HON. H. W. VENN: Will it be competent to move the insertion of words after these have been struck out?

THE SPEAKER: You can add words. If you have an amendment before the word "area," you must propose it now.

HON. H. W. VENN: I think I am right in saying that, under the ordinary rules, if a question has been dealt with in any way, and it is negatived by the House, it is not correct for a member to bring on that same question in another form.

THE SPEAKER: No; certainly not.

HON. H. W. VENN: In the event of this question being negatived altogether, it would be well to bring forward a motion saying it is desirable that the Government should erect abattoirs, not at Fremantle, but somewhere else.

THE PREMIER: You can do that.

HON. H. W. VENN: The paragraph does not say where an abattoir should be provided.

THE PREMIER: It means at Fremantle. The paragraph contains the words, "brought from Wyndham to Fremantle."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I desire to call the attention of the member for Wellington to the fact that, if he allows this motion to pass, he will be blocked in the very

thing he desires, because this portion of the motion which it is proposed shall stand implies that cattle may be brought to Fremantle. I understand the hon. member for Wellington desires that cattle shall not be brought to Fremantle.

HON. H. W. VENN: I wish to introduce the word "not" after the word "should," in line 2, so that the paragraph shall contain the words, "that in view of the urgent necessity for an increased supply of beef for our southern market, cattle should not be permitted to be brought from Wyndham to Fremantle."

MR. VOSPER: Is not that a direct negative?

HON. H. W. VENN: I suppose it is. I move, however, that the word "not" be inserted after the word "should" in line 2.

MR. HUBBLE (Gascoyne): I second the amendment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I have an amendment before that. I desire to move that all the words after "markets," in line 1, be struck out, and the words "chilling works should be erected at Wyndham" be inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. A. FORREST: I have an amendment to propose, that the word "Wyndham" after "from," in line 2, be struck out, and "Kimberley" inserted in lieu thereof.

HON. H. W. VENN: On reconsideration of this question, I think the object of those who are opposed to this paragraph altogether would be met if we voted "no" against the whole motion. Therefore, by permission of the House, I beg to withdraw the amendment that the word "not" be inserted after "should," and allow the question to go on its merits without any amendment from me.

THE PREMIER: If the amendment moved by the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) be carried, it means that cattle will not be allowed to come out of the Kimberley district, that they will have to be slaughtered there and chilling works provided there, so that the meat will have to be brought southward in a frozen or chilled condition. But hon. members know that chilling works cannot be erected there for 12 months, at any rate, whereas cattle can be brought to the southern markets at once by the other procedure. It would be better to have chilling works some-

where else than at Wyndham, as the cost of such works at Wyndham would be much greater.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): Although we have discussed the question of erecting chilling works at Wyndham, yet the effect of the amendment moved by the member for Central Murchison is that the people of Perth and Fremantle and the large centres to the eastward will have to wait 12 months before they can get the benefit of the large supply of meat there is in the Kimberley district; and that delay will inflict an expenditure of £40,000 or £50,000 unnecessarily on the people of the colony. For what purpose? Surely the hon. member does not understand the significance of his own amendment. As to the supposed protection of herds in the southern portion of the country, they cannot be protected, as the evidence shows, by any human agency; whereas human agency can, by this amendment, prevent people in the southern and eastern districts from getting meat at a reasonable price for at least 12 months, while chilling works are in process of erection at Wyndham. Before the machinery can be bought and landed in the North and erected there, and water provided, and experts obtained for managing the works, a long delay is inevitable, and that delay means the locking up of the whole of the cattle in East Kimberley for 12 or 18 months. What object has the hon. member in view? As a popular representative in this House, he does not want to inflict hardship on the owners of large dairy herds near Perth and Fremantle, neither does any other member. But we know that the experience of America is that proper restrictions can be introduced and successfully carried out, whereby clean cattle can be brought to a centre for slaughter, that they can be watched there under quarantine, and that those which are not required to be killed on the spot can be sent to the eastern goldfields, where there is no risk of tick spreading or doing any harm. I want to see cattle brought in here as quickly as possible, and to be utilised for the market without inflicting any hardship on the owners of herds in the south. In the present hard-up condition of the working people of this colony—and we know there are scores of men

looking for a meal, and they even come into the refreshment room of the Legislative Assembly for something to eat—if any popular representative will vote for protecting a few head of cattle in the South, with the object of saving the expenditure of a few pounds, and yet on the other hand inflict a cost of hundreds and thousands of pounds on the consuming portion of the colony, I fail to see that such a member is representing the opinion or the interests of a majority of the people, or that he is doing the greatest good to the greatest number; and I emphatically protest against any such step being taken.

MR. GEORGE (Murray): I shall vote against the amendment on practical grounds. We have had an experiment of chilling and cold storage works, as far as Perth is concerned, carried out right under the eye of the Government; and we find that the upkeep and cost of running those works have amounted to about £35,000 for the year. What the revenue derived may be we do not yet know, but I believe it will be found to stand in the proportion of about 1 to 3 as compared with the expenditure. This is the result of chilling works carried on in Perth under the immediate eye of the Government, and with any amount of water available, and all other facilities necessary for carrying on the works cheaply. One hon. member has proposed that chilling works shall be provided at Wyndham at a cost of about £15,000, but he may as well say 15,000 donkeys, for such works cannot be erected in a place like Wyndham at a minimum cost, and they would have to be run clear away from the supervision of people down here. It is madness to attempt to put an industry there at the expense of the Government, and have to run it at so great a distance from a centre of control, and at the same time make it pay. I shall vote against the erection of chilling works at Wyndham, and shall oppose it as much as I can.

MR. HARPER (Beverley): I wish the mover of the amendment (Mr. Illingworth) had explained the object he wishes to attain, because it is quite contrary to the action he had previously taken in the matter of cheapening the price of meat. He was strong in moving for the reduc-

tion of the duty on meat with the object of getting the price reduced to consumers; but the effect of his amendment will be in the contrary direction, whatever his intention may be. Everyone knows the colony is not producing sufficient meat for its own consumption. There are two directions from which the colony may draw the necessary supplies to fill up the gap; one being from the eastern colonies and the other from the north. The eastern markets, in consequence of the spread of tick on the eastern seaboard, have been largely and materially affected by the presence of tick, and consequently the price of stock in the areas that are not subject to quarantine has risen to a considerable extent. That is what we are suffering from now. The cheapest place in Australia to get cattle is from the Northern Territory of Queensland; and the effect of the amendment will be that we shall not be able to draw the supplies from the cheapest market, but we shall have to draw them from the dearest; and I cannot see how the hon. member can reconcile that with his previous action in this House, in endeavouring to reduce the cost of meat to consumers.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You have closed that market.

MR. HARPER: But the hon. member's amendment will prevent any supply coming from places where it can be obtained cheaply. My idea is, and I intend to move in this direction later, that instead of restricting the supply to East Kimberley only, cattle should be drawn from the Northern Territory as well as from Wyndham for supplying our southern markets.

MR. VOSPER: Free of stock tax?

MR. HARPER: No. You cannot touch that. At present East Kimberley, as is well known, would fill up the necessary demand there is for live-stock in this part of the colony, therefore you are still drawing from a restricted supply; but if you admit cattle from the Northern Territory, the probability is there will be sufficient stock, along with that from East Kimberley, to supply all we require; and therefore there is a reasonable probability of a reduction in the price of meat to the consumer. If the amendment is carried, it will practically lock up the whole of that country until the

Government have found money to provide chilling works at Wyndham, and until chilled meat can be sent down to this part of the colony for distribution and consumption; but in the meantime, until that stage is reached, you will have to go on paying the higher rate. It is not necessary to have chilling works at Fremantle; but I say cattle can be brought there and slaughtered independently of chilling works, which are not absolutely necessary there. The action of the hon member (Mr. Illingworth) is inconsistent with his previous attitude, and would tend to keep the price of meat high, instead of reducing it.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): My opinion on this question may be summarised in a few words. Firstly, we have the objection of the Premier to the erection of chilling works at Wyndham or elsewhere; and that is tantamount to saying the Government have no money to erect chilling works; therefore that puts the proposal entirely out of court, and it is no use our advocating the erection of chilling works. On the other hand, we know the people in this portion of the colony and on the goldfields and elsewhere are now in a more poverty-stricken condition than they have been for many months past, and that they have no money to buy dear beef. They are in exactly the same position in regard to beef as are the Government with regard to chilling works. What we have to do is to see, if possible, whether we can bring this supply, which the colony itself affords, down to consumers in the south. That, I take it, is the problem before the House. There is no necessity to go deeply into the tick question; but, as far as I have been able to gather from the evidence, it appears that no system of quarantine will be thoroughly successful in restricting or limiting the area over which the tick pest must spread. That is the purport of the evidence; and, if that be the case, there will be nothing whatever gained by maintaining the rigid policy of exclusion towards the Kimberley districts. When this question was before the House last year, I voted in favour of quarantining East Kimberley, because I believed that the quarantine system was calculated to restrict the ticks. Now that

idea has been completely exploded by the expert evidence.

A MEMBER: Not at all. The test is not complete yet.

MR. VOSPER: The weight of evidence is distinctly in that direction; and, that being so, we will have to revise our position and change our belief. We are, however, informed by experts that cattle can be brought down safely to Fremantle, and be trucked directly to the goldfields, without any great risk of the tick spreading over the southern areas of the colony. As there is no one in this House with sufficient expert knowledge to contradict this statement, why should not the Kimberley district be thrown open and an opportunity given to the people to obtain meat at a reasonable rate? With regard to the argument that we must protect the southern herds, we have to consider the question of a few head of cattle against a number of head of people; and I say that members of this House should always be in favour of the people as against the cattle. When we have to consider the interests of a few stock owners in the south of the colony as against those of the great mass of the meat consumers, personally I am with the meat consumers every time. I shall certainly vote against the amendment of the member for Central Murchison. I am inclined to agree with the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) on the question, and what I would like to see carried is the motion of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham) as amended by the Premier.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): I need scarcely say, as a representative not only of an agricultural district, but one which can boast, so far as this quarter of the colony is concerned, of producing the greatest number of stock, that I will take the responsibility on my shoulders, on behalf of my constituents, of supporting the proposal of the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham), for the reason that, with the restrictions made, so far as the goldfields are concerned, there can be no fear whatever of any infection. There is no pasture on the goldfields; there are no cattle there, and the only fear of tick would be on the part of human beings, who are doubtless already affected by the disease. Generally speaking, we live upon "tick."

MR. A. FORREST: Speak for yourself.

MR. QUINLAN: I am speaking for myself, and I know the hon. member is even a greater believer in "tick" than I am. So far as the goldfields are concerned, if it be strictly forbidden to send these cattle to other portions of the colony, there will be no danger whatever. The stock will have to pass the inspector, and, in view of the care exercised by the department in the past, there need be no fear of infection on that score. And, as has been mentioned by the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper), the supply of meat would be cheapened, and unquestionably the goldfields are the market for us, seeing that they are at our very elbow, as it were. At any rate, we should protect the industries of our own colony; and, even if we had to run a little risk, I should prefer to do so rather than have a market opened here for other countries. The result of such a policy would be ruin, not only to the districts in which most of our cattle is produced, but to persons who have been paying rents to the Government, and who have been a source of revenue to the country. It would, with one fell stroke, bring ruination to those who are engaged in that pursuit, by shutting the market at once against them. If this restriction is continued, the price of meat would, no doubt, be increased; at least, it would not be decreased; and I think that stockowners in the eastern districts are not in the least afraid of this proposal, providing it is safeguarded by the restrictions mentioned in the motion. The chilling works proposed or suggested by the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) are undoubtedly necessary; but, to say that they should be provided in our present circumstances is altogether beside the question. In the first instance the Government have not the money to do it, and there is time enough for chilling works to be established when the supply of the commodity is greater than what is required for consumption. Up till now, we have not got that, and, therefore, chilling works are not required. On behalf of my constituents, I am quite prepared to run whatever risk of infection there may be, and so I give my hearty support to the motion.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I did not happen to be in the House, the other evening, when this debate begun; but, as I understand it, the price of meat and the erection of chilling works are both side issues. The real question is: Are we going to allow tick-infested cattle to come from the tick-infested district in Kimberley?

MR. HIGHAM: That is the question.

MR. LEAKE: That is the question as I understand it; and, if that be so, I am personally satisfied with the first paragraph in the motion. It is my intention to vote against all the other paragraphs in the motion; and with this object, I say at once my idea is that those tick-infested cattle should not be allowed to leave the tick-infested districts.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Not alive.

MR. LEAKE: If we read the reports, we shall find that the expert advises that the probability is that, sooner or later, the ticks will come into the southern portions of the colony, in spite of all precautions we may take.

MR. MORAN: Not a probability. He says it is a certainty.

MR. LEAKE: Say a certainty. And he says there is, so far as the cattle are concerned, a perfect immunity to be acquired by a process of inoculation. We affirm the necessity for inoculation by passing the first paragraph of this motion; and we know that inoculation cannot be effected for a number of months to come; therefore, our first step should be to inoculate all the cattle that we think are likely to be infected, before we think of removing the existing restrictions.

MR. MORAN: How long does the inoculation take?

MR. LEAKE: I do not know; I am not an expert, but it can be done; and we are advised by Mr. Hancock, the expert, to whom a debt of gratitude is due, not only from this House but from the colony, that inoculation is the best remedy available. But, throughout his report, I defy any hon. member to say that gentleman has gone so far as to recommend that cattle should be admitted from the tick-infested area. He, in fact, has suggested and advised a maintenance of the strictest quarantine. When pushed, when cross-examined and

so forth, he admitted that if you have inoculation, if you have isolation and strict quarantine, you may reduce your risks to a minimum; but he has never gone so far as to say that, given these restrictions and precautions, tick will not come into the southern districts. In fact, he has said it will come; and he is fully borne out in that opinion by the practice and procedure of our neighbours in other colonies, who at the present time have defined a strict quarantine limit, with quarantine regulations which are strictly observed. Their cattle are not allowed to cross the quarantine border; and, if it is regarded as a matter of importance and of necessity to keep these tick-infested cattle back in the eastern colonies, I cannot see that the same principle should not apply here, or why we should not advance any further steps in this direction than our neighbours have done. In New South Wales and Queensland they say: "We will do all we can to prevent the spread of tick to the southern portions of the continent;" and, consequently, they insist upon strict quarantine. We know exactly where the tick is at the present moment; and let us do our best to keep it there as long as possible; and if we do that, there is no doubt that private enterprise will come forward and combat the difficulty, as has been done in the eastern colonies, by providing for the erection of chilling or freezing works. It is inopportune, it is too soon for us to consider the necessity of chilling works being erected by the Government. One would expect that the firms particularly interested in the meat industry in Kimberley would have come forward with some proposal for establishing chilling works there themselves; but, curiously enough, nothing of the kind has been done, but an appeal has been made not only to this House, but to the Government, to provide this remedy or boon for the people of the Kimberley district. We know that any cattle which come from Kimberley come in ships; and, if ships bring tick-infested cattle from Kimberley to the southern ports, each ship will be more or less affected, for it will be quarantined or impeded in its operations when it goes round to the eastern colonies. As to the cost of meat, that is a side issue. We can reduce

the cost of meat to the consumer by removing the duties. We have not done that, and we do not want to debate that subject now. But the mere fact of removing this restriction on ticked cattle in Kimberley will not, in my humble opinion, reduce the price of meat in the way suggested. There are other members in the House who understand the subject better than I do; but I venture to say that cattle can be brought to Fremantle quite as cheaply from the other colonies as from Kimberley, and therefore the consumer will not suffer. It is urged also that we should allow these cattle to come here because it is protecting or encouraging an industry which is thriving and growing within our own borders. That argument is all very well; and other things being equal it would apply if there were no disease such as this arising. We all know that when disease is rampant in cattle or sheep or any other animals, quarantine and supervision are absolutely necessary. We have only to go back a few years to remember the difficulty we had with the scab in sheep, and then there was no howl in this Parliament about allowing certain flocks to come from certain districts. Why should we make a general departure in favour of cattle, when we would not do it in favour of sheep? So far as local industry is concerned, we must not forget that the majority or a great number of the cattle which find their way into Kimberley come across from the Northern Territory of South Australia. It is of no use to beat about the bush. As I have said, this question never would have attained its present importance in the eyes of members, had it not been for the fact that two members in this House are particularly interested in the industry; and the echoes of the debate which took place in this Chamber last session are still ringing in our ears. It was then proved conclusively that these cattle were brought into Kimberley, and that Kimberley was "ticked up" owing to the actions and defiant attitude assumed by members of a particular firm. It is those hon. members who are raising all this cry and hubbub in order to have further protection for that firm, who defied the law last year and brought over 900 head of ticked cattle from Wave

Hill and said: "There is no danger of tick: there never will be tick." Now they have to eat their own words, and say: "Yes, there is tick, and we are very sorry for it. We want you still to allow these cattle to come down here." That is the position. Every member in this House knows that, whether he has the courage to say it or not. I am perfectly certain that when the matter comes to a division hon. members who are interested in the matter will not vote on it.

MR. MORAN: Then I suppose none of those on the other side will vote on it.

