

pays better to bring the meat to Fremantle and then take it to Java on the following trip.

Division put and passed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at 1.47 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 21st November, 1923.

	PAGE
Mission: Mining Industry, Arbitration Court case	1540
Annual Estimates, State Trading Concerns, report ...	1540
Bills: Native Mission Stations, 2r., Com. report...	1540
Public Institutions and Friendly Societies	
Lands Improvement Act Amendment, 2r.,	1550
Com. report ...	1550
Gnowangerup Reserves, 2r., Com. report ...	1550
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2a. ...	1551
Land Act Amendment, 2r. ...	1551
Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	1552
Amendments Incorporation, 2r., Com. report...	1552
Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders	
Act Amendment, Council's amendments ...	1552
Abbas Day, 2a., Com. report ...	1552
Motion: Sandalwood, amended regulations ...	1554

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

QUESTION—MINING INDUSTRY.

Arbitration Court case.

Mr. CORBOY asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the mining case in the Arbitration Court, on which an award was delivered last week, was heard before a great many other cases listed prior to it? 2, At whose request was this done? 3, Who was responsible for the case being heard before its proper time?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, This not known to the Government. 3, The procedure to be followed as to sittings of the Court and cases to be taken is provided in Sections 65 and 68 of "The Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912." This being so, no case can be heard before its proper time.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—NATIVE MISSION STATIONS.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to make free simple grants of 1,000 acres each to the Perth Diocesan Trustees, Forrest River, and the Benedictine Community, Drysdale River; such grants to include main buildings and improvements. Members will be aware that the two churches have spent considerable amounts of money on buildings and improvements at the respective localities; and it is desired, therefore, that they should be granted these areas. Personally I regard the proposal as perfectly reasonable, because the churches, besides spending a considerable sum of money, have done good work, and it is not much to give them the lands on which their money has been spent. The blocks proposed to be granted have not yet been surveyed, and therefore cannot at this juncture be described. With regard to the Forrest River mission, a Class "A" reserve of 100,000 acres has been leased to the diocesan trustees as an aboriginal mission station for 21 years at a peppercorn rental. The passing of the Bill will remove the area of 1,000 acres from the Class "A" reserve. The mission is kept up by voluntary contributions amounting to about £1,900 a year. There are 136 natives on the roll, and there is a mission staff of five. The possessions of the mission include 380 cows and 410 goats, and 16 buildings. In the case of the Drysdale River mission station, there is a special lease of 50,000 acres, and £1,750 has been spent on buildings and £430 on cultivation. The annual expenditure of the mission amounts to £500. Thirty natives are actually housed at the mission, and the number of natives receiving rations occasionally rises as high as 1,300. The mission has a staff of four. I hope the House will agree to the passing of the Bill, because it will mean assisting people who are doing much to help the State in its development work in the North. Certainly they ought to be given the land on which their improvements are standing. The land is not very valuable. Once we got settlement in those localities, we shall be giving away the land to settlers in 150-acre blocks. Members know of the good work that both these missions have been doing for years. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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.

BILL—PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: The Bill contains a small amendment to the existing Act, under which certain public bodies have the right to mortgage their holdings for the purpose of improving their properties. The principal amendment affects Section 2, which defines the word "institution." At the present time the Act states that an institution shall include "any public library, public museum, working men's institute, mechanics' institute, lodge of Freemasons, lodge of Oddfellows, agricultural society, lodge of Good Templars, temperance society, any society or branch thereof established or registered under the Friendly Societies Ordinance 1863, or any law to be hereafter passed to regulate friendly societies and any association holding lands in the said colony granted by the Crown to the trustees thereof for a public purpose." The Bill proposes that these powers shall extend to other organisations. It will be seen that trades halls were not included under the parent Act. I doubt if there were any in existence in 1892 when the Act was passed. The bodies holding these grants of land may desire to mortgage them in order to raise funds for improvements. We cannot reasonably withhold that right, seeing that it has been granted to so many other bodies. Apart from that, it is desirable that these organisations should use the land for the purposes for which it was granted, and to enable them to do so it is necessary to provide the right to mortgage the land and thus furnish proper security to the person lending the money. Without the amendment proposed in the Bill these organisations have not that right. I know the House will agree to the proposal and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2:

Mr. PICKERING: There may be bodies other than those mentioned in the Act and the Bill desirous of having the same privileges extended to them. These are now excluded. I do not know whether there are any other institutions that should be included in the Bill.

Mr. Davies: Such as the Primary Producers' Association.

Mr. PICKERING: It may be that that association will desire to come within the scope of the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: But the Primary Producers' Association is defunct now!

Mr. PICKERING: It is not.

The Minister for Mines: It was revived this morning.

Mr. PICKERING: The Primary Producers' Association is as solid as ever, if not more so.

Hon. P. Collier: But where are their representatives?

Mr. PICKERING: I have the distinction of being one of the representatives of the body.

Hon. P. Collier: One of the three blind mice!

Mr. PICKERING: What is that?

Hon. T. Walker: "Three blind mice."

Mr. PICKERING: We could not expect anything else from the hon. member, seeing that his vision is not too clear.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PICKERING: We may number them now, but there will be more than three after the next elections.

Mr. Angelo: "Three blind mice; see how they run."

Mr. Johnston: The country is with us.

Hon. P. Collier: You are like a man keeping up his courage on a dark night.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask hon. members keep order.

Mr. PICKERING: I am content to abide by the ruling of the Chair, but it is only right to reply to these interjections. The Minister may have made some inquiries as to whether there are other bodies desirous of coming within the scope of the Bill. Has the Premier made those inquiries with a view to avoiding the introduction of further amending Bills?

The PREMIER: I do not think there are any organisations not covered by the Bill now. I have had no requests from any other bodies.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and report adopted.

BILL—GNOWANGERUP RESERVES.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. K. Maley—Greenough) [4.55] moving the second reading said: The Gnowangerup Road Board propose to erect a memorial hall on Gnowangerup Lot 22 which will serve the joint purpose of an agricultural hall and a road board office. The lot is at present reserved for a soldiers' memorial and Executive Council approval was given to the issuing of a 999 years' lease to the road board for that purpose. The issuing of the lease was held up pending further negotiations. The Returned Soldiers' League prepared to hand it over to the road board in order to raise funds for the building,

is desired that a lease of Gnowangerup Lots 5 and 53 be granted to the road board with power to sell, provided the proceeds are applied for the erection of the new hall. Lot 5 is vested in the Minister for Works as a road board site. The Public Works Department has notified its approval of the transfer and the Bill will enable this transaction to be carried out. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [4.56]: I support the second reading of the Bill. It will enable the people of Gnowangerup to devote the money raised by the disposal of the agricultural hall and land as part payment for the beautiful memorial hall erected in that district to commemorate the fallen soldiers from Gnowangerup.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to grant certain reserves to the board:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We should have more information. The member for Katanning pointed out that it is proposed to sell not only the land, but the hall which has been erected there, the proceeds to be applied for the erection of a better hall as a memorial to the fallen soldiers. Was the hall built out of Government funds granted under the conditions for agricultural and other halls? Was it built entirely by the road board? There is nothing in the Bill dealing with a hall. The only reference made is to land. I trust the member for the district will enlighten us on the point.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.2] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is virtually the same as that of last year, but with small amendments consequent on the amending, last session, of the Assessment Act. Clause 5 is the same as the corresponding clause in last year's Bill. The provisions are that where income including or consisting solely of dividends equals a sum liable to a higher rate than 1s. 3d. in the pound, that income shall carry tax, credit being given for payments under the Dividend Duties Act. In the proviso to Clause 6 reference to Subsection 7 of Section 30 of the Assessment Act of 1907 is deleted. This subsection was repealed by the Act of last ses-

sion. It provided a four per cent. allowance on business premises, etc. It was agreed last year that this allowance on business premises should be discontinued. Then there is another amendment with which, I am sure, all will agree. Where the super tax was applied we arrived at the income to be taxed by refraining from making certain allowances that were made in respect of the ordinary tax. For instance, if a man had a taxable income of £264 the super tax applied. The Act said that the possessor of such an income must not make the usual deductions for insurance premiums, children, and rates and taxes on land or income paid in Western Australia. That was not fair because, of course, those are ordinary allowances, not taxed except under the super tax provision. The super tax is applied to the taxable income after all deductions have been made.

Hon. P. Collier: It should apply to only the taxable income of £264.

The PREMIER: Yes, I do not know quite how the Commissioner read the Act, but apparently we did not allow the deduction.

Hon. P. Collier: I think we did, and that his interpretation was wrong.

The PREMIER: No, it is quite clear in the Act. If the calculated income is to be subject to super tax, the allowances are not made. Now, however, we calculate the income much more simply, because the ordinary taxable income will be subject to the super tax, and all deductions in respect of the ordinary tax will be allowed in respect of the super tax. For the rest, the Bill is the same as that of last year. The amendments are small, devised merely to do justice by the taxpayers. The existing system has meant a good deal of trouble to everybody whose income was subject to super tax. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.8] in moving the second reading said: It is well known to hon. members that there is a very great demand for land just now. People have the right to take up land and withhold the improvements for some time. Under the Act one-fifth of the prescribed improvements to non-residential conditional purchase leases must be made within two years. Under the residential lease the time fixed for the improvements is the same, but in neither class of lease can we forfeit before two years. Under the non-residential lease the improvements are 100 per cent. greater than those under the residential lease. We want to get over this period of two years for the making of one-fifth of the necessary improvements. The Bill provides that improvements on leases shall be begun within six months on both residential and non-residential holdings, and shall be con-

tinued to the satisfaction of the Minister. I hope the House will agree to this amendment, rather than have men holding land for two years without improving it. There is also an amendment in the pastoral lease provisions. It will be remembered that it was said a man holding more than 1,000,000 acres must get rid of the surplus within a given time. Some lessees held over 1,000,000 acres, and so had to forfeit or transfer because the time limit for conversion had expired before they became aware of the provisions of the Act. The Bill extends the time for applications to come in under the 1948 tenure to the 30th June 1924, provided double rent from the 28th March, 1918, with 7 per cent. interest on the additional rental is lodged with the application. It must be remembered that it was through distance from the centre that some of the lessees did not learn of the provisions of the Act in time.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Did we not amend the Bill in order to give them opportunity?

The PREMIER: That was during the war.

Mr. Underwood: They have the right to come in. Why deal with the five years period before you come to it?

The PREMIER: We should give these people opportunity to come under the extended terms. It is important that the State should get the additional revenue from such lessees and get the improvements done. There is no reason why all leases should not expire at the same time. When leasing Crown lands not previously applied for, we to-day make the term 1948. No one would take up a pastoral lease on a short term. A man holding a lease expiring in 1928 is at a disadvantage compared with a man whose lease runs till 1948, because he must borrow money to make improvements. In every way it will be an advantage to the State to bring all the lessees into line. There are not so many acres affected, about 6,000,000 out of the 300,000,000 acres. Sixty-five lessees have not come under the new Act, and they hold 186 leases. I hope the House will agree that all may come under the same term and that these leases may be extended till 1948. Such lessees will have to pay the double rent from the passing of the 1918 Act until the present time; they will have to pay the assessed rental value till the expiry of the lease in 1948 and they will have to carry out the improvements required.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Those leases will fall to the State in 1928.

