

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 17th December, 1935.

	PAGE
Wheatgrowers, Federal assistance, Select Committee Report presented	2508
Motion: Health Act, meat inspection, to disallow regulation	2508
Bills: Road Closure, all stages	2518
Limitation, Assembly's message	2518
Native Flora Protection, Assembly's message	2519, 2527
Supreme Court Assembly's message	2519
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2R., defeated	2538
Appropriation, 2R. etc.	2523, 2533, 2536
Bulk Handling, Com., recom., 3R.	2528, 2535
Traffic Act Amendment, Assembly's request for conference, conference managers' report	2535
Traffic Act Amendment, Assembly's further message	2538
Bulk Handling, Assembly's further message	2539
Adjournment: Close of Session, complimentary remarks	2528

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

WHEATGROWERS, FEDERAL ASSISTANCE, SELECT COMMITTEE.

Report Presented.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.33]: I desire to bring up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Federal assistance granted to wheatgrowers in this State. I submitted a draft of this report to Mr. Williams, as well as to other members of the committee, and Mr. Williams suggested that two paragraphs should be amended. I amended the two paragraphs, but as I have not yet been able to get in touch with him, I do not know whether he approves or disapproves of the amendments. I move—

That the report be received and read.

Question put and passed; report read.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes ordered—that the report be printed.

MOTION—HEALTH ACT, MEAT INSPECTION.

To Disallow Regulation.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.50]: I desire to make a personal explanation. The session is very near to its close, otherwise I would not adopt the course I am pursuing now. Some time back a regulation was placed on the Table dealing with the inspection of meat, and No. 4 of that regulation applied to the disposal of carcase meat in

the metropolitan area. On a motion I moved, the regulation was disallowed. Today, which is probably the last day, or at any rate the last but one of the session, an amended regulation has been placed on the Table, and if not disallowed it will affect the livelihood of a large number of people.

Hon. J. Cornell: Give notice to disallow it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Under the Standing Orders, I am not allowed to move in that direction in circumstances such as these. I therefore ask the House for leave to move, without notice and as a matter of urgency, a motion to disallow the regulation.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that under Standing Order 102 the hon. member desires the leave of the House to enable him to move a motion to disallow a certain regulation.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is so. Leave given.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: While the regulation that has been tabled permits, to a certain extent, trade that has hitherto been carried on for many years past, it is still of practically no use to those on whose behalf I and others put up a fight some weeks ago as a result of which the regulation was disallowed. I do not intend to speak at length on this occasion because the case submitted by me and others is, I feel sure, still fresh in the minds of members. The latest regulation gives permission for the retention of the Perth and Fremantle meat inspection depots, but only in respect of carcases of calves of a weight of 125 lbs. or under.

Hon. L. Craig: Live weight or dead weight?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of a dressed weight. That regulation will certainly relieve the veal situation, but the difficulty that arises is that with veal alone to be dealt with in the metropolitan area, I am afraid there will be no avenue for disposal of the carcases and the present avenue will be closed. That is not the most important feature, which is that we have hundreds of people on small holdings who send to the markets a few sheep or lambs, in addition to calves, and those people will be seriously affected. The settlers on the Peel and Bate-man Estates are in the habit of sending in a few beasts on occasions, particularly if they have animals they do not desire to keep on their holdings. The regulation will not

enable them to do that in future, and what applies to those settlers applies practically to the whole of the dairying area.

Hon. L. Craig: But there are no sheep on the Peel and Bateman Estates.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I know that, but there may be some day.

Hon. V. Hamersley: At any rate there are some pigs.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: From as far east as Merredin and south as far as Manjimup, people have been in the habit of sending a few head of stock to the metropolitan market. In fact, it has applied practically all over the State. People have been sending a few sheep and a few vealers although, in the circumstances, they could not think of sending them to established abattoirs. The Chief Secretary, when replying to Mr. Hamersley, indicated very clearly, to my mind, what is behind this regulation. The Minister said that had Mr. Hamersley not assisted to disallow the particular regulation I refer to, the Midland Junction abattoirs would have been better off to the extent of £20,000 a year. That is where the trouble comes in. This House should not consider that phase, important as it may be, because the imposition of this regulation will affect the livelihood of very many farmers. Some bring down eight or 10 sheep and a few calves in order to dispose of them, but they could not think of undertaking such a trip for the sake of the calves alone. I have known farmers to make the trip from beyond Beverley in the cool of the morning. Under the new regulation that will be prevented, and to what end? I know that the department will advance the plea that it is done on the score of public health. From that standpoint, the inspection by the City and Fremantle health inspectors is just as rigid and reliable as that exercised at the abattoirs. Since the previous regulation was disallowed I have paid two or three visits to the auction floor in the metropolitan area where meat is sold. On one occasion I inspected a load of carcase meat. The owner was not there at the time and I had the temerity to inspect the load. I saw 10 sheep and two calves. Over the lot had been spread a tarpaulin and the carcasses were covered with white cotton sheets. I know a little about the dressing of meat, and I assure the House that on no previous occasion had I seen better dressed carcasses, or carcasses in a better condition. In fact,

they represented prime meat. They had been brought down from the Dale River district, the other side of Beverley. On the other hand, I asked to see some Midland carcasses. I had some pointed out to me, and they were quite all right. At the same time, I saw 14 carcasses on the hooks, and had I been an inspector I would have condemned six of them for the filthy manner in which they had been killed and dressed. That is not typical of what one sees at the Midland abattoirs. I am fully aware of that fact, but nevertheless those carcasses were there for me to see. As to pigs, they may be held at Midland and the inspection carried out with the viscera, but with other animals the viscera and other entrails go straight down the shoot, and most certainly they are not inspected. It is different when the viscera can be handled. The other important feature, which I shall not labour as members are acquainted with the whole position, is that there is a tremendous lot of meat sold in Perth and Fremantle—I have not been to Fremantle to inspect the conditions there—but it must be recognised that that meat largely controls prices in the markets of the metropolitan area. Our leading butchers make their purchases there. If we close down the metropolitan markets—and that is what will occur if the regulation is not disallowed—members will find that the cost of meat will immediately increase, because the whole position will be in the hands of the wholesale butchers. The result will be that the consumers will be adversely affected by the increased prices that will follow.

Hon. L. Craig: The market will not be closed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, but the regulation will affect seriously the position of the farmers. They have a big clientele now and the more we restrict the market, the fewer buyers there will be. Buyers will not waste their time by going to the central markets to purchase meat if the quantities they require are not there. That will be the position. There will be no competition, and without competition the wholesale butchers will not supply. If the supply from outside sources is to be restricted, the wholesale butchers will certainly not make up the supplies, because the present position is to their detriment and they do not desire competition.

Hon. L. Craig: A farmer can send his beasts to the Midland abattoirs with in-

structions that the carcasses shall be sent to the metropolitan markets for sale.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, but that would be impossible for the small man who sends in half a dozen head. The costs entailed would be excessive. It cannot be done and that is the trouble. The argument has been advanced as to how you can fill a truck with small lots, say half a dozen sheep. That is impossible. Where small lots are sent to the sale rooms, with this particular regulation in force, farmers cannot possibly be successful. Great injury will be done to a lot of people who will be forced off their holdings unless we disallow the regulation. I am not going to repeat the arguments that I advanced a few weeks ago when I moved for the disallowance of the previously tabled regulation, but I will content myself by moving—

That Regulation No. 4 made under the Health Acts, 1911-33, and laid on the Table of the House on the 17th December, be and is hereby disallowed.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [5.3]: I second the motion. This morning I received a letter which I intend to read and which ought to satisfy members that people in the country districts are alive to the disabilities under which they will suffer if this regulation is not disallowed. It seems to me that the Government, or those in authority, are persistently refusing to realise that only recently a somewhat similar regulation was disallowed by an overwhelming majority in this House. Now it is proposed to enforce another. The letter which I received came from Popanyinning and read as follows:—

A largely attended meeting was held in the Popanyinning Agricultural Hall to protest against action being taken by the Minister for Health to close the Perth and Fremantle meat markets.

I was instructed to ask for your support in opposing this action, as hardship and inconvenience would be caused to the small farmers in the country and suburban districts.

The farmers in this and the Wandering districts forward between 30 and 40 carcasses of pork and mutton each week by motor truck which leaves here at 11 p.m., and delivers at the metropolitan markets in the early morning. In the event of the markets being closed there would be no outlet for the farmers utilising this service.

The Minister's contention that the inspection of meat at the metropolitan markets is inadequate would seem to be of little value when it is known that carcasses from the Midland

Junction abattoirs have been condemned at the markets after having been presumably passed by the Government inspector at the abattoirs.

It is understood that the Minister intends taking further steps to have the regulation brought into force, and I trust you will use every endeavour to oppose such action.

I think this letter justifies my seconding the motion submitted by Mr. Baxter in support of his request for the disallowance of the regulation.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.6]: As we are all aware, Parliament will rise within a day or two and even if the House disallows the regulation in question, the Government will still have power to draft another and camouflage it to some extent. Then the position will be that the new regulation will remain in force until such time as Parliament meets again.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: We can move for its disallowance when the House re-assembles.

HON. J. CORNELL: Of course; but the position is that we may disallow the regulations we are now discussing and if another one is drafted and gazetted, it will probably be six or seven months before we will have the opportunity of discussing it. Only a little while ago in connection with a regulation to which exception was taken, a compromise was effected between the Chamber of Mines and the Minister for Mines, and a working arrangement was arrived at between the parties to the dispute. I think a similar course might well have been followed in connection with the subject under discussion. I do not know whether Mr. Baxter took the reasonable course in moving in that direction, or whether he determined to stand on the disallowance that he was successful in bringing about. When there is any merit in a regulation, it is the duty of its sponsors, after that regulation has been disallowed, to endeavour to arrive at a compromise with the objectors.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Government would not stand dictation from outside.

HON. J. CORNELL: The mining regulation to which I have referred and which was disallowed by this House, was of equal importance to that we are now discussing, but a compromise was arrived at and a new regulation was promulgated satisfactory to both parties. A similar course could be followed in the present instance.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.8]: I hope the House will hesitate before agreeing to disallow this regulation. I remind hon. members that the motion to disallow the original regulation was debated in this House and that the main bone of contention was in respect of calves. Now there is no serious complaint with regard to pigs. Practically every hon. member agreed that it was absolutely necessary we should be particularly strict where pigs were concerned. Mr. Baxter told the House that the regulations would affect some of his constituents who, from time to time, sent calves and pigs to the markets, but there was no strong advocacy in favour of disallowing the regulation on account of the question of pigs being sent to the metropolitan markets. I am perfectly fair when I say that quite a number of members expressed the opinion that if calves were allowed to be sold at these markets, that course would be satisfactory, and in replying to the debate I was asked by one member whether it was the intention of the department to frame another regulation which would allow calves to be sold at the Perth and Fremantle markets. My reply was that the Minister in control of the department was giving the matter consideration and that there was every probability of a regulation being framed which would permit calves to be sold at those markets as had been done for some time past.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is it proposed to prevent the district referred to in the letter I received from sending to these markets?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will deal with that letter in a moment. Having advised the House as I did, I knew of course—though not being the Minister in charge of the department—that arrangements were being made for the gazetting of another regulation which it was hoped would meet the objections raised in this Chamber. Only the other day one hon. member asked the question as to whether it was the intention of the department to gazette fresh regulations, and the reply I gave was that it was the intention of the department to do so and that the usual procedure would be followed; further, that as members who were so critical of the original regulation would not be in the position to criticise the department, if we followed the usual custom of gazetting the regulation before laying it on the Table

of the House, it was intended to take steps to see that the regulation was tabled to-day, before its actual appearance in the "Government Gazette." The customary procedure, as members know, is for regulations to first appear in the "Government Gazette."

Hon. J. Nicholson: A courteous procedure.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I might explain to the House why we were so keenly desirous of having an amended regulation which would not close down the markets, but which would allow those markets to continue the sale of calves as in the past. We have a committee constituted called the Food Standards Advisory Committee. That committee has been dealing with this and other allied questions, and it has agreed to the regulation which has been laid on the Table to-day. One member of that committee is the Hon. Mr. Macfarlane, who was very critical of the original regulation tabled in this House. I understand he is quite in accord with the regulation tabled to-day. When the matter was referred to me to-day I said that I did not see that there was much to be achieved by delaying—

Hon. A. Thomson: Are there any country people on that committee?