MR. LEAKE: I do not know; but there is the fact of this trouble arising from the defiant attitude of members of a particular firm, and the pliant attitude of the Government of the day. The Government allowed themselves to be flouted and bullied into a suspension of regulations, and now we find the difficulty that has arisen. It was predicted last year, and the fact is realised. I ask hon. members if we are to be made a medium of charity for persons who have taken upon themselves to defy the law, and defy practically the interests of the country. I declare emphatically my vote shall be cast in the direction of keeping these ticked cattle within the limits of East Kimberley. If West Kimberley is ticked, then that, too, must be quarantined, and so on. It is not a time to show favour to any persons who are members of this House, or members of the community. The matter is one of urgent importance. The House was laughed at last session because we saw the necessity for stringent measures being taken. The Government were hoodwinked or cajoled, and we were told on all sides that there was no risk run at all. We have gone to the expense of engaging the services of a competent man, a well-qualified expert, who has done his work admirably, and without fear or favour, and he has strongly recommended that these cattle should not be allowed to stray from this particular infested district. It would be simply waste of time, money, energy, and good sense if we did not act up to the advice given by the man who, we are all prepared to admit, is well qualified to speak and report upon the subject which he has had under discussion. Those are my reasons for supporting the first paragraph of the motion, and opposing

all other clauses which are proposed or which may be brought forward. If we are at any time to allow these cattle to come in, let it not be until all cattle south of East Kimberley have been inoculated, or such a time has elapsed as will enable the stock-owners south of that particular locality to inoculate if they think fit. If, in defiance of the warning they have, they take it upon themselves to live in a fool's paradise, and say "This tick can never harm us; we will be glad to have it amongst us," and all the rest of it, that is their look-out; but give them, by all means, a full opportunity, and under no circumstances allow cattle to leave the East Kimberley district until at least twelve months have elapsed from now, so that the stock-owners may be enabled to take proper precautions. We know perfectly well that if we pass the proposal now before the House, shipments will be made within a few weeks, and cattle will be brought down here and slaughtered, it is said, within certain restricted areas and subject to certain quarantine regulations; but the conditions do not obtain which would enable us at the present time to say we shall be immuned from this danger if cattle are brought down and slaughtered either on an island near the coast or elsewhere. Nor are there facilities. It will take several months to erect the necessary abattoirs, and I presume chilling works, before this can be done; and this is only a loophole to enable one particular firm to get a ready sale for their cattle; to bring them down here, and, irrespective of the consequences which may happen to stock-owners, let these cattle run right over the colony, and perhaps tick up herds around here in the settled districts. I am not going to be a party in such a thing. I regret much to see any individuals harassed and injured to the extent that possibly some men may be, but we have not to consider individual interests, but the interests of the whole country; and it always happens that, when there is a pest or disease besetting the community, individuals whom you can name and count upon your fingers suffer in a greater degree than many others. At the same time we cannot forget the debate of last session and the circumstances which have led up to the present position. It is, I

repeat, the defiant attitude of one particular firm, and there is no shutting our eyes to the fact that it is one particular firm that would be affected by the proposed measures. These gentlemen have caused all this trouble, and if they are now suffering they have no one to blame but themselves. For my part I will not do anything that will admit of other members of the community sharing in the disaster which those people seem to have brought upon themselves.

MR. EWING (Swan): The question is not whether certain members or persons will suffer by this motion, or will benefit by it. I take it that the question is whether we can, with reasonable safety, supply the meat markets of Western Australia from the northern districts in the way the motion proposes. The member for Albany says the question of the price of meat and of supplying the meat market is merely a side issue, and he alleges there is a way of getting cheap meat by removing the food duties. We have done all we could to remove the duty on meat, and as we have failed in cheapening meat in that direction, it is our bounden duty—pledged to cheapen all the necessities of life in this colony—to do all we can, consistently with the general interests of the colony, to see that meat is cheapened in some other way.

MR. LEAKE: To be enhanced in price, later on.

MR. EWING: It is an important question which underlies the motion now before the House, and if we can admit cattle as the motion proposes, without any real danger to the rest of the community and to cattle producers in other parts, it is our bounden duty to the people to do it. An expert sent here from Queensland said that, subject to proper restrictions and proper regulations, cattle could be brought to Fremantle and could be trucked by railway from Fremantle to the goldfields.

HON. H. W. VENN: He never said that.

MR. EWING: I understand that, when pressed in cross-examination, he said tick-infested cattle could be brought down here and slaughtered at Fremantle without any serious danger. In other words he said that the danger could be minimised. As far as I am able to gather from the report of the Select Com-

mittee, quarantine itself has not reduced the risk to a minimum, because the Select Committee say, in paragraph 12, that quarantine not having proved an absolute barrier to the tick, we must further extend the limits of the quarantine area. Therefore, assuming there is risk in bringing cattle to Fremantle, there still exists the risk of tick spreading, notwithstanding the quarantine restrictions; and the natural conclusion we get from the report is that, do what we can in the way of quarantine, the ultimate result is that we cannot stop the spread of tick, but only check it. If we accept the amendment proposed by the Premier, we shall, it appears to me, safeguard the rest of the community; and, in the words of Mr. Hancock, the risk of the spread of tick through bringing cattle to Fremantle will be reduced to a minimum. If we can reduce it to a minimum, such is the condition of the meat market in this colony, that it is, I take it, our bounden duty to stretch a point and enable people, even if there is a slight risk to the rest of the community, to get their meat supply at a reasonable rate. I believe the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) intends to move in this direction, that we admit cattle from the north subject to these restrictions, which will reduce the risk to a minimum; and under the amendment a vast area of cattle-producing country will be opened up, so that we will be able to draw our supplies in great quantities from the Northern Territory of Queensland, from South Australia, and from the Kimberley district; and if we do that I say, as representing consumers in this community, that if the hon. member is correct when he says we would be able to get cheaper meat in the south by doing as the amendment proposes, then it is our bounden duty to allow the cattle to be introduced here, subject to quarantine restriction.

MR. HOLMES (East Fremantle): When the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham) first tabled his motion, it was not my intention to address the House on the subject, for the reason that I have already on several occasions expressed my views in reference to this matter. However, I will briefly reiterate some statements I have made here before, and will, if possible, throw a little more light on this m-

portant subject. The first thing we have to consider is, what would be the result if the prohibition that now exists in East Kimberley were removed? The first result undoubtedly would be that cattle from East Kimberley would be landed at Fremantle in the course of the next three or four weeks; and from the evidence that came before the Select Committee on this question, and from information that has been before hon. members, we may all admit that, accompanying these cattle, will be the dreaded tick. We all agree that those interested, the pastoralists in East Kimberley, are deserving of our sympathy; they also have our sympathy; but we have also to consider the pastoralists of the colony generally, and not only those of East Kimberley. I find from the report of the Select Committee that there are about 70,000 cattle in East Kimberley within the quarantine area, and there are about 170,000 outside of that area and within the colony. It is the duty of this House, in my opinion, to protect the pastoralists owning the 170,000, and to restrict as much as possible the spread of this disease which now exists among the 70,000 cattle within the quarantined area. That is our duty as legislators. The proposal is now to bring these cattle to Fremantle and swim them ashore. We have had experience of this at Fremantle for years past, and it is not only cruel but dangerous to carry on that process. I know from experience that, in the attempt to swim cattle ashore at Fremantle, some 300 bullocks are thrown over the ship's side to get ashore as best they can, and some of them land within the proposed quarantine area, and sometimes bullocks land outside of it. You will have now and again a wild bullock racing about the streets of Fremantle; and if you get him into the quarantine area within reasonable time, it will be good work. One thing I object to is the proposal to swim these cattle ashore, and I understand that proposal comes from the Premier. We know that one coasting steamer came across a bullock which was swimming some 10 miles from the point at which it had been put over the side of the ship. The member for West Kimberley can bear me out when I say that a wild bullock on one occasion charged through the streets of Fremantle,

and came in contact with a well-known and respected citizen, with the result that the citizen, unfortunately for himself and his sorrowing family, is now in his grave. I believe the member for West Kimberley compensated the family in that case. This, however, is only a side issue, as to what will occur in landing tick bullocks about Fremantle. The next thing to be considered is, what will be the advantage gained if cattle from the tick-infested district are allowed to land at Fremantle? The advantage is that the pastoralists of East Kimberley will be able to land their cattle in a good market and command the highest price, and obtain the best profit by the transaction. I am sure we are all agreed that they are entitled to this concession, and would like to grant it so long as we are convinced that it will not injure other pastoralists, and will not injure the country generally. We have to consider the whole of the pastoralists to the south of Kimberley; and I say again the pastoralists on this side of East Kimberley hold considerably more head of stock than do the pastoralists inside the quarantined area, and are entitled to some consideration. The "red herring" that is drawn across the path by this cry about cheap meat is really absurd, to those who know the facts of the case. The evidence before the Select Committee went distinctly to show that cattle cannot be landed any cheaper from Wyndham than from Sydney.

MR. MONGER: Is it not far better for us to bring cattle from a district in our own colony, rather than get them from Sydney?

MR. HOLMES: I say the evidence given before the Select Committee was that cattle in East Kimberley were worth £6 on the station and £6 10s. at Wyndham. We know that the recognised freight for bringing bullocks by sea to Fremantle is about £4 per head; and also know that the cost of attendance and fodder amounts to 10s. per head, and that £1 per head is allowed for insurance to cover loss. These items bring the total cost of the £6 10s. bullock at Wyndham to £12 at Fremantle, being equal to about 4d. a pound at Fremantle. The report also shows that in Sydney cattle are sold generally at the rate of £6 to £6 10s. per head. We

know that there are large boats engaged in carrying coal to Fremantle, and they fill up with cattle as deck cargo at a freight of about £2 10s. per head from Sydney to Fremantle, as against £4 freight from Wyndham to Fremantle, and we know that cattle can be bought as cheaply at Sydney as they can be bought at Wyndham; yet, in the face of all this, we are told that this amendment will be the means of reducing the price of meat to the consumer. I am satisfied that statements of this kind only serve to throw dust in the eyes of members. Stock-owners at Sydney are on the high road to Fremantle for shipping purposes, and, using boats that come here with coal, the shipowners are glad to fill the deck space at any freight they can get. If you send to Wyndham for cattle, you have to charter boats specially, and these cannot store cattle three or four deep, but can only put one tier on the bottom and another tier on the deck. They have also to take in coal at Fremantle for steaming purposes to Wyndham, the coal having to be imported in other boats, thereby increasing the cost; and the steamers cannot bring other cargo with the cattle, and have to bring the cattle back to Fremantle. The disadvantages our pastoralists in East Kimberley labour under are considerable in regard to the shipping of stock to Fremantle; and I hope to show this House my solution of the difficulty. I have shown it is not possible to land tick-infested cattle at Fremantle without danger to this part of the colony, and we have also to convince the public that there is no danger in doing so. But if we allow cattle to be landed at Fremantle, I think I have shown distinctly that the public are not likely to derive any direct benefit by the transaction. I hope I have also shown that the amendment, if carried, will have a disastrous effect on pastoralists generally outside the quarantined area. I have shown there is no doubt we shall spread the tick by these means throughout the length and breadth of the southern districts, if the amendment is carried; and this result is what none of us desire. We must all admit that this result will follow, if the prohibition is removed and the cattle from East Kimberley are allowed to land at Fremantle.

Hon. members will recollect that, about two years ago, I told the Government that, if they allowed tick-infested cattle from the Northern Territory of South Australia to be brought into the Kimberley district, those cattle would bring the tick with them. I ask this House to-day, was I right or not in the statement I then made? I can tell this House that, if they allow these tick-infested cattle in East Kimberley to be landed at Fremantle, as is suggested in the motion, then within a few months or a year it will be said of any member who supports this motion now: "You were one of the representatives who allowed tick-infested cattle to come to Fremantle." I am here to-day to say distinctly that I am not going to be one to have it said of me that I voted for bringing tick-infested cattle into the southern parts of the colony. I do not want to influence any other member, but I stand here to-day with a duty to perform, and I tell this House what my views are on the subject. I will not accept the grave responsibility. It has been said by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham), who ought to have known better because he was a member of the Select Committee, that tick had been found in paddocks at Fremantle and in other places throughout the colony. From the evidence before the Committee, the only place where cattle tick was found in Western Australia, outside of East Kimberley, was on the hide of a bullock in a slaughter-house at Fremantle.

MR. MORAN: Where did the hide come from?

MR. HOLMES: The reason that a paddock has been quarantined is that it was found out where the bullock, from which the hide was taken, came from, and that paddock was quarantined at once. We have the evidence of the stock inspector that he took the tick off the hide, but we do not know how the tick got there. We know at this time that tick were being carried about Fremantle in matchboxes. We know from the Premier that a tick was delivered at his house in a matchbox; and, when questioned as to who delivered that tick, the Premier would not divulge the secret. We have evidence that a lot of tick have been found; but we have no evidence as to where they came from. I am con-

vinced that if the Queensland tick, which were brought here, had been ear-marked before they were sent to Fremantle for distribution, the ear-marks would have been very conspicuous on this lot.

MR. GEORGE: Somebody must have put the tick there.

MR. HOLMES: Hon. members can draw their own inference. The Premier said that those who should have been interested in proving that tick did not exist in Fremantle had taken a prominent part in bringing the fact to light that tick did exist. It never dawned on the right hon. gentleman that the object of those interested was to prove that if tick did exist in Fremantle, the prohibition would not be continued in East Kimberley. Hon. members will notice that it has been suggested to slaughter and chill at Fremantle. As one who understands the business, I may say that if slaughtering and chilling are done at all, they should be done at Wyndham and not at Fremantle. The difficulties of carrying live-stock, as I have already shown, on our own coast and in the intercolonial trade, are very great. Apart from the freight, there is the loss of weight, which is always estimated at 100lbs. a bullock; and there is the mortality on the voyage. A lot has been said about the price of meat here, but the difficulty is that, added to the cost of transit, is the deterioration in the value of the animals being carried in a live state. We must remember that an inspector was sent to East Kimberley to report on the subject, and the inspector says in his report that chilling works can be erected at Wyndham at a cost of £7,000.

MR. MONGER: £7,000.

MR. HOLMES: Yes; £7,000, capable of chilling 500 head of cattle per week.

MR. MONGER: You know yourself that is absurd.

MR. HOLMES: We have the evidence of Mr. Hancock, the manager of the Perth Ice Company, who says that yards and all the appurtenances could be erected, in addition to a freezing plant capable of chilling 500 head of cattle per week, at a cost of £9,000. This would save 100lbs. in weight on each bullock, if they were chilled at Wyndham. I can show the 100lbs. saved will put at least £2 per head upon the value of the bullock. We are

told there are 7,000 bullocks in East Kimberley ready for shipment at the present time; £2 per head would be £14,000—an advantage to the owners of this stock which would be a good set-off against the £7,000 which would be expended in the construction of the chilling works. We know frozen meat can be carried at a cheaper rate than live-stock. Frozen meat can be stowed away like bricks, and consequently vessels not nearly so large as those engaged in the live-stock trade could be used, and the expense would not be so great in taking smaller steamers there and back, and this would have a tendency to reduce the freight. I have always said that the only way to secure a cheap and wholesome supply of meat for this market would be to erect chilling works at the northern ports, so that the stock owned there could be brought down to this market in prime condition and delivered to the purchasers here at the same weight at which it left the station, or left the port nearest to the station. I have advocated this as the only possible chance of cheapening the meat supply to the market; and if this is the solution of the difficulty, which I am more convinced of every time I go into figures, and if this is to be done, why not do it now, before we bring a greater distress on the pastoralists than exists? We know that there has been a tendency on the part of pastoralists in the north and throughout the colony to send their stock to market, and turn it into money too quickly. They do not give the stock an opportunity to mature and turn into weight. If a delay does occur—say, six, nine, or twelve months—in preparing the necessary freezing works, then undoubtedly the pastoralists will be compensated by the increased weight and value of their stock. I do not know that I need say anything further. The object of hon. members seems to be to bring the price of meat down to a reasonable rate. I admit the necessity for this, because meat really is too dear an article for the public generally at the present time; but under existing circumstances, with all the difficulties in the way, there is really no hope of improvement, unless you give the grazier an opportunity of delivering his article under reasonable circumstances, which do not

exist at the present time. I will conclude by stating that the erection of freezing works along the northern ports of the colony is the only reasonable solution of this difficulty; and if I have given any information to the House on the subject, and assisted hon. members in coming to a reasonable and satisfactory conclusion of this difficulty, then I think I have done my duty.

MR. HUBBLE (*Gascoyne*): I think the hon. member for Albany (*Mr. Leake*) hit the nail on the head when he said the real question is, are we or are we not going to allow tick-infested cattle to be brought into our midst here? The majority of members who have spoken, and those who are likely to speak, intend to bring tick into our midst here, and at all hazards ruin or partially ruin the owners of small herds in this part of the colony. It is doubtful if any tick came on the cattle that have come to this portion of the colony at all. Most of the tick have come in matchboxes. We have good evidence that some tick came here in matchboxes. The member for Fremantle (*Mr. Higham*) astonished me by bringing this subject before the House in the manner in which he has done. All the questions which were put by the Select Committee appeared to be against the introduction of tick into Fremantle; but somehow the hon. member has changed his mind, I cannot understand why. A majority of the members of the Select Committee investigated this matter with no selfish motive, as I noticed from the examination of the witnesses. One of the principal objects of the Committee was to find out the best way of getting rid of the disease. From the evidence before us, there is no doubt that inoculation is the only remedy for fever, and that remedy is recommended, not only by the Select Committee, but also by the member for Fremantle (*Mr. Higham*). I would like to see restrictions put on East Kimberley cattle for some nine months, so as to allow time for the people in the southern parts to inoculate their cattle.

MR. MORAN: How long would that take?

MR. HUBBLE: Considering the winter season is here plenty of time should be given to everybody to inoculate their stock. We are told that it will take six weeks or two months to inoculate the whole of the

cattle; but we have no instruments to carry out the inoculation, and therefore I should like to see the Government quarantine East Kimberley for at least nine months, to allow people in the southern parts to inoculate their cattle. If the owners do not choose to carry out the wishes of the Government in this respect, they cannot blame the Government if their cattle become fever-stricken. The small dairy herds of 20 or 30 head in the southern parts of the colony are as dear to their owners as are the thousands of cattle in East or West Kimberley; and it is our duty to look after those people who have put their little all into the dairy business. Last session it was decided that an inspector should visit East Kimberley, and the Government sent to Queensland for Mr. Hancock, who is an expert in this disease. We ought to be proud indeed to think we have had the services of that gentleman. We have heard Mr. Hancock run down, but, as a member of the Select Committee, I formed a very different opinion of that gentleman, who gave his evidence in a straightforward way, and showed he was a practical man who knew his business thoroughly. If we are going at the present time to allow cattle to be brought here, after sending for this expert evidence, we shall become the laughing-stock of the colonies. No one has more sympathy for the settlers in East Kimberley than I have. People may say I am prejudiced, but my only object is to look after the interests of the colony, and in this instance, after the interest of all the people in the southern districts. I cannot make myself believe that if we allow cattle to be brought to Fremantle under quarantine restrictions, tick can be prevented from spreading all over the colony. The moment one tick commences to lay its eggs, it is a matter of spreading the disease in a short time, and to allow infested cattle to come in means ruination to this part of the colony. It has been said that ticks will not live on the goldfields, and that may be so; but I only hope that cattle sent there will not drop tick on the way, or, otherwise Northam, Newcastle, and other places will suffer. A lot has been said about the price of meat; but that consideration cannot be allowed to enter the discussion. It is simply absurd to think that because tick-infested cattle

are to be brought here, the price of meat is going to be lessened. Cattle are coming from New South Wales at the present time, and I am in a position to say there is a firm here at the present time prepared to accept contracts for cattle at 4½d. for the next twelve months, and yet at the present time the price is 4d. to 4¾d. wholesale. I do not see therefore that the price of meat will be brought down in consequence of the transportation of tick-infested cattle. The hon. member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) said he believed that cattle from the Northern Territory should be brought in, although Adelaide at the present moment would not allow cattle to be sent into that city for slaughter. That hon. member, though willing to extend protection to fruit trees, is not willing to protect the cattle industry in which so much money has been embarked. I hope the House will throw out this motion, and show we are in agreement with the proposal of the member for Albany.

