absolve the Premier from attempting in any way to intimidate any member with respect to this Bill. I am sorry I am prevented by the Standing Orders from saying much more with regard to the Bill; but I know that this is not the end of the measure, and that we shall later have every opportunity of speaking, of which opportunity I shall be glad to avail myself.

On motion by MR. LAYMAN, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10·35 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1906.

	PAGE
Question: Agricultural Land for British Immigrants ...	969
Motion: Dingo Destruction ...	969
Bills: Second-hand Dealers, 3R. ...	971
Fremantle Reserves, 3R. ...	971
Permanent Reserves Rededication, Recommittal, progress ...	971
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 1R. ...	972
Stamp Act Amendment, 3R. ...	972
Government Savings Bank Act Amendment, Com., progress ...	972
Nelson A.S. Land Sale, 2R., Com., progress ...	980
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Com., progress ...	981
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2R., adjourned ...	981

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: By-laws of Gingin Roads Board.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL LAND FOR BRITISH IMMIGRANTS.

HON. J. M. DREW asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is the Government prepared to give this House some information—(*a*.) As to the aggregate area of agricultural land reserved exclusively for British immigrants? (*b*.) As to the localities of the various reservations?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: At present no land has been reserved exclusively for any particular class of immigrant.

MOTION—DINGO DESTRUCTION.

HON. F. CONNOR (North) moved—

> That owing to the ravages being committed by wild dogs in the North and North-West Districts of this State, some action by the Government is necessary to cope with the pest.

He said: I do not intend to speak at length on the motion, which is the result of an intimation from some of my constituents through me to the Government, of the necessity for doing something to eradicate the dingo pest; and I think this the best method of bringing the matter into prominence. Unfortunately, it is well known, not only in this but in the sister States, that the ravages of wild dogs are increasing, that the pest must sooner or later be dealt with, and that the sooner the work is taken in hand the more easily will eradication be effected. I have here a long letter from the Tableland Roads Board office at Tamboora, setting forth that wild dogs are increasing in the North-West. We know the dangers arising from wild dogs; that where they exist in numbers it is impossible for sheep to increase or even to flourish. We know farther that even in cattle country, where there are no sheep — and of this I speak from personal knowledge—when the dogs become numerous they do not stop at killing calves; they sometimes kill even cows when these are in a weak state. There are three methods of dealing with the pest. The first is by poison. It is hardly the province of the Government to send out men to poison dogs; but the poisoning can be effected by other agencies. The second is to pay to anyone, even to people who make a business of killing dingoes, a certain bonus for what are known as scalps and tails. The third method is by fencing. Of course in the large areas of the North, dog-proof fencing is out of the question; consequently my remarks as to fencing will not apply to the far North, but to

the smaller holdings where settlers are trying to establish sheep-breeding. I have another statement that I do not intend to read, from Mr. Ponton, in the Eucla Division, who says that the dingoes are advancing in great numbers from the east and committing terrible ravages. I hold that the Government should by every possible means help the small sheep-farmer whose run is not of such magnitude as to make prohibitive Government aid for fencing. We can come quite near home, to the Wagin district. Mr. Piesse will bear out my statement that in the unfenced portion of the almost thickly-populated district of Wagin it is nearly impossible to keep sheep. I have said all that is necessary to bring this motion under the notice of the Government, and to recommend immediate steps to cope with this pest; for the longer the work is delayed, the more expensive will it be. I wish to say one word in reference to South Australia, where the pest is now increasing alarmingly. The South Australian people never thought it possible that so many wild dogs could live in such small areas as some of the sheep-breeding districts of that State. I hope that the Colonial Secretary will bring the motion under the notice of the Government, and that some steps will be taken to prevent the great calamity which will ensue if the dingo or wild dog is allowed unlimited scope for his depredations.

Hon. R. F. SHOLL (North): I also have received a letter from the Tableland Roads Board as to the depredations of the wild dog, and urging that the Government should increase the bonus, which I think is about half the amount offered in the southern districts. The board inform me that they used to supplement the Government bonus of 5s. by a similar sum derived from halfcrown dog-license fees; but the board received a communication from the Public Works Department declaring such expenditure illegal, and it has been discontinued. Hence they ask the Government to increase the subsidy. On one of the stations in that district I have a son who tells me that the loss of sheep from the depredations of wild dogs is deplorable.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: Were any steps taken to check the depredations?

Hon. R. F. SHOLL: Yes. The roads board have supplemented the Government bonus by funds obtained from dog-license fees. The board now ask that the Government offer in the North the same bonus as is allowed in the South, that is 10s. What with bad seasons and the depredations of dingoes, settlers on the Tableland are not able to make any headway. I had no idea that the dogs were increasing in the South to the extent mentioned by Mr. Connor; but on the Tableland the sheep are killed by scores, and I think the Government ought to assist settlers to assist themselves, in view of the fact that the roads-board expenditure on dingo destruction has been declared illegal.