The HONORARY MINISTER: What does the hon. member mean?

Hon. A. Thomson: Anyone representing people who are 40, 50 or even 100 miles away from the markets.

Hon. V. Hamersley: People scratching for a living.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This is a health matter purely, and as I said before, the question of the health of the metropolitan area is of such importance that the Health Department cannot afford to ignore it. It is on account of that fact that the department have for so long been endeavouring to bring about the alteration this regulation will do. The department are not satisfied with the examination of many of the carcasses which come in to be sold at the metropolitan markets, and there is every reason on the part of the department to be dissatisfied. On a previous occasion I gave instances which I thought would carry weight with members of this House. Mr. Baxter has stated that if the regulation is agreed to it will force a number of people off their holdings.

Hon. A. Thomson: It will certainly affect a number.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think there is any justification for that argument. On a previous occasion I quoted the numbers of stock going through these markets, and it was shown that by far the greater proportion were calves. Almost without exception, hon. members who spoke against the regulations referred to calves, and nothing but calves. One or two hon. members, like Mr. Mann, did refer to pigs; but other members almost exclusively depended on the argument that the small holder and the dairyman would not have an outlet for their unwanted calves unless permitted to send them in this way to the Perth and Fremantle markets. Therefore, in view of the fact that there was comparatively little risk connected with the carcasses of calves sent forward in this manner, we agreed to eliminate calves from the regulations, and allow them still to be sold at those markets as formerly. Mr. Thomson has quoted a letter which he considers a strong argument for the disallowance of the regulation.

Hon. A. Thomson: Thirty or 40 carcasses per week are in question.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The letter which he quotes states something to the effect that the writers are aware that further action is to be taken with a view to closing down the Perth and Fremantle markets. Those are not the exact words, but I think them near enough. If the letter is handed to me, I will quote it verbatim. I want to be accurate. There has been handed to me a circular letter which has been sent to various people.

Hon. A. Thomson: Only to the three members for the Province.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The letter apparently emanates from a meeting called to protest against action taken by the Minister for Health to close the Perth and Fremantle meat markets. The Minister has no intention whatever of doing that.

Hon. A. Thomson: But when he debar these men from sending in 30 or 40 carcasses per week, he might as well close the markets.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no intention on the part of the Minister for Health to close those markets. The producers in question will continue to have opportunities to sell carcase meat from the abattoirs. Even to-day quite a fair proportion of the meat disposed of through those abattoirs is veal. I am surprised at Mr. Baxter's remarks with regard to certain

calves which, he said, he saw at Fremantle, I believe.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No. At the central sales.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They did come from the Midland Junction Abattoirs.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is quite right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The condition of those calves, the hon. member stated, was quite a disgrace.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is true.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Their condition was most unsatisfactory. I think the hon. member said that in his opinion they should have been condemned.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I would have condemned them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: May I ask the hon. member whether he took any action in connection with those half-dozen calves?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What action could I take?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member could have notified the department in the first place. Or it would have been reasonable for him to ask some other inspector to inspect those calves and give his opinion on them. The hon. member raises the question in this Chamber when it is impossible either to verify or disprove the statements he makes. I do not know much about carcase meat, but I have always held the opinion that when meat is sent out from the Midland Junction Abattoirs, there is as a rule no complaint to be made concerning the manner in which it has been treated.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is quite true, as a rule.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Each carcase is branded, too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Baxter agrees that that is so as a rule. However, on one occasion when he visited the market he found half-a-dozen calves, which, had he had the opportunity, he would have condemned. I consider it was up to the hon. member either to see the local inspector, or himself to notify the department of the necessity, if the hon. member chooses, for better inspection than apparently had taken place. If there is anything at all in the hon. member's statement regarding those half-dozen calves, he certainly did

not fulfil his duty—as I think he should have done—by merely referring to the matter here. I think he should have mentioned the matter, at the time, to the inspector who inspects meat at those markets; and, if necessary, the hon. member should have brought the matter before the Health Department.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You inspect at Midland Junction and down here also.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The contention of the Minister for Health that inspection of meat at the metropolitan markets is inadequate would seem to be of little value when it is found that carcasses passed at Midland Junction Abattoirs are condemned at the markets—presumably after having been passed by Government inspectors at the abattoirs. However, it all depends upon the reason for which the carcasses are condemned. Carcasses when leaving the Midland Junction Abattoirs may be perfectly sound in every respect; yet it is not uncommon for an inspector to be compelled to condemn such a carcass either at the Perth or at the Fremantle market for faults arising out of conditions over which the officers at the abattoirs have no control, for instance, for putrefaction. The fact that carcasses have been condemned as stated is not ground for saying that they should have been condemned at Midland Junction. So that while the circular letter suggests that these facts constituted justification for the continuance of the Perth and Fremantle markets as in the past, I contend that when one gets the other point of view an entirely different construction is placed on the subject. Like Mr. Baxter, I could spend a good deal of time in giving details, as I did on a previous occasion, as to the number of calves which would be affected by the new regulations, and the effect which the new regulation might have on the Perth and Fremantle markets; but I do not propose to do that except to the extent of mentioning that as calves constitute a majority of the carcasses dealt with at those markets, and as the amended regulation has been specifically designed to meet the strong objections raised in this Chamber—

Hon. J. Cornell: The Minister said the regulation has not been gazetted.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It has not been gazetted.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then, is it a regulation?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is, according to advice I have received.

Hon. J. Cornell: What advice? I do not think it is a regulation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am affording hon. members an opportunity to discuss the amended regulation at the earliest opportunity.

Hon. J. Cornell: An opportunity to disallow something that has never been gazetted?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is a regulation even before it is gazetted. I understand that gazettal does not matter so much as the laying of the regulation on the Table of the House matters. I have taken this opportunity to lay the new regulation on the Table here.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It does not come into force until after it has been published in the "Government Gazette."

The HONORARY MINISTER: The date on which the regulation will come into force is a week or two hence. There was no need for the department to table the new regulation at the moment. However, it was desired that Parliament should know what was being done, and should have an opportunity of discussing the new regulation. I cannot do more than stress the fact that this is really a public health matter. I suggest that we put on one side all arguments which have been used from any other aspect. This regulation will not close down the Perth and Fremantle markets. Certainly it will affect the number of carcasses other than calves those markets will receive from the country, but there is no prohibition against the sale of meat from the abattoirs at the Fremantle and Perth markets as obtaining to-day. I have no doubt that if the regulation is agreed to, those markets will carry on as they have done in the past, but complying, of course, with the new regulation. I do not know that I should spend any more time in endeavouring to justify the regulation. I am convinced that the department are concerned solely to see that the inspection is as rigid as practicable in the interests of the public health of the metropolitan area in particular. If the regulation is allowed, I do not think it will create the hardship suggested by some hon. members.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am sure it will create great hardship.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: It will certainly give the dairy farmer an outlet for his unwanted calves. When it is realised that the greater number of the carcasses sold in those markets are carcasses of calves, it will be agreed that the department have at least endeavoured to meet the objections previously raised. In view of the fact that the new regulation is promulgated in the interests of the health of the people, I trust the House will not disallow it.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.27]: It was not my intention to take any part in the discussion. However, my name has been mentioned in connection with the matter as a member of the committee which put up the regulation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Who are the other members?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The Commissioner of Public Health, the Government Pathologist, the Government Analyst, and two commercial representatives—the seat of one of the latter being vacant at present.

Hon. A. Thomson: Not a single primary producer among them!

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Neither is there a representative of the patent medicine interests, a much larger question in regard to public health. I wish to stress the point that I was called to a meeting of the committee last week in consequence of an instruction from the Minister to give earnest and speedy consideration to the position created by the disallowance of the last regulation, in order that a new regulation might be placed before Parliament prior to the close of the session. I was able to take part in the committee's discussion. The recommendation before the committee was that calves should be cut out of the regulation and admitted to the markets up to a dressed weight of 100 lbs. I explained that I had seen many calves of the right type and good breed, at ten days old, weighing 70 or 80 lbs., and that a well-nourished calf of a month or more would easily reach 120 or 135 lbs. After some discussion the regulation was amended to include weights up to 125 lbs. That difference would about meet the difficulty regarding calves.

Hon. A. Thomson: Did the committee take into consideration the disabilities the regulation would impose on the small producer?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If Mr. Thomson will give me a chance to put the case, he will see that the committee did. The calves were the greatest objection to the regulation before the House previously. It was admitted that there were single carcasses coming in from farmers who had only one to sell, besides having a few sheep or lambs. With those men I was strongly in sympathy, having regard to their situation; and I endeavoured to have them relieved from the regulation. As for pigs, I admit frankly that I could not support the exclusion of pigs under the conditions stated by the health authorities. I am bound to acknowledge that under those conditions the carcasses of the pigs would be a menace to public health. The regulation is highly necessary so far as pigs are concerned. However, I was in sympathy with the farmer having the single carcase of cattle and a small number of sheep or lambs, who would not be able, under the amended regulation, to make up a consignment. Unfortunately I was not able to carry the committee with me on that point. I did support the new regulation in other respects, although I was not able to give it a full support. I was with the other members of the committee on the question of calves.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the hon. member resume his seat? Under Standing Order 114 the debate must now be stopped unless some hon. member moves—and it be carried—that the debate be continued.

On motion by **Hon. H. J. Yelland**, the debate continued.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: It was agreed that the markets of Fremantle and Perth should remain open for the marketing of those carcasses and such other carcasses as were coming from the slaughter yards. I do not wish to influence the Committee one way or another in regard to that decision, nor shall I vote on the question.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.31]: My only desire is to facilitate business. It seems to me we are asked to vote on a regulation that we have not seen. Apart from that, I understand that within 21 sitting days regulations can be disallowed.

Hon. J. Cornell: Fourteen sitting days.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I suggest that the motion be withdrawn for the time being, that the Government experiment with the regulation during the recess, and that when

we meet again, if the shoe be pinching, the motion can be again moved.

Hon. G. Fraser: In eight months' time?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. If we go on as we are going and vote on a regulation that we have not seen, we ought to get eight months somewhere else.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.32]:

Although we have not seen the regulation, we know its purport, which was explained to us by the Minister. Also we know from remarks made in the House on the original regulation that one of the reasons behind it is that all these carcasses should go to Midland Junction for the convenience of people who deal in those carcasses and, incidentally, to bring in more revenue to the Government, although it means further expense and inconvenience in closing markets which have been of great use to a number of people who are not in a position to send in larger consignments. It is to those people their only means of existence. They have been doing their best to eke out an existence under the rigorous conditions that have obtained during the last few years. The chief hope of those people has been to keep off sustenance. Many of them have started dairying and so must be allowed to dispose of their products. They have a few sheep, some have pigs and some poultry, and by hook or by crook those settlers have just managed to eke out an existence with those products and other products, such as vegetables. But it is impossible for them to send down a truckload of carcasses, or even to join with others in making up such a truckload. I notice there has been an earnest appeal made to the Railway Department to reduce the freight on these carcasses because half the price of the animal is at present going in railway freight. Calves have been mentioned as constituting the most important sideline that these people have to market, because they have only one or two at a time and it is not convenient for them to send a truckload. If they wish to send their calves direct to the Perth market, say from Rockingham, they will have to send them past Perth to Midland Junction and then bring the carcasses back to Perth. These health regulations may be reasonable, as has been contended, but I take that contention with a pinch of salt, for the officials concerned have no consideration for those who are struggling to eke out an existence. We

know that even amongst the workers, along comes some scientific gentleman who, learning that the workers are under an insurance, straightway finds a number of them suffering from some organic disability and sets about treating them for it, and continuing that treatment perhaps for six months. I was glad to hear Mr. Macfarlane say that he sympathised with those who are being embarrassed by these regulations. I was vexed at hearing it said that calves were the principal line, because no doubt pigs and sheep also play an important part. When these small producers send carcasses direct to the Fremantle and Perth markets, they are correctly marketed and in every instance carefully dressed. This method has been going on satisfactorily for years past, and except on the score that the Government want more revenue, I am surprised that there should be an attempt made to bring about this departure.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.38]: I have not seen the new regulation, but I believe it to be an improvement on the old one. I understand that it will admit calves up to 125 lbs. weight, but it means probably the exclusion of most other carcasses.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Of everything else.