Mr. SOLOMON (South Fremantle) : Hitherto I have not taken a part in this debate, because I know little about the question, and was only anxious to hear both sides. The introduction of the tick to Fremantle would, no doubt, be a serious matter; but I have come to the conclusion that, if we can be hemmed in to such an extent that it would be impossible for the tick to be imported, I should not be opposed to the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley. I would suggest after the word "Wyndham," in the second paragraph, the words "after thorough inspection and after being certified as clean by a stock inspector" be inserted. These words appear in paragraph No. 3, but apply only to cattle going to the goldfields. If the mover of the proposition will accept my suggestion, I will vote with him, but otherwise I shall not.

Mr. HIGHAM (the mover): I understand the Premier proposes to add words to the motion, to the effect that anything done under this resolution shall be under regulations.

THE PREMIER: What I propose is to add, after the word "area," the words "under regulations to be made by the Government."

Mr. LEAKE: We had regulations last year, and you overruled them.

Mr. SOLOMON: Would the animals be inspected before leaving, and be passed as clean?

THE PREMIER: Oh, yes.

Mr. SOLOMON: That is all I want.

Mr. HIGHAM: After that assurance from the Premier, I hope the hon. member will not press his suggested amendment.

THE SPEAKER: The amendment is not before the House at all. The question before the House now is to omit all words after "markets." If no other member is going to speak, I had better leave the chair until half-past seven o'clock.

At 6.25 p.m. the SPEAKER left the chair.

At 7.30 the SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Amendment (Mr. Illingworth's) put, and Mr. LEAKE called for a division, which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	20
Majority against				12

<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Noes.</i>
Mr. Holmes	Mr. Connor
Mr. Hooley	Mr. Doherty
Mr. Hubble	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Leake	Mr. George
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Harper
Hon. H. W. Venn	Mr. Higham
(Teller)	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Locke
	Mr. Lefroy
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Solomon
	Mr. Vosper
	Mr. Kenny
	(Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): I move, as an amendment, that the word "Wyndham," in line 2 of paragraph 2, be struck out, and the words "the Kimberley districts" inserted in lieu thereof.

HON. H. W. VENN: I think that in the division which has just been taken,

some hon. members who had just come into the House did not quite realise the nature of the point at issue, though this was not for want of being told by the Speaker. I think it very probable that hon. members in that division were voting, not so much on the question as to whether the cattle should or should not come here from Kimberley, but were voting against the erection of freezing and chilling works at Wyndham. I take it that the large majority by which the amendment was negatived was intended to emphasise the fact that the House does not consider it urgent that such works should be erected.

MR. CONNOR: The meaning of hon. members will be made clear on future divisions.

HON. H. W. VENN: I am trying to make it clear as to whether members in the last division were voting on the question whether tick-infested cattle should be introduced into Fremantle.

THE PREMIER: We have not come to that yet.

HON. H. W. VENN: No; but we are rapidly approaching it, and it is necessary that the question at issue should be clearly apprehended. I cannot exactly see the force of the words that the member for West Kimberley desires to introduce. We are dealing with something in existence at the present time, and not something that may take place six or 12 months hence, or which may occur in Fremantle or some other part of the colony. At the present moment there is no tick in the West Kimberley district, therefore we do not want to legislate against that district.

A MEMBER: What proof is there?

HON. H. W. VENN: We do not think there is any tick in the West Kimberley district. Therefore I do not see much force in having these particular words introduced.

MR. A. FORREST: They will not do any harm.

HON. H. W. VENN: Whether they will do harm or not, the sequence of the argument will be that, if we are going to introduce tick-infested cattle from East Kimberley, it does not matter from what parts of Australia tick-infested cattle may be introduced. We may as well introduce them from all parts of Australia,

if they are going to be introduced at all. There is no particular reason why we should introduce tick-infested cattle only from East Kimberley. If other districts have tick, let us have cattle from them too. It is surprising, but the Premier seems most desirous that the whole of the colony shall have tick. He seems anxious to introduce it. If so, how was it that he, as head of the Government, went to the expense of getting an expert from Queensland? What was the object of that gentleman's visit here? What was the use of the expense? It was to tell us that we had tick, or that we had no tick. The sequence of reasoning would be that if he came here to tell us that we had tick, this very tick which will bring disease among cattle and create great loss, that would be an additional reason why we should isolate cattle and keep them where they are. We have the evidence of this man who is credited all over Australia as being an expert on the question; yet the Premier absolutely ignores it. He does not take the slightest notice of it, and says, "In my opinion, there cannot be any harm in it." If so, why did we go through the farce of getting this expert here at all? It is simply a farce. If the Premier, as the head of the Government, and the Government with him, say, "Whether he says so or not, we are going to introduce the tick," we might as well have saved the colony the expense of bringing this man, for what was the use of it?

MR. MORAN: Has he not taught you how to prevent it?

HON. H. W. VENN: He said a great deal, but has not told us how to prevent the tick. We know we cannot prevent it, in a measure. What I mean to say is that this man came for one specific purpose, and he has given his evidence, stating most distinctly that he could not recommend or suggest the bringing of cattle to Fremantle and killing them there. He came to prove we had tick; and now, having it, we are going to hug it as closely as we can and introduce it all over the colony. It is as though we were told we had a wretched case of small-pox in a northern district, and we said, "We like it so much, we will bring it down amongst us." One member said to-night—I do not think he

wished to convey the impression, but he did so, and it was really unjust and ungenerous to Mr. Hancock—that Mr. Hancock was rather in favour of introducing cattle here, because under strict regulations you can reduce to a minimum the chances of infection or of disseminating disease. Mr. Hancock did not intend to say anything of the sort. He did say that, under certain conditions, you might reduce the chances of infection very much; but directly you touched the question of bringing cattle down here to the southern part of the colony, his evidence was most emphatic. That being so, I cannot understand the Premier treating his evidence in the manner he has done, throwing it on one side and saying that in his opinion there would not be much chance of the disease being introduced. That might be so; but in my opinion there is every chance of it, and that opinion is based upon the evidence of Mr. Hancock, and of experts all over the world. Members say there would be no chance at all, but if they read the evidence they will find that, even under the most stringent dipping, the dipping that almost kills the cattle, you cannot eradicate the tick from the cattle. You can get at the greater portion of them, but in the creases on the breasts, and underneath the legs, and in parts of the cattle which cannot be got at freely, these ticks adhere. Therefore if you had a regulation by which you would dip the cattle, even then you could not say you would not introduce tick into Fremantle or other parts of the colony by bringing them down. I think that even the most rigid crush inspection would not be a complete guarantee that cattle coming down would be absolutely free from tick. If tick cannot be absolutely cleared from the cattle, where is the minimum chance of not introducing it throughout the colony? You would bring the disease right down into Fremantle. The Premier or someone suggested that the cattle should swim ashore. Swimming ashore might be effective in washing the ticks off, but the ticks would be washed on to the sea shore, and then they might be spread all over the colony. We have had evidence that certain islands in the northern portion of Queensland away from the main coast have this disease, and it may be said it

has been taken by birds; but the chances are that it was taken by the sea itself. We do not know. At any rate there is the fact that this disease by some means spreads from one part of the colony to another, in spite of the precautions taken. I wish to call attention to this fact again, and I cannot emphasise it too strongly, that the conditions prevailing in West Australia are not the conditions prevailing in any other part of Australia. We have a natural barrier, and although the time may come when this tick may come across the barrier, still we can arrest its progress for a very long time by these rigid quarantine regulations. If we do not do that the result will be that we will have tick all over Western Australia in a very short space of time. Some members made a very great point by trying to delude the House with the idea that it was proposed as an absolute necessity, in order to reduce the cost of food. Some of those gentlemen a little while ago were not so anxious to reduce the cost of meat on these particular lines. They did not speak so strongly on that point then, but now it suits them in a way, to speak of introducing these cattle for the purpose of reducing the cost of meat. One member who is an authority on the subject has told us that is all moonshine, that there is nothing in it, and that the cost of getting cattle from Kimberley is equal to, if not greater than, that of getting them from the other colonies. That being so, this bogey raised up about the cost of meat has nothing to do with the consumer at all, and I think we may throw on one side altogether this red-herring which has been thrown across the track. It has nothing to do with that.

THE PREMIER: You could get cattle cheaper from Kimberley than from other places.

HON. H. W. VENN: These gentlemen who know something about it will tell us we cannot.

THE PREMIER: I think we can.

HON. H. W. VENN: The right hon. gentleman says he thinks we can. He does not know.

MR. LEAKE: He says it.

HON. H. W. VENN: I am afraid that in this case we cannot take the Premier's view of the matter, inasmuch as

all those who are best able to judge say they cannot get the cattle cheaper from Kimberley. We are bound to take the evidence of those whose opinion is worth having, just in the same way as we take the opinion of an expert. The Premier says he does not believe it. We brought an expert here, and I for one am going to stick to the opinion expressed by that expert, and vote against introducing these cattle. I voted with the Premier, just now, on that motion, with the idea only of dealing with the question of abattoirs and chilling works up there, because I thought, on further consideration, and after hearing the remarks made by the member for Albany, it would be better to try the general issue on the one point as to whether cattle shall or shall not be introduced from Kimberley into the southern portion of the colony. It is my intention now to vote entirely against the other two motions before the House dealing with the introduction of these cattle from East Kimberley, and let the one motion, if possible, stand before the House. I should have liked to have put some addenda to the motion which would have made it compulsory on people to inoculate the cattle, but my attention at the time was drawn on one side and the motion was put without any addenda, so that even if this motion is passed by the House it will be nothing but an abstract one, just conveying an opinion, and if it is left as it is there will be nothing compulsory about it. There will be nothing to say that people shall inoculate, or shall not do so. It will, as I say, be simply a bare motion passed by the House, unless we have some further enactment to enforce it. It seems to me most extraordinary that, while we are dealing with this question in a light and airy way, we find that in other parts of Australia, in New South Wales, the question at present is a burning one. The Government there are as anxious as possible that they shall not have their districts infested with tick. Although they may know, as we know, that in the course of time tick will infest the whole of Australia, yet the Government in New South Wales are doing all they possibly can to keep the tick out, and we are doing all we can, as far as I can see, to keep them

in. If tick-infested cattle are introduced, here we may bring the tick into a district where it may flourish better than in other parts of Australia. We have a humid, moist climate in the southern portion of the colony, and the disease may become very virulent there, and the 170,000 head of cattle which are now there will become infected more or less, and there will no doubt be mortality. Some hon. members have gone so far as to say that, if the House favours the introduction of tick-infested cattle, we can have a shipment here in three weeks; and if that is not going mad over the matter, I do not know what is. Three weeks—before there is a chance of inoculation at all! It does not much matter whether the cattle are good or bad, they will bring the disease amongst cattle which are not immune from the disease. If it is intended to introduce cattle at all, let a sufficient time elapse to enable the people in West Kimberley downwards to the southern portion of the colony to inoculate their cattle. We have been told that the tick have been found in different parts of Fremantle, and in match-boxes, but we have no particular evidence—we cannot get the evidence—of tick having been landed at Fremantle and thrown about on the fields, as some hon. members would lead us to suppose they have been. Even if tick had been introduced in this way, according to the history of tick, it may lie dormant for a year or two, and then the disease may break out in a virulent form, creating havoc amongst our herds.

MR. LEAKE: Is it proposed to inoculate cattle before they leave Kimberley?

HON. H. W. VENN: Oh, no. The matter which is of great moment to us is the inoculation of our own cattle.

MR. LEAKE: Still it ought to be done.

HON. H. W. VENN: I think so. The regulation should provide that the whole of the cattle throughout the colony should be inoculated. The Kimberley cattle would probably not be inoculated, because they have the disease: but what we are anxious about is, that we should have sufficient time before the introduction of tick-infested stock, if they are allowed to come in at all, to inoculate the cattle throughout the colony.

MR. GEORGE: Are there no clean cattle in East Kimberley at all?

HON. H. W. VENN: If the hon. member reads the evidence he will see, but we cannot say there are absolutely clean cattle, when the cattle are in an infested district. Will you say, if there is small-pox in a country, that everybody has the small-pox?

MR. GEORGE: Certainly not.

HON. H. W. VENN: But you quarantine the people coming from a country where there is small-pox. I cannot but draw a parallel in reference to certain circumstances which occurred in this House a year or so ago. Some time ago the Government were anxious to eradicate scab; what were the regulations then? Sheep from the southern districts, animals that were apparently clean, and had never had a symptom of scab disease, were not allowed into the northern portion of the colony at all. There was a most rigid quarantine established, and sheep could not go beyond a certain line under a great penalty. The Government treated the disease which was amongst the sheep—it was simply a skin disease, and had nothing whatever to do with the meat consumption at all—as if it were of great importance. The Government then did not consider the sheep owners at all, and I cannot understand the same Government being so anxious now to release the quarantine regulations, and bring a virulent disease, which has been known to cause destruction throughout America, and throughout Queensland and wherever it has been found, into this part of the colony. I cannot understand the desire of the Government in this instance to bring ticks to Fremantle, and distribute them gratuitously among the cattle in the southern portion of the colony. As sure as night follows day, if we do this, before many years are over, I do not think people will thank the Government for the introduction of tick. It would be wiser to put up with the consequences now, and prevent the tick coming into this portion of the colony. If it had been shown that, by the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley, it would really and absolutely lessen the price of meat, I might admit that the argument would have had a good deal of force in it, but when we are told, by those who know a great deal

on this subject, that it will not make any appreciable difference, inasmuch as we can introduce clean cattle from New South Wales at a lower cost than we can from Kimberley, I do not see that we should introduce cattle from the north. That is not the sort of argument I care about. I prefer, and I am sure all hon. members prefer, doing all we can to assist those who are of ourselves. There cannot be any doubt about that. One hon. gentleman was anxious to introduce the home-bred tick, but he was not in favour of introducing the tick from other parts of Australia. I do not think that is the sort of idea that would find sympathy with hon. members of this House. That hon. gentleman said "We do not want the foreign-bred tick," but I think it was the foreign-bred competition he did not want. We are told we do not want the foreign-bred tick brought here, although the tick in the other countries is just the same kind of tick as we have here. The Government have said "We cannot afford what is proposed; we have not the money." I do not think the Government or hon. members of this House should plead that state of poverty. I have yet to learn we are in a chronic state of bankruptcy; we are not in that state. One member says the Government have not the money. I say we have, if we like to do what is proposed. We reappropriated loans for railways, for battery purposes, for a jetty at the Ashburton, and for jetties elsewhere—£10,000, £12,000, or £15,000—and if we establish chilling works, the £5,000 or £10,000 or £15,000 required for the purpose would be forthcoming. I banish from my mind the idea that the colony is in a state of bankruptcy, and cannot afford it. I rather favour the idea, from figures that have been shown us, that it is quite within reason that those gentlemen interested in stock should erect abattoirs and chilling works themselves. It looks to me as if there was a good profit in the whole of this business, and if a profit can be made by the erection of chilling works, I think the time has arrived when we should let private enterprise have a little of its own sweet will, and do the best it can. I was anxious to go further and say that, if we prohibit stock coming into this portion of the country, I would have given my vote in favour of the Govern-

ment spending the money to bring the meat down, and I am quite willing to do that now. I feel very strongly on the point, and I feel much disappointed. I thought I should have had the Premier with me on this point, and the influence which he exercises over the members of this House. But this is not a no-confidence motion, or there would have been a larger majority than there is in favour of the introduction of the tick. I thought the Premier would have taken a stand in this matter, and confirmed the action of the House last year. I shall vote absolutely against the introduction of cattle from Kimberley under any regulations whatever.

Mr. KINGSMILL (Pilbarra): The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) has spoken of the ravages that this disease, which we are about to import into Fremantle, is likely to create amongst the herds in the southern districts; but he seems to forget that we have passed paragraph No. 1 of the motion, relating to inoculation. If there was one point more than another on which the expert brought here by the Government gave strong evidence, it was on the fact that the inoculation of cattle rendered them immune from the fatal effects of tick. That gentleman, in his evidence, conclusively proved that inoculation creates an absolute immunity from fatal results; he also proved that it does so without any serious injury to the animal operated on; and he also proved that, in the case of dairy herds, milking can go on while the slight fever caused by the inoculation is in course of progress, and without detrimental effects on the animals. The member for Albany (Mr. Leake) estimates the time which would be required for the inoculation of the southern herds at 12 months. I fail to see how he arrives at that. Mr. Hancock's evidence shows that, in order to inoculate the whole of the cattle in Western Australia, the importation of one bullock in an acute stage, or one that is recovering from the acute stage, is all that is necessary. After the inoculation with virus from this bullock, there will be no need for further importation. In the first place, a bullock such as I have described would have to be obtained from a reliable source, and for that source we can count on the Stock Department of

Queensland. Such a bullock, or possibly three or four of them, would take a month to get round here. Then, taking these bullocks as the centre from which to obtain the inoculating fluid, the stock inspectors—of whom I believe the Government have almost a superfluity in various districts of the colony—could, as part of their duties, have the supervision of inoculation in their various territories. I should say that the requisite inoculation would not take more than, at the outside, six months. The districts in which the tick would probably assume dangerous proportions might be taken first, and the animals in Fremantle first operated on. If the Government took speedy steps to enforce inoculation, and give every facility for inoculation, the colony would almost be in a state to receive cattle from infected districts as soon as such cattle could arrive here. In Western Australia we are in a peculiar position. We are a population consisting largely of consumers, and, in a very small proportion, of producers. The other colonies—in which more stringent regulations in regard to this disease have been enforced—are in exactly an opposite position, particularly Queensland. The stringent regulations in Queensland are not insisted on so much by the Queensland Government as by the Governments of the other colonies. Queensland has more than enough meat for her own consumption, and she exports to New South Wales and Victoria. In no colony is it more necessary that an importation of meat should go on than it is in the colony of Western Australia, and in no other colony are the people suffering under such a burden from the high price of meat as here. I am afraid I must differ from the member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) in the view he takes on this subject. He treats with absolute scorn the contention that the admission of East Kimberley cattle would affect the price of meat by at least 1d. per lb. Whatever we can do to help the people of the colony to get cheap meat, even though there may be only a reduction of 1d. per lb., it is our bounden duty to do it. The greater part of the cattle which the people of Western Australia eat, comes from the other colonies, and accordingly the money for the cattle is sent to the other colonies, and if we by

any means, can keep that money here, we ought to do so. I have read the report of the Select Committee on the tick question, and the evidence given before that Committee, with the utmost interest, and, I hope, with a great deal of instruction to myself. I must compliment the Committee on having brought together evidence which I think might, if differently formulated, be taken as a text-book on this disease. I have very much pleasure in supporting the general principle of the importation of these cattle.