Hon. J. M. DREW (Central): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion. The dingo pest, especially in the northern portions of the State, has assumed such large proportions that it is necessary for the Government to take systematic steps to ensure its diminution. In the Victoria district hundreds of sheep are sacrificed every year by the dingoes. I have known one squatter who in the year before last lost as many as 500 sheep, and many other pastoralists have suffered in a less degree. So forcibly was the matter brought before me when I was attached to a previous Government that I had taken steps to have a measure drafted to deal with this question. It was based on the legislation passed in New South Wales, which is called the Destruction of Noxious Vermin Act, by which power is given in boards to place a tax on stock, and the Government subsidises the boards. On the certificate of a justice of the peace the Treasury pays either 10s. for the Victoria district where tails are secured or 5s. for the northern district. There is absolutely no supervision, and in some instances there is reason to believe the system opens the door to fraud. About two or three years ago a man in the Dongarra district was carrying on the industry of manufacturing native dog tails and scalps. He carried on the industry for some time, but he happened to drop across a justice of the peace who knew something about dingo tails and scalps, and the result was that this man got two years' imprisonment. Owing to their being no legislation to deal with this

matter and no proper administration of the vote, the number of dingoes is yearly increasing. If some encouragement were given it would bring into existence a large number of hunters and reduce the dingo pest. We are spending at the rate of £1,000 a year, with little result so far as I can see. I hope the Government will introduce some measure based on the lines of Eastern legislation in this respect, and I will render them every assistance, if they do so, in the direction of advocating and endeavouring to secure its passage.

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. C. A. Piesse): I wish to state that the motion has my strongest sympathy. The mover referred to the Wagin district in particular, and I can endorse what has fallen from him. Only recently within a mile of the town of Wagin a wild dog killed a sheep after the sun had risen. On another occasion near my home a man with his family was sitting down to breakfast, and a dog killed three sheep and was still chasing others. This man appealed to me, as he was near my property; he did not know what to do, as he had had no experience with wild dogs. It was a town dog. When I got home from Parliament last week a man from the Arthur way came in with a certificate of a justice of the peace that he had killed five wild dogs, half-grown pups: these he had killed in the Arthur district. We have been 25 years, to my knowledge, trying to get rid of wild dogs. I have inflicted tales on the House previously showing what the wild dogs have done in the Wagin district. This year on the Arthur River I have lost 100 sheep, and my neighbour, Mr. Brown, has lost 200 or 300 sheep. We are losing at the rate of £10,000 or £20,000 a year by the ravages of wild dogs. If anything can be done I shall be only too pleased to assist to do it. Better steps must be taken to cope with the pest than have been taken in the past. I trust the motion will be carried.

Question put and passed.

BILL—SECOND-HAND DEALERS.

THIRD READING.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) moved an amendment—

That the Bill be recommitted to reconsider Clause 14.

This measure would apply in a very harsh manner to every wheelwright in the back blocks, as in all cases these men would have to be licensed as second-hand dealers, under the Bill. It would then become impossible for any man to go to a wheelwright shop with a second-hand vehicle or a second-hand stripper, with the idea of selling it to the wheelwright and taking a new article in exchange. If that were done the wheelwright would render himself liable under the Bill. If a wheelwright happened to sell a second-hand hammer, or file, or saw, if not licensed he would render himself liable under the Bill.

The Colonial Secretary: Wheelwrights would not be asked to take out a license.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That should be made clear in the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY opposed the recommittal as not necessary. The Bill had already been recommitted, and the very points now raised were put forward by the hon. member and several other members. He (the Minister) stated then, and would repeat now, that the Bill only applied to persons who made their sole business second-hand dealing, and the definition in the Bill clearly set that out. There were very few persons in business who did not buy second-hand articles sometimes. The Bill was not intended to apply to ordinary business people, but only to those who made second-hand dealing their sole business. He had consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Attorney General, who gave it as their opinion that the Bill was only intended to apply to persons who carried on the business of purchasing and selling second-hand goods.

Amendment put and negatived.

Bill read a third time, and *passed.*

BILL—FREMANTLE RESERVES.

Read a third time, and *passed.*

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION.

SOUTH PERTH, GOLF.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary, Bill recommitted for farther consideration of Clause 3.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: At the last sitting, a new clause was added for greater security over the reserve at South Perth, the Government being desirous that at all times the public should have the right of free access. The question was raised at the time whether the clause went far enough to insure this; and he now agreed with the opinion then expressed, that the clause did not sufficiently cover the ground desired. Therefore, to meet the case more completely he now moved that Clause 3 be struck out, with a view to inserting the following in lieu:—

Notwithstanding any vesting order, lease, or grant of the aforesaid Reserve No. 10,250 which the Municipality of South Perth may make or give, it shall be their duty to make and enforce by-laws under the authority of the municipality for the management, control, and use of the said reserve; and the said by-laws shall provide for the free admission of the public to all parts of the said reserve; and every such by-law shall be subject to confirmation by the Governor-in-Council, and when so confirmed and published in the *Government Gazette* shall have the force of law.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment appeared to him, from merely hearing it read, to be a clumsy method of achieving the object in view. Supposing the municipality of South Perth refused to carry out the injunction contained in the amendment, and did not make such by-laws, it would then be necessary to take out a mandamus in the Supreme Court to compel the municipality to make the necessary by-laws: and that would be an expensive and round-about way of achieving the desired object. He would prefer, rather than this duty should be cast on the council, to see inserted in the Bill a clause definitely giving the public the right of access, notwithstanding any lease. Why the necessity for the framing of by-laws for this purpose, when by a simple provision made in the Bill itself the public could be given that right of access to which Parliament said they were entitled?