Hon. G. FRASER: The regulation is an improvement on the previous one, but it still appears to me that if it be endorsed it will mean the closing down of the market at Fremantle. I find that the carcasses of veal handled down there represent approximately 50 per cent. of the total carcasses handled. For instance, from the 1st January of this year till the 8th November, the veal carcasses handled totalled 1,900, whereas the total carcasses handled during the same period numbered 3,623. So, as I say, the veal carcasses represent approximately 50 per cent. of the total carcasses handled in that market.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And all the others will have to go to Midland Junction.

Hon. G. FRASER: They will certainly have to come under the regulation if it be agreed to. In those circumstances it would be impossible to keep that market going, because it would be unpayable. The handling of veal alone would not be sufficient to permit of the market being successful. In those circumstances I have no option but to vote against the regulation.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.40]: I can hardly let the remarks of the Honorary Minister pass without challenge. He said that no serious objection with regard to the marketing of pigs had been raised when dealing with these regulations. I made a very serious objection on the previous occasion and I am now repeating it because I know what the regulation would mean to quite a number of people in the South-West. Mr. Macfarlane said he had not taken into consideration pigs, because the marketing of pigs under the old conditions was a menace to public health. This has been going on for the last half century, yet I have not heard of the public health suffering in consequence, nor that disease had been disseminated amongst the people. When last the matter was before us, I quoted a letter from a settler at Augusta, who said that if this regulation were allowed to stand, his marketing and that of other settlers in the district would be practically closed, as they had in the past received an appreciable benefit from being able to send up their stock chiefly by carcass. It is impossible for a man with a small farm to be sure that he is going to have a truckload of porkers at any given time. Buyers go through the South-West and, to meet them, the settler brings his porkers to the siding, where he has to take the price offered or leave it. In many instances the price has been so low that the settler has refused to accept it and has taken his animals back home, endeavouring later to find some other market. I have personal knowledge of some settlers receiving 2d. per lb. above the average for their porkers merely because it is known that the carcasses had come from a farm locally renowned for the quality of its pork. I am sorry I have to vote against the regulation. I agree that we must have some supervision, but there are times when these regulations emanate from people who are not trying to conserve the best interests of the producer. I will vote against the regulation.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [5.45]: I shall vote for the disallowance of the regulation. Let me point out to the Honorary Minister that Mr. Crouch's letter was sent out, not as a circular letter, but to members representing the province. I think those people are to be commended for

the great interest they are manifesting in their own affairs. The previous regulation was disallowed only at the end of November or early in December and, on the 11th December, those people held a meeting at Popanyinning and advised the three representatives of the province that a new regulation was about to be tabled. It is of vital importance to them that the regulation should not be allowed, and I am pleased that the people we represent take such an interest in matters affecting them and advise their representatives in Parliament. A point I should like to stress once more is the freight cost for conveying live calves and other stock to Perth, whereas it can be transported for 100 miles at a cost of 2s. 6d. per 100 lbs. It is essential that this opportunity for marketing stock should be open to settlers. Heavy pigs are not as a rule marketed in that way; mostly small porker lines are sent as carcass meat. Farmers might have insufficient lambs to make up a truckload, but it is advantageous to them if they can slaughter half a dozen and send the carcasses to market.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [5.47]: I shall support the motion. The regulation will place too great a handicap on small farmers such as those at Popanyinning, and will make it more difficult for many of them to remain on their holdings. To be able to slaughter a few head of stock and send the carcasses direct to the city, instead of sending livestock to the abattoirs, means much to those settlers. I regret that the regulation has been tabled at this late stage of the session. Mr. Thomson read the letter which has been sent to members for South-East Province and I think it covers all the points.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [5.48]: When the previous regulation was debated I had no desire to speak, because I realised that the House was practically agreed that the regulation would impose a great disadvantage on settlers who relied on sending the carcasses of excess stock to the markets in question. To-day the debate seems to have centred around the advisableness of allowing the carcasses of pigs to be marketed without passing through the abattoirs where they would be subjected to inspection for quality. Let me direct attention to a reference made by one of the leading doctors of Western Australia, a high

authority on health matters. His attention was directed to what I might describe as the filthy or certainly unclean way in which meat was distributed throughout the metropolitan area, and he stated, "We do not eat raw meat," indicating that the process of cooking rendered the meat wholesome for human consumption, no matter under what conditions it had been carried or kept. Cooking destroys germs which might be detrimental to health, and so long as meat is properly cooked, there is no danger.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He did not say that.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Given proper cooking, germs would not survive.

The Honorary Minister: Then there is no need for any food regulations at all provided all food is cooked?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If food were properly cooked, that might be so. It is not necessary to introduce health regulations which will prove a menace to the farmers who are supplying the stock.

The Honorary Minister: This is the only State of the Commonwealth where this kind of thing is permitted.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I am not aware that that is so.

The Honorary Minister: I tell you it is.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The conditions do not demand such a stringent regulation. If we could get a guarantee that the carcass could be delivered on the hoof at the abattoirs at the same cost as under the present system, there would probably be no objection, but to insist on all stock being forwarded on the hoof to the abattoirs would make it impossible to market many head of stock. For that reason, and because I desire to help the man on the land particularly, I shall vote for the disallowance of the regulation.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.52]: I shall vote against the motion. The chief argument used against the previous regulation was that the disabilities the regulation would impose on farmers of the Fremantle district and elsewhere would have regard to calves. Speakers at a meeting at East Fremantle stressed the fact that if the regulation were insisted upon, thousands of calves would be killed and buried, instead of being marketed. The alterations requested by the opponents of the previous regulation have been made by the Government and are embodied in this regulation

shortly to be gazetted. The question of the marketing of pigs under the new regulation can be met by organised effort by the farmers concerned. We must have regard to the recommendation of the Health Department. What is being done is in the interests of public health and safety.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [5.54]: I shall support the motion. Having some farming interests, I have realised the advantage that accrues to the farmer from ability to send down carcasses as at present. I supported the disallowance of the previous regulation and shall oppose this one.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East—in reply) [5.55]: Mr. Cornell stated that the disallowance of the regulation would mean nothing because the Government could bring in another regulation in a slightly amended form. That, of course, is possible, but it is improbable. I do not think any Government would act in that way against an adverse vote of Parliament. The hon. member also said that those members responsible for the disallowance of the previous regulation should have suggested amendments to be embodied in the regulation now before the House. I would have been only too pleased to assist to that end, but one might have run the risk of being knocked back for offering. It is the business of the department to frame regulations, and the officials would scarcely welcome intrusion by any member. The regulation is based on consideration for public health, but not one instance has been quoted to show that the present system has been detrimental to public health. No one has attempted to prove that the inspection at the central sale room is not as effective as that at Midland Junction. Had there been any danger to public health through permitting carcass meat to be sold in the central sale room, I would not have moved the motion. I cannot see that it makes the slightest difference whether the meat is inspected at Midland Junction or at Perth. Both the Health Department and the City Council have very efficient health inspectors: I do not think better could be obtained. Therefore, from the viewpoint of the health of the people, there is nothing in the argument that all the stock should be slaughtered at Midland Junction.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is an old argument.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But it is a sound and true argument. I hope the House will agree to the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	9
					—
Majority for	4
					—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

All Stages.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [6.4] in moving the second reading said: This is purely a formal Bill, necessary to authorise the closure of certain roads. Lithographs giving particulars of the proposals have been laid on the Table of the House for the information of members. There are only two matters to deal with. In the first case, the City Council has applied for the closure of portions of Scott and Melrose streets, adjoining the Oval at Leederville, for the reason that the portions referred to serve no useful purpose as streets. All the adjoining land is held or controlled as reserves by the City Council. The portion of Melrose street referred to is not a constructed street. It is now proposed to include these streets in the adjoining parklands reserve, and to place them under the control of the City Council. There is no departmental objection to this closure. The second proposal is in regard to a private road bisecting some land owned by the Bunbury Golf Club. This private

road was intended to give access to the golf links, but is not constructed or used, as other alternate roads have been provided. The Bunbury Golf Club is the owner of all the land coloured green on the lithograph, including the road it is proposed to close. The club has subdivided the whole area with the intention of selling it, but, owing to the fact that the road mentioned has been registered on the Certificate of Title and in the Titles Office, it finds that it cannot secure approval of the subdivision until authority is obtained to close the right of way. The Bunbury Council has no objection to the closure, and there is no departmental objection. I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [6.6]: I am speaking only in connection with the portion of the Bill as it affects some land owned by the Bunbury Golf Club. There is an implied right-of-way to the golf links, and the golf club requests that this should be closed. The municipal council has no objection, and, so far as I know, no resident of Bunbury has any objection. The land is privately owned, and has never been used. A bitumen road has been constructed up to the links, so that this particular piece of land never can be used.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—LIMITATION.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had disagreed to the amendment made by the Council for the reason set forth in the Schedule annexed, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Council's amendment. Clause 36:—Add at the end of the clause: "Unless such pos-

session has continued for a period exceeding 60 years":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is that the Assembly considers the Bill sufficiently expresses existing law as not to require amendment in the direction indicated.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—NATIVE FLORA PROTECTION.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendment No. 2 made by the Council but had disagreed to amendment No. 1 for the reasons set forth in the schedule annexed.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, consideration of the message postponed till a later stage of the sitting.

BILL—SUPREME COURT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9 made by the Council, but had disagreed to Amendments Nos. 4 and 8 for the reasons set forth in the schedule annexed.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

No. 4. Clause 77:—After "marriage" in line 2 of Subclause 1, add the words "on a petition charging adultery."

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment is that this amendment unduly limits the application of the clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Although the object of this amendment was to bring the

law back to what it is at present, the Bill is too important to take any risk of anything happening to it, so I shall not say anything further.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 8. Clause 94:—At the end of Subclause 1 add the following words: "and such petition shall be served on the alleged adulterer and the wife unless the court shall dispense with such service or direct some other service to be substituted":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is that the proposed amendment should be a rule of court which this Bill gives power to the court to make.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The amendment was moved after consultation with the Parliamentary Draftsman, who thought it advisable that it should be included in the Bill. However, it refers to possible action only, and I doubt very much if any such action will ever be brought. In those circumstances I shall not worry about it.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 10th December.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.41]: This Bill has three outstanding features. The first is that purporting to amend certain sections in the Legal Practitioners Act as at present existing. The second important feature is that dealing with the importing of new sections, primarily the question of the keeping of accounts for trust funds. The third feature is the establishment of a guarantee fund. The point to be considered is whether, having regard to the importance of the last-named feature I have alluded to, it would not have been better to include that portion in a Bill by itself so that it might have been

discussed quite free from any amendment to the Legal Practitioners Act which might be considered desirable. Possibly that would have been the better course, for it would have given members opportunity to consider certain of those amendments which are contained in the Bill. But the whole having been amalgamated, any objection which a member might have against one or other of those points I have mentioned would mean the abandonment practically of the Bill if a majority of members should think fit to support that objection. I do not require to traverse the ground which has already been covered by other members, but I do support them in much of what they have said, although I will not go as far as to agree with the idea that there is anything immoral behind the Bill. Some allusion was made to that, but I am sure the hon. member who used that expression did not intend to convey the meaning that there was any immoral purpose underlying the Bill. I do not intend either to deal with the amendments that are contained in the first part of the Bill. That brings me to the second point, namely, the question of trust accounts. Everyone who has been associated with the legal profession must recognise, as I think is recognised by the public generally, that it is desirable, and indeed important, that trust accounts should be kept. I certainly hold with what Mr. Parker said in that direction. Any person who fails to keep a trust account fails to carry out a duty which is incumbent upon him if he be a member of the legal profession. However, there is this observation which I would make about the keeping of trust accounts: Clause 5 provides that all moneys received for or on behalf of any person by such practitioner acting professionally or as a trustee shall be trust moneys for the purpose of this Act, and shall be held by him in trust for such person to be paid or applied as he directs, and until so paid or applied all such moneys shall be paid into such trust account. I point out to the Honorary Minister that there are many sums—Mr. Parker, I know, will bear out what I have to say—many trust funds which pass through a legal practitioner's hand which could not possibly be paid into a trust account as directed in the Bill. As an instance: Not infrequently a solicitor receives