MR. KENNY: I have always recognised the question before the House as a most serious one. Last year, when we were discussing this question, I made it my business to enquire from every possible source the exact facts. On the one hand, I was supplied with information that led me to suppose tick in the Kimberley district was not such a very dread disease, and that we ought not to anticipate any great danger from it. On the other hand, I was informed by one of the best authorities in the colony, that already cattle from the tick-infested paddocks at Fremantle, were in seven different parts of the colony, and that it was only a matter of a short time when cattle in this portion of the colony would be decimated. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that people who gave me information in regard to Kimberley were interested, and that those who gave me information in regard to the actual state of things were not interested. I gave the benefit of the doubt to the disinterested parties, and I voted against the introduction of the cattle—or rather for the prohibition of any further shipments of cattle from that portion of Kimberley. Now, I cannot help asking myself: where is the decimation that had to take place? Which of these sources of information has proved correct; the one I recognised as being interested and rejected, or the one that was not interested and I accepted? I am bound to confess that those interested have certainly shown me I was mistaken in the estimate I formed. I was a member of the Select Committee appointed by this House to enquire into the question. I took a very great interest in the matter, and attended every meeting of the Committee from the first to the last; and that is a great deal more than can be said by

some members of the Committee who have had so much to say about the question to-night. In regard to Mr. Hancock, I do not profess to give the House the letter of the words used by him, but I can convey, possibly as clearly as those who profess to recollect every word of Mr. Hancock's answers, the meaning of that gentleman's evidence. Mr. Hancock gave the Committee distinctly to understand that quarantine could not be considered a barrier—that in fact it was impossible to create a barrier against the spread of tick. Mr. Hancock's opinion was that the one and best and only means of relieving the herds from the disease was inoculation, the effect of which is to render cattle immune, though it does not destroy the tick. Inoculation reduces the tick to a mere parasite, or, as Mr. Hancock put it, an insect nuisance. When the Committee came to the question of some means of freeing the cattle of East Kimberley, Mr. Hancock was asked whether, if a strict inspection of cattle were made before shipment and an equally strict inspection made when cattle were being landed, and a strict inspection also made before they were allowed to go outside the paddocks at the quarantine line at Fremantle, there would be any danger, and he cordially admitted that these steps would reduce the risk considerably. Then one member of the Committee asked Mr. Hancock: "Why have you not recommended that?" and Mr. Hancock said: "Because I am fully convinced that sooner or later tick will be here. You cannot prevent the spread of tick, and in the position I hold I decline to leave it open to the people of this colony in the future to single me out as having been the means of introducing the tick which is now infesting other portions of the colony." That was what Mr. Hancock conveyed, and that was the great responsibility he declined to take. It was a question for a stronger and higher power than Mr. Hancock to decide; and the question is now before the House. It is for this House to decide whether we will act on the suggestion of Mr. Hancock, or whether we will admit cattle from this district. I quite fail to understand how certain members have worked themselves into such a state of horror at the idea of tick being brought down here. We have it

distinctly, on the evidence of Mr. Hancock, that although tick must be brought down here sooner or later, inoculation will render cattle immune, and reduce the tick to a simple nuisance. As a simple nuisance, tick is very different from a scourge, calculated to decimate the herds of this portion of the colony. I have no desire to detain the House. All that can be said for and against the proposal has been said, but I cannot sit down without remarking how very strange it is that the same set of facts may create diametrically different impressions on the members to whom they are related under different circumstances. I do not mean to suggest for a moment that members of the Committee have in any way permitted the fact that they were interested parties to weigh with them in the decisions which they gave as a Committee, or in what they have stated before the House this evening; but I think it is worthy of note that while those interested have been taking one view of the subject, members who are entirely disinterested, and can consequently give an unbiassed opinion, have formed a different opinion from the evidence placed before the Commission. For my own part, I think I can claim to have the interest of my country at heart quite as much as any member of this House; and I feel that I am not in any way doing an injustice either to the cattle owners, or to the other interested parties in this matter, by voting for the motion, as amended by the Premier, that is now before us. But I cannot shut my eyes, as some men can, to the fact that the price of meat is simply ruinous, nor to the fact that I am as confident as I am standing here that, if those cattle are admitted, it will reduce the price of meat, and that I am representing a constituency who are now looking forward to my doing my duty by them as far as I can; and, in speaking and voting as I am doing, and shall do to-night, I feel I am doing what is due to the workers of the North Murchison, who have sent me here to represent them.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): I do not intend to vote on this question, being personally interested in it. I am going to speak my mind here, but shall not vote.

MR. GEORGE: If that course were followed, a good many votes would be mis-giving.

MR. A. FORREST: This question is of grave importance to the people I represent; it is more than a grave question to them, for it means, if we allow these cattle to come here to be killed, destruction to their occupation. The effect of the motion is that cattle are to be trucked through to the goldfields, and there sold—driven to the northern goldfields, perhaps past Menzies, where there are no railways, amongst other cattle. Before we allow these cattle to be introduced, it seems to me we must take those further precautions which have been recommended by Mr. Hancock, who was sent here by the Queensland Government to advise us on this question. No one can go beyond the inquiry that was held, and the answers he gave to the questions put to him. By reading the evidence we can see he is a practical man, and a man of undoubted honour.

MR. KENNY: Hear, hear.

MR. A. FORREST: A man who could not be swayed, one way or the other. Probably no man was ever tried in his examination on very difficult points as he was, and he was greatly abused by a certain section of the Press of this colony, so that he went away from here not too well pleased with the treatment he received. The question of allowing these cattle to come into the southern parts of the colony before they are inoculated is a serious one. I would suggest that before this be permitted, a period of six months should be allowed to elapse, to give time to inoculate the cattle both here and in the north. Then they could be admitted without any further notice whatever. That would make the cattle here safe; it would make those in other portions of the colony safe, and those of East Kimberley safe, too; because the cattle owners in the northern district and the West Kimberley district will lose no time in inoculating their cattle, whatever it costs them to do so. They will not run the risk of having their herds broken up and destroyed by this pest. If we agree to this period of six months during which nothing shall be done, it seems to me we shall be doing all that

we are justified in doing at the present time. The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) referred to a debate in this House some 15 years ago, when the member for the Ashburton (Hon. S. Burt) fought the question of scab in sheep. On that occasion we protected, by an Act or resolution, the southern portions of the colony against sheep from the north passing through the Victoria district. All sheep coming through that one district were obliged to be dipped, at a cost of thousands of pounds to the northern settlers, before they could be introduced into the southern portions of the colony; and, by that means, we altogether eradicated the scab out of the country. I should like to ask those members who are in favour of admitting these cattle at the present time, whether they would be prepared, presuming that scab in sheep broke out in the Kimberley district, to allow them to come down in steamers and then be trucked away all over the colony or to the goldfields? Would they allow that for one moment? Would the stock-owners or the members of this House allow it? I say, no.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They would not dream of it.

MR. A. FORREST: No; they would be very far from dreaming of it. It must be amusing to all of us who are largely interested in stock in those districts to learn from the amateur members of the House, who know little or nothing about the question, that if we admit these cattle from the tick-infested country, we will effect an immediate reduction of 1d. a pound in the price of meat. I think that matter was fully explained by the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes). I could not explain it better, for he went into the exact figures, and showed the House that the purchaser of a bullock in East or West Kimberley, or anywhere else in our colony, bought it as cheaply as it could be procured in Sydney or in South Australia. In Melbourne, of course, the price is much higher than it is here; but in Sydney or in South Australia, bullocks can be bought as cheaply as in our northern districts, and can be brought to this colony at a price 30 per cent. lower than that at which they can be imported from our northern districts. I have been engaged in the business for

a great many years; I am not speaking without knowledge; and I should be sorry indeed if it were thought that I intended to mislead the House in any way on this question.

THE PREMIER: We cannot compete, then, with the other colonies?

MR. MORAN: Why, then, do we want the Kimberley cattle?

MR. A. FORREST: I told the hon. member what I thought about that subject, and he did not take any notice. He has taken the duty off, which, of course, will be a great benefit to him. The prophecy that this proposal will reduce the price of meat is something drawn over the trail to make the goldfields members believe they are gaining great advantages. Does any reasonable man in the House, or any business man outside of it, think that an East Kimberley cattle-owner is going to undersell the market quotations? Is it a likely thing? I do not think so. I would not do it, nor would any other member in the House. The residents in East Kimberley are solely to blame for the presence of tick. The cattle-owners there insisted on bringing stock from the Northern Territory of South Australia, though they were told there was great risk in doing so. But the reply was that there was no risk whatever, and my friend, the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper), says to-night that we will bring them from the Northern Territory of Queensland and of South Australia, where all the ticks are bred. He even wants to go so far as that. I notice that this vote is, as it were, ear-marked, and no doubt it will be resolved by a large majority to bring in ticked-cattle. Anything we may say will not alter the vote; for I can see as well as possible there is not the slightest doubt as to how it will go. Although the member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) thinks the division taken this evening does not represent the feeling of hon. members, he will find that in the next division the numbers will be practically the same, and that the whole question is a foregone conclusion, so that nothing I can say on this important matter will take one vote away, for every vote is ear-marked. I say the motion will make no difference in the price of meat. We are running a great risk, and those who are sending the cattle down here will run a greater risk. If the re-

port be correct which we read in the papers the day before yesterday, of a bullock being found by the inspector in an acute stage of fever, from which he was enabled to get the necessary virus for the inoculation of other cattle, I say it behoves us to be very careful. The risk to the importers and owners of cattle, whatever they are, will also be enormous, when we consider that they will have to muster and drive them, and put them in the ship, and bring them down here, under very strict quarantine at both ends. If the motion is carried, as I am sure it will be, it behoves the Government to take the greatest precautions to see that the quarantine ground in Fremantle should be fenced, not with an ordinary fence, which cattle can jump, but with a high fence; and the majority of them must be killed, though what is to be done with the hides I do not know—they must not be exported to the other colonies. And another thing: it is well known by those engaged in the trade in this colony that we cannot more than half supply the demand of the meat market. That is about what we are doing now; and, if each port is gazetted as a tick-infested port, our sheep skins and all other similar products will have to be quarantined, and the trucks in which they are carried thoroughly disinfected, before they carry other stock. The whole thing will require the gravest attention from the Government.

MR. GEORGE: Then they will raise the railway freight.

MR. A. FORREST: I am speaking on the tick, not on the railways. I hope that, before the vote is taken, the Premier will give an assurance to this House that no stone will be left unturned to do everything that is necessary, so that the tick will not spread to the other districts of the colony. I wish to say once more to the Government that they are most to blame in this matter. They were the people who allowed these cattle to come in in the first instance. They now intend to vote to allow these ticked cattle to come in in the course of a few weeks. I say they will have to adopt the most stringent measures to prevent disastrous consequences following their action, and no alteration of the regulations should be allowed anywhere. The cattle will have to come here under the strictest quaran-

tine, and, if they go up to the goldfields, the cars will have to be marked, as they are in America, "Tick-infested cattle;" and those cars must be washed and cleaned before they are allowed to return to Fremantle. That is my idea of the whole question. I would much prefer—and I believe it would be for the interests of each district—that a Bill should be brought in making inoculation compulsory, even if the Government had to pay for its being done; or, on the other hand, the cattle-owners might do it at their own expense. But, if this motion is to be carried, six months at least should be allowed to elapse before any cattle are brought down from East Kimberley. The herds in the East Kimberley district, where the greater portion of the meat supply used to come from, have been killed down to a very low age—lower than they should be—because the market has been fairly good. They have been killed down to less than three years old on the average; and the hardships would not be very great if they were not admitted till a season when cattle of that age are usually brought from there—say next March or April. I threw out a suggestion that these paragraphs should be amended in the direction that strict inoculation should take place forthwith under an Act of Parliament, and that the quarantine regulations should be put off till, say, the 1st March of next year.

MR. CONOLLY (Dundas): I have listened with great care and interest to the opinions which have been expressed by the member for West Kimberley and others, representing opposite sides of this question. While I cannot agree with the attitude which the member for Wellington has taken, I can see no reason for not giving my support to the amendment moved by the member for West Kimberley. It is, in my opinion, a reasonable amendment, and I cannot see any cause for disagreeing with it. The member for Wellington was probably more averse than any other member to the importation of cattle from the north to the southern portions of the colony. I do not think any member in this Assembly, certainly any goldfields member, has any desire to jeopardise or imperil the interests of the farming community in this portion of the colony; and it is for

that reason possibly most goldfields members have paid special attention to a gentleman who is himself interested and represents a large portion of the farming community in the southern portions of the colony. Still, surely he must have read the report placed before the House which emanated from the expert who came from Queensland. That gentleman stated distinctly that with inoculation we may create an immunity from the evils of the tick trouble both in regard to cattle in this portion of the colony and cattle in the north. That expert said that inoculation was the best, the quickest, and most adequate means for preventing the ravages of tick. Surely the hon. member must see that, provided this is carried out properly, without delay, and a reasonable time allowed to elapse before cattle are brought down from the North, the breeders in this portion of the colony will run very little risk from the ravages of tick. They will have immunity for their own herds, and the cattle coming down from the North will also to a large extent be immuned from the evils of tick. Even allowing for the force of the statement of the member for West Kimberley, that cattle brought from the North cost the people of this portion of the colony as much as cattle imported from the eastern colonies, it should be born in mind that the money paid for cattle brought from the North would remain in the colony. Looking at the condition of the colony at the present moment, no one can fail to fully realise the enormous extent to which money is now and has been leaving the colony and going into the hands of people living in other portions of Australia. One of the main troubles in relation to the industrial progress of this colony is that we are not retaining our own money here. The money is leaving us, and surely the question is worth looking into, especially with reference to the importation of meat. We have cattle reserves and cattle stations up in the North, and it would be more to the benefit of the colony to let the pastoralist there have the advantage of our money, than to send that money to the eastern colonies and let other people have the benefit of it. Another question, and one which has not been previously raised, is how long quarantine

would last in a district where it has once been imposed. How long would it take to destroy ticks in the North?

A MEMBER: You would never do it.

MR. CONOLLY: A district would practically continue to be in quarantine. Certainly we might adopt a system of inoculation whereby the evils of the tick would be obliterated—that is to say, red-water fever. The ticks would always be there, but the whole of the evidence given by the expert before the members of the Committee goes to prove that tick are not the originators. They inoculate this fever into the animals, and ticks may exist without the red water fever. The main danger to the cattle is practically red-water fever, and not tick. It would be wise for Parliament to so regulate the importation of cattle from the North as to allow fair and reasonable time for inoculation both in the North and here. The herds here should be inoculated just as much as those in the North, and after a reasonable time has been allowed to elapse the consumers here should reap the benefit of the northern supplies.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): I do not intend to detain the House many minutes with reference to the subject of ticks, but I do urge upon members the importance of considering carefully the fact that we are only a small community, and cannot be supposed to have all the experience of the world. The sister colonies of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia have all, at large cost to themselves and at very great inconvenience, endeavoured to quarantine tick. It seems to me a strange thing that we, knowing the experience of these large colonies, with herds larger than our own, and where the people have gone to so much trouble and cost to check the progress of tick, should be so indifferent about it. At the present we have one district that is ticked up; and it seems that district is so peculiarly situated that it would be possible for a considerable length of time to detain the tick and keep the infested cattle in that district. A little while ago I made a proposal which was lost, which seemed to me to point out the only way whereby we could deal with this question fairly, and that was by detaining cattle in quarantine and yet

providing for cattle being slaughtered in that particular district and sent to market dead. That seemed to me then, and still seems to me the only solution; but I do urge upon the House, before a vote is taken, to carefully consider the experiences of the other colonies—Queensland with over 400,000 people, New South Wales with over 1,200,000, Victoria with over 1,100,000, and South Australia with 366,000. The past wisdom of the whole of Australia is on the lines of detaining as much as possible the ticks in the districts in which they break out. Of course there are conditions prevalent in which it has not been possible to carry out this to the full extent. Our position is that we have tick in only one particular district. That is the evidence. The expert says he advises, in consequence of the possibility, and not the probability, of tick spreading in the colony, inoculation; and we have proof of the benefit of that, because the cattle that first came to the Kimberley district passed through a sort of inoculated state. A certain number had tick fever and recovered, and so became immuned. I do not understand the question, and the only object I had in rising was to call attention to the fact that we have the experience of the larger colonies, where people know more about this question than we do. All the evidence goes to show they have tried quarantine as far as possible. Then we have, as I say, tick in only one district, and the only reasonable and proper solution of the question is to keep the tick where it is, also to adopt a system of inoculation in case of its getting beyond those boundaries, and to find some means of allowing persons who have cattle in the district to send the animals to market not living, so that they may disseminate disease, but dead.

MR. HARPER (Beverley): The member who has just spoken stated he does not understand this question, and he particularly wished us to be guided by the experience of the other colonies. He informed us that the colonies of Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, had gone to enormous expense, as I understood the hon. member, to keep tick out. That proves his utter ignorance of the subject; for New South Wales has not gone

to any expense to keep it out, but is making an enormous fortune out of it.

MR. OLDHAM: Out of the tick?