MEMBER: Is not that provided for in the Municipalities Act?

HON. M. L. MOSS: No. The Bill when passed into law would give the municipality of South Perth power to grant a 21-years lease of this reserve; and the desire of members was to see it definitely provided in the Bill that the right of the public to free access should be given, notwithstanding the provisions of any lease or grant. The Government should reconsider the matter and place a clause in the Bill defining this right.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY did not agree with the objection raised. The wording of the clause was mandatory, not permissive, and the hon. member would know that the Governor-in Council had power over municipalities to compel the making of necessary by-laws. There was no need for fear that the municipality of South Perth or any other municipality would act in the manner suggested. The clause went far enough, and covered all the ground required to establish the right of the public to have free access to the reserve at all reasonable times.

HON. M. L. MOSS: As the proper course was not being followed, he moved that progress be reported.

Motion passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

BILL—FIRST READING.

Bills of Sales Act Amendment, received from the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—THIRD READING.

Stamp Act Amendment Bill, *passed*.

BILL—GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that all words after "local authority" be struck out with a view to inserting the following:—"including the council of a municipality or the board of a roads district, or any body constituted by or under the authority of any statute." The object was to make the clause a little wider in application. At present it was not quite clear that a local authority such as the King's Park Board or the Karrakatta Cemetery Board could bank at the Government Savings Bank. This would allow any body constituted by the authority of a statute to do business with the bank.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Governor may appoint officers:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in reply to Mr. Moss, explained that officers appointed under the Bill would be outside the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commissioner.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Limits of deposits:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This clause was in slightly different form when the Bill was introduced in another place. Having been amended in the Assembly, its meaning was not very clear. The object was to allow depositors to deposit £1,000 only, but according to this clause the deposit might be £1,000 in every year. In order to make the matter clear he moved an amendment—

That Subclause 1 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"The manager, his officers and agents, shall not receive from any depositor any sum which makes the total amount to which the depositor is entitled for the time being exceed one thousand pounds."

Hon. G. RANDELL moved an amendment—

That the words "exceeding three hundred pounds or" be inserted after "sum" in line 2 of Subclause 1.

The subclause would then read: "The manager, his officers and agents, shall not receive from any depositor in any one year any sum exceeding three hundred pounds, or which makes the total amount deposited exceed one thousand pounds." The clause was a great departure from the original intention in regard to the Savings Bank. The original intention was that it should be a savings bank in fact, and not a bank for the encouragement of depositors to deposit moneys, savings or otherwise. The Government apparently were entering into a system of trading in opposition to the institutions doing legitimate banking business in this country. This step was likely to land the Government in some difficulty, and it would at the same time interfere with the ordinary course of financial business. The original amount which one could deposit in one year was £150. There were four amendments to the original Act, and by the last amendment we permitted the total sum to be deposited to be increased to £600. As to the total amount allowed, that was a matter for the individual; but the principal thing was that the Government might find themselves in some difficulty, though of course they were protected by requiring three months' notice in some cases and one month's notice in other cases. That, however, was not a new feature. The existing Act provided that notice of withdrawal should be given. It was inadvisable that the Government should embark on enterprises of this kind. His views had often been expressed on that point. The tendency was in an utterly wrong direction. If the Government took up these trading concerns, their attention was diverted from the responsibility for the good government of the State. Apparently we were going to provide that a man could deposit £1,000 in the Savings Bank year after year.

The Colonial Secretary: No; the amendment was to provide that the deposit be limited to a total of £1,000.

Hon. G. RANDELL: That was an improvement. We all knew where the amendment effected in another place had come from. It was undoubtedly against the principles of the Savings Bank. No doubt it was admirable that the Government should take care of the savings of the people and pay interest that was secured by the revenue of the country; but when we went beyond the fair and reasonable limits of a savings bank, then the Government were pursuing an improper course. It would be noticed that his amendment was a liberal one because it increased the amount to be deposited in one year to £300.

The CHAIRMAN: The simplest way was for members to agree to strike out the subclause. Mr. Randell could then move his amendment on that of the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. W. T. Loton: Should not Mr. Randell's amendment be put first?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY submitted that his (the Colonial Secretary's) amendment should be put first, because it provided that the bank could receive £1,000 in one year or at any subsequent time, whereas Mr. Randell's amendment was that in one year only £300 could be received.

Hon. S. J. HAYNES: Every member could agree to the amendment moved by the Colonial Secretary, because it was

moved in order to remove an ambiguity with respect to a deposit of £1,000. Then members might agree to the amendment moved by Mr. Randell.