money in the form of cheques drawn to the order of some particular individual, and he is responsible for the passing over of the money represented in the cheque to the individual concerned. It might be money for the payment for a mine or for some big property. Most solicitors would say to their clients, "Very well, you had better arrange to draw a cheque for the amount that is to be paid direct to the vendor, and I will hand it over." So that money may not really be trust money, yet under the Bill it has to be paid into a trust account.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And it may be a bank cheque.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, in the circumstances it would require to be. I refer to that because there is also provision made in the Bill for an audit. If an audit of these accounts revealed that the solicitor had failed to pay this money into a trust account as required by the Bill, that solicitor would be guilty of a breach of the Act. That matter certainly requires consideration, and if the Bill should reach the Committee stage, undoubtedly it will require to be amended in that respect. Now I come to the third important feature in the Bill, namely, the part which deals with the establishment of a guarantee fund. I have taken the opportunity to make inquiries from a large number of practitioners and have received from them, and also in a letter from a country practitioner, very strenuous protests against the establishment of such a fund. I agree with other members regarding the freedom which we as practising solicitors have enjoyed from such serious crimes as have been recorded in other places. No profession and no body of persons have made greater efforts than have the legal practitioners to cleanse the profession of the so-called black sheep. They have exercised very strict vigilance indeed, and we in this State have enjoyed an immunity from serious offences such as have been committed in other places. A simple instance will suffice. In New Zealand some years ago the restrictions that were in existence were relaxed and the result was the appearance before the court of many practitioners for serious defalcations. If they were not brought before the court, many reports were made to the board. The result has been that the rules and regulations there have been tightened up. Because of what happened, practitioners in New Zea-

land were compelled to approve of some measure such as this. The Bill, however, is not called for here because there is not the same urgency for it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have closed your union books, have you not?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would not like to say that, but we have endeavoured to cleanse the profession of those likely to do the acts which the guarantee fund is designed to meet. I support members who have spoken against the Bill. There is absent from the measure one of the essentials of all guarantees undertaken by companies or individuals. If I am asked to guarantee a man I am given the opportunity to say yea or nay. The first thing I would do, as a guarantee company would do, would be to make inquiry about the person to be guaranteed. This Bill, however, would call upon the practitioners, who are seeking to do their best in the discharge of their duties, to guarantee persons without having the opportunity to say whether they were willing to give a guarantee. If a company discovered a black mark against a man who was to be guaranteed, the company would turn the application down. Here, however, there would be no option; the practitioners would be compelled to subscribe to the guarantee fund. It is true that a limit has been stated, but instead of that remaining the maximum, it might have to be increased. That would place a very serious charge upon many members of the profession, which, together with their obligations in the shape of admission fees, practising fees and office expenses, would represent a very serious burden, and it would not be fair at the present time to exact such a toll. Many other reasons might be advanced in opposition to the establishment of a guarantee fund. The principle of a guarantee on the lines suggested in the Bill is wrong. If it should become necessary in future to establish anything in the nature of a guarantee fund, it would be much better to require all practitioners to enter into a bond for a stated sum with an approved guarantee company. That could be done, doubtless, through the agency of various companies who transact such business, and there would be the added advantage that the company would make close investigations into the antecedents of the practitioner. Under the Bill no inquiries at all would be made, but the practitioners would simply be compelled to subscribe and the

fund would be made liable for any wrongful act.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What would the man's antecedents have to do with it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A great deal. No one would guarantee an individual without knowing something about him.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You might be penalising a man for the misdemeanours of his parents.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not think that would affect the position. Under my suggestion there would be an obligation on the practitioner to find the requisite bond, and until it was provided, he would be unable to get his practising certificate and therefore could not hold himself up as a practitioner. Another detrimental feature of the Bill is that it seeks to bring in every practitioner. Quite a number of the members of the legal profession who are free to practise are engaged in offices. They occupy responsible managerial positions, but they do not practise. It would be unfair indeed to place the burden on those men. Holding these views, I am compelled to record my vote against the Bill.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [8.0]: Prior to the introduction of this measure I thought the legal profession was the most honourable one in the State, but after reading the Bill, one might have some doubt about that. As a fact, however, I do not think there is any doubt about the standard of the profession. If the Bill does get into Committee I should like to see a new clause embodied in it, to provide that all Ministers of the Crown, present and future, should contribute 20 per cent. of their salary to a guarantee fund, as an undertaking that the Government trust funds will not be misappropriated during their term of office. If there were any such thing, then Ministers of the Crown would forfeit the 20 per cent. of their salary which would have been placed in a guarantee fund. I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [8.1]: Although I did not agree with Mr. Parker's statements, I listened with a great deal of interest to his speech. I certainly do not think the Bill itself could have given rise to some of his statements, nor to the complicated position which he suggested does in reality exist, or would exist if this measure

were passed. I really think the hon. member was trying to be humorous, and if so he certainly was successful. He went so far as to suggest that because the clients of members of the profession would be protected by the Bill to the extent of the amount of money which some legal practitioner might be guilty of misappropriating, quite a number of the members of the profession would most probably run their heads into a noose, and spend a little time at Fremantle because of that fact.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I said if they did do those things, that is what would happen.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is an entirely wrong construction to put upon the Bill. My experience of members of the profession is such as to cause me to regard that section of the community as just as honest as any other section. After listening to Mr. Parker one cannot get away from the inferences he has drawn. I certainly think he was endeavouring to be humorous in raising the objection he did to the measure. Why should we in this State object to the provisions of the Bill, when similar provisions already exist in New Zealand, New South Wales and Queensland?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: There are more members of the profession there.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not subscribe to Mr. Parker's suggestion that because there is a smaller number here we are likely to have a larger number of defaulting legal practitioners if we pass this Bill. That is a ridiculous construction to put upon the principles contained in the measure. There is very little difference between this Bill and the Acts in operation in New Zealand, New South Wales and Queensland. The differences are simply in detail and not in principle. The hon. member suggested that trust funds would include quite a lot of things. He even suggested that they would include certain documents, mortgages, bonds, etc. I am advised that the Bill does no such thing. It merely covers moneys that are held by the legal practitioner in trust for his clients. It cannot by any stretch of imagination be given the interpretation the hon. member gives to it. The only other point I wish to deal with is that of the submission of the Bill to the Barristers' Board and the Law Society. Mr. Parker discounted my statement in that regard. I want to be fair to him. I think he inferred that neither

the Barristers' Board nor the Law Society had given the Bill consideration.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I said it had been submitted to those organisations, but that they had not submitted it to the members.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I can only repeat what I am advised. The fact is that the matter was brought before the Law Society and the Barristers' Board, who were asked to appoint a committee representative of both bodies to go into the matter with the draftsman. That was done, and a committee was appointed consisting of Messrs. Lohrmann and Goodman (Barristers' Board) and Messrs. Solomon and Virtue (Law Society). That is about as far as the Government could be expected to go.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Those gentlemen did not agree with the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know about that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I know some of them personally and that is their view.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They only went into the matter so far as the drafting was concerned.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Bill was submitted to them for consideration and advice. The Government could not go further. What sort of position would we be in if the Government were to circulate the contents of a Bill amongst all and sundry in the particular section of the community affected, advising them that these were the contents of the Bill which was to be brought before Parliament at an early date? We would never get any Bill at all in such circumstances. Every section of the community would want some amendment moved and would raise some objection to some part of the measure. I do not think we would get anywhere at all under such an arrangement.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would be like the Bulk Handling Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Government submitted the Bill to the two organisations who may be said to control the legal profession. We went as far as we could to get their concurrence. Whether individual members of the committee really agreed to the Bill I do not know. That does not seem to matter much.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you suggest that four legal gentlemen did not understand the Bill?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I imagine they did understand it, but Mr. Parker suggests they did not submit it to other members of the profession. That is his complaint.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I would draw your attention to Clause 28 dealing with theft or fraud.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member said it would be necessary for members of the profession to pay into a special trust fund in order that that fund might be audited, etc. However, that is a point which need not be discussed in detail now, in view of the strong objections expressed to the Bill, which make me realise that the House does not feel inclined to pass it. Still, I have thought it necessary for me to clear up at any rate one or two matters. I suggest that Mr. Parker has put an entirely erroneous construction on some clauses of the Bill. Really the measure speaks for itself. To me as a layman there appears no reason for misunderstanding of any one of its clauses, notwithstanding the construction placed on them by Mr. Parker.

Question put and negatived; the Bill defeated.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 12th December.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [8.13]: In offering a few remarks on the Appropriation Bill I would prefer that the Chief Secretary was present, because that hon. gentleman when introducing the measure intimated that he would seek to reply in the fullest degree to points raised by members during the second reading stage. I have only three or four matters to touch upon, and the first of these relates to that hardy annual dear to goldfielders—workers' homes. No doubt the present position is all right for persons who have established freehold homes, not being willing to accept workers' leasehold homes. On the Loan Bill I mentioned an item of £15,000 for new capital to be furnished to the Workers' Homes Board, and I called attention to a statement made by the Premier himself in a letter to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Coun-

cil, to the effect that the Workers' Homes Board needed no additional money, having plenty of funds for carrying on. The Chief Secretary said he would explain where the money comprised in that item was going, when he replied on the Appropriation Bill. To me it seems there is no need for the hon. gentleman to offer such an explanation, as he has already indicated the Government's intention. Summed up, the Chief Secretary's remarks amounted to this, that the Government intend to let things go on as they have been and are going; that is, to leave the question of the extension of workers' homes to the Workers' Homes Board. If that is the intention—there being no hint as to the view of the board—we can write workers' homes off as far as the goldfields are concerned. If there is no desire to extend the operations of the board to the goldfields now, the time for such extension has never been and never will be. My only comment is that I regret exceedingly to learn that an Administration said by its political opponents to have done so much for the goldmining industry has not sufficient confidence in the goldfields to back up with a miserable £20,000 for workers' homes the millions of money pouring into the country to develop the industry. During the discussion of a proposal to extend workers' homes to the fields, there was introduced in another place, by a side wind, a motion suggesting that goldfields municipalities themselves build workers' homes. A motion, I say, was introduced; and after some discussion, and also after the passage of a certain Bill through this Chamber and its ruling-out in another place, Mr. Millington quite placidly, in the style so characteristic of him, said he was entirely satisfied with the terms of the motion moved by Mr. Cunningham. As a consequence, that motion was most obligingly withdrawn. As for goldfields municipalities undertaking the erection of workers' homes, an amendment of the Municipal Corporations Act is necessary to enable them to embark on such an enterprise. It has been said over and over again by the high factotum of the Agricultural Bank when Minister for Works, and it was suggested on his behalf in this Chamber, and it was uttered to deputations, that until such time as the Legislative Council was prepared to abolish plural voting

the present Administration had no intention whatever of amending the Municipal Corporations Act. Yet the Minister puts his tongue in his cheek and says goldfields municipalities should step in and build where the Government are afraid to do so. Another matter I have to raise is the taxing of residential leaseholds on the goldfields. Unquestionably the present Government are out to get every bob they can from the goldfields. They have even instructed the police to raid two-up schools, so that the Treasury may extract the last possible shilling from goldfields workers. The Taxation Department have put into operation a tax on residential leaseholds, and are calling up arrears of taxation at the minimum of 2s. 6d. per annum. In all humility I suggest that if the Land and Income Tax Act is to apply to goldfields residents and leaseholds, it would be infinitely more honest, and also of greater financial advantage, to do the only right and practical thing—increase the yearly rentals of residential leaseholders from 10s. to 12s. 6d. At present the goldfields residential leaseholder is paying 10s. a year. The Taxation Department send him an assessment, which he has to send back with 2s. 6d. Then the assessment is stamped and sent back to him. The Government would have done infinitely better to say honestly and straight out, "We will not put a tax on goldfields residential leaseholders. We think it much better for all concerned, and more productive of revenue, to increase the annual rental from 10s. to 12s. 6d."

The Honorary Minister: Would not they still have to do the same thing under the Land and Income Tax Act if the rental was raised from 10s. to 12s. 6d.?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No.

The Honorary Minister: Then the Land and Income Tax would have to be abandoned.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Could not the Act be amended with respect to residential leaseholds in the same way as with respect to workers' homes? Could not the Government simply say, "The rent is increased by 2s. 6d."? Then the leaseholders could pay their annual rent in two instalments of 6s. 3d. each instead of two instalments of 5s. each, plus 2s. 6d. land tax.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: That on the goldfields, too!