The PREMIER: Those lessees will also be subject to reappraisal of their leases in 1933, that is 15 years from 1918. I see no good reason why they should not be brought under the longer term, seeing that practically the whole of the land is leased under the one Act. There seems to be no object in having some of the leases falling in at one date, and other leases at another date. I hope members will agree to this extension of time. The present Act inflicts a hard-

ship upon the man who bought from an owner that held more than 1,000,000 acres and had to disgorge because of the passing of the Act. The advantage is all with the State. There is another amendment that is not of great importance. There is some doubt whether the Act makes it quite clear that all leases shall be dated from the same day. This was the intention of Parliament, and in my opinion the intention is quite clear.

Mr. Underwood: You cannot force a man to come under it if he does not wish to.

The PREMIER: But this is for the benefit of the people who do come under it. The 1st April, 1918, was fixed as the starting time for the payment of the double rental, and I think it was clearly intended that this should also be the starting date for new leases. The amendment proposed will put all lessees in precisely the same position. It will make the date of reappraisal the same, namely 15 years from 1st April, 1918, and all land will be re-assessed at the one time. There was considerable delay in making the appraisements; often two or three years elapsed, and if this amendment be not agreed to, the man appraised last of all will gain as against the one appraised earlier. The old leases carried on until the issue of the new leases. Suppose an old lease was 10s., and a new lease 15s., a lessee appraised immediately after the passing of the Act would pay from that date.

Mr. Underwood: I know that some of the appraisements were not increased, but were reduced from 10s. to 9s.

The PREMIER: On the other hand, the lessee whose appraisal was delayed would pay only the original rental until the appraisal. That was not the intention of Parliament, and in fact that has not been done, but we want to make quite clear the intention of Parliament. It is not right that because the assessors could not get on to a man's property promptly, he should benefit by the delay. All should be treated alike. That certainly was the intention of Parliament. The only stipulation laid down by Parliament was that the application for the renewal of leases should be made within a certain time. All leases have been issued as from 1st April, 1918, and it is advisable under this Bill to make clear the intention of Parliament and set at rest any legal doubts. We wish to avoid any litigation or trouble. The two points for the House to consider are, first, shall the applicants for land under non-residential conditions have two years in which to make improvements, really two years in which to commence making improvements, or shall they be required, as is proposed under this Bill, to commence their improvements within six months? I think the House will agree with me on that point. The other clause merely provides that all pastoral lessees, irrespective of whether they applied within the stipulated time to come under the Act, shall have the right to come under the Act.

Hon. P. Collier: Are there many?

The PREMIER: No, only 65 lessees involving about 6,000,000 acres.

Hon. P. Collier: The holdings must be very small.

The PREMIER: Yes, and these are really a very small proportion of the whole.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A man that steals 3d. is as big a criminal as the man that steals £1. The area makes no difference.

The PREMIER: I do not think anyone has stolen 3d., much less £1.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The rights of the country were given away under the previous amendment.

The PREMIER: The hon. member might equally well argue that the rights of the country are given away when we lease any land at all.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No.

Mr. Munsie: The leases had only 11 years to run, and you gave away the country's rights by extending the leases for another 20 years.

The PREMIER: It is essential to renew leases years prior to their expiration. Otherwise a man would be in doubt about keeping his stock on the property.

Hon. M. F. Troy: He had a definite contract, and knew perfectly well what it was.

Mr. Munsie: One man stayed in the House merely to finish that job.

The PREMIER: We need not argue the merits of the previous amendment.

Mr. Munsie: I shall finish the job if ever my vote can do it.

The PREMIER: It is only right that all lessees should be brought under the same term. Those who applied in time have 1948. Those taking up land to-day have 1948. Other people who bought surplus lands from pastoralists that had to sell have leases expiring in 1928. It is of no advantage to the State to have these differences in dates. We have three sets of lessees, and it cannot be argued that two should have 1948 tenure and a small section 1928 tenure. We should give all an opportunity to come under the 1948 tenure so long as they pay equally for the renewal. It does not amount to a large area—6,000,000 acres altogether. It is advisable to have all pastoral leases falling in on the one date.

Mr. Munsie: They should all fall in in 1928.

The PREMIER: I do not intend to argue that question now.

Mr. Munsie: We might have a chance to argue it presently.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will have an opportunity.

Mr. Munsie: I shall use it, too. Make no mistake about that.

The PREMIER: I do not wish to deny the hon. member the right. All I am asking is that the few people concerned shall have their leases extended so that they shall expire with the other leases. It is convenient to have all leases expiring at the one time. That has been the custom, and it is a good custom. Before the 1948 leases expire, les-

sees will have to be given a good number of years if they are treated fairly. On the last occasion they were treated only fairly by giving them time to make the necessary arrangements. I move:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. M. F. Troy, debate adjourned.

BILL—VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 15th November.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.27]: This Bill does not make the provision that some members desire. The Minister is seeking power to issue a permit to any person he thinks capable of practising the profession if he is 30 miles distant from a registered veterinary surgeon. The distance is too great.

The Minister for Agriculture: What, in these days of motor cars?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If a motor car were used, it would have to be paid for. A veterinary surgeon working under a permit might have a good practice in a district and a registered man might set up and take the business from him. All the registered man would have to do would be to reside within 30 miles of the other man, whose business would then be gone. Most members are acquainted with one man who could have secured registration at the time had he stated he was obtaining his livelihood by practising as a veterinary surgeon, but he said he was getting a livelihood as a member of Parliament, and on that ground he was refused registration. He possessed the ability, and the board had no objection to registering him. He missed securing registration because he was honest enough to say that at the time he was getting a salary from the State that constituted his livelihood. This Bill will not give him the right to be registered if there is a registered veterinary surgeon in his district. I know that since he ceased to be a member of Parliament he has been doing a lot of good by helping farmers in the district where he resides. There are one or two other similar cases. Some men were at the war, and failed to become registered because of that fact.

The Minister for Agriculture: A district that has no veterinary surgeon may want one.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We should protect those who have already done a certain amount of good. The reason why some men have not gone into certain districts is that they did not think there was a sufficient livelihood for them there. When there are a number of registered men available no doubt they will go to those districts, and cut out the local man who is already doing the work. I hope the Minister will prepare an amendment to this Bill. If not, others will do so, but I prefer that he should do it. Mr. Titus Lander, who was an inspector employed by the Society for the

Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, is the man to whom I referred, and who was not registered because he declared he earned his livelihood as a member for Parliament. He should be allowed to be registered. I know of others who possess only permits. A registered man could go along and take their work from them, if the limit as to distance is allowed to stand.

The Minister for Agriculture: We have to make a start somewhere.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit that. No one would deny registration to a man who was not registered because he went to the war. The right to practice veterinary science should not be restricted to within a distance of 30 miles of another registered surgeon. I hope the Minister will agree to amend the Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: I know of the case of one man who was not registered because he went to the war.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There are not many such cases, but I do hope the Bill will be so amended as to allow such persons to become registered and to practice in any part of the State.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.37]: One is apt to under-estimate the vital importance of veterinary science. We have to think only of the immediate present to realise the great danger to this State through the outbreak of disease in our dairy herds, and the necessity for inducing men to come to this State who are experts in veterinary science. In this morning's "West Australian" there appeared an article illustrating very fitly the dire loss that might occur from such a disease as the one it is now alleged has broken out in the Fremantle district. I think I am correct in saying that in Europe in the 17th century there were enormous losses in stock in consequence of an outbreak of disease. As this State develops, and goes ahead under the system of group settlement, it will become increasingly important that every care should be taken through veterinary science to protect the interests of our dairy farmers. Some of these people have already suffered losses that have caused their positions to border on ruin. The whole foundation of our efforts in group settlement is dairying. It is of vital importance not only to the settlers but to the State that every possible precaution should be taken to ensure the protection of our stock by means of veterinary science. Whilst we may sympathise with certain individuals who, through the war or other causes, were prevented from registering under the Act, we must not lose sight of the fact that veterinary science is a highly skilled profession. If it is to be of any real benefit to this State, we must look only to the most highly skilled veterinarians to prevent or deal with any calamitous outbreak amongst our stock. If we desire to encourage veterinary scientists to come here, we must give them some security of tenure in the way of an assured livelihood. It may be advisable that the principles that are followed by the Medical Department in respect of resident medical officers should be adopted in the case of veterinary surgeons.

In the past we have followed a more or less rule of thumb method in dealing with our stock. Our wool and our dairy stock have now greatly increased in value, and we must therefore view the matter from a different outlook. In my opinion this Bill does not bear the impress of the recognition of the Government of this fact. It is an evasion of the responsibilities of the Government to conserve the vast interests involved. We are gradually bringing new stock into the State. The stock is increasing in value. As an illustration of this we have to refer only to the recent importations of valuable rams, and the additions to our dairy herds. Everything points to the fact that the grade of our stock is improving. If this Bill had carried with it some guarantee to trained veterinarians that they could make a living in this State, it would be more to the point. In the old days it was possible for a bone setter to practice as a surgeon and physician. Within our own memory it is known that in New South Wales men, who were absolutely untrained in the medical profession, practised as doctors.

Hon. P. Collier: As bone setters and blood letters.

Mr. PICKERING: It was discovered that the lives of our fellow creatures were being endangered, and it became the bounden duty of the authorities to displace those unqualified men with others who showed that they possessed the necessary attainments. The position with respect to our stock is becoming just as vital as it was in those days with human beings. We must do something to preserve the vast stock interests that this State now possesses. This measure is only a temporary expedient to meet that contingency. It will not encourage students from the Eastern States who have passed through the veterinary colleges, nor will it encourage our young men in this State to qualify in this science.

Mr. Latham: Show me how this Bill will injure them?

Mr. PICKERING: It is impossible to show the hon. member anything.

Hon. P. Collier: Now we shall get some candid comments.

Mr. PICKERING: I shall not attempt to illustrate to any untrained intellect what is necessary in this case.

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member is speaking to the Bill?

Mr. PICKERING: If the hon. member will persist in interjecting when I am endeavouring to put my case in the best interests of the State, he must expect me to reply. He will have his opportunity of speaking later on. I do not think the Government have a due sense of the importance of the measure they have submitted. I admit that it was introduced before the vital necessity for further steps to be taken had been illustrated. This should be a warning to them to encourage men trained in veterinary science. I hope the Minister will reconsider the Bill. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) has suggested certain amendments. If the Minister is prepared in Committee to report progress, and consider the

advisability of amending the Bill in such a way as to induce expert veterinarians to come to this State, he will be conferring a great benefit upon the community. To endeavour to fill the gap by men who are not really experts in this profession would be fatal. We are confronted with stupendous problems, most of which are associated with our primary industries.

Hon. P. Collier: Problems political and otherwise.

Mr. PICKERING: I trust members will not allow any political position to worry them on this occasion, but will concentrate their attention upon a subject that is so vital to the State. I have had many complaints from men practising as veterinary surgeons as to the work that is done by unqualified and unregistered men in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Munsie: Some of the registered men are not as well qualified as those who are not registered.

Hon. P. Collier: That applies to all professions.

Mr. PICKERING: I am afraid it also applies to some farmers and to some ex-leaders. I am not detracting from the professional capacity of any member. I am satisfied, from the manner in which my services have been recognised by my electors, that they are content with their representation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's services are not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: They have been reflected upon. I regret that a certain remark has been made behind me by a late member of the Country Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not debate that question on this occasion.

Hon. P. Collier: All rejected men take things in that way.

The Premier: The others came in late, as in this case.

Mr. PICKERING: I thought their position would have encouraged them—

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill does not apply to them.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a surgery connected with them.