MR. HARPER: Yes; most decidedly. Queensland has lost by cattle being quarantined, and New South Wales has gained the restrictions having raised enormously the value of cattle in New South Wales. New South Wales does not want the restrictions removed, because restrictions raised the price of cattle far beyond what it would have been if Queensland cattle had been allowed in. That operates to some extent here. The very fact of cattle being locked up in East Kimberley raises the price outside, and you must not overlook it in considering the question before us. This House owes a deep debt of gratitude to two hon. members who have spoken on this subject, the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes), and the member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest). In discussing the question of the tariff the other day, the member for East Fremantle, whose candour I much appreciate, said that in taking off the 15s. stock duty, there would be no benefit to the consumer, but that he would pocket it. He tells us to-night that he can get cattle at £2 10s. per head from New South Wales, against £4 from Kimberley—that also he puts in his pocket, because he will not allow it to operate in reducing the price here. He will keep the price up. The member for West Kimberley says that he can introduce cattle at 30 per cent. less from New South Wales than from Kimberley—that he puts in his pocket. I have thought over this subject, because I represent an agricultural district, and I am interested in the raising of stock. We should look at the question from the point of view of the consumer, and we should also endeavour to put the producer in the best position we can. All producers of live-stock are against the importation of chilled or frozen meat. It is recognised on all hands that the introduction of frozen meat would be a very serious blow indeed. The result of maintaining the present conditions must put the country under pressure to reduce the price, somehow or another. If it cannot be done in regard to live-stock, it must be done in dead meat. Therefore the interest of the producer is best watched and guarded for the future, not

for the present time, in encouraging the live-stock trade.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: How will the Kimberley cattle reduce the price?

MR. HARPER: The hon. member has not appreciated the point which I endeavoured to make. If you leave the trade to East Kimberley, you leave it in the hands of practically two firms. If you introduce cattle from the Northern Territory of Queensland and South Australia, you have a supply which is larger than you require. As long as you draw from districts that cannot supply you, you keep up the price; and that is what the member for Central Murchison has determined to do. I say we should draw from the largest possible supply rather than from a restricted one, and by that means we shall serve the best interests of the grazier in the colony. That is the way to cheapen meat, without doing serious injury to the producer.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The way to import the tick.

MR. HARPER: There is one point I must emphasise, and I must say it has raised a feeling of wonder in my mind. Those who have spoken, and spoken strongly, in opposition to the introduction of these cattle tried to frighten hon. members with the terrible disaster that would follow. If there is one thing more than another, established in the evidence taken before the Select Committee, it is that, after inoculation, there is practically no danger of loss. Even hon. members who sat on that Committee have urged that if you introduce this terrible scourge, it will devastate the country. That is absolutely false.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Why do the other colonies quarantine, then?

MR. HARPER: Because they have not learnt until now. I am surprised at another point that was made, and that is the attempt to draw a parallel between the scab and the tick disease. The two things are on a totally different footing. You can eradicate scab, and the country is justified in using extreme measures to eradicate it, and the country has succeeded in doing so. If the same could be done with the tick, I should very likely be assisting those members who desire to keep the tick where it is. We have it as

an established fact, beyond any doubt, that this is impossible; therefore you must treat the tick disease in a different way. I must say the remarks of the member for Albany (Mr. Leake) have puzzled me a good deal. I cannot understand the action he has taken, unless he has a lasting and undying desire to injure local production, because the whole of his action from first to last has been aimed in that direction, whether through ignorance or not I cannot say. If you examine the hon. member's argument, you must come to that conclusion. I have no objection whatever to the amendment before the House. I think it is a reasonable one, and should be accepted.

MR. WILSON (Canning): I am afraid I must plead guilty to being an amateur on this question; but I hope, amateur though I be, I shall be able to bring to bear a little common sense on the matter, and adduce some facts from the speeches that have been made. It seems to me we have reached the sub-acute stage in this tick business, and if we carry this motion before the House, we shall soon reach the fatal stage, and have the tick overrunning the colony from one end to the other. I cannot help thinking of the remarks of the member for West Kimberley, when he boldly stood up and accused members opposite of having been at fault in allowing tick to come to Western Australia. It appears to me it is a most unfortunate and regrettable circumstance that the Premier was so pliable last year, when he gave way to the extreme pressure brought to bear upon him, and removed the prohibition in regard to the Wave Hill cattle, which his colleagues, in his absence, had placed upon them. His colleagues had been forced to prohibit these cattle from Wave Hill; but as soon as the Premier came back he gave way to pressure, and allowed these cattle to come over the borders, and the tick with them. The Premier still insists, notwithstanding all the expert evidence we have had, at some little cost to the colony, that the tick will not thrive in the southern portions of the colony. The Premier says he does not believe tick will exist here at all.

THE PREMIER: There is no evidence at all that it will.

MR. WILSON: I think Mr. Hancock, who came from Queensland, distinctly stated that the southern portions of this colony were suitable to the propagation and increase of tick.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: What is his opinion against the Premier's?

THE PREMIER: Quote what Mr. Pound says.

MR. WILSON: The Premier says that we should not fear the tick, because he does not think the tick will thrive down here. I prefer to be led by the opinion of the expert who has come here from Queensland, the home of the tick in Australia, and who has gone carefully through the country and given us a sensible and honest report on the matter. It cannot be to Mr. Hancock's interest to report one way or another. If he could have reported that tick would not thrive here, no doubt he would have been pleased to do so, but he has not reported to that effect; he has reported that the East Kimberley district is tick infested, and he further says we should keep the quarantine on it. He also says that if tick are allowed to come to this portion of the colony, undoubtedly it will spread and increase, and cause a great amount of harm. The position to my mind is as to whom this motion will serve, and what will be the result. I sympathise very much with the pastoralists, who are affected at the present time by the quarantine. Everyone wishes that we could remove the quarantine, and let the cattle in so that the industry may thrive, but we must consider the question from a national standpoint. We must look at it from the standpoint, whether we should permit cattle in the southern portion of the colony to be affected by this dread disease, for the sake of benefiting one or two people in East Kimberley, who are now suffering loss from the quarantine. It is a question as to whether we should legislate for one or two firms, or one or two persons, as against the whole of the other portion of the colony. We must consider the question from the standpoint of the whole of the colony, and as to how it affects the people, and what would be the result of removing the quarantine? We are not only allowing one large firm, and possibly two or three smaller firms,

to send the 7,000 or 8,000 cattle, which we believe are ready for market to come down here, but we shall throw the door open to the Northern Territory and Queensland. If we throw open the door of Western Australia to the tick-infested portion of the other colonies, so that tick-infested cattle can come in *via* Wyndham, why should we not allow Queensland cattle, and Northern Territory cattle, to be shipped from Queensland and Northern Territory ports direct here?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is what will be done.

MR. WILSON: Possibly that will be done. Hon members who are interested do not want that.

MR. GEORGE: There will have to be a certificate that the cattle are clean before they are allowed to come in.

MR. WILSON: We have at least one-half of the total number of cattle in this colony south of the Kimberley district. We have a number of herds of milch cows in the south-western portion of the colony, and we hope to build up a butter industry, and we hope—although I am very much afraid it will be hoping against hope—to build up a cheese industry, and yet we are going to threaten these industries with this dread disease, which will follow the introduction of the tick down here. I hope hon. members will not vote to raise the quarantine, but let it rest for the present, at any rate. If we carry out the advice received from experts, the first thing we must do is to insist on the inoculation of the whole of the cattle in the colony, not only down here, but in West Kimberley, which is said to be free from the tick, although I do not know whether it is or not. Let all cattle, including those of East Kimberley, be inoculated. That will take five or six months, and it will be time enough next session to re-introduce this question. It would be the height of madness to pass a resolution of this description before taking steps such as have been suggested by the expert, who was brought here to prevent the disease spreading. Many hon. members have argued that we cannot prevent the disease going into the southern portion of the colony, and I am inclined to think, from the evidence given before the Select Committee, that that is correct, and that sooner or later the disease will reach the southern

portions in the same way as it will eventually extend to New South Wales and Victoria. Nevertheless, it is our duty, if we cannot prevent the spread of the disease, to delay it. That is the step which, I gather from the advice received, we ought to take. We ought to delay the spread of the disease as long as we possibly can by strict quarantine; and, if that advice be carried out, the introduction of the disease may be delayed for five, six, or even ten years.

MR. GEORGE: Then we will never get the cattle here.

MR. WILSON: At any rate, that is the course being adopted in Queensland, where the cattle industry is one of paramount importance, as the industry upon which the prosperity of the country depends. You do not find them in Queensland raising quarantine.

MR. CONNOR: New South Wales will not let them.

MR. WILSON: In Queensland they only raise the quarantine as they find the tick gets over the quarantine line. Just the other day, the line was removed as far south as Gladstone, but the Queensland people are battling with the disease, inoculating their cattle and keeping the quarantine, so as to prevent tick-infested stock getting into New South Wales. That is the course we will have to pursue in the colony of Western Australia. I hope that if it is necessary to take means to protect this trade, chilling and freezing works will be established.

MR. GEORGE: Not by the Government, anyhow.

MR. WILSON: Let private enterprise do it. The Government did not build the freezing works in Queensland. There the pastoralists formed themselves into a company, paid up their own money, and built large works for chilling and freezing. Certainly they got into difficulties sooner or later, and the Government had to help them out, but the pastoralists established the works themselves, and so found relief. I throw out this suggestion to hon. members opposite who are interested in the industry. Let them put their heads together and raise £15,000 or £20,000, establish works, and send meat down here to the people, at a lower rate than prevails now. I am opposed to the Government undertaking these works, espe-

cially after the experience of the Works Department in the matter of day labour. If such works as I now suggest were instituted by the Government, they would cost £50,000 or £60,000, instead of £15,000 or £20,000 as under private enterprise. We recognise the weakness of the Works Department, which cannot do anything on a moderate scale, whether it be a railway station, a stockyard, or chilling works. Everything the department takes in hand must be first-class, and cost five or six times the amount which would be spent in the case of private enterprise. I would much rather see a bonus offered to outside people for the establishment of freezing works, in the same way as a bonus was offered in the case of smelting works at Fremantle. Let the Government offer a bonus for the first 500 head of chilled cattle sent down to the southern market.

MR. GEORGE (Murray): So much has been said by professional and non-professional experts that I do not propose to add much to the store of knowledge in regard to the pest. I rise for the purpose of stating that I understood the Premier to say he would take care that proper precautions were observed at the shipping ports in the north, to see that cattle were clean before being sent down to Fremantle, and that on arrival at Fremantle, the cattle would be examined, and, if they had the slightest thing the matter with them, would not be sent to the goldfields. I hope there is no misunderstanding in regard to that promise given by the Premier in answer to the member for South Fremantle; because I must understand it before I vote on the question.

THE PREMIER: It is only a question of Wyndham or East Kimberley.

MR. GEORGE: I like to be secure in the steps I take, and this is one of the steps in which I shall make myself secure. The Premier stated that the cattle would be clean before they left the yards, and would be again examined at Fremantle.

THE PREMIER: I do not think I have spoken at all yet.

MR. GEORGE: The statement of the Premier was in answer to the member for South Fremantle. The Premier stated that it would be provided for in the regulations, and I am emphasising the fact in order that we may know what we are doing. It is not every head of cattle in

East Kimberley that is affected with disease. Some cattle are not affected at all ; and surely it is not proposed to bring down nothing but tick-infested cattle, and amongst those on the ship there will be some in good health, others being left until they are thoroughly immune.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : How will it be known they are thoroughly immune?

MR. GEORGE : The hon. member has confessed his ignorance on the matter, and should not therefore interfere.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : I am asking for information.

MR. GEORGE : Exactly. You are like *Oliver Twist*—always asking for more, and don't you wish you may get it? This is a question I do not understand and I know it, and that is the difference between the hon. member for Central Murchison and myself. The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) does not place much reliance on the inspection at Fremantle, and therefore he would have no faith in the inspection where the cattle were shipped from. That is another reason why I would impress on the Premier the necessity of seeing the inspection in the North is beyond suspicion. It should not be within the power of hon. members next session to insinuate that gentlemen who were interested in bringing cattle down might have got an inspector to pass stock which should never have been passed. It has been insinuated that the ticks found at Fremantle were introduced there from interested motives ; but nobody suggested exactly why this should be done. It might be understood that gentlemen interested in the cattle trade of the northern districts desired to prove there was tick at Fremantle, in order to show there could be no danger in bringing cattle down from the northern districts. Nobody has said that straight out, but I come to the conclusion that that was what hon. members meant, but did not like to say. If hon. members have that idea, they may also have an idea that the same astute gentlemen may possibly be able to "get at" the inspector ; and it is with the object of impressing on the Premier what is in my mind, and in the minds of other members in regard to inspection, that I rose to offer these remarks.

MR. OLDHAM (North Perth) : I wish to state, with all modesty, that I, also, am ignorant on this subject. I merely wish to state that, whilst I possess very little knowledge of the subject, beyond that which I have gathered from hon. members, who are supposed to be authorities, I desire to call attention to the remark of the hon. member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest), who, as usual, is not in his place. That hon. member stated that to admit tick-infested cattle from the East Kimberley district, meant disaster and ruin to the people he represents. Yet, in the face of that statement—in the face of the disaster and ruin to the people he represents, and whose interests he is here to safeguard—he states he is not going to vote on the question. Looking at this question from an outside point of view, it appears to me there is really no very great danger in the introduction of these cattle, especially as the hon. member for West Kimberley says he is not going to vote against their introduction, although it means disaster and ruin to the people he represents.

MR. HUBBLE : It shows his good taste as an interested party.

MR. OLDHAM : It shows his good taste because he is an interested party in the cattle trade!

MR. HUBBLE : Yes.

MR. OLDHAM : If the hon. member for West Kimberley followed out that principle, he would scarcely have a vote in the House, because there are very few questions which come up in which he is not interested. It has been stated by various hon. members that the introduction of these tick-infested cattle will not affect the price to the consumer. I am not a believer in the disinterestedness of the squatter and the butcher, whose hearts do not bleed for the consumers. I do know that they make the consumers' heart bleed at the prices which have to be paid. It seems to me that the throwing open of the southern portion of the colony, with the markets of Perth, Fremantle, and other centres of population on the gold-fields and elsewhere, to the introduction of 71,525 cattle, would certainly have some effect on the price of meat. Whilst we admit it is not intended to send all these cattle down at one time, and so flood the market, yet it certainly appears to me to

be a reasonable supposition that a portion of these cattle will not come down here without affecting very materially the interests of the consumer, and the price of meat. I am going to vote for the introduction of tick. That, I presume, is the meaning of the motion.

THE PREMIER: What sort of tick?

MR. OLDHAM: Any sort. I am going to vote for the introduction of these cattle from the tick-infested districts.

MR. CONNOR: You want to breed the tick down here?

MR. OLDHAM: Yes; I would not mind breeding tick down here.

MR. VOSPER: It is a scarce commodity now.

MR. OLDHAM: The hon. gentleman must recognise that in those tick-infested countries—in Queensland, for instance, the home of the tick—meat is exceedingly cheap; and, if breeding tick means the cheapening of cattle, then by all means let us have it. I intend to vote for the introduction of these cattle, because I believe that it will be a further step towards the particular end which the centres of population in this colony have in view. I am not prepared to believe that the presence of these cattle will not reduce the price of meat. I believe that, as soon as the squatters of East and West Kimberley are placed again upon equal terms, the old collusion which used to exist between them will again spring up, and eventually, after the people have suffered for another year or two—

MR. WOOD: For many days.

MR. OLDHAM: After they have suffered for many days, I firmly believe, they will come to the conclusion that the only way in which we can get meat at a reasonably cheap price in this country is by removing altogether the duty on frozen meat.

MR. CONNOR: You want to kill the squatter?

MR. OLDHAM: They are already killed, as far as we can do it. I believe the introduction of these cattle will have the effect of opening the eyes of the people to the fact that the only way to get meat at a reasonable price will be to remove the duty on frozen meat.

THE PREMIER: On "tinned dog."

MR. OLDHAM: Yes; I believe that would not be a bad idea. As I said last night, if the Premier will bring anything

forward that I believe to be correct, I shall be very glad to support him; and, if he will only bring forward, in the interests of the consumer, a proposal to remove the restriction upon frozen meat, I will support him on that point also. I have given my reasons for supporting the introduction of these cattle, and with these few words, although I may have exposed my ignorance of the subject, I will leave it in the hands of the House.

HON. S. BURT (Ashburton): It is truly marvellous to me that those gentlemen who know nothing of this subject can persuade themselves that they are capable of instructing other gentlemen who do. This is the third occasion on which we have debated this matter, and I believe I may be pardoned for saying that we have other business as important as this to deal with, and it is about time we disposed of this question of opening our southern ports to the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley. The subject has been before a Committee; we have their report, and it has already been twice dealt with in debate in the House this session; and, looking at the fact that we have been assured by more than one member that the fate of the motion is a foregone conclusion—that everyone knows how he is going to vote—I think I may venture to ask that the debate be allowed to close this evening. Now, I had something to do with the placing of the present restrictions on the East Kimberley district. When this question first came before us last year, it seemed to me a matter of the very first importance to all the pastoralists and breeders of cattle in the colony. We saw what was being done in the other colonies, and heard the note of alarm which was sounded throughout Australia. That being so, I moved a resolution now upon the Journal of this House, to which I would like to draw attention, because I think in this debate many members have forgotten exactly how that resolution reads. What Parliament has done on this subject is that it has said:—

That the introduction of cattle into Western Australia by land or sea from Queensland and the Northern Territory be absolutely prohibited, until those places are declared by their respective Governments to be free from tick. Then with regard to the East Kimberley district the resolution reads:

That no cattle be allowed to be moved by land or sea from East Kimberley district until such district is declared by the Chief Inspector of Stock to be free from tick.

That is what we may call the present law on the subject. If I understand the paragraph before us, it is proposed, in the words of the second paragraph of this motion, "that in view of the urgent necessity for an increased supply of beef for our southern markets, cattle should be permitted to be brought from Wyndham to Fremantle." I say in the first place that if you bring tick-infested cattle from one place, I do not see why you should not bring them from any other place that is infested; and therefore, it is senseless to open the door to East Kimberley only, and to keep it closed against the Northern Territory and Queensland. If the door is kept closed, it is for other reasons than the mere desire to keep out tick. We cannot say that, if we admit cattle from East Kimberley, there is any reason for not admitting them from the Northern Territory and from Queensland.

THE PREMIER : Those districts are worse infested than East Kimberley.