HON. M. L. MOSS: If Mr. Randell were correct in saying that there was any undue interference with private enterprise, he (Hon. M. L. Moss) would be the first to assist the hon. member; but the proposition of the Government was eminently fair, and was a good business one from the State's point of view. We had two million pounds in the Savings Bank belonging to depositors, and the State was using it at a low rate of interest, lower than the interest paid in London on the money we raised there. The State was fully safeguarded by subsequent provisions in the Bill in the case of a run on the bank. Unless the hon. member could furnish better arguments to show that there was interference with other banking institutions, he (Hon. M. L. Moss) could not support the amendment. The idea of the Government increasing the amount to £1,000 would not interfere with any private institution. On the other hand it was a good thing the State.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The object of a savings bank was to give facilities for the deposit of their savings by people of moderate means; but there was no reason why the Government should open an establishment to induce people of large capital to deposit their funds. The question was, what was a moderate amount that could be saved by the average individual? It was not very easy for the average individual to save £300 in one year. Perhaps the Minister could say how many depositors in the Savings Bank last year had reached the limit of £600. With regard to the proposal to allow depositors to deposit £1,000 in each year ——

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was not intended.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Not many persons in this State would need or would be able to deposit as much as £300 of savings in one year. The clause might give facilities to persons having investments falling in, to deposit the money in sums of £1,000 for one, two, or three months, to suit their convenience, and the amounts might be withdrawn at very short notice; and so the bank could not safely invest such sums for earning interest.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We could compel depositors to give three months' notice of withdrawal, if necessary for the bank.

HON. W. T. LOTON: If the Government desired to give facilities to such people, it should go the whole distance and enter on the banking business in its entirety by constituting the Savings Bank a bank of issue as well. The amendment for a limit of £300 would meet all requirements for some time to come.

HON. W. MALEY: To limit the amount of deposits in one year to £300 would probably be a hindrance, and would deprive many people of a desirable form of security for depositing their money in a Savings Bank which had agencies scattered throughout the State. A few days ago a lady was anxious to deposit a fairly large amount of money in the Savings Bank, but was told by the officials that they could not accept a greater deposit than £150. The consequence was that she had to pay her money into the banking account of a friend, accepting his cheque in return; and that cheque was still travelling around awaiting opportunity for investment. The Savings Bank should be in a position to accept moneys for investment, as the rate of interest paid by other banking institutions on deposit was very small, and out of all proportion to the rate of interest charged by the banks when lending money to customers.

HON. G. RANDELL: The danger against which he desired to guard was that at the expiration of three months from the time of depositing a large sum, and when the depositor might desire to withdraw, the Government might find that it had invested the money through the Agricultural Bank or elsewhere, and was not in a position to readily realise; in which event, if several large sums were so involved simultaneously, the Government might have to go to other banks and raise money at high rates of interest for meeting its obligations to Savings Bank depositors.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That objection applied equally to small as to large amounts.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The Savings Bank should not accept large sums on deposit, except for a fixed period of one or two years. The profits of the bank last year were between £900 and £1,000, which showed that in its operations the bank was sailing close to the wind.

The Colonial Secretary: Because the Government used most of the money as trustee.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The Government would have to prosecute any other trustee who misused money in that way. The money invested by the bank was lent at five per cent., but if necessity arose for the Government to borrow for the reason he had suggested, the rate of interest to be paid would be much higher. The public should be safeguarded against the possibility of a consequent panic. The proposal to increase the amount of yearly deposits to £1,000 would involve the Government in difficulties, and would go a long way towards making the bank a losing instead of a paying concern.

Hon. S. J. HAYNES preferred to see the bank established on the lines of the South Australian Savings Bank, which was managed by trustees. In the interests of the public, the proposal in the amendment to limit deposits in one year to £300 was a liberal one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY trusted the Committee would not agree to the amendment. There appeared to be a fear that the intention of the Government was to establish a trading concern on the lines of a commercial bank, or some socialistic scheme. There was no such intention, and he failed to see why the mere fact of a depositor being permitted to deposit £1,000 in any one year as against £300, could be said to be converting the bank into a trading concern. There was nothing in the Bill which would put the bank in line with ordinary banks in this respect, for it was not permitted for any commercial house to do business with the Savings Bank in the same way as with ordinary banks. This was a bank of deposit only, with which a trading concern, owing to the absence of facilities for numerous daily withdrawals and for temporary assistance, could not do business. Why should not large deposits be made, without interest, in the Savings Bank, so that the country might have the use of the money? If placed for short terms in private banks, the interest would be nominal; and who were better entitled to the use of such money free of interest—private banks or the people of the country? Mr. Loton questioned whether many Savings Bank accounts now reached £600. The number was considerable, and would be greater but for the fact that no more than £150 a year could be deposited. A new arrival with £600 could deposit only £150 in his own name; hence he deposited the balance in his wife's and children's names, increasing fourfold the work of the bank officials, and reducing the average deposit.

Hon. G. Randell: Was not the average, £37 odd, the highest in Australia?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; but it had decreased for all that; and for the decrease the bank gave the reason mentioned. Mr. Randell said that in accepting and investing such large deposits as £1,000 the bank ran a considerable risk of not meeting withdrawals. Surely there could be no more risk in receiving £1,000 than £100 deposit, since the daily deposits balanced the daily withdrawals. Withdrawals of £100 would co-exist with deposits of £100.

Hon. G. Randell: Not necessarily.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Savings Bank would thus conveniently provide the Government with cheap money, partly free of interest; and who were better entitled than the people of the country to such accommodation?