Mr. PICKERING: Those who have been members of the Country Party should have some sympathy with a subject that means so much to the electors they represent. In any event, I am unable to support the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.42]: I scarcely think that the unfortunate outbreak of disease amongst the stock in the Fremantle district is sufficient ground for the hon. member to take up the attitude of an alarmist on this Bill. I see no connection between the two things. It is certainly desirable we should have men skilled in all the professions. That is the aim we are all striving for. If in Western Australia, however, we are unable to reach the unattainable, it is advisable to go half way.

The Premier: We must do justice.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Our population is spread over great distances, and there must be many scores of miles of country occupied by stock wherein no veterinary surgeon practises.

Mr. Piesse: Quite true.

Mr. Tessedale: You can go 1,500 miles without seeing a person.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No qualified or registered veterinary practitioner would be likely to go to those districts for generations to come. The member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) says that unless we can obtain the services of the highest technical skill throughout this great country, we shall have no assistance in this direction, skilled or otherwise. The same thing applies to the medical profession. To give one instance: the nearest doctor to Wiluna is 120 miles away. The member for Sussex would say that because that little town is unable to maintain a doctor, there should not be any person in that district holding lesser qualifications. The town, however, does not adopt that attitude; the people there have a trained nurse, who is of immense assistance to the community. The hon. member would have neither qualified medical practitioners nor trained assistance.

Mr. Pickering: No similarity at all.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The case is analogous. The hon. member would have a qualified trained man or no one. I have often been struck in this House, when dealing with legislation of this kind, by the keenness of members, and indeed those outside as well, in their desire to put a ring-fence around a particular profession and exclude others from entering it ever afterwards. I do not wish to make any personal observations or to reflect on the hon. member when I refer to the Architects Act. About 60 members of that profession secured registration on the Bill becoming law, and I understand that not more than 11 of that number had qualified by examination. However, all entered the charmed circle and they, like members of other professions, declare they will not pull the barrier down. In a State that is growing and developing like Western Australia, it is not practicable always to carry out that aim, and if we are certain that skilled persons are not available to handle stock, no obstacle should be put in the way of permitting others who have a knowledge of the particular science to give the benefit of that knowledge when requested to do so. As a matter of fact there are to be found amongst people of this description some who are infinitely more skilled than many who obtained registration under the original Act, and who really never qualified. We need have no fear about the Bill; my only regret is that it does not go far enough in regard to the distance set out, because in these days of motor cars 20 miles or 30 miles is not more than 10 miles might have been some years ago. I understand that in the last four years only one man has been registered as a veterinary surgeon, and if we are to wait until we reach the ideal ad-

vanced by the member for Sussex, when we shall have veterinary surgeons dotted all over the countryside at distances of 10 or 15 miles apart, we shall then be somewhere within reach of the millenium. But in the meantime the stock will die out. If we can give the assistance that will be possible under the Bill let us by all means give it.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [5.50]: I support the Bill. It is a necessary measure and I am surprised that there should be one member on these benches opposing it. The Bill will provide that which people in the country districts have been asking for. There are men who are thoroughly qualified by virtue of the knowledge they possess of veterinary science, to practice that profession, but the law will not permit them to do so. I might mention Mr. Titus Lander, who will be remembered as an inspector for many years for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Mr. Lander's knowledge is equal to that possessed in some instances by men who are registered as veterinary surgeons, and he is doing wonderful work in the district in which he is engaging in farming operations. Under the existing law, however, it is impossible for him to make a charge for his services, even though he is at times compelled to be away from his farm for days on end, giving the assistance that people in the surrounding country require for their stock. If this Bill becomes law Mr. Lander will be able to obtain remuneration for the services he renders, and those who require his assistance will go to him in a straightforward manner. The House is thoroughly justified in giving a man like Mr. Lander legal authority to render services in connection with ailing stock. The Bill does not propose to do anything that will injure the profession. If anyone wants to practise veterinary surgery in a district where a registered, though not qualified man is residing, it will be possible for him to do so, and the permit granted to the unqualified man will automatically cease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is a weakness in the Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: We should assist all those who are taking up the profession of veterinary surgery. I hope every member will help to pass the Bill into law. It is a necessary measure and I trust that not one vote has been influenced by the opposition of the member for Sussex.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [5.53]: I intend to support the Bill, though I do not altogether agree with the distance set out. This should be left to the discretion of the Minister. In Geraldton, for instance, there is a veterinary surgeon who resides 29 miles from the town. In the town itself there is a man who is extremely well equipped with veterinary knowledge and the people there cannot avail themselves of his services. There have been prosecutions because charges have been imposed for veterinary

services rendered. At the same time the people who require veterinary assistance are willing and anxious to pay. There is also a man in Geraldton who has been practising as a veterinary surgeon for over 20 years. He went to the Boer war with the veterinary corps under Colonel Campbell. Then he went to South Australia, where he was allowed to practise for years, and later went to England when the war broke out. Now he is settled in Geraldton, but is unable to practise veterinary science to which he has devoted his life. He is unable to register, and under the Bill he would be debarred from practising where he resides, notwithstanding the fact that there would be any amount of work available. His war record is excellent, and it can also be said in his favour that he had charge of Millars' 600 horses in the South-West for a considerable time. But because he is living in Geraldton and there happens to be a qualified man some 20 miles out of the town, it would not be possible for him, as the Bill is framed, to practise. The qualified man who is out some distance from Geraldton is not practising the profession, but is engaged in farming operations. There is no need to arbitrarily fix the distance as the Bill does; discretionary power should be given to the Minister to declare the distance. When the Bill is in Committee I intend to move an amendment in this direction.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [5.58]: There seem to be periods in the history of this Parliament when it becomes seized with panic and it proceeds to impose as many restrictions as it possibly can by setting up a high standard that it thinks will lead to more scientific skill being applied. I am certain, however, that the aim stated to be the objective has never been achieved. Let us examine what has been done under the existing Veterinary Surgeons' Act. I am advised that in order to become qualified to register, the Act demands that student shall take a four years' course at the university. This involves an expenditure of £800, while for another year's study and an expenditure of an additional £200 a student can obtain the degree of M.D. Is it likely that anyone is going to stop at securing registration under the Veterinary Surgeons' Act when by another year's study and a little more expenditure he can obtain the degree of doctor of medicine? It would be foolish. Look at the difference between the two callings, and the different natures of their surroundings. One man goes to the house and is shown into the bedroom, performing his duties under the most pleasant circumstances. The other man is shown into the stable, and has most disagreeable duties to perform. Moreover, the difference in earning capacity is great. Too high a standard has been set for veterinary surgeons, with the result that the existing law has defeated its own ends. Sooner than stop at the four years' study necessary in order to become a veterinary surgeon,

students possessed of any grit would continue for another 12 months and become doctors of medicine.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am informed that there are no fewer than a dozen veterinary surgeons practising in this city.

Hon. P. Collier: They are not increasing in number.

Mr. McCALLUM: They are decreasing. Some who are registered have ceased practice; others have engaged in other avocations; some have gone on farms. People will not take a four-years' course if a five-years' course will give them a much pleasanter job with a much larger income. I know of cases of very unfair treatment under the existing law. One man who was studying at a leading veterinary hospital of Perth when the principal Act was passed, went to the war and was away during the whole period of hostilities. I have here a testimonial given him by his commanding officer, the Colonel of the Tenth Light Horse. It speaks brilliantly of the man's ability, of the care he gave to the horses, and of the regard in which he was held in the army. It states that he gained a reputation throughout the expeditionary force for the attention he gave to the animals under his charge, their condition being much superior to that which was to be seen in other regiments. A finer testimonial has never come under my notice. I have here also a petition signed by all the master carriers of Fremantle, and another signed by practically every horse-owner in Fremantle, requesting that the man be registered. However, he cannot be registered under the existing law. He had about four years' study before going to the war, study in a properly equipped and up-to-date veterinary hospital, but on returning from the front he found he was too late to secure registration. I propose to move an amendment in Committee to provide for such cases. The stock-owners of Fremantle have great confidence in the man, and are anxious to have his services. Until the last month or so, Fremantle was without a veterinary surgeon. A Perth veterinary surgeon has now established a hospital at Fremantle, but he has to be secured by telephone when his services are wanted there. The man I have referred to resides in the district, but the stringency of the existing law prevents him from practising. I hope the Minister will agree to make the Bill a little more elastic. During past sessions we have been engaged in passing Bills to create preserves for individuals. I agree that quacks should not be allowed to practise, and that in the interests of stock-owners it is essential that practising veterinary surgeons should have certain qualifications. But the stringency of the existing law has defeated the ends in view, and has prevented competent men from entering the profession. In Committee I shall move an amendment as indicated.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [6.6]: I must support the second reading of the measure, if only on account of the inconvenience and

losses suffered by men who settle on the land without having knowledge of stock in connection with farming pursuits. In every new district there is in practically every season a case of some settler being in great difficulties with his stock. The man does not know to whom to apply. Indeed, it is some time before he realises the necessity for consulting a qualified man when an animal is accidentally injured or suffers from an internal complaint. The general community want educating up to the fact that it is better to save a valuable animal than lose it for the sake of paying for the services of a qualified veterinary surgeon. The Bill provides that registration will not be granted unless the applicant proves that he possesses certain qualifications. While I recognise that the Bill will fill a long-felt want, I also agree that a 30-mile radius represents too great a distance. The radius should be 20 miles, and even this should not be calculated by road but by linear distance from the residence of the nearest professionally qualified man. The passing of the Bill will mean a good deal of saving to the individual and to the State. With veterinary surgeons competent to advise them, the men on the land will reach higher values in the stock maintained on their properties. Another result of enacting this measure will be to create a desire for additional qualified veterinary surgeons in the various country districts. Thus the Bill, instead of being against the interests of certificated veterinary surgeons, will operate in the contrary direction. At present farmers rarely call in a veterinary surgeon.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. K. Maley—Greenough—in reply) [6.8]: It is generally recognised that one has to begin somewhere with regard to limitation when fixing a radius as proposed by this Bill. Probably all of us will agree with what has been said by the member for York (Mr. Latham) regarding the assistance rendered by a man like Mr. Titus Lander to settlers in his district by way practically of voluntary service. For that service he has not been entitled to charge, and in order to render it he must have been absent from his own farm during many days. There is in Australia a distinct lack of young men qualifying for veterinary practice. The reason may be, as suggested by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), that the medical degree only takes a year longer than the degree of veterinary surgeon. We should meet the situation as is proposed by the Bill. If the second reading is carried, I shall ask that the Committee stage be deferred so as to afford me an opportunity of consulting the chief veterinary officers of the State regarding the suggestions offered by hon. members in the course of the debate.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—AMENDMENTS INCORPORATION.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [7.31] in moving the second reading said: The title of the Bill is self-explanatory. Hon. members know that frequently when amending Bills are introduced we provide for the reprinting of the principal Act as amended. If the Bill becomes law, such a course will not be necessary, because every reprint of an Act will include all amendments. A great many Acts have been amended, and to-day if any person wishes to look into the provisions of an Act he is compelled to look not only for the principal Act, but for several amending Acts as well. This is undesirable, and power is sought under the Bill to reprint Acts with all amendments. It is provided that every reprint by the Government Printer of an Act with its amendments shall be under the supervision of the Clerk of Parliaments. There may be some slight danger in connection with the work, but after all it should be very slight indeed. The effect will be that in future every Act will be complete. The member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) will recognise how convenient that will be to anyone having to consult Acts of Parliament. Frequently a member desiring to look up an Act has to look up quite a number of amending Acts as well.