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes. Advantage has been taken recently of the provision in the taxation legislation that requires everyone

to submit a return and fixes the minimum land tax at 2s. 6d. The Taxation Department officials are assessing the whole of the residential leases and they are requiring the individuals concerned to send in their returns, together with the minimum tax of 2s. 6d., for which a receipt has to be posted back. I suppose half of the money raised is eaten up in collection costs. It would be infinitely better if the lease rents were increased as I have indicated, and that course would certainly be less vexatious. Another phase I wish to deal with is one that vitally concerns you, Mr. President, and me. During the discussion on the Loan Bill, I referred to the policy proposed by the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank for the rehabilitation of the Esperance district. In his reply the Chief Secretary did not make one reference to that matter. I am forced to the conclusion that the Government intend to allow the Commissioners to carry out their policy. If that policy means that the settlers of the Esperance district will be forced to shoulder a capitalisation of £1,500, there will be no progress in that part of the State. The settlers who are still there are more determined in their attitude than ever, and have telegraphed to members of Parliament as follows:—

Settlers, realising that the session is ending, demand that their affairs shall be discussed by both Houses prior to the adjournment, with a view to appealing to the Bank officials to reconsider their proposals. Other members have been notified.

That means that all members of Parliament have been notified, and there can be no question that the settlers have made up their minds, rightly so, that they cannot, and will not, shoulder the extra burden involved in the policy proposed by the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank. During the discussion on the Loan Bill, I suggested, as a final attempt to rehabilitate the Esperance district and to reconcile the divergent opinions between the settlers and the Agricultural Bank, that there were local men in the district who could have been consulted. It must be remembered that upwards of £2,000,000, apart from Agricultural Bank advances, has been sunk in public utilities in that part of the State. I suggested that there were local men who could be consulted and asked to adjudicate on the question of what capitalisation was possible, or reasonable, to expect settlers who were prepared

to stay in the district, to carry. I again advance the suggestion that there are men in the Esperance district who have lived there for 40 years, have worked there, grown wheat there, bred and sold stock there, and earned their livelihood in that part of the State. They are the men who could give the Government an idea that would be the true reflex of what the district is capable of. They could indicate what capitalisation it was reasonable to expect the settlers to shoulder. First of all, Dr. Teakle went through the district and then there was Mr. Rodgers. Then Mr. Wardle went through, and 50 per cent. of the recommendations of Dr. Teakle and Mr. Rodgers were immediately scrapped. The Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank took a flying tour through the country. They saw, and they were satisfied. Now the Commissioners have promulgated a scheme that was recommended by people who were practically strangers to the district. Another phase of the scheme is apt to be lost sight of. There are some men who have succeeded and are in a fairly good way in the district. Those men are to sign away their rights on exactly the same terms and with the same consideration as are imposed on the most impecunious settler in the district. I have been through there recently, and the settlers are not prepared to do it. I do not blame them. At this late hour of the session, I do not know what Parliament can do in order to enter a protest. I realise that the present powers-that-be were appointed to their positions with the best of intentions. On the other hand, I am perfectly satisfied that the Commissioners who are asking the settlers in the Esperance district to shoulder a burden of £1,500, know just as much about farming, and farming conditions there, as a bullock knows about snipe breeding. They know nothing about what they are asking the settlers to do. I do not know that I can protest any more.

The Honorary Minister interjected.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Honorary Minister has introduced the "Tell England" phase. If the story of the Esperance district were gone into and thoroughly investigated, a lot of the pommies in the district could make out as good a case as did the pommy settlers in Victoria.

Hon. F. H. H. Hall: That is saying a good deal.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am perfectly satisfied they could do so. In addition, they have in their favour in the Esperance district the fact that about £500,000 of the Migration and Development Scheme money has been spent there, and the British Government contributed towards that expenditure.

Hon. T. Moore: That contribution is just about finished.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In what way?

Hon. T. Moore: It cuts out in ten years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I shall not labour the question any further. I feel keenly regarding the position as it affects the Esperance district. If settlement is closed down there, we can put up the agricultural shutters in the district for the next 30 or 40 years. In fact, that part of the State will not be re-settled again, except by extending settlement eastward from Newdegate, and that means that the district east of Kalgarin will have to be settled first before the Esperance area can be tackled again. Another point I wish to deal with is that when moving the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, the Chief Secretary said that £10,000 extra had been provided for the Crown Law Department to cover the expenses in connection with the next general election. I do not know if other hon. members take the same view of Parliamentary life as I do, and as a soldier would. The latter realises that the ammunition dump is what really keeps him wherever he may be. If the ammunition fails, he fails. So it is with the Electoral Act, which is the ammunition dump for members of Parliament. It is by means of that Act that he is able to get into Parliament. If he does not attend to the requirements of the Electoral Act, then he cannot get here. If he does give attention to the Electoral Act and its requirements and he is subsequently defeated, he will at least know that he did what was required of him in that respect. I want to make this observation, that I am perfectly satisfied that the electoral rolls for the Assembly and for the Council were never in such a deplorable state as they are in today.

Hon. F. H. Gray: You have a short memory.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I speak from a knowledge of the South Province roll. In

making a comparison the other night between that roll and the Yilgarn-Coolgardie Assembly roll, I found that of 110 electors from Southern Cross, Marvel Loeh and Yelowdine, whom I had added to the South Province roll, 70 of them were not on the Yilgarn-Coolgardie roll, for which the enrolment is compulsory.

Member: It is not different in other parts of the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then there are on the Assembly roll hundreds who ought to be off it, while there are thousands off it who ought to be on it. Yet I understand orders were issued to print the rolls irrespective of the condition they are in. On the Eastern Goldfields a canvass was made in four of the Assembly electorates, four of the easiest electorates in which to enforce compulsory enrolment; for with the exception of that bit of Hannans which goes out to Broad Arrow, one could walk east and west and north and south around the four of them. And they were canvassed from house to house, despite the fact that there are prominent business men in the main street of Boulder who have been notified that their names are to be struck off the South Province roll because they do not appear on the Assembly roll. I am speaking of things as I find them.

The Honorary Minister: Whom are you blaming for that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The people who are in power to-day and those who have gone before them, for having starved financially the Electoral Department and expected it to do impossibilities. None of them has had the courage to endeavour to enforce compulsory enrolment for the Assembly.

The Honorary Minister: The rolls are in better shape now than they were when you said much the same thing 12 months ago.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know that I spoke of it 12 months ago. I will give the ex-Chief Electoral Officer this credit, that he did as much as, if not more than, any of his predecessors with the niggardly amount placed at his disposal. I assume that the extra money to be provided under the Vote is for the conduct of elections; because it is too late now for the Assembly, and almost too late for the Council, to do anything with the rolls, so that matter will be left entirely in the hands of canvassers and candidates. That is a state of

affairs which should not be tolerated. I know of electors whose names are on the Assembly roll, but who, four years ago, left the district for which they are enrolled. And the electoral registrars, particularly those on the goldfields, have too much work to do in their ordinary avocations in the Mines Department and other departments, and so cannot possibly give proper attention to the rolls. It is wrong to leave the registrars to do the work of the rolls, for they have not the time to carry out their own immediate duties and electoral duties also. Take a young clerk of courts on £280 per annum. The turnover of his court during the last 12 or 18 months has increased by 80 per cent. or 100 per cent.; and not satisfied with his doing that work, some genius in the messengers' department here thought he might save 2d. per fortnight in the distribution of the Miners' Phthisis Act money, and so it is now left for a boy to deliver by hand. The registrar is expected to do this work, and I do not think he gets anything for it, although he has to go back in the early morning in order to keep up his roll. I do hope that some of the increased Vote will be devoted to cleaning up the rolls. Lastly but not leastly, I want to join Mr. Williams as to the position on the goldfields regarding miners' phthisis legislation, workers' compensation legislation and the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. Mr. Williams struck the proper note when he said it is time to build up some semblance of a reserve fund. During the last two or three years 6,000 or 7,000 new men have come into the industry; yet we are simply drifting along as if the industry were largely stagnant, leaving things as they were a few years ago, prepared to pay miners' phthisis money and workers' compensation and mine workers' relief without any thought for the morrow or for the load that certainly will accumulate and will have to be carried. I can understand metropolitan members not feeling very much interested in this—

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: It affects the whole State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The position is that unless there is a thorough overhaul in the direction of setting up a reserve fund, the time will come when all those specious promises that have been made to the men when they have fallen by the wayside will have to be cut down by one-half. Now is the time to set about building up that reserve

fund. I can understand Mr. de Bernales and other people in their advocacy for helping the mining industry; I can understand their reply to arguments used at the Trades Hall where they were treated as comrades—"If you reduce the working week to 40 hours, the grade of ore will have to be increased correspondingly." I agree with all that, but there is something higher than the grade of ore; it is that the mining industry will continue to create victims so long as there is a mine, and with gold at double the price it was a few years ago, surely a contribution could be asked of the producing mines, those making a profit, for the building up of a reserve fund. To give the mine managers due credit, I do not think they would offer any objection. The position is serious and will have to be faced. It seems that goldfields members can talk and talk without avail. All the talking during this Parliament has been done in this House. In the preceding three years all the talking was done by the Labour Party when in opposition. During the Mitchell regime, when the Miners' Phthisis Act was passed and when the late Mr. John Scaddan piloted through the Mine Workers' Relief Act, all the criticism came from the Labour Party sitting in opposition. To-day the Labour Party, with the exception of one member, are dumb in the matter of ensuring that in future what has been promised shall be performed.

Hon. T. Moore: Mr. Scaddan's miners' phthisis measure was never put into operation by the Government who introduced it. The Labour Party gave effect to it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Why was it not put into operation?

Hon. T. Moore: That is the point.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can tell the hon. member. I made inquiries in South Africa at the request of Mr. Scaddan. A condition of Mr. Scaddan's introducing the Miners' Phthisis Bill was that Mr. Hughes, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, would provide a laboratory and the necessary staff at Kalgoorlie and pay the cost. This was contingent upon the State's introducing legislation to make the examination of miners compulsory. Mr. Scaddan kept his part of the compact, but not until the Collier Government took office was the laboratory completed and put into working order.

Hon. T. Moore: And the measure was then put into operation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The measure could not be put into operation until the laboratory had been completed. The Parliament of Western Australia anticipated by some 15 months their part of the contract to bring in legislation making the examination of miners compulsory. I do not wish to delve into ancient history. I could tell Mr. Moore when the 25s. a week was introduced and of the noise that was made in this House. I could tell him when a large deputation sat in the workers' hall and of the schedule of benefits they asked for under the Miners' Phthisis Act.

The Honorary Minister: You have told us that many times before.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Not that. I could relate what the late Mr. Walker said and what they told him, too.

Hon. G. Fraser: Tell us at the next sitting.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member need not attend then or now.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Tell us after we have dealt with the Bulk Handling Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that I have been filling a gap; I was asked to speak. However, I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

BILL—NATIVE FLORA PROTECTION.

Assembly's Message.

Amendment disagreed to by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. H. J. Yelland in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 6:—Add at the end of the clause the words "with the permission of the owner or occupier."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is that protection to private owners is already provided in other measures.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: In view of the satisfactory reason given, I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

As to Committee Stage.

The PRESIDENT: Pending the drafting of certain amendments to the Bulk Handling Bill, the sitting will be suspended.

Sitting suspended from 8.50 to 9.40 p.m.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 13th December. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 35-40—agreed to.

Clause 41—Regulations:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (vii.) the following words be added:—"or under which one warrant may be issued in exchange for more than one warrant."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The word "warrant" is used in many cases in this Bill, but that reference is not in accordance with the usual practice. The amendment will put that right.

Amendment put and passed; the Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed Clause 7—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 17—Company to insure wheat:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in lines 26 and 27 the words "to be approved by the Minister" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"which, or who have complied with the provisions of the Insurance Act, 1932, Commonwealth."