HON. S. BURT : Worse infested? The history of this question greatly amuses me. In the first place, it should be recollected that last session it was said there was no tick at all. I do not mean to say I hold very strong opinions on one side or the other. I hope the question will go to the vote this evening, and it will then be ascertained which side I propose to support. But it was said there was no tick at all in either of the Kimberley districts. Then it was proved, after some debate, that there was tick. Next it was said: "That is not the proper tick at all; that is a harmless, innocent sort of tick." It has been proved it is the very cattle tick of Queensland. Then it was said: "It has always been there, and has done no harm at all." It was also said: "Well, it is not certain whether it is a new tick in the district, or an old tick; but, at any rate, there is no danger in him." This being the state of affairs, it will be remembered it was argued by many: "Let us inquire about this. We do not seem to have too much knowledge of it. Let us see whether this is the genuine tick that does harm to the herds of Queensland and the Northern Territory of South Australia, and which

has so alarmed the Governments of those countries." It was suggested we should send for a man who knew more about it than we did—the expert from the tick country of Queensland. Well, he came. He proved that it was tick. He said: "This is the very tick, the proper tick, the genuine article." He said, although he had not been long here, that there was plenty of danger in this tick, and that it would kill the cattle in the district, more or less. Then of course the other party said the expert knew nothing about it; he was no good; he was not a good expert. He was not the man they wanted. Well, my mind was inquiring. I wanted to get information. Then some people said: "Why, Mr. Pound is the leading authority in Queensland on this subject; he is the great bacteriologist of Queensland, and he threw over Mr. Hancock, and said he knew very little about tick." The Premier asked Mr. Pound: "What do you know about Mr. Hancock?" I have the paper in my hand containing the reply of Mr. Pound, and Mr. Pound confirms Mr. Hancock, and holds him up as a very great authority on tick, and says in effect: "You do what he tells you; he knows as much about it as I do." Therefore, although the other side said at the outset there was no tick at all, and, if there was, it was always there and did no harm, yet we have proved conclusively that there was tick there and that it is the harmful, the very tick; and now the tactics have changed. Prior to this, they said that Hancock, the expert, was no good; but they find now that he is a great deal of good and they no longer abuse him, but they say: "We will not try to stop the tick; it is bound to come here; so let us have the tick after all." I have been only too anxious to find some evidence which would satisfy me that I would be right in saying, let us bring the cattle here and take the risk; but I have come to the conclusion that I cannot do it. I must support the same views that I took upon a former occasion. My fears as to the introduction of this pest into these southern districts have been confirmed by the investigation we have had. When the Select Committee was proposed on a former occasion, I at once accepted the suggestion, because we wanted information. But no one can say that the investi-

gations thus made can possibly do more than confirm the fears we all entertained, by proving the danger of this tick. There is no gainsaying that. You can vote blindly if you like, and say: "I do not care what the evidence is; I am going to chance it." Hon. members can do that; and those who can satisfy themselves that they are acting rightly will do that. I hoped that I would have been able, before this moment, to have satisfied myself on the point, but I cannot do it; and therefore I must vote against the motion now before the House to allow these tick-infested cattle to come to Fremantle. The question of the price of meat is brought in. I do not think that affects the issue. I will say nothing about the price of meat; others have said a great deal too much. If we want cheaper meat, I suppose the duty can be further remitted to make it cheaper; but this is not the way to make cheap meat; it is the way to make dear meat. If you introduce tick to these southern districts, it seems to me you will raise the price of meat very considerably, instead of lowering it. That is the argument the member for the Canning (Mr. Wilson) dwelt upon on a former occasion—that it would tend to raise the price of meat if you got tick throughout the herds of the colony. If we have a disease that affects human beings, we do not usually dilly-dally with it as it is proposed to do here, by saying that we are prepared to run the risk, and that we will inspect, and all that sort of thing. We say we cannot afford to run the risk. What considerations are there to induce us to run any risk at all? We are in the happy position of having this insect located in one part of the colony, and I should say, let us keep it there, at any rate until cattle in this part of the colony are inoculated; then we might say, "We have done all we can; and, looking at the interests involved and the security taken by inoculation, we may run a little risk by introducing cattle from the seat of this pest."

A MEMBER: That is all that is asked.

HON. S. BURT: It is asked that cattle shall be allowed to come in at once. If this motion is passed, what is to prevent a shipment being brought to-morrow?

A MEMBER: The regulations.

HON. S. BURT: I do not think we can trust the regulations too much on a question of this sort. We know we have had some difficulty already in regard to regulations that exist. Tick has come. Our regulations said it should not; how is that? Our regulations were designed to keep tick out of Kimberley.

MR. VOSPER: The tick has no respect for regulations.

HON. S. BURT: I do not know what attention the tick pays to regulations, but in face of regulations the tick should not come. It came, however, into East Kimberley.

MR. LEAKE: They drove 900 head of cattle through the regulations last year.

HON. S. BURT: I thought for some time it might be possible to permit cattle to come into Fremantle under sufficient precautions, rigid inspection, and so on, but I have asked questions from those who know far more about the matter than I do, and it must be admitted on all sides, by those who know what the tick is and have been amongst cattle all their lives, that it is next to impossible for an inspector at Kimberley, be he ever so honest, to give a certificate that any beast is free. The ticks are so minute and are hidden away in such places on the animal that it is next to impossible, I am informed, to say absolutely that a beast is without ticks upon it. We know these cattle must bring tick to Fremantle. I believe the member for East Fremantle told the House something in relation to the transshipment or unshipment of cattle, and the danger that exists. Consequently until, at any rate, cattle are inoculated down in these parts, we should, it seems to me, be running too much risk; a risk that I am not prepared to run. In view of opinions expressed by members who know more about it than I do, I may be wrong, but though I have tried to think the other way I really cannot. I would like to do so in view of the interests that must be affected, but I think the House knows from the action I have taken on former occasions with regard to diseases in stock that I cannot stop to consider private interests. We cannot look largely to those interests, but we may serve them, perhaps, in another direction. To say that we must take disease from one portion of the colony to another on account of any per-

sonal interests involved would be a monstrous proposition, and to my mind it cannot be permitted. The motion is that cattle should be permitted to be brought from Wyndham to Fremantle. It is proposed to insert the words "East Kimberley." I would like to point out that that would enable cattle to come not from the port of Wyndham but overland. I do not know that that is intended, but if the word "Wyndham" be struck out, and "Kimberley districts" inserted, it will, as I say, enable stock to travel overland.

MR. LEAKE: They want to put in the two Kimberleys—the Kimberley districts and Wyndham and Derby.

HON. S. BURT: Why not say the ports of Wyndham and Derby? If you say "districts" they can travel overland, and that is not intended. You want to protect all the northern districts. It is, I take it, only intended by supporters of this motion that the cattle shall be shipped from Wyndham or Derby and shall not go overland. Surely cattle must not be allowed to travel overland. There is nothing in the motion to compel inspection and the issue of a certificate before they leave Wyndham or Derby.

THE PREMIER: We are prepared to add, after a certain date.

HON. S. BURT: I cannot help thinking a very great risk would be run, and if these districts are infected, and the price of meat is raised, I hope members will not forget that those who brought the tick here will have been the cause of such increase.

MR. LYALL HALL (Perth): I do not think any member of this House will give a vote on this question from the standpoint of private interests. Several times this evening it has been said that some who vote for the introduction of cattle from those districts will do so on account of members of this House being particularly interested. I think members will look at the matter from a national standpoint, and consider what is best in the interests of the people of the country generally. It has been acknowledged to me by an inspector of the Stock Department that ticks have been found at Fremantle, Perth, and Coolgardie. I respect the opinion of that man very much, and do not think for a moment that he would tell me such a thing unless he knew it to

be true. That being so, I cannot see reason why we should try to prevent cattle coming from the Kimberley district. In fact it has been admitted by an inspector sent over from Queensland that sooner or later the tick will reach the whole of the colony, and as he admits that by inoculation cattle may be made immune from disease, I cannot see any reason why we should not admit them here. Cheaper food is a desideratum which should be obtained here as quickly as possible, and it is ridiculous to assert that the introduction of a large quantity of cattle from the East Kimberley district will not assist in cheapening the price of meat in Perth and elsewhere. I am credibly informed that there are 120,000 in East Kimberley, and there are some 7,000 fat cattle ready to come down at a moment's notice. To say that the introduction of these cattle into the central portion of the colony will not cheapen the price of meat is, I think, ridiculous.

MR. HUBBLE: Why did they not do it before, when they did come?

MR. LYALL HALL: The cry raised for the past few years to cheapen the price of food and take the duties off, would scarcely have been heard except for the very high price of meat. To allow the price of meat to remain at from 8d. to 10d. per pound is simply to prolong the depression which now exists, because unless we considerably cheapen the cost of our food supplies people with small incomes cannot afford to live here. It will not take long to inoculate the whole of the cattle in this colony, and the expert has stated that inoculation is absolutely effective. It will render the cattle in this colony absolutely immune from disease. It has been said that it would take 12 months to erect chilling works, but in my opinion two years would be required to get them into working order; therefore I think we should take time by the forelock and allow these cattle to come into the centre of the colony, thus cheapening the price of meat. I intend to vote for the introduction of these cattle from the East Kimberley district, as I believe in the Latin quotation *bis dat qui cito dat*. I think that by cheapening food at the present time we will be giving twice to the people what we would be by prolonging the high price.

Another consideration has been pointed out which I must not forget to mention, this being that the revenue from these cattle be kept in the colony instead of going out of it, as is the case now.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We have had a long debate on this subject, and I think it is advisable we should bring it to a close as quickly as possible. My object in rising is to inform hon. members of the amendments it is my desire to make in this motion. In the first place, I desire that "Wyndham" shall be struck out and "Kimberley districts" inserted. I also desire to insert after the word "Fremantle" the words "after the first of December." That will give some time—September, October, and November, nearly three months—in which to inoculate the cattle down here, and also the cattle in the Kimberley district. I also propose to add after the word "area," all the other words being struck out—"under regulations to be framed by the Government." That will, I think, as far as this paragraph No. 2 is concerned, put it in shape. I propose that after "Fremantle," the words "after the first of December" be inserted, and after "area" the words "under regulations to be prepared by the Government" be inserted. I shall deal with paragraph 3 when we come to it. I think these amendments ought to meet the objection of hon. members who have a doubt on the matter.

HON. H. W. VENN: Why not make it six months?

THE PREMIER: We ought to be able to inoculate all the cattle in a month or two. At any rate, we shall be able to inoculate all the cattle down here within the next three months.

MR. MORGANS (Coolgardie): It appears to me, from listening to this debate, that the principal point we have to decide is the question of allowing cattle from East Kimberley to come to Fremantle or not. I know this is not quite the nature of the motion before the House, but at the same time the whole point of the debate turns on that question, and it appears to me after that, so far as the goldfields members are practically concerned, and also so far as hon. members in this House are concerned, the next import-

ant question is this: supposing by a resolution of this House, cattle are allowed to come in from East Kimberley for the purpose of supplying the great dearth in the market—

THE PREMIER: There is no dearth in the market.

MR. MORGANS: That is a matter of opinion. I contend there is a dearth, because the price is high. You could not have a greater proof of dearth of a particular product than that of its high price. Supposing these cattle are allowed to come in, will it have the effect of reducing the price of meat which we all so much desire? The member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) says it will not, but I contend, from the natural state of things, it must reduce the price of meat. What are the conditions? At the present moment cattle from East Kimberley are prohibited from coming into the markets of Perth and Fremantle, and, so far as I understand the position, East Kimberley supplies one-third of the total cattle consumed in the markets of Western Australia, or nearly one-third. What is the point in the meantime? Since the cattle from this particular district have been prohibited, cattle have been imported from the other colonies—I believe from New South Wales in particular—and the supply—a small supply I contend—has been kept up from New South Wales.

MR. A. FORREST: It comes every year.

MR. MORGANS: I am willing to take that proposition of the hon. member, that the same supply comes every year. Looking at the ordinary course of trade in all matters respecting supply and demand, if you cut off 33 per cent. of the supply of any particular article in any particular market, the result must be to raise the price of the article in the market. I propose to take the position which the hon. member suggests. I say that if you cut off one-third of the supply of any article in any particular market the inevitable result must be to increase the price.

MR. A. FORREST: Put it fair.

MR. MORGANS: I do not wish to be unfair. I am stating what is a commercial fact, and there is no getting away from it. It is an indisputable law that, if you increase the supply of a particular article in a particular market, the result

must be a fall in the price. I do not think any member in the House will attempt to controvert that position, because I think it is incontrovertible. I would like to remark, I have listened with the greatest attention to the marked eloquence of the speech of the hon member for West Kimberley; I never object to his speeches, they are always interesting, and always eloquent; the only thing that is found wanting in them sometimes is good argument. At the same time I am prepared to pass that by, looking at the eloquence he gives to the House. The point I wish to come to is this; I take it as a proposition that if we can allow these cattle, which means an increase of one-third of the total consumption of the cattle in this colony—

MR. A. FORREST: That is not correct.

MR. MORGANS: I am open to correction.

MR. A. FORREST: One-third of the supplies of this country.

MR. MORGANS: I am prepared to be corrected if I am wrong. Will the hon. member inform me what is the true position as to the consumption?

MR. A. FORREST: One-third of the supply comes from East Kimberley, of what we grow in this country.

MR. MORGANS: What is the supply of this country?

MR. A. FORREST: One-half is imported, and one-half is grown here.

MR. MORGANS: I will take that; it does not alter the argument. I am now going on the undeniable fact that if you increase the supply of any particular article, the price must come down in the market.

A MEMBER: You must not forget that a lot of these cattle come from the Northern Territory.

MR. MORGANS: I do not care where they come from. My argument, from a commercial point of view, is the correct one, and I defy any hon. member to controvert the position which I take up.

MR. A. FORREST: We cannot reply to you or we would.

MR. MORGANS: I wish, sir, you could give the hon. member an opportunity to reply to me, but still, as the rules of the House will not permit it, I am sure, on a future occasion, the hon. member can reply to me in an indirect manner. I

have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for the Ashburton (Hon. S. Burt). There is always a great deal of sound common sense in what he says, but I am bound to say, at the same time, he knows how to avoid a difficult point; he knows how to leave out of the position the essence of it, when it does not suit his argument. He said he did not see how this point raised to-night had any effect on the price of meat. I think what I have said shows that it certainly has an effect on the price of meat. I think it must be admitted that the member for the Ashburton is wrong, in his argument. Let us look at the question from Mr. Hancock's point of view. Mr. Hancock gave his evidence before a Committee of most intelligent members of this House. I may just name them: we have Mr. Harper, Mr. Higham, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Kenny, Mr. Monger, and Mr. Hubble. Who would deny that those are gentlemen of eminent intelligence and intellectual power. This enquiry was held before them. What are the conclusions they have arrived at? First of all they tell us that so far human agency has been powerless to either exterminate or prevent the spread of this parasite. That is the position. It does not matter what special regulations are made in reference to this, because human agency, up to the present time, has found it absolutely impossible to exterminate or prevent the spread of this dire disease.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is true of small-pox.

MR. MORGANS: What I have quoted is told us by these intelligent gentlemen. If that be so, I ask—and I know that I am relying on the intelligence of this House—what is the object in attempting to prevent the spread of this disease, if those gentlemen, who were appointed on the Committee, tell us regulations do not stop it? What can be the object of the restriction? If you have the parasite you have the disease up to a certain point. Then we come to another point. They tell us in the report that the mortality has reached a maximum in the heat and humidity of a tropical coast, and the minimum, or vanishing point, in the high dry open uplands. I desire to inform the House that not three months ago the stock inspector at Coolgardie, Mr.

Northam, showed me a piece of hide which was in his possession which had more than a dozen ticks upon it, and I may inform the House that I know the ticks quite well. I have seen hundreds and thousands of them in Central America. He showed me on a piece of hide four inches square taken from a slaughterhouse in Coolgardie, 15 of these ticks in all stages of development.

MR. A. FORREST: Why did he not report it then?

MR. MORGANS: I am not supposed to know why he did not report it, but I have in my possession two ticks taken from the hide of a certain animal in Coolgardie.

THE PREMIER: You are liable to a great fine, I think.

MR. MORGANS: If my right hon. friend tells me I am liable to a fine, then I desire to withdraw that statement.

MR. A. FORREST: I hope the Government will take notice of what has been said about this inspector.

MR. MORGANS: The Select Committee go on to report that experiments in Queensland—that is the great home of the tick in Australia—have conclusively proved that inoculation with blood from a beast recovered from the acute form of tick fever, creates immunity. It is stated that this is so. It may be so, I do not deny it is, but I am bound to confess I have very serious doubts about it. I may say this, that the very same tick exists in Central America, in Mexico—a country I know well, and in which I resided for many years. The disease exists, and there are millions and thousands of millions of ticks of that character on the cattle, and no damage has resulted therefrom. I never heard of a case of acute fever, or of an animal dying from the effects of the tick.

A MEMBER: Possibly they were inoculated.

MR. MORGANS: Possibly they were inoculated. But I can assure the House that there no attention has ever been paid to artificial inoculation. I have the strongest proof that, although ticks may have a local effect for a short time, in the long run they do not affect seriously any head of cattle.

MR. LBAKE: Then you do not agree with Mr. Hancock at all?

MR. MORGANS: It may be that some cattle have died in quarantine.

MR. A. FORREST: Thousands of them.

MR. HOLMES: Seventy-five per cent.

MR. MORGANS: I am always open to correction as a modest man, and if I am told that the deaths are 75 per cent., I will accept the statement; but I refuse to believe that the 75 per cent. of deaths arose from the tick. It is all very well for an expert to say that the deaths arise from a certain cause, but he ought to prove that it is so. I am going on my own knowledge, gained by experience of cattle in Central America and Mexico, where the cattle are infested by thousand of ticks, and where no difficulty has arisen from deaths amongst the stock. An ounce of practice, or an ounce of knowledge acquired by observation, is worth a great deal more than tons of theories propounded by any particular expert on the question of ticks. The expert we had before us says that inoculation secures immunity from the disease. If that be so, let us inoculate; but what does the expert say further? He goes on to say, when asked if inoculating cattle in the southern parts of the colony would make it safe to bring in cattle from the northern parts, that it would not be a safe thing to do. I respectfully ask if this is not a contradiction?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No, certainly not. Vaccination does not prevent small-pox.

MR. MORGANS: The member for Central Murchison has already stated to the House that he knows nothing about the subject; and I admire him for his candour. I admired the overwhelming honesty of the hon. member when he made that statement.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is only of your logic I am speaking.