Hon. P. Collier: Look at the Land Act.

The PREMIER: That is a good example. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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.

BILL — RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—

3. Section 2 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the deletion of the word "other," in the definition of "superior court."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

I have consulted the Crown Solicitor, and he informs me that the word "other" should not have been inserted.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 6, as follows:—

6. A section is inserted in the principal Act as follows:—15. This Act shall not be deemed to repeal by implication the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act, 1918.

The PREMIER: Referring to a proposal on one occasion, the Leader of the Opposition stated that while it would not do any good, it would not do any harm.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not originate that remark.

Hon. T. Walker: It originated on the Government side of the House.

The PREMIER: It was adopted by the Leader of the Opposition. That remark can well be applied to the Council's amendment.

Hon. T. Walker: It will be a safeguard.

The PREMIER: But nothing more. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

BILL—ANZAC DAY.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 23rd August.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—"Anzac Day" inserted in certain sections of the Licensing Act, 1911:

Mr. LATHAM: I believe it will be necessary to repeal the Anzac Day Act, 1919. In the meantime, however, I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment I suggest as set out on the Notice Paper. I propose to strike out Clauses 2, 3 and 4, and to insert a new clause to stand as Clause 2, the wording of which appears on the Notice Paper. I propose to make Anzac Day a sacred day. The Bill seeks to alter the Licensing Act, but that does not go far enough. It does not propose closing the picture shows; it will not prevent prize fights, athletic sports, or other sporting engagements. It is the wish of the Returned Soldiers' League to make the 25th April a sacred day, and I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

The PREMIER: The amendment to the proposed by the hon. member is taken from the

New Zealand Act whereas the Bill is taken from the Queensland Act which, I understand, has worked well. In New Zealand the law governing the observance of Sunday is very different from that obtaining in Western Australia, where we have the old English Act still in existence. Of course, by custom that Act has fallen into disuse; but if we were to legislate that Anzac Day be observed strictly as a Sunday, and if the English law were to be enforced, it might be very inconvenient for a large number of people. For instance, under that law the hon. member who has moved the amendment could be successfully prosecuted for not having attended church last Sunday. The law is most stringent. Under it no person shall do any work, drive any horse, or attend any meeting, other than a religious meeting, on Sunday. Newspaper boys could be prosecuted for selling papers on Sunday. I want Anzac Day to be kept sacred, but it would be impracticable to observe it as a Sunday if our existing law governing the observance of the Sabbath were to be strictly administered.

Lieut.-Col. DENTON: I am surprised at the Premier. It is hard that we should have to quibble over the observance of a day set apart to perpetuate the memory of those who went away from Australia to uphold the integrity of their country. All that the returned soldiers want is that a day shall be kept sacred to the memory of those who fell for the nation and are now sleeping far from our shores. Anzac Day should be kept sacred as a day on which we can revere the memory of those who did so much for us. Surely it is not too much to ask Parliament to provide for this! Is this House to go down to posterity as having said that it cannot give up one day for the memory of those who made the great sacrifice?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I quite appreciate the view expressed by the hon. member who has just spoken but, after all, there is room for difference of opinion as to how far we ought to legislate on this subject. I understand the clause in the Bill is similar to the Queensland legislation, whereas the proposed amendment follows the lines of the legislation in New Zealand. Surely nobody would assert that the people of Queensland would have less regard for Anzac Day than would the people of New Zealand. There is a danger of going too far in legislating as to what people may or may not do on Anzac Day.

The Minister for Mines: With the legislation based largely on sentiment.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We should be careful not to swing back to the old Puritan days, when every action and expression was governed by law. To-day nobody would support that condition of affairs. I should prefer to set up in the hearts of the people a willingness to observe Anzac Day as it ought to be observed, to do it voluntarily, not by compulsion. The amendment provides that Anzac Day shall be observed as a Sunday; but in some parts of the State Sunday is

observed as a day of pleasure and of sport. The goldfields people hold their sporting events on Sunday.

Lieut.-Col. DENTON: The people of the goldfields are too broadminded to desecrate Anzac Day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The proposed amendment says that Anzac Day shall be observed as a Sunday. But I take it that does not mean that all the laws affecting Sunday are to be strictly enforced on Anzac Day. Does not the hon. member mean rather that Anzac Day shall be observed in the ordinary way that Sunday is observed? I am not particular as to which provision be carried, but I think the Bill meets the situation. I do not know that the people really require much compulsory legislation for their direction as to how they should spend the day. I will vote for the clause as printed.

Mr. CORBOY: I, too, will vote for the clause as printed. There is not much difference between the two provisions, but there is this point: in various parts of the State, under the official direction of the local branch of the Returned Soldiers' League, certain celebrations have been held on Anzac Day for some years past, and if the amendment were carried it would not be possible to continue those celebrations.

Lieut.-Col. DENTON: That is not correct.

Mr. CORBOY: It is correct. While I consider the day should be observed in the most fitting manner possible, I cannot see that any harm is done by its being observed as it is in certain centres. The people in those centres are as genuine in their desire to observe the day fittingly and in their feelings towards the fallen soldiers as are the people in any other part of the State, and we would not be doing right if we passed a law to prevent them from observing Anzac Day as they are accustomed to do.

Mr. PICKERING: We realise that Anzac Day calls for the expression of all that is most noble in our characters. One of the most fitting ways to observe the day is to have a parade of school children at the local memorial.

Capt. Carter: In other words an in memoriam service?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, so that the true significance might be impressed upon the rising generation. There is no law to prevent the playing of football, cricket, and other sports on Sunday.

Mr. Latham: Yes, there is.

Mr. PICKERING: Throughout the State it is not regarded as wrong to devote portion of Sunday to sport. If we passed the amendment, it is questionable whether we would be giving effect to the desires of those who support it. It does not matter whether we retain the clause or accept the amendment; either will give effect to the intention behind the Bill that Anzac Day should be fittingly observed.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I support the amendment. The Bill will simply require licensed premises to be closed and prohibit horse rac-

ing on Anzac Day. The Leader of the Opposition prefers voluntary action on the part of the people, but there is another important phase. Few of us have not suffered a loss through the war, and the children should be trained to revere the memory of the men who fell in the war. If the amendment be passed the people will realise it is the wish of the legislature that Anzac Day be observed to honour the memory of the fallen.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am opposed to any attempt to compel the people to honour the memory of our fallen soldiers. The Bill practically says that some people, at any rate, have refused to pay the honour due to the fallen and that legislation is necessary to compel them to do so. Such an honour is not worth having. Unless our reverence for the memory of the fallen springs voluntarily from a sympathetic heart, it will not be evoked by legislation.

Mr. A. Thomson: The war is not far off and many have forgotten.

Hon. P. Collier: Why say many have forgotten? That is a gratuitous reflection.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The last thing the men that laid down their lives for their country would wish is that legislation should be passed to compel people to revere their memory.

Mr. A. Thomson: Why the necessity for the Bill?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think it is needed. There are men in the community who could impress upon the people the duty they owe to the soldiers by fittingly observing this day and who could get them to do it voluntarily. We may compel people to keep the day as a Sunday, but we cannot compel them to do honour to the men that defended us. I am tired of so much lip sympathy. It is time we paid the honour due to the men that made the supreme sacrifice in our behalf.

Mr. A. Thomson: Do not you think most of us do?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If most people do, there is no necessity for the Bill. Last Anzac Day there were sports gatherings in the metropolitan area to raise funds for soldiers' memorials.

Capt. Carter: Do not you think it would improve the tone of the day to stop sports gatherings?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know that it would. I speak as one that suffered through the war, and I feel those related to me would not desire that people should be compelled to honour the memory of our soldiers. If Anzac Day be observed as Sunday, football and tennis matches will still be played. An interstate yacht race was contested on the Swan River on a Sunday. It is the duty of everyone to observe Anzac Day voluntarily.

Mr. WILSON: I agree that Anzac Day should be a close day for the diggers and their dependants. We cannot say too much for those who made the supreme sacrifice, but for the relatives remaining Anzac Day

is a very mournful day. In most of the country towns where there is a soldiers' memorial, the day is observed by holding a memorial service. We should retain the day in memory of the boys and sympathy for the relatives. I support the idea of making this a close day if possible, and intend to move an amendment on the amendment. I do not know why English troops should be specialised. The amendment does not even say "British troops." What about the Scotch, Irish and Welsh troops? My son was at the landing at Gallipoli, and my sister's only son, who was in a Scotch regiment, was also there. It is about time we referred to something that is universal. This word "English" falls upon me occasionally. The amendment should read, "The first landing of the British troops." We should have the best of commemoration days for the boys we sent away.

Mr. TEESDALE: When the member for North-East Fremantle was dealing with the question of sentiment he lost sight of the promoters of sports, from whom no consideration can be expected. I refer to those gentlemen with the cauliflower ear, who would seize every opportunity to get a good rousing house on that day.

Mr. Hughes: We have not a decent pugilist in the State.

Mr. TEESDALE: What has racing done for the State that it should be particularised? Racing is not half so demoralising as this accursed prize-fighting, and as foot-racing, in which so much gambling is done by hoodlums. The member for North-East Fremantle is jumping to the conclusion that this class of people will appreciate sentiment.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is not worth having if it comes by compulsion.

Mr. TEESDALE: We are leaning on a rotten stick when we lean on that class.

Hon. P. Collier: We shall do some good if we compel that class to observe the day.

Mr. TEESDALE: By preventing them from hiring the hall we shall prevent the assembling of these people. The member for Yilgarn says that this particular day has been chosen by returned soldiers for functions connected with their institution. That is an extraordinary admission. It would appear that our consideration is wasted, because there is a diversity of opinion as to what constitutes the observance of this day. I want to keep it as sacred as possible. We owe a duty to those who did not return. That is not fulfilled by recognising horse-racing, foot-racing and whippet-racing on that day.

Mr. Hughes: You would allow picture shows?

Mr. TEESDALE: I would not; I would not allow those greasy Yankee promoters, who are taking thousands out of the State every week, to continue to do so on that day. I would also have Australian films barred.

Hon. P. Collier: The amendment will not stop picture shows on Sunday.

Mr. TEESDALE: The authorities do not allow Deadwood Dick pictures on that day. We can safely leave that matter in the hands of the Colonial Secretary.

Mrs. COWAN: I support the amendment. We cannot pay too high a tribute to our soldiers who have passed on, or too great a respect to their memory in every way. Many mothers and other women relatives have had their hearts wrung by what has occurred on Anzac Day. They do not take the view that people are wilfully disregarding it, but that they forget. The only way to make them remember is to put something upon our statute-book that will constitute an ideal for the future. I have always felt it to be a good thing if sometimes the statutes are a little ahead of the ideals of the people, because the law is there for them to live up to. If they break the law it cannot be helped, but it is there for them to follow. Those who come after, when we have all passed away, will realise in a more definite way than they would otherwise do what this meant to the nation in our day, and to the fathers and mothers from whom our soldiers sprang. They will know that we did realise the extent of the sacrifice, and did our best to leave behind us something that would be a mark for all time to cause people to realise the wonderful work that was done by our soldiers for the whole world during the dreadful ordeal of war. That is why I support the amendment. I want this made by law so sacred a day that the people will never forget it.