Hon. J. M. DREW opposed Mr. Randell's amendment. Last year he (Mr. Drew) introduced a Bill with an identical clause, rejected by a narrow majority in a thin House. The discussion to-night seemed to indicate that money in the Savings Bank was withheld from circulation. Not so. It was used by the Government for repurchasing estates under the Lands Purchase Act; and during the last ten years a fairly large number of estates was repurchased and settled, many of which must have remained in private hands but for the Savings Bank funds available, which enabled settlement to proceed at its present pace. The Agricultural Bank's loans to settlers were also exclusively from Savings

Bank funds. Last year the loans aggregated some £80,000, and had doubtless since increased with the progress of land settlement. Could not the funds of the bank be replenished, if necessary, from loan moneys, thus preventing any disaster from a run? The proposed amendment of the Colonial Secretary did not go far enough. The amount of deposit should be unlimited as in Queensland, to promote the prosperity of the country. Private banks would not receive a deposit for less than six months, and then at a nominal interest, while for current accounts they charged £1 1s. for opening and £1 1s. a year for keeping open. In consequence, many small depositors in banks closed their current accounts, and would doubtless do business with the Savings Bank were its sphere of usefulness extended. None could say that the money lent to agricultural settlers and expended on the repurchase of estates had been used in risky fashion. Rather had it been invested on the best possible security.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Whether the limit were one year or three did not seem to matter; for very large deposits would be few.

Hon. E. McLARTY: There was much in the contention that people with idle money should be able to bank it safely and earn a little interest. For a current account a private bank charged £1 1s. on opening and 10s. 6d. per half year, even where the account was opened for only a month. Instead of receiving interest, the customer thus paid £1 11s. 6d. The proposal in the Bill to make the maximum deposit £1,000 could do no harm. How many Savings Bank depositors would lodge £1,000 in one year? If they did, no great evil would result. If the bank could use such deposits, it had as much right to them as a private bank.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD: Better proceed with caution. The Bill would increase the maximum yearly deposit almost seven-fold—a longer step in advance than this House usually took. Mr. Randell's proposed hundred per cent. increase was more in keeping with the character of the Chamber. The Minister said, a man wishing to deposit £1,000 would open accounts for his wife and family; but by a subsequent clause the Government intended to charge 1s. a year for keeping accounts, thus providing in some measure against this practice. Recently he (Mr. Langsford) in Committee on the Stamp Act was asked to withdraw an amendment which might have affected the Treasurer's Budget Speech. For this reason, better support Mr. Randell's proposal and see how it worked till next year, when another Savings Bank Bill would probably be introduced.

Hon. J. A. THOMSON: A man coming to the State might have £1,000, but he might not desire to place it in a bank where he would get no interest. This man might be looking for land, and he would put his money in the Savings Bank for the time being so that he would get interest. A person came to the State nearly 16 years ago with nearly £1,000, and he placed his money in one of the institutions in this State. That institution stuck to the money for about four years, and the man could not get it. If the money had been invested the man might have been wealthy to-day.

Hon. G. Randell: Was it a bank?

Hon. J. A. THOMSON: Yes.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If too much money came into the Savings Bank because of the greater facilities afforded, the Governor might by proclamation reduce the rate of interest. This Bill would, he believed, interfere in a measure with the legitimate business of banks of issue, because people would avail themselves of the opportunity of placing their money in a bank where they could receive interest. At times the Government were not in a position to float a loan, and it was necessary that works should be continued. In such cases the Government had had in the past to pay as much as 4 per cent. interest for money. If the Government had plenty of money in the Savings Bank they could utilise the money for public works. Large sums of money were invested in real estate in Perth and Fremantle. He would like to see the amount enlarged rather than cut down. To a certain extent the measure would act detrimentally towards other banks.

Hon. G. Randell: It would in no way interfere with them.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Then it came down to this. Could the Government be trusted to deal with the moneys placed in the bank in a way to the best interests of the country?

Amendment negatived; the Colonial Secretary's amendment put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that Subclause (3) be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Deposits of minors:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that in line 3 of Subclause (2) the word "or" be struck out, and "and" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 13, 14—agreed to.

Clause 15 — Deposits by friendly societies, etcetera:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that in line 1, after "society" the words "co-operative society" be inserted. This was consequential on an amendment made in another place.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Transfer of deposits from and to other savings banks:

Hon. G. RANDELL: Was this provision taken from an English Act, and was it in existence in any of the Eastern States?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This had latterly become the law in the Eastern States. It was now law in the United Kingdom.

Clause passed.

Clause 25—Deposits a charge upon the consolidated revenue:

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD: This clause referred to a possible deficiency that might arise, and the deficiency was to be met out of the consolidated revenue fund. He asked for explanation.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The clause was merely intended to meet emergencies in the case of a run on the bank and investments not being readily realisable, when it would be the duty of the Treasurer to report the deficiency to both Houses of Parliament.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 29—agreed to.

Clause 30—Treasurer not liable for fraudulent withdrawals:

Hon. G. RANDELL: The clause was capable of being used to the injury of depositors, and was contrary to banking law. An ordinary bank had to pay in the event of a cheque being forged, and the Savings Bank should take an equal responsibility.

The Colonial Secretary: This bank was not responsible at the present time. The matter was governed by regulation.