Amendment put and passed: the Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Postponed Clause 26—Tolls and charges to be subject to Governor's approval:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 1 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—" (1) Every holder of a warrant on surrendering the same to the company shall pay to the company a toll of

five-eighths of a penny per bushel, or such lesser toll as the Governor may from time to time fix by Order-in-Council. The amount of the toll shall be considered as an advance, and shall be repayable by the company at the time and in the manner prescribed in the deed of trust. (2) In return for all services performed by the company in the receipt, handling, storage and delivery of any wheat the company shall be authorised to make a handling charge to be fixed by the Governor from time to time but not to exceed one and one-eighth of a penny per bushel and such other charges as are from time to time approved by the Governor."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There has already been a discussion on the toll, which might be regarded by the Commissioner of Taxation as something the company were gaining. There was a danger of the Taxation Department taking a mistaken view and treating the toll as income of the company, whereas it is really money lent to the company. The amendment will clarify the position.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

First Schedule—agreed to.

Second Schedule:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to paragraph (a):—"Provided that the wheat shall be deemed equal to standard, if in the case of wheat delivered for shipment the running bulk sample of the working shift is equal to standard, or, if in the case of wheat delivered other than for shipment, the running bulk sample of each truck or container in which the wheat is delivered is equal to standard."

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (1), sub-paragraph (c), the following words be struck out:—"For every pound below the quantity of millable wheat in the particular standard, a payment equal to one and one-half per centum of the market price of the standard."

Further amendments, which are to be moved, will explain the situation.

Hon. T. MOORE: To strike out something before we know what is to take its place is rather an unusual proceeding. A committee is putting up all this stuff on the House, without members in general knowing anything about it. As a representative of wheatgrowers I want to know all about it.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You will hear it all.

Hon. T. MOORE: This proceeding is utterly unusual. What is the idea behind it all?

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the words "equal to one and one-half per centum of the market price of the standard" be struck out wherever they occur, and "of one half-penny per bushel" inserted in lieu; and that the words "equal to three per centum of the market price of the standard" be struck out and "of one penny per bushel" inserted in lieu.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The reason for the amendment is the difficulty there has been in assessing under the f.a.q. system in order to arrive at the payment equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the market price of the standard. To make it more workable and to retain the system that has been in vogue for 30 years, the amendment, which fixes the payment at $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel, will simplify the position.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in lines 13 and 14 of paragraph (c) "equal to three per centum of the market price of the standard" be struck out and the words "of one penny per bushel" inserted in lieu.

The particular portion of the subparagraph concerned sets out that for every one per centum of hard ball smut above that stated on the warrant, a payment equal to three per centum of the market price of the standard shall be made. The amendment will make the payment fixed at 1d. per bushel.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Again simplifying the procedure.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Clause 4 of the Schedule, after "company," the words "in any country bin" be inserted.

The amendment refers to warrants in respect of wheat received by the company in any country bin.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Clause 4 of the Schedule "fourteen" be struck out and the word "seven" inserted in lieu.

The amendment refers to the time within which the holder of a warrant must notify the company that he desires delivery of certain wheat.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line 11 of Clause 4 of the Schedule "thirty-first day of May" be struck out and the words "thirtieth day of April" inserted in lieu.

It is provided that the company shall not be obliged to hold wheat under this particular portion of the Schedule after the 31st May following the issue of the warrant, and the amendment will fix the date at the 30th April instead of the 31st May.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That after "warrant," in line 11, the following words be added:—

"Provided further that the Minister may, subject as hereinafter provided, relieve the company of its obligation to deliver wheat from a particular siding under the preceding provisions under the following conditions:—

(i) The Minister may require the company to satisfy him that the company has made adequate provision at some other convenient siding to deliver to the holders of the warrants wheat from the same district as the wheat received at the siding of receipt.

(ii) The Minister may relieve the company entirely if in the opinion of the Minister the holder of the warrant does not bona fide require the wheat for milling requirements in his own business."

The object of the amendment is to guard the company against warrant-holders oppressively exercising their rights against the interests of the company.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The amendment deals with millers' wheat or wheat that is required for milling purposes. While I prefer the clause in the Schedule. I will not oppose the amendment, but I sincerely hope that if the arrangement contemplated does not operate in the manner expected by those who have agreed to the amendment, we shall next year have an opportunity to deal further with the position. It must not be forgotten that the millers should receive due credit for the fact that they endeavour to keep up the standards of Western Australian wheat products. They are free buyers and they must have

the best quality of wheat in order to maintain the flour standard. That is why they desire to be able to select wheat from different parts of the State, instead of having to accept softer grades. To a great extent that position has been met, but it is rather unfortunate that we have not these amendments before us. We cannot grasp them as you, Mr. Chairman, read them rapidly to the Committee and we are really passing them "on the blind." We cannot grasp their full import as we could if we had them in print before us.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Without some protection such as this, Bulk Handling Ltd. could not be successfully operated. As the Bill stood, the company were compelled to hold certain wheat at certain sidings. This has been tried once or twice under the bag system, but has failed badly. Personally I welcome this protection for the company because it makes the position more workable.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: It is the desire of the millers eventually to handle their wheat through Bulk Handling Ltd. But if they cannot obtain the wheat they require to keep up the standard of their flour, they will have to arrange to get their wheat in bags and that of course will increase costs. It is most important that the millers should have the right quality of wheat in order to maintain their standard of flour. One cannot follow the amendment put before us this evening, but apparently it is an endeavour to meet the situation, and so I will accept it.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That all words after "date of" in line 5 of Clause 5 be struck out and "delivery of the wheat" be inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That there be added at the end of paragraph (b) of Clause 6 the words "or at market price as defined in Section 16 of this Act."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: As paragraph (b) stands, it would be impossible in this State. Of course it might be all right in New South Wales where they have a big market in Sydney in which to sell the wheat, but without these proposed additional words the paragraph would be quite unworkable in this State.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (e) of Clause 7 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

(e) The Board may require either party to work overtime in the delivery and loading of the wheat and if the parties cannot agree as to the liability for payment of the overtime the Board shall decide the question.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That there be added at the end of paragraph (a) of Clause 8 the words "provided that for the purpose of this paragraph delivery shall be deemed to have been made at the place of loading, provided the company prove that it promptly loaded and arranged for the despatch of the trucks."

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Without the amendment this paragraph in the Schedule would cause no end of trouble between the agent and the company. The company would have no control of the wheat after it was loaded. The amendment will safeguard the position from the millers' point of view. It is only reasonable that this protection should be given.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) of Condition 8 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Preamble:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 13 "charged to" be struck out and the words "contributed by" inserted in lieu.

This will be in keeping with the amendment regarding the toll.

Amendment put and passed; the Preamble, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 2, 9, 11, 15, 16, 23, 27, 28 and 33.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Definition:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the definition of "grower" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"Grower" includes the legal personal representative of a deceased person, a trustee, the liquidator of a company, and a person entitled to a share of a wheat crop under a share farming agreement."

The amendment covers the definition in the Bill, but is much more specific, and, on that account, more desirable.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9—Company not to trade in wheat:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the words inserted in the previous Committee "weighbridge clerks or bin attendants whilst acting in those capacities" be struck out, and the words struck out by the same Committee "its directors, officers, servants or agents" be re-inserted.

This will restore the first part of the clause to the original drafting.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) of the proviso be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"Penalty: Five hundred pounds. Provided that nothing herein contained shall apply (a) to any such person who at the 1st day of November, 1935, was and still continues to be (i) a director of Westralian Farmers Limited or Westralian Wheat Farmers Limited; or (ii) a trustee of the body corporate known as the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia; or (iii) the General Manager or the Manager of the Wheat Department of Westralian Farmers Limited, in so far as any such person bona fide acts in the ordinary course of the business of the company or body which he represents under paragraphs (i), (ii), or (iii) of this proviso."

Hon. G. FRASER: I feel inclined to raise a protest against this sort of thing. We are asked to pass this important Bill, but do not know where we are. Some members who have been in conference over it may understand what is going on, but I am sure nobody else does. It appears to me that Clause 9 is practically useless. In one place it directs the company to do certain things, and in another place provides exemptions for it. How can we possibly understand what is being done without the amendments being before us?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Fremantle never does understand.

Hon. G. FRASER: I notice that some members are very particular about dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's," and want debates adjourned to the following day, so that they may see that these things are properly done. Anyway, I enter my protest against this sort of thing.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We are acting in accordance with the report of the Royal Commission. They considered that the present directors should be protected. Probably we did not sufficiently protect them, but the proviso does so, to a reasonable extent.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The directors of Bulk Handling Ltd. are gentlemen who are associated in different ways with the other companies that come under Clause 9. But for the proviso it would be necessary to find a different set of persons altogether, and this would lead to greater expense to a concern that desires to economise.

The CHAIRMAN: I have some sympathy for Mr. Fraser. Although the amendments are before me I can scarcely follow them.

Hon. T. MOORE: Mr. Holmes' interjection was uncalled for. We are passing many things to-night that I am sure we do not understand. I think Mr. Fraser was quite correct in drawing attention to it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not care what you think.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am afraid most members do not understand what we are doing. There are other days in the week left to us. It would be more satisfactory to report progress until to-morrow, and to have all these amendments put on the Notice Paper. It is hardly fair to members to have these amendments forced upon them in this way. They cannot possibly get a grip of them.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 11—Company not to give preference or show favouritism:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That a paragraph to stand as paragraph (b) be inserted as follows:—"Tout or canvass on behalf of any wheatgrower doing business with the company."

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause 1 the following proviso be inserted:—“Provided that nothing herein contained shall apply (a) to any such person who at the first day of November, 1935, was, and so long as he still continues to be—(i) a director of Westralian Farmers Limited or Westralian Wheat Farmers Limited; or (ii) a trustee of the body corporate known as the trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia; or (iii) the General Manager or Manager of the Wheat Department of Westralian Farmers Limited—in so far as any such person bona fide acts in the ordinary course of the business of the Company or body which he represents under paragraphs (i), (ii) or (iii) of this proviso; (b) to Westralian Farmers Limited while it acts as handling agent under the agreement made the seventh day of June one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three between the Company and Westralian Farmers Limited.”

The exemption is qualified insofar as it applies only to any person bona fide acting in the ordinary course of the business of the company or of the body which he represents under paragraph (1)—that is, as a director or a trustee or a general manager—and to any person who acts as handling agent for Westralian Farmers Ltd. The exemption is qualified severely.

Hon. G. FRASER: I take it that a servant or officer or agent is not covered by the proviso, that the proviso applies only to directors, trustees and general managers.

The Chief Secretary: That is so.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 15—Company not liable for act of God or unforeseen damage:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, the words “and delivery order” inserted by a previous Committee in line 5 of Subclause 2 were struck out, and the clause as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: There will be a consequential amendment in Clause 16.

Clause 23—Liability of holders for conversion; negotiability of warrants:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the words “(a) the first person who acquires title from the stated grower of any wheat to a warrant originally issued in the name of the stated grower; or (b) any person in whose name a warrant is first issued on the nomination of the stated grower of any wheat, shall be responsible to the same extent as if such person had acquired the actual wheat in respect of which the war-

rant was issued” be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—

“(a) the person delivering the wheat mentioned in the warrant to the company;

(b) the person in whose name the warrant in respect of such wheat is issued by the company; and

(c) every person to whom the warrant is negotiated,

shall be liable to the true owner of such wheat or to the person in derogation of whose right title claim or interest it was delivered to the company in the same manner and to the same extent as if such person had received the actual wheat.”

The object of the amendment is to spread the liability.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Will the liability be joint or several?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Several.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause 2 the following proviso be added:—“Provided always that every person to whom a warrant is negotiated or transferred shall accept and hold the same subject to the interests of all lien holders and other persons claiming title to or security over the wheat in respect of which the warrant was issued.”

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 4 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as further amended, agreed to.

Clause 27—Company to have lien for charges:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, the words “a delivery order from the company in respect” inserted by a previous Committee in line 1 of Subclause 2 were struck out, and the words “delivery order from the company” struck out by the same Committee were re-inserted.

Clause 28—Delivery board:

On motion by the Chief Secretary, the words “who shall be the Chief Traffic Manager of the Western Australian Government Railways” were inserted after “him” in line 5; and the words “one member being a grower, to be nominated by the Minister,” inserted by a previous Committee, were struck out.

Clause, as further amended, agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: In Clause 33 there will be a consequential amendment with regard to “delivery.”