Capt. CARTER: I do not wish to arrogate to myself, as a returned soldier, any special right to deliver myself upon this question. I have been pleased to hear what I expected to hear—the universal expression from members that the observance of Anzac Day should be placed on a basis satisfactory to those to whom it is most dear. The member for North-East Fremantle can be placed amongst those who deserve of the best in any expression of opinion as to his patriotism or interest in those who went to serve the Empire. But I cannot agree with him when he says that legislation is not needed to obtain a proper observance of Anzac Day. Our civilisation is such that it may be said there is no necessity to place upon our statute-book any law to preserve life, but we frequently find it necessary to enforce the law in this respect. He also says we cannot compel people to pay homage when they do not feel it in their hearts. I do not wish to impress upon people the necessity to pay that homage when such a thing does not arise in their hearts. There is a big element in the community who love to think of the day as one of commemoration for those who paid the supreme sacrifice. In their interests we should make it possible for Anzac Day to be observed in such a way as would most fit in with the peculiar sense of duty held by these people towards it. We have never had a properly educated public on this question. It is only 12 months ago that Anzac

Day was made a universal day of mourning or commemoration. We have even had the sorry spectacle of the day being desecrated in this State. Just as the Sabbath Day is desecrated, so will Anzac Day be desecrated unless the law is enforced. Because Sunday picture shows have become a habit in this State, that should not be taken to mean that they can be shown on Anzac Day. I feel sure members do not desire to impress upon the people by statute the task of paying homage to Anzac Day, or to force them to do honour to those that have fallen. However, in order to give an opportunity to that great majority of our people—I believe it is the great majority—who still find it in their hearts to do homage to the fallen, we should preserve the day to them. The Bill restricts horse racing and the sale of liquor in regard to Anzac Day. In view of what has been witnessed on past Anzac Days those two reforms may be described as laudable. But if horse racing is stopped other professional sports should also be stopped; otherwise the only effect will be to let those other sports score by the restriction of horse racing. With regard to the amendment, I do not know that it is legal to hold a prize-fight or a football match on a Sunday.

The Minister for Mines: It is not illegal.

Capt. CARTER: Simply because no prosecutions are undertaken. I ask that Anzac Day should be made sacred for the sake of those who desire to go to church on that day. The statute compelling church attendance on Sunday, which was quoted by the Premier, is utterly obsolete. Therefore it cannot affect the operation of this Bill.

The Premier: In that case we can do nothing.

The Minister for Mines: Would you cause railway men and tramway men to work on Anzac Day?

Capt. CARTER: I suppose that so long as we have a community constituted as ours is to-day, we shall have demands on public utilities which will render it necessary for some men to work at all times—for instance, in order that people may be able to go to church. I fail to see that the Bill will affect that position. The suggestion has been made that the nearest Sunday to Anzac Day should be taken. In recent awards of the Arbitration Court Anzac Day is included in the list of paid holidays.

Mr. Munzie: No private employee will be paid for Anzac Day if he does not work on that day.

Capt. CARTER: Many private employees are now being paid for the holiday on Anzac Day.

Mr. Wilson: Coal miners are never paid for holidays, not for a single one.

Capt. CARTER: The spirit of the Bill, as reflected in the speeches delivered to-night, is that we should fall into line with New Zealand and Queensland. Western Australia has never been, and I hope never will be, behind in any matter of national importance. I support the proposal of the member for York.

The PREMIER: I do not think we can compel people to show respect for any day unless they wish to do so. Certainly I have no wish to compel anyone by legislation to pay respect to Anzac Day. What we wish to effect by the Bill is that no one shall interfere with the proper observance of Anzac Day by other people. As regards the amendment, if Anzac Day is to be observed as a Sunday, there is a statute covering the position. If we carry the amendment, the first law to be applied under it will be that anyone can inform against a transgressor.

Mr. Latham: That can be done to-day on every Sunday, but it is not done.

The PREMIER: By passing the amendment we shall be re-enacting that old law. If the old law applied to-day, I could inform against members for not going to church on Sunday. The amendment provides against the running of trains on Anzac Day, against work of any kind on that day. By carrying the amendment we shall land ourselves in serious trouble. Let me point out that the amendment does not provide any penalty for an offence.

Mr. Latham: I propose to put that in.

The PREMIER: An offence against the amendment would be a misdemeanour necessitating trial before a jury, and rendering the offender liable to imprisonment for a year. We ought to know what the results of passing the amendment will be. I am as anxious as anyone to have Anzac Day observed as a sacred day. The men who wore conscription badges should be the first to endeavour to see that reverence is shown for the greatest of all the days that we have lived through. But I do ask the Committee to be reasonable. The Bill as introduced will do everything that is necessary. At any rate, it will do all that will be done under the amendment, although the amendment goes so much further than the Bill.

Lieut.-Col. Denton: You have not done much for the "wingies" and "stumpies," though.

The PREMIER: I have done a little more than most people for the soldiers, and I desire to do more for them by this Bill. Let us have legislation that can be administered. If the amendment is carried, the measure cannot be applied. I venture to say the mover of the amendment would be the last to desire to have it applied. Sunday observance has fallen into disuse, but if the amendment were carried and I were to inform against the member for West Perth for not going to church, any bench would have to impose a penalty on her.

Mr. J. THOMSON: I am sorry to oppose my returned soldier colleagues. I shall vote against the amendment moved by the member for York.

Mr. Wilson: You have twisted, Jock!

Mr. J. THOMSON: I have not. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle that unless we can carry out what we desire, as in France, we will not properly commemorate the memory of men who will never come back.

A few months ago I was in France. In the town of Hazebrouck a meeting was held in memory of the men who left that town and who fell during the war.

Mr. Latham: Have you seen the French legislation on that point?

Mr. J. THOMSON: That is how the commemoration should be observed here. I have as much sympathy as anyone else for the men who fell, and I am certain the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have just as much sympathy, too.

Capt. Carter: That has not been questioned.

Mr. J. THOMSON: If the Bill is to be agreed to, it should be without all this talk of commemorating the memory of those who have fallen. To my mind it is all humbug.

Mr. LATHAM: The Premier has led the Committee to believe that the amendment will have the effect of re-enacting an old Act dealing with the sabbath. While I am not a legal man, I think that Act could be brought into force to-morrow if desired.

The Minister for Mines: That is admitted.

Mr. LATHAM: To-day we could compel people to go to church. The point is that such things are not done and ordinary common sense is used. If the amendment were agreed to, common sense would be used in giving effect to it. I believe it is still possible to hang a man for stealing a sheep.

Mr. Wilson: In Scotland people were not allowed to whistle on Sundays.

Mr. LATHAM: The amendment will not re-enact any legislation at all. It merely says, if read intelligently, that Anzac Day shall be observed as Sunday is observed to-day.

Mr. Harrison: But you said the Act was a dead letter.

Mr. LATHAM: I did not.

The Colonial Secretary: But you know it is.

Mr. LATHAM: It is not a dead letter; the old Act is not used because we have outgrown those early methods.

Mr. Harrison: It is not observed, so what is the difference?

Mr. LATHAM: It can be observed if required. All that will happen, if the amendment be agreed to, is that we will observe the day as we observe Sundays now, with the exception that I hope the Colonial Secretary will not grant authority to people to run picture shows on Anzac Day. The amendment is beautifully worded and I cannot see why any exception is taken to it. The Bill merely provides a series of amendments to the Licensing Act and does not make edifying reading in such a measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I press the point that the hon. member himself is not clear regarding his own amendment. He desires an amendment that he himself will interpret from time to time. That is not possible.

Mr. Latham: I have not suggested that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have been waiting for the member for York to explain what he means by "Sunday observance." That can only be in accordance with an existing statute.

Mr. Latham: And with custom.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The only statute governing the Sabbath is an Imperial one, and is applied in the direction explained by the Premier. What does the member for York want? He stated that he wanted Anzac Day observed as Sunday is observed to-day. In the same sentence he said he hoped the Colonial Secretary would not grant permission for picture shows and so on. In some places football matches are played on Sunday; in others, cricket, tennis and so on. The objection by an individual to any one of those games might be as strong as it would be against horse racing. The result would be that a person could lay a charge against his neighbour under the Imperial Act.

Hon. P. Collier: It would resolve itself into a matter of taste.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: What the member for York must appreciate is that if the amendment be agreed to, there will be the danger of placing the Imperial Act within the grasp of every individual.

Capt. Carter: Why does not the mention of Sunday in the Licensing Act not bring the Imperial Act into force?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Because the Licensing Act merely says what shall, or shall not, be done on Sundays. It does not prescribe the observance of the sabbath, but merely to the extent that hotels shall not open.

Hon. P. Collier: At the same time it permits anyone to go 20 miles away and get as much liquor as he likes.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Does the member for York say that on such a day it should be illegal to engage a charabanc and go for a picnic?

Mr. Latham: It should be observed exactly as we do our Sundays.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: And the hon. member is to interpret that for himself. That cannot be allowed and the hon. member must realise that the effect will be to revive this old Imperial Act, and so, perhaps, enable a relative of a returned soldier to take action against his neighbour.

Capt. Carter: Why does it not apply in New Zealand?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Because New Zealand has a Sunday Observance Act.

Capt. Carter: The hon. member says that is not so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If there are sports to which objection is taken, let them be specified in a schedule to the Bill.

Hon. T. WALKER: I appreciate the intention and desire of the member for York but I must uphold the soundness of the views expressed by the Premier and the Minister for Mines from the legal point of view. It would be all right so long as we did not approach the court on the question as to what was Sunday observance. The law courts would be obliged to go back to the old Imperial Act which governs the observance of the sabbath, and that could

be done to-day. In other States of the Commonwealth not long ago the old Westminster Aquarium Act was put into operation for the prosecution of men who delivered speeches on the Sabbath. And it was held that that law could be put into operation. Suppose there were a breach of the proposed law prescribing that Anzac Day should be observed as a Sunday, and it came to the court for decision as to what was Sunday observance in the interpretation of the existing law. The courts would go back to the law of Charles the Second, in 1677, taken over and not repealed in our own State. That law, as the Premier has shown, is most stringent in its provision.

Mr. Latham: But that applies to every Sunday now.

Hon. T. WALKER: That is so, but see what the hon. member is raising up! Under that law all persons are to repair to the church on that day and to exercise themselves in the duties of piety and true religion. In that law there is only one church, not half a dozen churches; one true religion, not several true religions. By the proposed amendment we are to revive that Act and bring it once more into operation. Sunday, of course, can be observed piously without one being altogether mournful on that day. How Sunday was observed by the Scotch contemporaneously with the Act of Charles the Second we are informed by Buckle in his "History of Civilisation." We read—

It was a sin to go from one town to another on Sunday, however pleasant the business might be; it was a sin to visit your friend on a Sunday, it was likewise sinful either to have your garden watered or your beard shaved. Such things were not to be tolerated in a Christian land. No one on a Sunday should pay attention to his health or think of his body at all. On that day horse exercise was sinful, so was walking in the fields or in the meadows or in the street, or enjoying the fine weather by sitting at the door of your house. To go to sleep on Sunday before the duties of the day were over was also sinful.

The Minister for Mines: Little wonder the Premier is against it!

[Mr. Stubbs took the Chair.]

Hon. T. WALKER: The passage continues—

Bathing, being pleasant as well as wholesome, was a particularly grievous offence, and no man could be allowed to swim on Sunday.

The Minister for Mines: Then if he fell in the river on Sunday it would be his duty to drown!