Hon. G. RANDELL moved that the clause be struck out.

Hon. W. PATRICK: Because the Savings Bank had not been responsible in this connection in the past was no reason why it should not be responsible in the future.

Hon. J. A. THOMSON: Pass-books issued by private banks were not similar to those issued by savings banks. In the latter case the pass-book of a depositor was an absolute guarantee that the amount shown therein was standing to his credit in the savings bank.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The cases of an ordinary bank and a savings bank were not parallel, because an account in an ordinary bank could be operated on by cheque taken from any cheque-book, whereas moneys in a savings bank could not be drawn against or operated on until a person produced the actual pass-book of the depositor. It should not be any great difficulty for a depositor to safeguard his pass-book; but if through negligence he permitted it to get into other hands, and the person who became improperly possessed of the book succeeded in deluding the officers of the bank and operated on the account, the genuine depositor should not be the sufferer. Such occurrences were, however, very rare. The distinction between the cases was that while there must be negligence in the one case to permit of a forgery, in the other case the depositor in an ordinary bank might be victimised by having his account fraudulently drawn against on a cheque taken from another cheque-book.

Hon. W. PATRICK: The cases were not exactly parallel. A recent regulation of the Savings Bank altered the previous practice of having a depositor's signature in his pass-book; and as signatures were now known only to officers of the bank, the bank should now take the same responsibility in the event of forgery as did other banking institutions.

Question put, and a division taken with the following result: –

Ayes	11
Noes	9
Majority for	2

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. H. Briggs
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. W. Oats	Hon. R. F. Sholl
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. W. T. Loton (*Teller*).
Hon. J. A. Thomson	
Hon. J. W. Langsford (*Teller*).	

Clause thus passed.

At 6·30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7·30, Chair resumed.

Clauses 31, 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—Unclaimed accounts, time limit:

HON. W. PATRICK: This clause was unjust. There was no reason why the Government should have power, after the lapse of any period, to confiscate funds remaining to the credit of any person. He moved an amendment—

That all the words after "February," in line 3, be struck out.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment would not achieve the mover's object.

HON. W. PATRICK: Possibly not; but if it was stated in an Act that the Government had power to confiscate money, there would be no legal quibble about it. On the other hand, if there was simply an advertisement in the *Government Gazette* that there were certain moneys unclaimed, it could not damage the Government in any way. It was quite possible that after 17 years someone might turn up to claim money.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The relation of banker and customer was that of debtor and creditor. Any banker keeping an account, if there was no operation on the account for six years, need not pay it at all. In this Bill the period was extended to 17 years, after which the money became part of the consolidated revenue; but the amendment would cut down the period to seven years. There was more right on the part of the Government to take this money after 17 years than there was for a man to keep land after occupying it for 12 years. Few accounts would be affected. There was also the matter of the trouble of bookkeeping, accounts having to be entered up year after year when there was no possibility of any claim being made for the money.

HON. W. PATRICK: Assuming that the hon. member was correct as to the limit of time under some other statute, in any case the alteration proposed by the amendment could do no harm.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There would be a lot of unnecessary work.

HON. W. PATRICK: The Bank of England kept an account for a five pound note for ever. There was no necessity to do any bookkeeping at the end of every year, because the account was practically closed and would not be required until the credit was claimed; and the Government could be using the money all the time. Under the Real Property Act, occupation for an indefinite period would not give the right to land. In South Australia the title was indefeasible for ever.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It was an exception in that State.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This clause did not savour of confiscation. It was simply put in the Bill to save a great deal of unnecessary work in the matter of bookkeeping. At the present time there were 1,574 unclaimed accounts, not amounting to a great deal individually, but they had to be kept on record and brought forward year after year. Was it likely that any person would leave a large sum unclaimed? First of all, the account had to be seven years without being operated on; and after that period, if the bank did not hear of the depositor, it was provided that the account should be advertised once a year for 10 years, making a total of 17 years, which was a very fair time indeed.

HON. W. PATRICK: The object of the Bill was to induce the public to put a little more money in the bank. The previous clause gave protection against fraud; and now, if a depositor left money in for a period of time, the Government confiscated it; so the Government scored both ways.

HON. C. SOMMERS: It was stated in another place that the unclaimed deposits fund amounted to £3,042, representing

1,574 depositors, so that judging by the past, the Committee would not be doing anyone any injury by passing the clause.

Amendment negatived; the clause passed.

Clause 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Charges on accounts:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That the words "minors' accounts shall be accepted," in line 2, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "except in the case of minors under the age of 12 years."

Legally a person was a minor to 21 years of age, but for the purposes of this Act it was fixed at 12 years.

Amendment passed.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: The proviso to the clause provided for exemptions from the charge of 1s. for keeping accounts. It provided that if the interest was not sufficient to cover the charge, the charge was not made. Therefore, in some instances the more a man should receive as interest, the less he would get; because the man getting 1s. 6d. interest was charged 1s. for keeping the account, and was credited 6d., whereas the man who earned 11d. in the way of interest was not charged anything and was credited with 11d. The machinery of Government ought to be available to meet cases of this kind. A man who got 1s. 10d. interest would be worse off than the man who got 11d., because he would get a shilling deducted. If any paid, all should do so. The Minister might help us so that all depositors should be treated alike.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If we were to do what the hon. member suggested, it would make the bookkeeping too complicated. Not only in this measure but in any Act we must always get little anomalies. It was not proposed to charge a shilling unless the interest on the account reached that amount.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD had thought the Government capable of suggesting something to the House that would meet the case of all depositors. He moved an amendment that all the words after "year," in line 7, be struck out.