Bill again reported with further amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [11.8]: When the Chief Secretary submitted this measure he asked us to refrain from introducing extraneous matter, and to keep to specific subjects. I have one or two specific subjects to place before members and before the Government, but I have not had a previous opportunity to do so. I wish to refer to the advisability of the Government assisting many of those orchardists and small farmers in the Bickley Valley who suffered loss through a severe storm some months ago. When one looks back at the assistance that has been given by the Federal Government to various sections of the farming community, especially the wheatgrowers, one wonders why something has not been done for those who suffered so severely as the result of that great storm. It was not the fault of the growers, it was an act of God, and it was so severe in its results that I feel it is a national matter which should be taken up by the Government. I should like the Chief Secretary, when replying, to tell us whether it is possible for some assistance to be given from those advances that have been made by the Federal Government for the assistance of farmers throughout the State. Originally, I understand, the Commonwealth money was advanced for the benefit of the wheatgrowers, but wheatgrowers secure crops year by year. If there is a failure, only a year is required for farmers to rehabilitate themselves, because seldom do we in Western Australia suffer successive droughts as do other States. When we consider what the Bickley orchardists have suffered and the impossibility of their rapidly rehabilitating themselves, they are entitled to some consideration. I had an opportunity to pass through the district visited by the storm, and I found that, counting the season they have already lost through the destruction of the growing crop, it will take close on four years before they can get back to normal. It is our

duty to stand by them and help them to overcome that enormous loss. The storm was so heavy that not only did it destroy the fruit-bearing shoots of the trees, but it broke away the bark and laid bare the wood to such an extent that there is no possible chance of its healing. This means that the trees have to be cut back and started afresh in order to make new wood. As this will take about four years, some assistance should be granted the orchardists by the Government. So far the Government have not shown any intention of helping those people to get back to a sound footing. Apart from the damage done to the trees, the deluge washed away the soil to such an extent as to cause great concern. For many years those orchardists have been fertilising their land heavily—sometimes the cost has been as much as £6 per acre—and when the soil was washed away, it destroyed the fertility of the orchards. It is quite impossible for those men, who will not receive any return for their work for two to four years, effectively to restore the fertility of the soil, and unless assistance is granted, they must go to the wall because the orchards must fail to produce sufficient to recoup them for their work. I want to know whether the Government are prepared to help those men during the next three or four years. When the cyclonic storm occurred in the North-West, and so much damage was done to the pearling fleet, the Commonwealth Government and the State Government very properly went to the assistance of the industry, but leaving out of consideration the fact that loss of life was involved, the damage done to the fleet could readily be restored. Yet nothing has been done to help the Bickley orchardists on work of restoration that must extend over a long period. The people who have thus suffered severely are entitled to consideration equally with those who suffered from the storm in the North-West. I hope the Minister will give some indication of the Government's intentions. Let me now refer to the anxiety existing regarding the education of outback children. For some years it has been our desire to help those who are outside the scope of the ordinary school curriculum, and the method adopted was that of teaching by correspondence. The great object is to secure close

touch between the children and the teacher. In our city schools the child is under the direct control of the teacher, and there is a personal touch between the two as a result of close association which is advantageous. When children are taught by the correspondence system, that close association is lacking, and the nearest approach we can get to personal touch is by forwarding personal letters. This means of communication has been refused through lack of co-operation between the Postal Department and the Education Department. The psychological effect of the personal touch is very important in the training of children, and when I remind members that some of the children are as far as 400 miles from a school, and that many in our more settled parts are seven to ten miles distant, they will realise that this lack of co-ordination is such a severe handicap as to warrant my protest. The story of this work goes back several years. The Premier made overtures to the Commonwealth; the Minister for Education endeavoured to get assistance, and various members and institutions have striven to secure the assistance of the Postal Department. The ordinary school work is delivered as second class postal matter. Something in the nature of a personal letter should be allowed to pass in the same envelope. It would not cost the Postal Department any more to carry the extra message, comprising as it does perhaps one small sheet of paper. Because, however, it happens to violate the regulation, that regulation must take precedence over any advantage which the children might gain from the psychological effect of such a letter. Officials who will deny that special work to the Education Department are lacking in foresight, because the child eventually has to become one of the citizens of the community, and may perhaps be one of the rulers of the nation. On looking over the files I find that the late Mr. Lovekin took the case up some years ago. A note of some significance was placed on one file in these words—

Should Mr. Lovekin see what is happening in connection with this work with the Postal Department, and how they are treating the Western Australian children, he would associate that with another reason for secession.

I do not think it was meant that this was so because of the refusal concerning this small concession, but the expression was due to the lack of co-ordination between the two

departments. That was the significance of it. If the Federal authorities would alter the regulation, it would be quite easy for them to do so and to confer this advantage on the children of the State. So far nothing has been done. The concession has been resolutely refused, and no consideration has been given to any question of altering the regulations. It is estimated that it would cost the Education Department about £250 to send that letter through in the ordinary way. I pointed out to the then Minister for Defence, Senator Pearce, to whom I wrote personally on the matter, that the authorities could do this work without any expense, and that even if it cost the Federal Government or the State Government another £250, that would not be nearly as much as the Federal Parliament had granted to him personally in the way of an increase in salary, at a time when everyone else was accepting reductions under the emergency legislation. It was not a matter of the shortage of money, but was one merely of adherence to a regulation, although 2,000 children in Western Australia would be the sufferers. I should like to know whether it is possible for the Government to do anything more in the matter. Because the interests of 2,000 children are at stake, the question is of far-reaching importance, and everything possible should be done to secure co-ordination between the two departments. I hope the Government will take the matter up, and will endeavour to get the support of other State Governments, so that the question may be made of Commonwealth-wide importance. I had intended to touch upon other matters, but as the Chief Secretary has asked us to refrain from dealing with too many questions. I bring these few points before the House and hope they will receive consideration. I support the Bill.

HON. T. MOORE (Central) [11.25]: A matter that has been agitating my mind very greatly is that of water supplies throughout a great portion of the country, and the dire necessity of helping our farmers. To-day the farmers are faced with a calamity such as they have never before experienced. In 1914, when there was as low a rainfall as there has been this year, they were in a bad way so far as water supplies were concerned, but at that time they had not the same quantity of stock to provide for. As a fact farmers have been

carting water since the end of October. The local dams, which have usually seen the farmers through in the bountiful seasons that have recently been experienced, have given out, and the farmers have been carting water for many weeks. Not only have the local dams given out, but the key dams are giving out, and when they do go matters will be even worse than they are to-day. I do not know what is going to happen to the farmers on account of lack of water. In past seasons the Railway Department, when certain sections of the community were short of water, brought relief in what are known as tankers. I am afraid there are not sufficient tankers in the rolling stock of the railways to provide water for all the stock that is in need of it. Immediate relief can come only if the unexpected happens, namely, if thunderstorms occur, but there has not been any indication that relief of that kind will come about. Unless the unexpected does happen the Government will be faced with a situation that no other Government have had to face. I refer to the position of water supplies in districts where the water has given out completely, and where the stock is so numerous that farmers will have to put it on the market at any price. That would indeed be a calamity. If a farmer loses his sheep, he loses his sideline, and in many cases he loses his mainstay, and will have to be equipped next year with more sheep. I cannot suggest what is to be done, but I do suggest that an officer of the Water Supply Department should be sent to the districts that are affected, so that he may ascertain exactly what should be done to relieve the situation. Some solution must be found for the problem before it becomes too acute. Already it is quite acute enough. I have received letters from various parts of my province indicating that the farmers are all in the same plight. I suggest that the Water Supply Department should wake up to the position. The drought is an extraordinarily severe one. It will be a calamity for all concerned if something is not done immediately to provide water for the farmers in the affected areas. I support the Bill.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [11.30]:

At the close of the debate I wish to stress the importance of doing something in a matter affecting the Central Province. There should not be much need to stress the matter,

as the Chief Secretary is one of the members for the Province affected and has personal knowledge of the subject. I refer to the menace which emus represent to settlers in the Ajana district more especially. I merely ask the Chief Secretary, when he goes out to the district—as I daresay he shortly will, whether opposed or not opposed—to be in a position to give those people an assurance that the Government have reconsidered their highly regrettable decision to discontinue the 1s. per head bonus on emus. It is useless for the Government to think they can put off the evil day. The question must be tackled; and the sooner it is tackled the better it will be not only for farmers in the Central Province but for farmers right along the rabbit-proof fence to the southern districts. The emu menace is very real. However, the Chief Secretary knows all about it. Before resuming my seat, may I stress the necessity for dealing with the matter of water supplies in the Central Province. The difficulty is acute, and I strongly urge the need for doing something promptly. I support the second reading of the Appropriation Bill.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting.

*Sitting suspended from 11.35 p.m. to
12.10 a.m.*

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Request for Conference.

Message from the Assembly requesting a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Council and intimating that if a conference were agreed to, the Assembly would be represented by three managers, now considered.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [12.12]: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to, that the managers for the Council be appointed by ballot of the Council, and that the conference take place forthwith in the Chief Secretary's room.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken.

Ballot resulted in the appointment of the Honorary Minister, Hon. C. F. Baxter, and Hon. A. Thomson.

Sitting suspended from 12.27 a.m. to 3.36 a.m.

Conference Managers' Report.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I desire to report that the Managers have met and have reached an agreement as follows:—

Clause 4: line 1, after the word "six" strike out the remainder of the clause, and substitute the following:—"is hereby repealed and the following is enacted in lieu thereof:—

2. (a) A carrier's license is required for every vehicle used for the carriage of goods for hire or reward;

(b) A passenger vehicle license is also required for every such vehicle if it is used for the carriage of passengers in an area lying within a circle having its centre at the General Post Office, Perth, and a radius of 30 miles; or within the district of any local authority which lies partly within the area contained within that circle;

Provided that no license shall be required when such vehicle is being used for the carriage of—

(i) the owner or the wife or husband of the owner or any child of the owner or of the wife or husband of the owner, or for the carriage of any servant of the owner, or

(ii) workmen to or from their work if no charge is made for hire or reward in connection with such use.

(c) Outside the areas mentioned in the preceding paragraph a passenger vehicle license shall also be required for any such vehicle if it is used both for the carriage of goods and for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward except with the permission of the local authority on some special occasion to be stated:

Provided that permission shall not be granted unless in the opinion of the local authority the vehicle may be safely used and is suitable for the carriage of passengers, and, further, that the local authority may at the time of granting such permission impose any conditions which the local authority thinks necessary for the purpose of ensuring the safety of the passengers to be carried on the vehicle.

Any person who fails to comply with any of such conditions shall be guilty of an offence against this Act: Penalty, £20.

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I desire to compliment the managers on having made the clause worse than it was before.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is because you cannot understand it.

Question put and some Noes called.

The PRESIDENT: It is most unusual and quite contrary to parliamentary practice for the report of Conference Managers not to be agreed to. The representatives from each Chamber are really plenipotentiaries.

Question declared passed.

Report adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [3.41]: Mr. Elliott suggested that a zone system for crushing facilities should be instituted. A zone system is already in operation in connection with cartage subsidies. It is designed to give assistance to owners within 30 miles of a battery by road, or 146 miles by rail. Prospectors or companies in the developmental stages can cart their ore by road from a distance of 30 miles at current prices of 8d. per ton per mile at a cost to them of 7/6 per ton, the Government paying the difference between that amount and the total cost. They can also rail their ore for a distance of 146 miles and cart it a further 5 miles for the same expenditure. Twenty-five State Batteries and a further 30 plants which have been assisted by loans or by the granting of a cartage subsidy to the customers are therefore available to customers at a reasonable cost, both in regard to transport and crushing charges. As to the hon. member's remarks about tailing treatment charges and extraction percentages, the Mines Department inform me that the average extraction obtained at State Batteries is very little above 75 per cent. This is due to the low value of the tailings and the refractory nature of a proportion of it, due mainly to the presence of copper and also the very bad water available at some batteries, notably Norseman and St. Ives. The problem has defied the efforts of metallurgists all over the world to treat the ore in the oxidised state. Dealing with this and another question

raised by Mr. Elliott, the Mines Department have advised me as follows:—

The question of increasing the percentage extraction from 75 per cent. and decreasing the deduction of 2 dwts. 8 grs. made to cover treatment charges cannot be considered unless the Government were prepared to depart from the flat rate charged in all districts, irrespective of isolation and cost of treatment. In the final portion of the report of the Superintendent of State Batteries—page 37 of the annual report of the department—the position is fully dealt with and it is pointed out that the charges at State batteries were 7s. per ton less than those at private batteries on all ore producing tailing of 2 dwts. 8 grs. or over—a difference of something like £21,000 in favour of the department's customers in 1934.