Hon. T. WALKER: That was the customary observance in those days of Sunday, and the hon. member by his amendment would resuscitate that. The motive is excellent, but the whole scope and purpose of the Bill is secured by the Bill itself. It certainly puts

Anzac Day on a par with Sunday in respect of closing the chief sources of evil, the public houses and places of that kind, and also precludes the hilarity that may be associated with sports, especially horse racing.

Mr. Latham: Horse racing alone is mentioned.

The Minister for Mines: You can include other sports.

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes. But to revive an Act of the 17th century and have the definition put in the language of the Scotch of the 17th century, would be derogatory to our sense of development and improvement and progress.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And to our sense of humour.

Hon. T. WALKER: I trust the hon. member will not insist upon the wording of the amendment.

Mr. A. Thomson: Is it not time that funny old Act were repealed?

Hon. T. WALKER: Maybe, but it is not repealed, and the Bill proposes, not to repeal it, but to revive it. That is the danger of the amendment.

Mr. DURACK: We are all desirous that a day should be dedicated to the memory of the fallen soldiers. I do not altogether like the clause. I rarely go to races, but I do not see why races should be singled out as the one form of sport to be debarred on Anzac Day. In the minds of everybody there is the acceptance that there is something sanctified about Sunday. With all due regard to the legal opinion that the amendment will revive the ancient law, I do not think it is at all likely. It would be interesting to see an attempt made to apply that law of Charles the Second in the direction indicated by the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker), and to note what the effect would be on the people. Nothing better could be done to consecrate the memory of our fallen soldiers than to have Anzac Day associated with Sunday. Since the dawn of Christianity, Sunday has been recognised as an exceptional day.

Hon. P. Collier: And it has been observed in different ways in different countries.

Mr. DURACK: If we have Anzac Day observed as a Sunday, it will be paying a fitting tribute to the memory of our soldiers.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not going to withdraw the amendment. I cannot believe that we are not already administering the existing law as far as necessity entitles us to do. The amendment, if carried, cannot possibly have an ill effect.

The Minister for Mines: How are you going to apply it?

Mr. LATHAM: We will have a try.

The Minister for Mines: What do you mean by "Sunday observance"?

Mr. LATHAM: That we should observe Anzac Day as we now observe Sunday.

Hon. P. Collier: But "observance" means observance according to the Statute.

Mr. LATHAM: I quite agree. I understand that even to-day, if I were to catch the member for Kanowna walking down the street

on a Sunday, I could lay a charge against him.

Hon. P. Collier: That is what you want to revive.

Mr. LATHAM: Not to revive; it exists to-day. Only a short time ago in New South Wales a man was fined 1s. for doing some work on a Sunday. I will vote against the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

MOTION—SANDALWOOD, AMENDED REGULATIONS.

To Disallow.

Debate resumed from the 7th November on the following motion by Hon. P. Collier—

That the amended regulations under the Forests Act, 1918, published in the "Government Gazette" of Tuesday, the 30th October, and laid upon the Table of the Legislative Assembly on the same day, be disallowed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Seaddan—Albany) [9.17]: I do not propose at this stage to endeavour to explain the whole position that led up to the regulations recently placed on the Table of the House, except to say that members are aware we have been trying for some time to devise means to obtain some stability in the taking of sandalwood from our forests and marketing it in other parts of the world. It must be borne in mind there are three parties interested—the State as the owners of the forests in which the sandalwood grows; the puller, who obtains the sandalwood; and the trader, who puts it on the market. The only persons that so far have benefited to any extent from the production and taking of the many thousands of tons of sandalwood from Western Australia are the traders, and through the traders, the Chinamen. I do not propose to again traverse the ground I previously covered in explaining the Government proposals and why it was necessary to endeavour to stabilise the industry. When it was proposed to do this by issuing a single permit to one trader under such conditions as would protect the men engaged in the industry by ensuring them a certain price much in excess of anything they had previously obtained, together with an increased royalty to the State, based upon tenders received, it was held by a majority of one that the course proposed by the Government was the correct one. The Government, however, did not proceed in that way, and the Leader of the Opposition, by the motion now under consideration, has taken exception to the Government not standing to their guns. The hon. member knows

that Governments do not act on all matters in a direction which may not be acceptable to members, even though they have sufficient support for their proposals for the time being. Although the Government proposals were endorsed by a majority of members, if other means could be found by which similar results could be obtained, following on the objections voiced in this House, the Government were justified in adopting them. The only alteration actually made in the amended regulations is that instead of issuing a permit to one firm to trade in sandalwood for export purposes—I am excluding the North-West—we have decided at the request of a number of members who opposed the previous proposals, including the member for South Fremantle, that those traders at present in the industry should be permitted to continue. Still it was found essential to take some control in order to stabilise the industry to the point that it could pay the royalty demanded as well as the amount prescribed for the getter. If members study the question they will find that for years the price paid for sandalwood has varied largely according to the conditions of the exchange market in China. Whenever the exchange rate was favourable to the Chinaman, he purchased heavily; whenever it was to his advantage to lighten his purchases owing to the exchange being against him, he did so. Thus the trader was often placed in the position of purchasing on a falling market and holding against a future rise. Quite a number of men that went into the business have gone out of it, and others in it have been able to carry on only by assistance rendered by competing firms or other people. On no occasion has the price paid to the getter been satisfactory, except during a short period after the war when the exchange rose to an abnormal figure. The conditions under which the getters live are as bad as can possibly be imagined. They are living 80 or 100 miles from the railway system.

Hon. W. C. Angwin drew attention to the state of the House.

Hon. P. Collier: Six on the Government side and not one of the official Country Party present.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The conditions under which the pullers live in the more remote parts of the State where sandalwood is taken are anything but satisfactory. They have to live on tinned dog and only infrequently visit towns for supplies. They depend upon teams to carry supplies to them and altogether they live under very bad conditions. This should not be so when we are producing a commodity we do not require and producing about 90 per cent. of China's consumption. Therefore, we should be able to devise means to compel the users of this wood to pay at least a fair price to the men obtaining it, as well as provide a fair return to the State producing it. Naturally

production belongs to the community as a whole. On the first proposals submitted by the Government, members differed. It was not until we had proceeded to the extent of receiving tenders that anyone in the State, except perhaps one or two of the traders, had the remotest idea what could be paid for sandalwood under a system of control. In my wildest dreams I never thought we could obtain anything like £16 per ton f.o.r. Fremantle for the getter and £9 per ton royalty for the Government. It was due to our calling tenders that we were able to impose those rates. Because of the objections raised, particularly the objection to putting anyone out of business, the Government sought another method by which the getter as well as the State could be protected. To our new proposals the Leader of the Opposition takes exception. Instead of granting a permit to one firm, we have granted a license to each of the firms engaged in the trade, and have allocated the quantity that each firm may take each year. I suppose all of them are dissatisfied. Naturally they would be, because they are paying a much higher price, are still to a certain extent in competition one with the other, and are paying a higher royalty, and this on a reduced turnover. The point is that if we were going to get this price for the puller and this royalty for the State, we had to devise means whereby China would not secure more than her requirements in any one year. The Leader of the Opposition contends that if we proceed on those lines, we should permit the traders to carry on as before. That sounds all right and it may appear right in theory, but it will not work out in practice. If the traders were allowed to trade freely, they would not do business at all at the moment, because of the huge stocks of sandalwood they have obtained at a royalty of only £2 a ton and a price of £12 to the getter—£14 as against the £25 they would have to pay in the next 12 months or two years. Thus they would profit to the extent of £11 per ton by disposing of the existing stock and doing nothing. No trader would deliberately lay out his capital upon what he had to pay interest for the next 12 months when he could obtain capital on which he could earn interest. The getter, on the other hand, would be tied up for 12 months or two years. To avoid difficulty, the traders were given fair warning. We told them they must take a minimum quantity, though we restricted them to a maximum so that there should be no cessation of operations. We did not want to see the getters driven out of the business or driven to making contracts under the lap at a reduced rate in order to secure a living. Therefore, we stipulated that the traders should take a minimum of 5,000 tons a year, and that quantity was distributed amongst the several traders on the basis of their previous operations. On that understanding the whole of the traders were permitted to continue. But one particular firm have been raising Cain; I refer to the

Sandalwood Co-operative Company of which John Stewart is chairman of directors. He has raised Cain right along the line, and he is more sore to-day because of the change of policy. He introduced a rather extraordinary method of tendering by offering 5s. per ton more than any other bona fide tenderer. He is the gentleman that puts huge advertisements in the newspapers. I have not yet heard of anyone that considered his method of tendering a moral one.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Another man put in two tenders.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: But this was John Stewart's third tender. In any case, each tenderer put in a separate tender with a definite price. The other tender of 5s. above anyone else's was absolutely absurd. John Stewart now finds that because he has linked up with the Sandalwood Co-operative Company his individual interest has shrunk in consequence of the new arrangement. If he had got the whole of the trade his interest would of course have increased. As things have turned out, his interest has been reduced, because he is only one of a number who claim to be operating under the Co-operative Company. Unfortunately the opinion exists that once a thing is labelled as co-operative it must be co-operative. My understanding of co-operative trading is that, under normal conditions, it is carried on in such a way that all the profits that are made are divided pro rata amongst those who go to make up the organisation. That is not proposed by this company. It is an ordinary trading company with the right to make big profits, and distribute them in the way of dividends. They claim that the will distribute the profits by way of bonuses. They have said to the sandalwood getter, "You take a few shares, and we will deduct the money from the price we pay you for the wood." The organisation is then boomed as a co-operative company. This company had issued 10,900 shares. Of these 10,700 went to previous traders such as Joyce & Watkins, John Stewart, Pilgrim, and others. I think about 250 shares went to another merchant in Boulder, known as Ford. Provision is made that 500 shares must be held, which no getter could possibly hold, before the holder has a right to sit on the board of directors. The articles of association also provide that shares can be distributed as freely as is desired without any payment for services rendered. These people, however, pose as being a co-operative concern established in the interests of the sandalwood getter. What interest the getter could get out of a co-operative company of this sort, I fail to see. All that the getters were allotted were 200 odd shares, as against 10,700 held by the others who made up the company. From the time when tenders were called no member of the Government has taken up any other attitude than would be taken up with respect to any tender that might be called on behalf of any Government department. All along the line I have insisted that the tenders should be called, and opened by the officers