HON M. L. MOSS: The hon. member should withdraw the amendment. This was a very small thing to interfere with.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 36 to 39—agreed to.

New Clause—Attachment by garnishee:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the following be added as a clause:—

Money standing to the credit of any depositor in the Savings Bank shall be liable to attachment by garnishee proceedings in the Supreme Court or any Local Court.

The question was raised at the previous sitting of the House, that moneys in the Savings Bank could not be garnisheed by a creditor in the ordinary way. That was not quite correct, because they could be garnisheed; but the process was rather long and expensive, and in order to get over that difficulty he moved the new clause.

HON. M. L. MOSS was obliged to the Minister for having done so much on the question; but the amendment was crude, because a man with a garnishee order under a provision of this kind would find himself in considerable difficulty. Who was to be the garnishee? Evidently the person drafting that amendment did so without very much consideration as to the difficulties that would surround people, particularly those living in the country, as to what statute they were going to take proceedings under to effectually attach money in the hands of the garnishee. The new clause should be amended to make the Colonial Treasurer responsible as the garnishee. He wished to move an amendment to that effect.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Colonial Treasurer being clearly mentioned in this Bill as the Minister responsible for administering the measure, there was no necessity for inserting the Treasurer's name in this clause as the garnishee. The clause was not drafted in a crude shape. He had asked several days ago for the amendment to be drafted; therefore the drafting was not hurried in the least. Knowing that the man who drafted the new clause had drafted the whole Bill, and was familiar with every

part of it, the draftsman was in a better position to draft that amendment than was a legal member who got up at a moment's notice and said the amendment was crudely or wrongly drawn. The amendment covered all that was wanted, and he asked the Committee to accept it as drafted.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Take the case of garnishee proceedings at Roebourne; if it would be necessary, in order to attach money, to send a garnishee order to Perth, the depositor would, if he got wind of what was going on, withdraw his money from the bank. If it was intended to give this power to garnishee money in the Savings Bank—and he had intimated on the second reading that it ought to be done, and the Government were in accord with him to that extent—surely it was expedient in the highest degree that it should be done in such a way as to be perfectly effective. He still thought the clause was crudely drawn, and that it would be practically inoperative. Mr. Haynes might enlighten the Committee upon this point. Where money was in a branch bank it would be necessary to serve the manager at once with notice of garnishee proceedings, in order to make them effective. He had not drawn his own amendment at a moment's notice. Before the House assembled he considered the matter, and did so even when the second reading of the Bill took place, because in his actual practice as a solicitor he had been confronted with the difficulty of getting at money in the Savings Bank.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY agreed with the principle advocated by the hon. member.

HON. M. L. MOSS knew that, but was not so stupid as to agree to the principle and see difficulties ahead of him through having no machinery to enforce the principle. He wanted a definite person named, and to see an easy means of serving the order upon the person in charge of the bank.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The new clause as proposed would be inoperative. He had his doubts in common with Mr. Moss as to whether the Minister administering the measure would be the proper person on whom to serve the garnishee order. If he was to be regarded as the garnishee, it was hard to say where we would be landed. The only addition required to the amendment suggested by Mr. Moss would be a provision that action might be taken in either the Local Court or the Supreme Court. Mr. Moss's suggested amendment should be accepted as an improvement.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment suggested by Mr. Moss could not be accepted as an amendment to the new clause, but if the new clause were not carried Mr. Moss might move his amendment at a later stage as a new clause.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

BILL—NELSON AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY LAND SALE.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading of the Bill said: This is a short and formal measure introduced for the purpose of giving authority to the trustees of the Nelson Agricultural Society to sell Bridgetown town lots 29 and 30, and apply the proceeds to the improvement of Reserve No. 6877, otherwise known as the new show-ground. These two lots were granted to the Nelson Agricultural Society some 20 years ago for the purpose of a show-ground; but as the district progressed it was found that the show-ground, comprising only four acres, was altogether too small for the purpose; and it has since been cut up for sale. The new show-ground consists of thirty acres, and it is now proposed to sell the original show-ground and devote the proceeds to the improvement of the new ground. The trustees have already cut up this ground, and are about to sell it. This Bill is the outcome of a request from the trustees of the Nelson Agricultural Society, and is simply a formal matter. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

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

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Qualification of managing clerks for admission to practise as practitioners:

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD moved that the following words be added after the words "or officer," in line 5 of paragraph 2:—

> Or shall have completed the term of ten years as a clerk in the office or offices of a practitioner or practitioners practising in Western Australia, or shall have obtained the degree of Bachelor of Laws of any University in the British Dominions recognised by the Barristers' Board.

That was in keeping with the principle advocated by the Bill, and in every instance the Barristers' Board would have the final voice.