MR. MORGANS: I have the greatest respect for Mr. Hancock, whom I had the pleasure of meeting, and with whom I was very much impressed. He was, to my mind, a very well-trained man, who understood the business he undertook, and who so far as I could see intended to perform faithfully the work put into his hands by the Government of this country. But when Mr. Hancock tells us that inoculation secures immunity from this disease, and when he, on the other hand, says

inoculation in the southern parts will not secure immunity from the disease extending to the herds in other portions of the colony—

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. MORGANS: So far as I understand, from the report of the Select Committee, that is what Mr. Hancock stated.

MR. HUBBLE: He said that if cattle are inoculated they are immune.

MR. MORGANS: Quite so; that is my point. We do not care a straw about the parasite: all we care about is the disease. It does not matter if the cattle have millions of ticks upon them: what we are talking about is the disease.

MR. HUBBLE: The parasite causes the disease.

MR. MORGANS: I hope I shall bring home to the House the fact that the expert stated distinctly and clearly, that if the parasite finds its way on to the cattle it causes a certain disease, namely, red-water. Then, Mr. Hancock goes on to say, inoculation will secure immunity from this particular disease. When asked the question, whether the inoculation of the cattle in the southern districts would secure immunity from the disease in that part of the country, his theory fails, and he says it will not do it.

MR. HUBBLE: No, no.

MR. MORGANS: He practically says that, in his report.

MR. HUBBLE: You do not understand it.

MR. MORGANS: I think I do understand his report, though I cannot refer to the particular part of it at the present time. Supposing I admit the theory of Mr. Hancock that inoculation will cure the disease, then I say there can be no danger in allowing these cattle to come from the northern districts—even from the infested districts—because the remedy lies in inoculation.

MR. A. FORREST: We all agree to that.

MR. MORGANS: We all agree to that? Then supposing that cattle are let into Fremantle to-morrow, what difference would it make, if you have a roval remedy for the disease? You have only to go on inoculating the cattle to secure immunity.

MR. LEAKE: The ticks may get on to something else.

MR. MORGANS: They do not affect anything else.

A MEMBER: Ticks got on horses.

MR. MORGANS: Well, if they get on to a man we would have to inoculate him also. The only panacea for the evil is inoculation; and I take that position from the great Queensland expert, whose opinion I respect. I believe him to be a most estimable and able man, and he furnishes one of the strongest arguments for letting in East Kimberley cattle, and thus reducing the price of meat.

MR. A. FORREST: Give us some arguments.

MR. MORGANS: That is argument. Mr. Hancock says that, in order to prevent the disease, there must be inoculation; and if the East Kimberley cattle are let in, the price of meat must be reduced, because the supply of meat must be increased. The hon. member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) used an argument which made a strong impression on me. That member said cattle could be imported from New South Wales, or any of the other colonies, for 50s. a head, and that it would cost £4 a head to bring cattle down from Wyndham. That gives an advantage of 30s. a head on all cattle imported from New South Wales, compared with cattle imported from Wyndham. Then, the duty is reduced by 15s., which makes £2 5s. per head in favour of the introduction from this particular place, compared with what it was two months ago. I would ask, is the consumer getting any benefit?

MR. HOLMES: I say the introduction of these cattle would not reduce the price of meat.

MR. A. FORREST: (to Mr. Morgans). You do not understand the question.

MR. MORGANS: That may be so.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You do not confess your ignorance as I do.

MR. MORGANS: I think I understand a simple question of arithmetic. If it can be shown that cattle can be brought from New South Wales, with the advantage I have indicated, where is all the profit going to?

MR. A. FORREST: You do not explain your business when you make a profit.

MR. MORGANS: I don't explain when I make a profit, but when it is a public matter, the position ought to be per-

fectly clear. It is a perfectly logical position for me to take up, when I ask why, in view of the advantages given, the public do not get any concession.

MR. HOLMES: The hon. member hardly understands my argument. I argue that the freight was always too high.

MR. MORGANS: The hon. member was most frank with this House, and I appreciated him very much, and for that reason I take the liberty of calling his attention to this important point.

MR. HOLMES: You undertook to show that the introduction of these Kimberley cattle would cheapen the price of meat.

MR. A. FORREST: And he has not shown it yet.

MR. MORGANS: Yes, I have; because it will increase the supply by 33 per cent, and that is bound to bring down the price. I cannot give hon. members a better answer than that. It will have the effect of breaking down a monopoly. The member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) says there is not a meat ring. I do not say there is; but there is a mighty big monopoly, and I know we have to pay a shilling a pound for mutton on the goldfields which we ought to get for sixpence. I do not blame those gentlemen who import the cattle. I do not know where the blame should rest. I have been told, and have told electors in my constituency at Coolgardie, that the men who import cattle into this country sell meat at Fremantle for 4½d. a pound, but on the goldfields we have to pay a shilling.

MR. A. FORREST: You pay a shilling for a drink on the goldfields.

MR. MORGANS: That is no reason why we should have to pay a shilling a lb. for mutton. Whisky is a luxury; meat is an absolute necessity. The point is this, and it is an astounding fact, that the cost of meat on the goldfields to-day is actually as much as it was before the railway was made from Southern Cross to Coolgardie.

MR. A. FORREST: So is the cost of drink.

MR. MORGANS: That is an astounding fact; and, if that is so, there must be something wrong, and the time is fast approaching when there will be a public outcry with regard to the price of meat

on the goldfields that will shake a strong political position in Western Australia. The price of meat must come down. They are all clamouring for it on the fields, where every man, woman, and child are feeling the weight of the cost of meat; and it is the same, to some extent, in other parts of this colony. I do not blame any hon. member for this: I impute no motives to anybody; but I say these are the facts, and I must emphasize them in the interests of the constituents I represent.

MR. A. FORREST: Why do you not form a co-operative company?

MR. MORGANS: I do not care what we do: we must do something. The price of this article must come down; and, after that, the price of other articles must come down also. The cost of living on the goldfields is becoming most oppressive. Some of my friends on the other side of the House will probably ask why I voted against the reduction of the food duties. There is my modest friend, the member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham), who just now said he knew nothing about this question, and made a long speech on it, notwithstanding his modesty.

MR. GEORGE: He is not singular in that, you know.

MR. MORGANS: My position on the food duties was, and always has been, and always will be, that the Government require a revenue to conduct the business of this country, and they have a perfect right to impose customs duties. If hon. members opposite can show me how the revenue of this country can be raised, how the business of this country is to be conducted without those duties, then I shall be only too happy to vote for the abolition of the food and other duties; but it is for them to show how this can be done.

A MEMBER: What about a land tax?

MR. MORGANS: The total food duties of this country amount to £1 5s. per annum *per capita*, and that will not injure any working man in this country, for it means 6d. a week; and I say the abolition of the whole of these duties will have no effect whatever upon the position of the working man in the colony. We must look further than that for some remedy. What must be done is to break down the monopolies that exist. [MR. KENNY: Hear, hear.] I do not know

where they exist; I do not accuse anybody; but I say some means must be found whereby the inhabitants of the goldfields, and of the colony generally, will be able to live at a cheaper rate than they do to-day. When and how to do this is a question not so much for this House, as for the people themselves to find some means of getting out of the difficulty, which does not arise from the imposition of food duties in this colony. I will not take up the time of this House longer. [MR. CONNOR: Hear, hear.] My friend says "hear, hear." He is glad I am going to sit down. They do not like these exposures; but, in any case, it is my intention to support the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley, and I hope and believe the effect of it will be to reduce the price of beef in this colony by 1d. or 2d. per pound.

Amendment (Mr. A. Forrest's) put and passed.

THE PREMIER moved, as a further amendment, that after the word "Fremantle" the following words be inserted: "After the first December next."

MR. SOLOMON (South Fremantle): Before that is put, I should like to know whether it will be inserted in the regulation that stock be allowed to leave Kimberley only after a thorough inspection and on being certified clean. It was on that condition that I supported the motion in the first place.

THE PREMIER: You have not come to supporting it yet.

MR. SOLOMON: I said if that was agreed to by the mover I had no objection to supporting it, and it was understood he agreed to it. If not, I shall move a further amendment that, before leaving East Kimberley, the cattle must be inspected and a certificate be given that they are clean stock; in fact, I move that, after the word "districts" the following be inserted: "after they are inspected and on being certified as clean by a stock inspector."

THE PREMIER: Are cattle to be certified absolutely clean in a district that is in quarantine? If you pass this amendment, you will probably be pretending to open the door, whilst keeping it as closely shut as ever. We propose to take precautions when the cattle land at Fremantle, to keep them in strict and

rigid quarantine. They are to be slaughtered there; or, before being moved, they are to be certified as clean. But, suppose we had a mob of cattle at Wyndham ready for shipment, and there was one with a tick on it, would the whole mob be turned back?

MR. GEORGE: Certainly not. Keep the ticked one there.

THE PREMIER: It seems to me the only risk we run is when we get the cattle to Fremantle. If there is any tick found on them at Fremantle, we will slaughter them; but, if they are absolutely clean, we will allow them to go away to Coolgardie. Is not that the position?

MR. GEORGE: No.

THE PREMIER: Otherwise it seems to me that, in trying to help this district, we will, by this proposed amendment, close the door as tightly as if we did nothing.

MR. GEORGE: I would like to explain.

THE PREMIER: Let someone talk who knows something about it.

MR. GEORGE: I am not the only speaker on the subject who knows nothing about it. I hope the Speaker will pardon this little interlude between the Premier and myself. Although I know nothing about the tick, I know something about the arguments adduced here by the Premier and other members, on which our votes have been given this evening; and the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) most distinctly laid down and emphasised that his desire, and my desire, and I believe the desire of a number of members in this House is, that the cattle should be examined before being allowed to be shipped. Only cattle apparently clean should be allowed to be shipped, and when they come to Fremantle they should be examined again, and if found clean they could be sent away. If they were not found clean they should be killed and sold to those who chose to buy them. Although I do not know much about tick, I have been reading this report, and it seems to me that it takes a certain time for a tick to "incubate," as it may be called; therefore where we may find a bullock at Wyndham apparently clean, incubation may be carried out partly on the voyage. A second examination at Fremantle would

thoroughly discover whether the cattle are clean or not, because I understand it takes 14 to 21 days to bring them down, and according to the tick expert about 21 days are required for the eggs to be incubated, so we should be pretty sure that if ticks do not show at Fremantle, the cattle may go anywhere about the colony without danger. What we want is that cattle shall not be shipped at Wyndham or other port unless they are apparently clean, and that they shall be examined and quarantined, and not be allowed to go out unless they are apparently clean. I do not think there can be any misunderstanding about that.

MR. HARPER: From the evidence before us, this proposed regulation would certainly make the whole thing a farce. We have had it in evidence that before a man could give a certificate that an animal is absolutely free from tick he would have to examine it with a magnifying glass. No inspector could possibly give a certificate to the effect proposed by the member for South Fremantle.

MR. SOLOMON: How will it be known that cattle are free, if you are going to send them to Coolgardie?

MR. HARPER: It is in evidence that the crush examination cannot reveal whether tick is on an animal. If you wish to impose the regulation proposed by the member for South Fremantle, we might just as well have saved the time of this Chamber, because it is absolutely impossible for the inspector to give such a certificate as that specified.

MR. LEAKE: I understood the intention of those who framed the regulation to be that every precaution should be taken that diseased cattle should not leave Kimberley; but now it is proposed that they should leave, whether inoculated or not. There is no provision made here for the inoculation of Kimberley cattle; and, regardless of consequences, no precaution is to be taken about bringing ticks here at all. That was never intended by the majority of members, whether they were in favour of or against this proposition, and I shall certainly support the amendment of the member for South Fremantle.

HON. H. W. VENN: The amendment (Mr. Solomon's) shows where the thin end of the wedge comes in. It shows, what I tried to emphasize, the absolute impossibility of even a crush inspection being any particular good. The member on my left hand (Mr. Harper), in common with myself, has taken great trouble in relation to this tick question. I do not suppose any other member of the House or anyone else has read more in a short time than we have. He has told you that a crush inspection is absolutely unreliable against tick. The only thing you can do is to kill them; and I was much astonished when the Premier said he was going to send them all through the country. I really think the words suggested by the amendment should be inserted, although they will be merely an extra precaution, for we will have tick down here whether or no, and this shows the difficulties in the way.

Further amendment (Mr. Solomon's, requiring inspection and certificate) put, and division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	19

Majority against ... 8

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. S. Burt	Mr. Conolly
Mr. George	Mr. Connor
Mr. Holmes	Mr. Doherty
Mr. Hooley	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Hubble	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Hall
Mr. Leake	Mr. Harper
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Higham
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Kenny
Hon. H. W. Venn	Mr. Locke
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Monger.
(Teller)	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Oldham
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Vosper

(Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. S. BURT: I move, as a further amendment, that after the word "Fremantle" the words "by sea" be inserted. If we do not insert these words, cattle will come from Kimberley right through the Northern districts.

THE PREMIER: I am willing to accept that amendment.

Put and passed.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move, as a further amendment, that after the word "sea" the words "after the first day of December" be inserted.

HON. H. W. VENN: The Premier said he would give three months. We are now getting into September, and I hardly think that until the first day of December is sufficient time.

MR. GEORGE: Say the first of January.

MR. MORAN: Knock the motion out altogether.

HON. H. W. VENN: Cattle can hardly come by sea from Kimberley in the month of December.

THE PREMIER: They will not come, then.

HON. H. W. VENN: It would be no hardship if we were to make it after the date the cattle can come.

THE PREMIER: They ship all the year round there.

HON. H. W. VENN: We might extend the time to the 1st of January or the 1st of February. If we make the time shorter, people will not be able to get the necessary serum. I ask the Premier to alter the date from 1st December to 1st January.

THE PREMIER: I cannot alter the date.

MR. HUBBLE: I hope the Premier will alter this date, for it seems to me to be opening the gates at once.

THE PREMIER: It allows two months and a half.

MR. HUBBLE: Hon. gentlemen seem anxious to get the cattle down at once. I do not know what can be their motive. Those who have herds and want to inoculate their cattle should be given a reasonable time in which to do it. I think six months should be given.

THE PREMIER: The cattle cannot start before the 1st of December from Wyndham; therefore, they will be brought from Wyndham after the 1st of December, and that is what I say in the amendment. It will be more than three months from now before the cattle can get here.

MR. HUBBLE: We have not even the instruments in this colony.

MR. DOHERTY: The instruments are here now.

MR. HUBBLE: We have to send for cattle to get the blood, and that will take six weeks or two months.

MR. MORAN: Cattle can come in a fortnight.

MR. HUBBLE: We know all about cattle coming in a fortnight from Queensland. I think the Premier should extend the time.

THE PREMIER: I am not in charge of the motion, but am only trying to put it into shape. I never saw this motion before notice was given in the House.

MR. LEAKE: No pressure has been brought to bear on you, this time.

MR. HUBBLE: We shall have to send to Queensland for the blood to inoculate with.

MR. MORGANS: As I have made a statement in this House to-night, on the opposite side of the question to that occupied by the member for the Gascoyne (Mr. Hubble), I desire to call his attention to a remark he made a few seconds ago with regard to imputing motives. As far as I am concerned, my only motive, and I speak for those acting with me in this matter, is for the best interests of the colony. We are acting on the lines laid down by the constitution of the United States: the greatest good for the greatest number. I am sure the member for the Gascoyne, who listened to all the remarks made by myself and others, must admit there were no motives except for the good of the country. My motive has been particularly straightforward and honourable, and I think the same in reference to other hon. members. I do not think reference should be made to motives in this House, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark. I do not think it is due to us, acting in the capacity we have been acting in to-night, that the hon. member should impute any motives, except those of the most honourable kind.

MR. MORAN: Is there any motion before the House?

THE SPEAKER: Yes; there is an amendment to insert after the word "sea" the words "after the 1st day of December next."

MR. MORAN: People ought to be able to start inoculating, three weeks from this date, or at least a month. It will not take long to inoculate the cattle about Fremantle, Perth, Bunbury, and other places where there are cattle. I do not think tick could travel to any of these places before the 1st day of December. Some hon. members do not consider the price of meat at all. We are now considering the people who have to pay for the meat. The interests of the great majority should have our first regard. Three months are given, and the cattle are to be under strict inspection. Is it to be supposed tick is going to be carried by telegraph? The idea is preposterous.

HON. S. BURT: I do not know whether it would be in order to move an amendment on the amendment, but, if so, I should suggest a compromise and make the date the 15th December.

THE PREMIER: I am willing to adopt that.

Further amendment (the Premier's, as altered to 15th December), put and passed.

THE PREMIER: I move, as a further amendment, that all the words after "area," in line 3, be struck out, and the words, "under regulations to be proclaimed by the Government," inserted in lieu thereof.

Put and passed.

MR. GEORGE: I suppose the regulations will be laid before Parliament at once?

HON. H. W. VENN: After the various amendments made in this motion, I have no doubt it is now one that the House as a body will pass. Nevertheless, I intend to divide the House on the motion as a whole; therefore I shall call for a division.

Question—that the paragraph as amended be agreed to—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	10
			—
Majority for	9

Ayes.

Mr. Conolly
Mr. Connor
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall
Mr. Harper
Mr. Higham
Mr. Kenny
Mr. Kingmill
Mr. Locke
Mr. Monger.
Mr. Moran
Mr. Morgans
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Doherty

(Teller)

Noes.

Hon. S. Burt
Mr. George
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hooley
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Leake
Mr. Mitchell
Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Hubble

(Teller)

Question thus passed.

Paragraph 3:

Pending the erection of abattoirs and chilling chambers, cattle, after thorough inspection and on being certified as clean by a stock inspector, be permitted to leave the quarantine area for immediate truckage to the eastern goldfields.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move, as amendments, that the words "pending the erection of abattoirs and chilling chambers, cattle" be struck out; also that before the word "after" there be inserted the word "that."

Amendments put and passed.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move, as a further amendment, that after the word "inspection" the words "at Fremantle" be inserted.

HON. H. W. VENN: It may be said there is some excuse or reason—although I do not admit there is—for introducing these cattle under regulations into the quarantine ground at Fremantle, and having them killed there; but surely it is going too far to say we will send these cattle right through the settled districts up to the goldfields.

MR. LEAKE: Divide on the paragraph.

HON. H. W. VENN: The paragraph is finished, is it not?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.