of the department; that they should be considered by the Government officials, who would make a recommendation on every point in connection with them. The files show conclusively that on no occasion have the Government issued any other direction to the officers than that setting out the policy. We have all seen the glaring advertisements in the papers and read of the bonuses the pullers are getting. These advertisements always appear when it is anticipated there will be a discussion in the House. Of course, this was not done to influence members. Stewart would claim that it was done in the interests of the sandalwood puller, and no one else. The Conservator of Forests recommended that we should have control to the extent of declaring that at least 5,000 tons shall be taken annually on a pro rata basis, to ensure regularity of employment to the getters. A maximum output was also laid down. It was also arranged that this pro rata allotment should be made on the basis of the trade done over a period of years by the firms remaining in the business. Without any directions whatever the Conservator adopted the period of 12 years. First of all he thought of five years, but then came to the conclusion that this was too short a period. The last five years have not been normal in the sandalwood trade. He then took ten years. This, however, covered the period of the war. This was before he had secured any figures regarding the trade. He finally decided to take the 12-year period, which covered two years before the war, the five years of war, and the five years of trade since the war. The last man to supply the trade figures was the man who has growled the most, namely, John Stewart. The others supplied the information without difficulty. Stewart, on behalf of the new firm, which came into existence largely with the object of securing a monopoly, then complained that their interests had not been properly attended to, and that more attention had been paid to other firms than his. He was so concerned about the equity of the matter that he claimed, because there were some 200 shares held by sandalwood pullers, he should have been given at least a minimum of 300 tons a month out of the 5,000 tons a year. This gentleman, therefore, wanted something in the nature of a monopoly, for he wanted 3,600 tons a year out of a minimum of 5,000 tons, leaving a miserable 1,400 tons for the other people who had been trading for years while Stewart was silent. This is the man who publishes so much about unfair and inequitable dealing. Some of the letters on the file disclose his impudence in connection with the matter. His attitude was tantamount to saying that the Conservator was a liar. He said that he or someone else connected with his firm discussed the matter in the Conservator's office. He claimed that the Conservator had said something which the Conservator denied. He then admitted that on one point he was not quite certain, but that he was quite certain on the other point. In view of his attitude we would have been

justified in saying we would not deal with him, that we could get sufficient from the cutter, and would not be humbugged by him any longer. If we had acted as a private concern we would have taken that course of action, and would have considered him no longer. Instead of doing that the Conservator discussed the matter with him, and put forward a definite recommendation for what he considered to be a fair distribution. There may be other means of dealing with this question, and I have tried to think them out. I could not at the moment see how it was possible, and I am doubtful about it now, whether this will operate successfully over a period of years. I am nervous as to whether it will not be found that so many inroads will be made in the method of trading that there will be some operations conducted under the lap. Some of the firms may go to the starving getters and compel them to take less than the regulations provide. I hope that whoever may be in charge of this business will insist that if there is any sharp practice of this sort the persons concerned shall be excluded from any further license. These people say they have plenty of money to carry on with. Let them carry on. They ought to be able to pay £25 a ton as they declared they could pay in their tender. For this period the market will be stabilised. A fair price to the puller will be guaranteed for his labour, and the State will get a fair return for the commodity that has in the past been going too cheaply. This comprises the whole of the regulations. Another question has arisen in regard to sandalwood oil. I have the greatest sympathy for the local distillers of oil for export. We ought to encourage the industry. Under this regulation we have adopted a method by which not only will the distillers get consideration, but the sandalwood puller will also get extra consideration beyond that which he has hitherto received. He will now pull the tree, roots and all, and, without more than disturbing the dirt from the roots, cut his tree as before, clean it and sell it for export purposes. The balance of the roots, without being cleaned, will be thrown into trucks, and for this he will receive about £14 a ton, less railage. This will work out at about £13 10s. a ton for roots for which previously the getter received very little. We shall then obtain an assured market for the roots. Indeed, I am afraid the supply may be insufficient for the distillers. We have made it a part of the license that for the purpose of oil distillation the merchants shall take the roots at the point at which we declare they shall be delivered. They shall only take a small amount to recoup them for the administration costs in the handling of the commodity, and they shall make no profit out of the roots used for distillation purposes. We are asking a paltry 5s. a ton royalty. We are also told that a certain amount of sandalwood will be required, that is the better part of the sandalwood, to make up the quantity necessary for oil

distillation within the State. We have decided that on that wood a royalty not exceeding £1 a ton shall be paid. Our whole idea is to get a fair return from the sandalwood sent out of the State to people who cannot get it elsewhere. Every action possible has been taken to protect the distillation industry. If we have failed in any point we are prepared to reconsider the matter, and to give that consideration to the industry to which it is entitled. We hope to be able to get the distillers to take a quantity each year from the North-West, so that the amount that is now taken from that source will continue to be taken. It has been said that the Government were not concerned about the interests of the cutter. The most serious complaint is on the part of the pullers in the North-West that the same provisions do not apply to them. They say, "Why should we be exempt? why should someone else be able to get wood for distillation purposes at £14 a ton, when we could get £25 if we exported?" As it happens, these people and the State will get the full advantage of the regulations. We have told the traders that these conditions shall prevail for five years, but the license will only be issued as from quarter to quarter, or some other short period. It is proposed to give this a trial for five years. If the trade takes the maximum output during that period, the State will receive £9 a ton royalty on the entire output. Our forests will not be depleted any faster than has been the case during the past two and a half years. The trade has been taking wood as rapidly as it could be handled in order to make big profits and to avoid what they knew would have to come eventually. Even if this is not all that members would wish, it is an effort in the direction of getting for the cutter and the State a fair return from that commodity which China must have. If it fails through the conditions prevailing, through traders not being able to compete, then the matter will have to be reconsidered. No definite period is allotted. If the project fails through other reasons, the whole scheme can be revised. But it is well that we should finalise this matter, and let the traders know how they will operate and the pullers know how they, too, will operate. Under the present proposal the State and the getter will be in an infinitely better position than was possible under the previous conditions.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [9.47]: I have listened attentively to the Minister, and I regret very much that a good deal of his statement consisted of abuse of the co-operative company.

The Minister for Mines: Have I not had abuse from them?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not matter.

The Minister for Mines: Doesn't it matter if I do not sit down under that sort of thing.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only one inference can be drawn from the Minister's statement,

and it is that those who are taking action in this matter of sandalwood are doing so in the interests of John Stewart.

The Minister for Mines: I take exception to that. I have never said such a thing, either by direct statement or by inference.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the Minister desire that the statement be withdrawn?

The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the member for North-East Fremantle withdraw the statement?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will withdraw it, but I can only say that that is the way the matter appears to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not have any reservation in his withdrawal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I withdraw the statement. Who or what the people are that have been opposing the Government's proposal has nothing to do with us. Whether they are a properly constituted company or not does not affect the question in the least. As for John Stewart, though he is in business at Fremantle, I have not spoken to him on the question of sandalwood since that question was brought up here some years ago by a former member for Kalgoorlie.

The Minister for Mines: I have not suggested it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But I want that clearly understood. I believe in open trading. I believe in all persons being placed on an equality as regards trading.

The Minister for Mines: We could not possibly do it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have to find out first that it cannot be done. The Minister has not yet shown that. The argument on this side of the House is that there should be protection of the getter in regard to price and protection of the State in regard to royalty. But no matter who wants to go into the business, every one must be placed on an equality. Under the regulations which have been made, however, that is a matter of impossibility. Therefore I am justified in lodging a protest against any persons being prohibited from carrying on any line of business here. With regard to certain matters placed on the file by John Stewart, the Minister said there was sufficient for the department to declare that they would take no further action so far as John Stewart was concerned, but would strike him out altogether. The Minister said further, "If we had been a private firm, it would have been done."

The Minister for Mines: What I said was, "If it had been a private concern, that would have been done."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That may be so, but I wish the Minister to realise the difference between a private concern and a public concern.

The Minister for Mines: I have done that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I want the Minister to realise that it is the duty of the Government to look after the rights of the whole of the citizens, and to see that every citizen receives that protection which the Government should extend to him. It is the Government's

duty to see that there shall not be preference to one citizen over another. The Government are not a private concern but a public concern, and a public concern cannot take such action as some of us would sometimes like to take regarding a public matter. We have to deal with this matter as it presents itself to us from a public point of view. It is a public right that all persons shall be on an equality. The Minister has stated how the allotment of trade was made. The Conservator of Forests first had difficulty in fixing a term of years. Originally he thought five years would be sufficient. After considering the matter further, he concluded that the five years had been abnormal in point of demand, that there had been a rush during those five years. Then he decided to take 10 years. But that brought him back into war time, when conditions were also abnormal. He could not, on the basis of the abnormal conditions of the war period, fix the right allotment to each person. Then the Conservator said, "I will take 12 years." Had he gone on longer he would, I suppose, have got back to the days of Adam.

The Premier: But people did not burn sandalwood then.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister also said that John Stewart had made a mistake. He said that John Stewart had found he had lost something through forming the co-operative company. The Minister said that the conditions which would have prevailed if John Stewart had not been in that company would have given the company a greater percentage. I do not know that that applies at all.

The Minister for Mines: Why should it not apply?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Two of the persons in the list have never been in the sandalwood business at all, except as servants of a company.

The Minister for Mines: By way of percentage of interest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then surely John Stewart had a percentage of interest in the trade he had done privately.

The Minister for Mines: But his individual interests have been reduced.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the percentage is given not to any individual but to a company. The whole quantity of sandalwood John Stewart had dealt in during the 12 years should conjointly have been taken into consideration.

The Minister for Mines: It has been.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister did not argue that way. The Minister said John Stewart found he had lost something through the formation of the company.

The Minister for Mines: But only as a partner.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If what the Minister now says is correct, and the whole of John Stewart's previous requirements were taken into consideration, he cannot have lost anything.

The Minister for Mines: He decided to join up his interest with a definite percentage of shares in a company. If he had continued

as an individual, as he was before, he would have done better.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But that is a very poor argument.

The Minister for Mines: It is true.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If I were going to join in a company with the Minister, and if I were doing a certain amount of trade, and the Minister took 500 shares and I took only 10 shares, and there were only 510 shares in the company altogether, and then if I had been doing a greater business previously than the Minister, though now finding it to my advantage to join with him, in such circumstances the whole of my requirements previously should be taken into consideration, and the allotment to me should not be on the basis of the shares.

The Minister for Mines: I am not arguing on those lines at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If that is the position, it shows that John Stewart has lost something by reason of the number of shares he took in the company. What should have been taken into consideration is not the number of his shares in the company, but the quantity of sandalwood he handled prior to the allotment, right through the past 12 years. With regard to the allotments which have been made, we now find that one firm have practically a monopoly; 62½ per cent. and 2½ per cent, or a total of 65 per cent.

The Minister for Mines: That is not fair.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I shall explain the matter. Those who were previously connected with the other firm have got 2½ per cent., which has been taken out of the 65 per cent. The firm, had they stood as they were, would have received 65 per cent. of the whole demand, so far as the Government intend to have sandalwood cut in the State. My opposition on this sandalwood question is due to the fact that the Government's proposal entirely does away with the right of private trading on the part of the general public, that it places a restriction on those engaged in the trade.

The Minister for Mines: We have to do that. You yourself have taken action against people desirous of establishing hotels in your district.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, you have. I have heard you say so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is not the point at all. The people of the district as a whole objected, in the general public interest, to having an hotel established in their midst. The action to which the Minister refers was taken by a large number of people.

The Minister for Mines: That does not alter the fact that it was taken.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know it was taken.

The Minister for Mines: Quite a number of hotels have been closed recently.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is true. A number of people have engaged in the

sandalwood trade, and as the years went by have withdrawn from it because they did not find it suitable or because they found it unprofitable. Their shipments might not have been of sufficient size to make the trade a profitable undertaking for them. But they all had the right to engage in the industry. While there is a public commodity open for trading to the people of Western Australia, every person should retain that right. I notice, further, that in these regulations the Minister has made a decided departure from what he told us previously regarding the methods to be adopted for the getting of sandalwood. Hon. members will recollect that the Minister previously informed us that he intended to retain the right of issuing permits to sandalwood getters.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He said he was going to see that the getters in the back areas would be properly protected, and permits would be issued to them through the Forests Department.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He emphasised that by saying that he intended to retain a certain percentage of sandalwood to be got by disabled miners, if necessary. What is the position as it stands to-day? The Minister, instead of giving the permit to the sandalwood getter, as has always been done, has issued a license to the sandalwood purchaser.