On motion by HON. S. J. HAYNES, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West), in moving the second reading, said: The desire in this short measure is to make more complete the Pharmacy and Poisons Act of 1894, which has been found in practice to be defective in one or two of its provisions. In the first place, the object in passing the Pharmacy and Poisons Act was to regulate the sale of poisons and prescribe proper qualifications for persons entrusted with the compounding and dispensing of drugs. It was intended to provide that only persons of proper experience and qualifications should deal with these very dangerous commodities. But in practice it has been found that the Act does not go so far as was really intended, and with that object in view Parliament is now asked to amend Section 36 of the principal Act by including in that section the words "or to sell, or offer for sale, or exhibit for sale, or have in his possession for sale, or compound or dispense, any medicine whether the prescription of a medical practitioner or not." When we get into Committee I shall more clearly explain what is intended to be amended in the original Act. By Clause 3 of this Bill permission is asked from Parliament to punish for disobedience of the regulations in the original Act by proceeding before justices. This is the ordinary method of inforcing regulations, but by a mistake under the Act of 1904 no provision was made penalising persons for breaking the regulations. There are a number of offences against the principal Act punishable by the Act itself. But the council of the Pharmaceutical Society, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, have made a large number of regulations, one of which is that chemists shall pay an annual fee of £1 1s. for the liberty of practising the profession, and it has been found that the non-payment of that money necessitates proceedings being taken for the payment of the fee. If the society could inforce the payment in the same way as the obedience of ordinary regulations, defaulting members of the society could be brought before justices and made to pay. But no power is contained in Section 3, therefore it becomes necessary under the original Act to sue for breaches of the regulations in the Local Court. As the council and the registrar of the society are located in Perth, in the case of chemists who enter a defence it costs the society more than the amount involved, that is the £1 1s., to recover it. It is sought to provide an easy means of enforcing compliance with the regulations by enabling people to be punished by summary conviction. The last clause of the Bill is rather an important one, because the original idea of forming the Pharmaceutical Society and providing for the qualification of members practising the profession of pharmaceutical chemists was that the public should be fully safeguarded, and that drugs and chemicals should not be handled by incompetent persons. But under the guise of the word "herbalist" continual breaches of the principal Act are being made, and there is little opportunity for the society providing against persons using this name. It is an offence punishable under the Act for any person using the word "chemist" or "druggist" or "pharmaceutical druggist," or such like term, but under the word "herbalist" persons in the city of Perth and elsewhere practically are carrying on the business of chemists. I have been informed—I do

not know this from personal experience —by those competent to express an opinion, that in certain parts of the city rather illegitimate practices are conducted. In order to deal effectively with persons carrying on the business of chemists under the name of "herbalist," it is sought, by including in subclause (2) of Section 3 of the amendment of 1903, to penalise persons who use that name if they are not possessed of the qualifications of a pharmaceutical chemist. I say I do not know if there is anything wrong with those who use this name, but the council of the Pharmaceutical Society have expressed the opinion that Parliament should be applied to to have this word included in the Act.

On motion by MR. LANGSFORD, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes past 8 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th August, 1906.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Wagons, Empties	982
Mining Slimes, Norseman	982
Arbitration Act, to Amend	982
Electoral, as to a Prosecution	982
Election Practices, if Illegal	983
Bills: Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 3R.	983
Mines Regulation, 2R. resumed, adjourned ...	983
Land Tax Assessment, 2R. resumed, adjourned	1023
Jury Act Amendment (Mr. Kingsmill), 1R. ...	1028
Motion: Railway Freights and Local Industries, debate resumed, adjourned	1020

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WAGONS, EMPTIES.

MR. HORAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that a charge of approximately £5 per wagon was recently collected for the transport of 200 empty wagons from North Fremantle to Kurrawang? 2, Is he aware that a truck load of chaff, requiring approximately twice the haulage power and to cover twice the distance, would be conveyed for a smaller sum? 3, Is he prepared to take action to remove such anomalies from the Railway Rate Book?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes, the Rate Book, folio 60, contains the conditions and charges under which wagons are conveyed. 2, A truck load of chaff if conveyed over the same distance would be charged about £8 for freight. 3, The subject will receive consideration.

QUESTION—MINING SLIMES, NORSEMAN.

MR. HUDSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Will the erection of the slimes plant at Norseman, so long promised, be commenced this month? 2, If not, what is the cause of delay? 3, If there is to be further delay, will the Minister make advances of money to the prospectors interested in the slimes on the values already ascertained by assay?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes, tenders will be called this month.

QUESTION—ARBITRATION ACT, TO AMEND.

MR. COLLIER asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Government during the present session to amend the Arbitration Act so as to provide for a separate Court for the coastal and goldfields districts, and with other than a Supreme Court Judge as President?

THE PREMIER replied: No.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL, AS TO A PROSECUTION.

MR. HOLMAN asked the Attorney General: 1, In view of the recommendation of the Chief Electoral Officer in reference to the taking of the vote of Edmund Dodgson, in connection with which case the Chief Electoral Officer made the following remarks—"The action of Mr. Learmonth in taking the vote of Edmund Dodgson, *since dead*, was a scandalous proceeding, and I trust the Minister will place no difficulty in the way of my