Geologists: The Government have the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie and attached to it are experimental plant and staff where mine owners or prospectors can have ore tested in order to solve the problems of treatment. This is peculiarly work for a laboratory and not for a geologist. In addition, there is a staff of inspectors stationed at Kalgoorlie, and these officers can, and do, tender advice regarding developmental problems, etc. The existing arrangement with regard to the geological work is considered to be most efficient and desirable.

The matter of amending the Companies Act to prevent the flotation of wild-cat companies is a matter requiring close and careful consideration, and it was not possible to do anything during the present session.

Mr. Wittenoom considers that the people of Albany are labouring under heavy disabilities in connection with shipping and rail transport facilities. The people of Albany are no worse off than those situated a similar distance from Perth, such as Kalgoorlie, etc. The Commissioner of Railways is averse to making any reductions in rates for any one town. I do not know the actual weight of the consignment mentioned by the hon. member, but I am sure that the ship's measurement would be far greater than the tonnage rate which would have been imposed had the consignment been railled. I am afraid that Mr. Wittenoom has not given all the details. True, the shipping freight—Fremantle to Albany—is 18s. per ton cubic measurement, which materially exceeds the actual weight charge of the Railway Department, but he has omitted to state that there are wharfage and handling charges, etc., at Fremantle and Albany amounting approximately to 20s. per ton to be added to the shipping

freight. This, combined with the difference between ship's measurement—40 cubic feet to the ton—and the actual weight for railway freight purposes would alter the comparison materially. I advise the hon. member also that fodder for starving stock is conveyed at the cheap rate provided the necessary declaration is made under the usual conditions.

Mr. Thomson considered that Albany should have complete control of its own port. Suffice it to say that the merchants at Albany desire to control their own port, but do not want to be saddled with the interest on the capital cost. The present control is best in the interests of the State in general and the town of Albany in particular.

Mr. Seddon, in his reference to short-term debt and the accumulated unfunded deficit, has misinterpreted the explanation of Treasury bill finance. Our short term debt at the 30th June, 1935, was made up as follows:—

Australian debentures carrying 2½ per cent. interest	£ 3,031,414
Australian Treasury bills:—In circulation, £5,550,000; under temporary redemption from proceeds of May, 1935, loan, £790,000 ..	6,340,000
Gross total short-term debt ..	£9,371,414

The London debentures are held by the Commonwealth Bank and cover the balance of our London short term debt, which was incurred on overdraft and by the issue of Treasury bills pending the raising of a loan on the London market. The whole of this money was used for loan purposes. At the 30th June, 1932, the indebtedness amounted to £3,426,273, but sinking fund moneys were used to redeem a portion of the bills, and at the 30th June last the debt had been reduced to £3,031,414. A further reduction of £33,400 was made on the 30th September of this year. It will be understood, therefore, that the London short term debt has nothing whatever to do with deficit finance. As to Australian bills, it is as well to mention that the proceeds of each loan, as received, are applied to the temporary redemption of Australian bills with the object of keeping our interest charges at a minimum. The bills so redeemed are then re-issued as funds are required. At the 30th June last, bills amounting to £790,000 were under temporary redemption. These were

bills issued for loan works purposes. The allocation of Australian bills then in circulation was:—

	£
Deficit bills	5,320,000
Deficit bills issued in respect of 1934-35 year, but redeemed in July, 1935	35,000
Loan works bills	195,000
Total	£5,550,000

The portion of the short term debt which applies to deficits was therefore £5,320,000, and, under the existing arrangement with the Commonwealth Bank, that amount cannot be increased. In time the whole amount will have to be funded or redeemed from surpluses. There is no other way of dealing with it. When any funding does occur, the 4 per cent. sinking fund provision under the Financial Agreement will commence to operate, but this provision does not apply to the funding of any short term debt raised for ordinary loan requirements.

Regarding the reference to the Auditor General's report, the statement mentioned by Mr. Seddon sets out the transactions on the General Loan Fund during the year 1934-35. He stated that last year authority was given to raise £750,000 for the purpose of funding the deficit, and that only £13,000 was raised. In both instances his interpretation of the position, as set out by the Auditor General, was quite erroneous. The General Loan Fund account records as receipts the net proceeds of all loan raisings, including public loans, counter sales, loan repayments, and Treasury bills. Disbursements, as authorised by the Loan Estimates, and advances to meet expenditure pending the receipt of revenue authorised by the Loan Act are shown as outgoings from the fund. Treasury bill transactions pass through the account, and consequently temporary redemptions and adjustments of discounts affect the position. The amount of £13,000 mentioned by Mr. Seddon is recorded in a sum of £13,989 11s. 4d. shown as an increase to the fund on account of London short term debt. The entry refers to an adjustment of discount which was charged against revenue and credited to the loan fund. Therefore, instead of the amount being raised from revenue it was actually provided from revenue. An explanation of the transactions on the short term debt during the year is

contained in the Financial Statement, pages 7-9. The loan fund transaction in regard to the amount of £750,000 followed the authority given by the Loan Act to make an advance to revenue of that sum. It was not an authority to fund the deficit. The amount was applied to the deficit for 1934-35, viz., £167,095, and the balance of £582,905 in reduction of the unauthorised deficits accumulated at the 30th June, 1933, as explained in my reply to the debate on the Loan Bill. Mr. Cornell will claim that I have not supplied the information for which he has asked. I am quite certain that I can get that information from the various departments and dissect it. In fact, I am satisfied that the matters referred to by Mr. Cornell were handled by me. For some cause or other, however, they have not been inserted in my notes. I regret very much that the information has not been furnished, as I went to a great deal of trouble to secure it. There have been some speakers to-night; and they, I think, will hardly expect me to supply at this stage the information they desire. I shall, however, post it to them when I secure it from the departments concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Remaining Stages.

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

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Further Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the Conference Managers' report.

Sitting suspended from 4.3 to 5.30 a.m.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

Assembly's Further Message.

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

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.*Complimentary Remarks.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.32]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to a date to be fixed by the President.

As this is the last occasion on which we shall meet during the session, and also the last occasion during the currency of this Parliament, I desire on behalf of myself, my colleagues, and hon. members, to convey to you, Mr. President, our appreciation of the courtesy and consideration you have at all times extended to us. You have earned our esteem by the admirable manner in which you have presided over our deliberations, and we cannot but recognise the spirit of strict impartiality which you have so consistently displayed—a spirit which has done much to secure the condition of harmonious and efficient co-operation which is necessary in connection with so important a body as this House. I desire to express the earnest wish of every member that you may long be enabled to retain the enjoyment of the honourable position you now occupy. I desire also to express, on behalf of members and myself, our recognition of the praiseworthy manner in which the Chairman of Committees has conducted the Committee work, and our sincere thanks for the kindness, consideration, and help that he has at all times extended to us. The Clerk of Parliaments and the Usher of the Black Rod have earned the appreciation of members for the faultless and efficient manner in which they have carried out their duties, and for the valuable assistance they have rendered. Hon. members fully recognise the accurate and efficient work that has been carried out by the Chief "Hansard" Reporter (Mr. Ramaciotti) and his staff, and I personally desire to thank them for their courtesy and for the services they have rendered to me. Other officers and the staff have given loyal and cheerful service, which has been fully appreciated by us all. During the life of the present Parliament, many important matters have received consideration in this House—matters that, I venture to suggest, have helped greatly in preventing the State from being overwhelmed by the misfortunes consequent on the severe period of depression which we have experienced. Present indications encourage us to believe that the tide has now turned, and that the current is carrying us, slowly but surely, towards a

period of comparative prosperity. Our progress may be slow, but it rests with all of us to do our best to ensure that it shall be certain. I desire to express my appreciation of the kind and sympathetic support that has been extended to me by members of the House during the period of my leadership, and to extend to them all my sincere wishes for their full enjoyment of the approaching festive season. I wish them health and prosperity in the coming year.

THE PRESIDENT [5.37]: Before putting this motion I would like to reciprocate the very kind expressions of the Leader of the House referring to myself and the way I endeavour to carry out my duties. All I can say in reply is that I am indebted very much indeed for the kindness that has been extended to me and the help that has been given me by all the members of the House, and for the excellent spirit that has been displayed—the spirit of tolerance for one another's views, and the fact that members of the House can be good friends towards one another whilst differing politically and without in any degree sacrificing any of their political principles. I have to thank hon. members one and all, and have also to thank the officers for the help they have extended to me. I wish you all a happy Christmas, and you and the State a prosperous New Year.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.9]: Before the motion is put, may I add a few words? I desire to thank the Chief Secretary for the nice references he has made to me, and also for the assistance he has given me in my capacity of Chairman of Committees. The same remarks apply to his colleague, the Honorary Minister. I beg to thank you, Mr. President, for the assistance and advice you have given me during my occupancy of the Chair of Committees in this Chamber. I wish also to thank the Deputy Chairmen for the assistance they have rendered me. Especially do I desire to thank Mr. Grant and Mr. Leake for their valuable help. I also wish to thank the "Hansard" staff and the staff of the House, down to the humble messengers, for their aid. During my long connection with this Chamber I have received the utmost courtesy and help from them all, down to the little boy who answers the telephone. My heart goes out to them for that assistance. Last,

but not least, I wish to thank the representatives of the Press in this Chamber for the consideration they have extended to me during my long tenure of a seat here, and for the impartiality with which they have treated me. In conclusion, I desire to thank all hon. members for the help, the kindly consideration, and the toleration they have extended to me both as Chairman of Committees and as a private member. I hope that they may all long be spared to enjoy health and prosperity; and may they enjoy a share of the good things which are coming to us all in the festive season so close at hand.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.42]: May I be permitted to express on behalf of myself and—I feel sure—on behalf of all my fellow-members our deep appreciation of the very kindly sentiments which have been expressed by the Leader of the House, and followed by you, Mr. President, and for the good wishes which have been conveyed to us. It has always been the desire of members of this House to further the interests of the State, help the Leader of the House and do what they can to assist you, Mr. President, in the conduct of the affairs of this Chamber. The spirit that animates every member is one of goodwill, to which you have been good enough to allude. The Leader of the House has referred to the prospects that he feels sure await us. We can but re-echo the wish that what he at least foreshadowed may be fulfilled. It will be the desire of every member of the House to assist him in measures that will lead to the greater success and prosperity that we know he desires the State to attain. May I also be allowed to add one word of appreciation to the Chairman of Committees. He has been good enough to allude to the Deputy Chairmen, and I feel that I may say, with my fellow deputies, that the Chairman has left very little for us to do. We are pleased to have been afforded opportunities to learn something of the intricacies of the work associated with the chairmanship of Committees, and the Chairman himself has been a generous source of help to each one of us. I know it has been the desire of my fellow Deputy Chairmen, as it has been mine, to acquire as much knowledge as may be regarded as proper and necessary to enable us to carry out the duties of the

office. May I again add an acknowledgment of our deep sense of thanks to you, Mr. President, and to express to you our goodwill and best wishes for the season, and for the New Year.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 17th December, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions: Law case, Hughes v. Clydesdale ...	2540
Aborigines, quarter-caste orphans, Sister Kate's Home ...	2541
Bills: Road Closure, 2R., etc. ...	2541
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, returned ...	2541
Supreme Court, returned, Council's amendments	2541
Native Flora Protection, returned, Council's amendments ...	2541, 2544
Road Closure, returned ...	2547
Limitation, Council's message ...	2547
Supreme Court, Council's message ...	2547
Native Flora Protection, Council's message ...	2547
Bulk Handling, Council's amendments ...	2547, 2549
Traffic Act Amendment, Conference managers' report, Council's further message ...	2547
Appropriation, returned ...	2550
Adjournment: Close of Session, complimentary remarks ...	2550

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

QUESTION—LAW CASE.

Hughes v. Clydesdale.

Mr. DONEY asked the Treasurer: In reference to the item appearing under "Sundry Expenditure Appropriations" on page 48 of the Auditor General's report and dealing with the payment of £200 in the case of Hughes v. Clydesdale—(a) to whom was such money paid; (b) on whose behalf was it paid; (c) were any other sums of money paid in connection with this action, and if so how much and to whom?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (for the Treasurer) replied: (a) Messrs. Lavan, Walsh & Seaton; (b) Advance pending collection of costs; (c) No.