Further amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move, as further amendments, that after the word "inspector," there be inserted "cattle shall;" that after "permitted," the words "subject to such regulations" be inserted; that after "immediate" the words "and direct" be inserted.

Further amendments put and passed.

HON. H. W. VENN: I will now ask the House to divide on the question of passing the paragraph as amended. I know that stock raisers are not very largely represented in the House, but I would fail in my duty if I did not press this matter to a division. Hon. members are going altogether too far, seeing that they have already succeeded in sanctioning the importation of cattle from East Kimberley to Fremantle.

THE PREMIER: We must have a certificate that the cattle are clean.

HON. H. W. VENN: We can quite understand a clean certificate before the cattle get here; but, apparently, the Premier does not mind whether they are clean or not when they are dumped in Fremantle. The greatest difficulty is in ascertaining whether the cattle are clean or not. A "crush" inspection is not reliable, and apparently dipping will not do it.

THE PREMIER: They do it in America, you know.

HON. H. W. VENN: But in America cattle are subject to more rigid regulations than we will have here. I say that without going into the whole of the subject, though I am prepared to do that, having read up the facts. Animals brought down will certainly have tick on them; and it is proposed to distribute that tick from Fremantle right through the goldfields. I do not think it is worth while speaking further on the subject.

MR. HARPER (Beverley): I am going to uphold the present restrictions, and will shortly give my reasons. The fact that cattle are allowed from East Kimberley into the metropolitan market, would mean the admission of cattle from other places. There is no necessity, so far as the goldfields are concerned; and, furthermore, it would be impossible to get a clean certificate, and it would be unwise to encourage the introduction of these infected cattle.

MR. HOLMES (East Fremantle): I can state from facts, suggested by the Premier—

THE PREMIER: It is not my motion. I only corrected it.

MR. HOLMES: The cattle would have to be got ashore somehow, and sometimes they would be got into the quarantine

area after landing, and sometimes they would not. Some hon. members want to prevent these cattle going to the goldfields; but it would be riding a horse to death, to consent to these cattle being landed at Fremantle, where the damage would be done, and thus obviate any necessity of preventing their going to the goldfields. If it be determined to start a tick farm, the sooner the tick is distributed the better.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): The question is whether we shall provide cheap meat for the people. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) in opposing the motion. If there is any danger, it would be in bringing cattle to Fremantle; the danger cannot affect the goldfields where there are no cattle. It has been mentioned there are cattle north of Menzies, and that the tick might be taken there; but I think that cattle are sent from the North, and not from the South to that district. The great argument is in favour of cheap meat for Perth and the goldfields; and I hope the House will insist on a clean bill of health for all cattle brought down. I support the motion as amended by the Premier.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I move that the debate be adjourned.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. LEAKE: Then we will have three hours of it.

Question—that the debate be adjourned—put and negatived.

MR. LEAKE: It is my intention to oppose this paragraph.

THE PREMIER: You are going to "stone-wall" now.

MR. LEAKE: It would be absolutely iniquitous to pass the motion with this paragraph.

MR. HARPER: I have an amendment I gave notice of.

MR. LEAKE: The amendment of the hon. member is in the fourth paragraph.

THE PREMIER: The worst of the lot.

MR. LEAKE: We have been discussing whether or not we shall restrain, in some way or other, the introduction of cattle from this part of the country. This paragraph would wipe away the present restrictions on the importation, and let in tick-infested cattle free. That is really

the object of it. Here we have already affirmed, after much hesitation and debate, that cattle should be permitted to come from Wyndham to Fremantle without restriction, and be slaughtered at Fremantle. That, we thought, would have satisfied even the firm of Connor, Doherty, and Durack, Limited.

MR. DOHERTY: I must object to my name being used in this debate, and I think it is unfair.

MR. LEAKE: I am referring to a corporation.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not out of order. He is not referring to any individual here.

MR. LEAKE: I am referring to a corporation known as Connor, Doherty, and Durack, Limited. I do not know whether there are any shareholders in the House or not, but there is no doubt these regulations have given ample scope and relief to particular persons; and now we are asked to let their cattle roam all over the colony and distribute ticks. Really, we might assume, from what has been proposed, that these ticks are a benefit rather than a scourge. It is suggested that, after thorough inspection and on being certified as clean by a stock inspector, cattle shall be permitted to be trucked to the eastern goldfields. We know the goldfields country is pretty dry; and if there is any place where the tick is likely to thrive in this colony, it is on the goldfields. (Some laughter.)

MR. HUGHAM: That shows all you know about it.

MR. LEAKE: I am glad to think I have made a corporation laugh.

HON. H. W. VENN: Menzies, you must remember, is up north-east—very near the cattle country.

MR. LEAKE: Yes; there are lots of cattle up there. If we pass this paragraph, there is no restriction at all upon the introduction of cattle into this part of the country, and it really nullifies the first two paragraphs of the motion. I am not a stock-owner, but I am astonished to think that the stock-owners, and those gentlemen who represent stock-owners in this House, are not more fully alive to the necessity for caution than they appear to be this even-

ing. If we can affirm that in no circumstances whatever can this tick do harm, then let this motion pass, and remove all restrictions whatever upon the tick coming here; but, if we are to judge from the experience of the other colonies, surely, as prudent persons, we ought to take some precaution against the spread of this disease throughout the country. I feel so strongly on this matter, that I hardly care to trust myself to speak on it this evening, because, I dare say, if I said all that is in my mind, I might offend someone; but I cannot help saying this much, that the Government are seriously to blame for the way in which they have treated this important question, and I cannot help thinking, too, that this debate and these proposals have not gone through this House by fair and proper means. The interests of the country have not been considered, but rather the interests, perhaps, of individuals. I am sorry to think we are asked to pass motions which, in the main, are not in the best interests of the squatting community or of the nation as a whole.

MR. MORGANS (Coolgardie): I cannot agree with the remarks of the member for Albany, for I believe this discussion has had for its object the best interests of the country. I do not think any personal interest or influence has been brought to bear in this matter. As I have stated before, the principal point that we who represent the goldfields have in view is the cheapening of meat to consumers on the goldfields. Such is the case as far as my own constituency is concerned. I do not take up the position of the hon. member (Mr. Leake) with reference to the dire disease he speaks of, for I do not believe the effects which some members seem to apprehend will follow. We have the report of the Select Committee, and what does it teach us? It indicates that, should the whole of the southern districts become infested with tick, no possible damage can result to the herds of this colony if inoculation is adopted under the advice of the Queensland expert. That is a sufficient argument against this terrible bogey which is put forward. I do not consider it necessary to follow my hon. friend further in his argument; but I am bound to say that if any advantage is to be de-

rived by the inhabitants of the goldfields from the motions passed to-night, this is not the proper time to adopt a course which will render them ineffective. If the motions passed are blocked by a proposal of this kind, it means nullifying all we have done before, and reducing the position of the House to one of absurdity.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): When I sat on the benches opposite for a few moments during the division, I could not help being struck by the strange spectacle which was presented. We had the leader of the Opposition and one of the avowed Liberal members side by side with two or three gentlemen who are acknowledged to be the most extreme Conservatives in the House. This is a very peculiar symptom. I do not know what it portends or means, but I do know that whatever may be alleged as to personal motives or consulting personal interests in the course of this discussion, I have set before myself one object, and one object only, that being the cheapening of meat supplies not only for the goldfields but the coastal districts as well. I regard the present price of meat as being a very serious obstacle to the health and advantage of the working classes, and of all classes; and, that being so, I could not act in any other way than I have done. If we had been told by the Queensland expert that the introduction of these cattle into the southern portion of the colony would mean absolute ruin to the herds in this part, it would have been a different matter, and I should have voted for the most rigid quarantine being maintained; but the evidence is exactly contrary to that. This expert has shown clearly enough that, if proper precautions be taken, no great danger may be apprehended. I take it my attitude has been that of most other goldfields members. We are now confronted with a proposal which would take from our grasp the very prize we have been seeking, and would defeat the object we have in view, which is the cheapening of food supplies to the goldfields. The people on the goldfields would stand a much better chance of getting their meat cheaper, if the meat had not to pass through the hands of another middleman. We have fought for this all along, and we have beaten those opposed to us on the

material points; and if the cattle are to be slaughtered in Perth, the goldfields will be no better off than they are to-day; therefore, we should try and get this paragraph passed. Not long ago I said that if the introduction of the codlin moth into this colony would have the effect of bringing the price of apples down to a penny per lb., I should vote for its introduction; and I say the introduction of so many head of cattle will be a benefit to the consumer, and I am with the consumer every time. When the hon. member for Beverley introduces his fourth paragraph, I shall vote for that too, because I have voted every time in this House for the cheapening of food in the colony, and I always shall.

MR. HUBBLE: The members for Coolgardie and North-East Coolgardie have referred to certain remarks which I made a short while ago.

MR. VOSPER: I was referring to the hon. member for Albany.

MR. HUBBLE: Then I will refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Coolgardie. It seems to me that during the whole of this debate, we have been opposed by certain hon. members; and I said, in a hasty moment, there seemed to have been some motive for it. I do not know of any motive, and I am sure hon. members will take it from me that I have no idea of any motive. As to the paragraph under consideration, I wish to say I would like to see it struck out. It is undesirable that we should distribute the tick through all the northern districts and through the agricultural districts; and we should not forget that the cattle which will be going to Menzies and up to Mount Leonora and Lawlers will be close to the northern cattle stations, and it will mean taking the tick right to these places. I intend to vote against the paragraph, and I hope it will be struck out.

Question—that the paragraph as amended be agreed to—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	10
				—
Majority for	6

Ayes.

Mr. Conolly
Mr. Connor
Sir John Forrest
Mr. George
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall
Mr. Higham
Mr. Kenny
Mr. Locke
Mr. Monger
Mr. Moran
Mr. Morgans
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Doherty (Teller)

Noes.

Hon. S. Burt
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hooley
Mr. Hubble
Mr. Leake
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Quinlan
Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. Wilson (Teller)

Question thus passed.

New paragraph:

MR. HARPER (Beverley): I move that the following paragraph be added to the motion:—

That the quarantine now existing between East and West Kimberley be rigidly enforced, but that cattle from the unquarantined areas of the Northern Territory be admitted into East Kimberley.

The object in adding this paragraph is that, if there be an area of the Northern Territory free from tick, cattle from there should be allowed to come into our markets.

THE PREMIER: There is no area free.

MR. HARPER: I am not clear as to that; but if there be a clear area, cattle should be allowed to come from it. I can understand many people being opposed to this proposal, because markets will be affected, inasmuch as it will affect the areas from which we draw cattle; but it is for the purpose of maintaining the live-stock trade instead of the dead-stock trade that I submit my proposal.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): I second the motion.

THE PREMIER: For several reasons I am unable to support the hon. member in his proposal. The first reason is that we know the Northern Territory of South Australia is in quarantine in regard to the southern part of that colony itself. In South Australia the quarantine line has only recently been altered, by being removed a little further north than it was before; but all the South Australian country adjoining us, that is all the Northern Territory of South Australia, is in quarantine. Cattle from that district cannot go into the southern markets of Australia. Another reason is

that I do not see why we should open our doors to the cattle of South Australia and of Queensland, when those colonies will not allow those cattle even in their own markets.

HON. H. W. VENN: If they came here they would pay duty all the same.

THE PREMIER: They would pay duty, but I do not want them to come in at all. It seems to me we shall have quite enough to do, during this coming year, to deal with the cattle within our own colony. In opening the door of the East Kimberley district to our own markets, subject to the conditions that will be imposed, I think we will be doing enough in this direction until we gain more experience; and it would be unwise to throw open our ports to the whole world. We might just as well say that cattle from eastern Queensland might come here.

MR. HARPER: Those from western Queensland can come.

THE PREMIER: How can they come in?

MR. HARPER: They can go into New South Wales.

THE PREMIER: All Queensland, north of Brisbane, is in quarantine at the present time; and the reason why I have been so anxious to assist in the direction in which we have been working to-night is that we should supply our own markets from our own colony; and, so long as we do that, there is for the present no necessity to do more. Therefore, we will be acting wisely, fairly, and consistently too, in not going further at the present time. By what we have done we will assist our own people, our own colony, and our own meat-market from our own territory. That is as far as I am prepared to go at present; and, if the hon. member goes to a division, I shall have to vote against his motion.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): As I pointed out in the early part of this debate, the logical sequence of the arguments used by the hon. member on my left (Mr. Harper) would, of necessity, lead to the motion he has now proposed; and if there is any force in the argument that, by what we have done to-night, we are going to cheapen the price of meat for the people, I think the present motion ought to be carried by a large majority of this House. The Premier said he desired

to assist our own people. Does he mean the consuming people, or the individual squatters in the country? If, as the gold-fields members say, their desire is to cheapen the meat market, then the motion before the House opens up to them a larger area from whence supplies of meat can be derived. It gives you cattle from Queensland or anywhere else, because I really do not see why we should confine ourselves to the Northern Territory of South Australia, in dealing with the question whether cattle shall be imported here or not.

THE PREMIER: It would be under our own control.

HON. H. W. VENN: You are really bringing cattle down from a tick-infested district. You cannot go further than that. It would not be worse to bring cattle from Queensland and the Northern Territory. We are going to bring these cattle from Kimberley, and I cannot see the logic of saying you must exclude cattle 50 or 60 miles away from Wyndham because they are across the border. If the intention of the House is to reduce the price of meat, I cannot see how you can oppose the motion of the member for Beverley, for it does not make a bit of difference whether it is Kimberley tick or South Australian tick.

THE PREMIER: You want it carried, do you?

HON. H. W. VENN: No; but if you want to cheapen meat, this is a ready way to do it. There is a very limited supply in Kimberley; but if you open the door to the Northern Territory, a large supply will be available. Why should you exclude it, if it can be brought in boats and duty paid on it? Why should cattle not be shipped at our own ports?

THE PREMIER: You would get a fresh supply of tick every five minutes.

HON. H. W. VENN: The desire of the House seems to be that we should get a fresh supply.

MR. WILSON (Canning): I would like to ask the Premier a question.

THE PREMIER: It is not my motion. Ask the member for Beverley.

MR. WILSON: I will ask the right hon. gentleman a question, and he can answer it if he likes. Messrs. Connor, Doherty, and Durack, Limited, cannot now introduce cattle from the Northern

Territory. Are you still going to prohibit them from bringing cattle over the border?

THE PREMIER: Certainly.

MR. WILSON: They can only draw from what we have in our own territory?

THE PREMIER: Yes. That is our desire.

MR. WILSON: I cannot see any sense in the thing. In East Kimberley you have the cattle ticked up to the eyes, and we introduced the tick from the Northern Territory.

THE PREMIER: There is not so much tick in Kimberley.

MR. WILSON: If you allow them to come to Fremantle, why should people not be allowed to draw supplies from the Northern Territory?

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): The question raised by the member for Beverley is an important one, and if cattle are allowed to come from the Northern Territory of South Australia, I will ask that member to alter his amendment by allowing ships to be loaded at Rockhampton (Queensland). The same thing applies.

THE PREMIER: He says, where it is not quarantined.

MR. A. FORREST: We know it is quarantined, and South Australia will not allow these cattle to go into her own markets, yet this House is going to make West Australia a dumping ground for them. The whole thing is absurd. It means that this country will admit ticked cattle when no other country will receive them. We have agreed to open the door to the East Kimberley, where there is supposed to be a great amount of fat cattle ready for the market and a large quantity growing; and, that being so, I am surprised at the audacity displayed by people who ask that this country shall be made the dumping ground for South Australia, when that colony will not allow cattle from the eastern colonies to be admitted there. It is going too far, and if we do not look out we shall have cattle from the whole of Australia. I am glad the Government have put their foot down, and will not allow the thing to go beyond reasonable limits. It seems to me the whole thing is absurd. We have been going on during the whole of this evening, and we

have agreed to motions under great pressure; and now we find the member for Beverley asking us to go further, and to have the tick always in our territory. We know the tick was first introduced from the Northern Territory of South Australia, and I hope the House will stop any further ticks being introduced from that quarter. I am positively shocked at the member for Wellington in regard to what he has said and what he has done this evening. We would not have had any tick in this country, if cattle had not been allowed to come from the Northern Territory of South Australia.

Mr. HUBBLE (Gascoyne): It seems to me we are really going to open the gates for the tick properly, because the motion proposes that Northern Territory cattle shall be allowed to come in here, and yet this in the past has been the cause of all the trouble. Some hon. members want to keep this trouble going. I intend to oppose the motion, because I think it will do a great deal of harm.

Mr. OLDHAM (North Perth): I do not know that hon. members need express so much indignation about this motion. It is the natural result of the motions which have been passed in this House to-night. I should like to give my reason why we should open the door to the South Australian tick-infested cattle. We shall be able to stock this country, which has not sufficient cattle at the present time, with tick and cattle; but how is it possible to keep the South Australian cattle outside this colony, under the present regulations? There is no fence or barrier of any kind.

Mr. GEORGE: The bullocks are educated not to cross the line.

Mr. OLDHAM: I believe bullocks are educated to cross the line, in some instances.

Hon. S. BURT (Ashburton): It is curious where the logic of our opponents has landed them. They must recognise that South Australia will not admit tick of any nationality, or from any place, into that colony, not even from its own Northern Territory. The Government of South Australia have quarantined all their Northern Territory. If we allow the tick to come from Kimberley, there is no harm in allowing it to come from anywhere else. If we admit tick from

Kimberley, we shall have to admit it from elsewhere. Why should we open the door for the Kimberley tick, and keep the Northern Territory tick out. This is an important question, and at this late hour many members have left. I hope hon. members will allow the debate to be adjourned, and I move to that effect.

Question—that the debate be adjourned—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	6

Majority for ... 13

<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Noes.</i>
Hon. S. Burt	Mr. Connor
Sir John Forrest	Mr. George
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Moran
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Oldham
Mr. Hall	Mr. Vosper
Mr. Harper	Mr. Wilson (Teller)
Mr. Higham	
Mr. Holmes	
Mr. Hooley	
Mr. Hubble	
Mr. Leake	
Mr. Locke	
Mr. Mitchell	
Mr. Monger	
Mr. Pennefather	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Wood	
Hon. H. W. Venn	
Mr. Doherty (Teller)	

Motion thus passed, and the debate adjourned.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on the motion of Mr. WILSON, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10 minutes past 12 o'clock, midnight, until Thursday afternoon.