The Minister for Mines: Quite wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Apparently it was done under the conditions referring to sawmill permits under the Forests Act.

The Minister for Mines: We have not issued a permit with regard to sandalwood except in the North-West for distillation purposes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The sandalwood buyer has the license now, and has the full option of employing the getter.

The Minister for Mines: Not a full option.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is almost a full option. The position is very similar to the licenses granted to hewers for cutting sleepers. Those hewers are permitted to go on private property or Crown lands under licenses which permit them to cut sleepers. The conditions set up now are entirely different from the previous ones under which the getter received a license—

The Minister for Mines: He did not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And he was able to sell his sandalwood to anyone he liked. Now he cannot do so. He can sell only to the person for whom he is cutting.

Mr. Mann: Does that matter?

The Minister for Mines: There is no difference, as it affects the getter who has always been, and will still be, registered.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And they can only get the sandalwood for the person who is granted the license. In effect, the getters are

the employees of the person who has the license and who has been granted an area.

Mr. Mann: He is the contractor.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It can be put that way if the hon. member desires. The fact remains the getter can sell only to the person who holds a license for that particular area.

Mr. Mann: What difference does that make?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Formerly the getters could sell to Hector, to Stewart or to Paterson.

The Minister for Mines: What does it matter, so long as the getter receives his price?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a possibility of the purchaser condemning sandalwood that has been cut by the getter.

The Minister for Mines: Nothing of the kind. You have not read the regulations.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not care about the regulations. The fact remains that the purchaser will take sandalwood only in accordance with the requirements of the markets he has to supply. He will leave on the hands of the getter sandalwood that does not fulfil his requirements.

The Minister for Mines: He cannot do it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He can, if he gets the quantity he requires without it. The purchaser will impress upon the getter the quantity, the size and the quality he requires.

The Minister for Mines: We set out in the regulations what must be done. What you suggest would be sharp practice and the individual concerned would have to come forward for another license.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That cannot be described as sharp practice.

The Minister for Mines: The Conservator of Forests would decide what timber is marketable, not the purchaser.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That will not stand in law.

The Minister for Mines: It will, under the regulations.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No one will be able to compel the purchaser to take sandalwood other than such as he desires.

The Minister for Mines: It is wonderful how you can find difficulties that are not there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The getters will not have the same freedom of trade owing to the areas granted to certain individuals.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [10.5]: I do not know whether it has struck hon. members that sandalwood in its original state is a commodity possessing a pleasant perfume. Under treatment and conversion into sandalwood oil it becomes less savoury. So it has been with this debate which, as it proceeds, becomes less palatable. The Minister has dealt with the sandalwood business in its varied phases during the course of the debates on this question. The loss of revenue the State has suffered owing to the lack of control has been immense. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin)

has argued in favour of the decontrol of the industry. He urged that it should be thrown open, and he likened the industry to that relating to jarrah. In my opinion there is no analogy between the two sections of the timber industry. On the one hand, we have a commodity of great value in its raw state to one race only, the Chinese. Jarrah has a world-wide demand and a more or less fixed rate. It has been demonstrated that under effective control the value of sandalwood has been considerably enhanced. So much is that so that it is astounding how much revenue will accrue to the State and what remuneration will be gained by the workers. The position as set up in the motion which was agreed to by the House recently was one with which I was in accord.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss a matter the House has already dealt with and upon which it has expressed its opinion.

Mr. PICKERING: Cannot I make any comparisons?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member would not be in order.

Mr. PICKERING: It is difficult for me to explain my position.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot help that. The hon. member would not be in order in discussing an action of the House this session.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not desire to discuss any action of the House, but I wish to discuss my attitude on a motion we passed dealing with the sandalwood business.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already done that.

Mr. PICKERING: This subject is of such vital importance to the State that surely some reference should be made —

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no desire to prevent the hon. member from making his position clear. He may proceed.

Mr. PICKERING: I was in accord with the proposal recently before the House because I believed it afforded effective control. During the course of that debate a position was evolved somewhat identical with that with which we are confronted this evening. I refer to the regulations dealing with this commodity. What is most remarkable to me is that the Minister failed to become seized with the position as it arose from the debate or that, if he were seized with the position, he did not secure an adjournment of the debate to enable him to put forward the definite scheme he has submitted to-night. Had the Minister done that, members on the Government side of the House would have known where they stood. As it is, we are asked to follow the varying moods of various Ministers until we are at a loss to know what attitude to adopt. In view of the vital importance of the industry I feel my responsibility to the State. It is my endeavour to do what is right and honest in the interests of the people and of an industry which is of such great value to the State. I have given much consideration to this subject, and I was at one with the other members of the Forests Com-

mission—the late Mr. Peter O'Loghlen and the member for Perth (Mr. Mann)—in a realisation that some method of control of the sandalwood industry had to be adopted, some method that would give the State its proper return for the product and would secure an adequate return to the men engaged in the industry. We are now confronted with the fact that the decision the House arrived at formerly has been negated. The principle of one-man control of the monopoly has been relinquished by the Government, although they secured the passage of a favourable motion through this Chamber. Now we have another proposition changing the one-man monopoly to one vested in five or six different firms. The ultimate result of these regulations is to create a monopoly in the hands of five or six firms instead of one. Under the original proposal the Government had absolute control. I am afraid that the advent of a number of firms will increase the difficulty respecting control. In the past the position has been entirely unsatisfactory. During the debate we have had illustrations demonstrating that the life of the getter has been one of hardship and penury. Under the original proposition the getter was assured of adequate remuneration and that is a phase every hon. member is anxious to conserve to the utmost possible extent, apart altogether from the question of the royalty the State will secure from the business. Unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition, in moving that the regulations be disallowed, has not advanced any definite scheme as a solution of the problem. I fail to see how it would be possible, if we allowed a widespread traffic in this commodity, to secure proper control and assure to the getter adequate remuneration. If we have an indefinite traffic in the commodity, how can it be regulated, when we have a market with which we are unfamiliar, and a traffic that requires expert knowledge? The member for North-East Fremantle would make it as wide as the earth. When it comes to the disposal of sandalwood, it is essential that those handling it should be skilled in the business and familiar with the markets of the East. The exchanges vary so much in respect of the dollar that anyone not in touch with the Eastern markets could not effectively deal with the financial position. No scheme has been put up that could take the place of either of those submitted by the Government. I am at a loss to understand why the Leader of the Opposition should disapprove of the regulations, since they so widely meet the position he set forth during the first debate. I would have been glad if he had showed us how the industry could be controlled. I fail to see how we are to effectively control the trade except we have some such system as that proposed by the Government. As to the distillation, it is essential the State should take every precaution to conserve the supplies. According to the announcement made by the Minister to-night due regard has been paid to the industries concerned. The Minister definitely assured us that

adequate supplies will be forthcoming, that the cost to the merchant will be reasonable, and the royalty small. Nothing more can be done in that connection. Certain firms have gone to the trouble and expense of installing the necessary plant, and every precaution should be taken to ensure to those firms adequate supplies. I regret that the Government should have departed from their original attitude, but in view of the lack of definite plans to take the place of the scheme set forth by the Minister to-night, I can follow no other course than to oppose the motion.

Mr. CHESSON (Cue) [10.17]: I will support the motion because I believe in open trading in sandalwood. I am in accord with the price fixed, namely, £25 per ton, being £16 for the puller and £9 for the State. It is only right that the men working in the bush should be fairly remunerated, and certainly the State should get more than it has had in the past. It is proposed by the regulations that every person licensed to cut and remove sandalwood shall be subject to the payment of a royalty of £25, and that when the wood is delivered on the rails he is to have a rebate of £16 on all clean wood of fair average quality, the Conservator of Forests to be the judge. The licensee is to furnish to the Conservator of Forests on the first of each month true returns verified by statutory declaration and supplemented by railway vouchers. So every provision is made to see that the Government shall get royalty to the full amount. Anybody who pays 2s. 6d. and is registered as a timber worker is to be allowed to pull sandalwood. Under the regulations licenses are to be given to four persons or companies to purchase and dispose of the wood. It is optional with those four licensees to purchase the wood from whom they please. This, I am afraid, means that a large number of those at present pulling sandalwood will be squeezed out of the business. The minimum quantity is fixed at 5,000 tons on a monthly basis. If the licensees take their quota of wood from each district, it might mean that, instead of those at present in the industry selling their wood, others will come in and squeeze them out, for there is nothing to compel the four licensees to take their wood from those now in the industry. That is a serious objection to the proposal. I cannot understand why the Conservator of Forests should go back 12 years to fix the percentage. The files disclose that there has been ill-feeling between the co-operative companies and the Conservator. Why should the Conservator go back beyond five years? For him to go back 12 years is to give a decided advantage to John Paterson and Co.

Mr. Mann: You are wrong.

Mr. CHESSON: I can see no other reason why the Conservator should go back 12 years in order to allot the percentage. Provision is made that the licensees shall from time to time, as directed by the Conservator, take wood from prospectors, from persons withdrawn from the mines suffering from phthisis, and from returned soldiers. The quantity of wood

allotted to those men is 750 tons per annum. It is but a small percentage to give to prospectors, phthisical miners and returned soldiers. My objection to the regulations is based principally on the way the percentage has been allotted, and on the fact that the regulations place the cutters in the clutches of four persons or companies licensed to purchase the wood. A number of those now in the industry will certainly be displaced.

Mr. MANN (Perth) [10.27] I desire to put before the House a few figures in order to disabuse the impression in some minds that a larger percentage would have been given to John Stewart and Co. if the Conservator had gone back 20 years. During the period from 1905 to 1910, 46,000 tons of sandalwood was exported. Of that quantity, Bateman and Guthrie exported 22,000 tons, Paterson and Co. 22,000 tons, and only 2,000 tons was left for subdivision amongst all the others in the trade.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Who said that if the Conservator had gone back 20 years John Stewart and Co. would have got more?

Mr. MANN: The Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: I think I said 15 years.

Mr. MANN: I am dealing with the period 1905 to 1910. If the Conservator had gone back to that time, John Stewart and Co. would have had but a very small percentage. John Stewart practically dropped out of the trade in April, 1915, and entered into an agreement that on a basis of 6,000 tons per annum exported, his share was to be 400 tons; and that was sold and controlled by another company.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Everybody had to make a start.

Mr. MANN: I only wish to show that he has had a very fair deal. It was suggested that had different dates been selected by the Conservator of Forests, John Stewart's company would have received a bigger percentage of the business. Had other dates been selected he would have got a lower percentage. From 1915 to 1919 his proportion of the business was 400 tons out of 6,000 tons per annum. Had five years been taken, he would have received a smaller percentage than that allotted to him. When the Conservator was allocating the percentage he gave Paterson & Co. and John Hector their percentage for the period, but he gave the other company the whole of the remaining trade, which included the business that had been done by people now out of the trade. Therefore John Stewart's company is getting the benefit of the proportion of trade previously done by other people. This shows that John Stewart's company has had a deal quite in keeping with, that to which he was entitled.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder—in reply) [10.32]: I would have allowed the motion to go to a vote without availing myself of the right of reply but for the remarks of the member for Perth (Mr. Mann). I am per-

fectly satisfied this House is tired of the question of sandalwood—

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, sick to death.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And that there is nothing fresh to be said on either side. The member for Perth entered into the debate on a former occasion in a somewhat dramatic way by presenting something new and original. He read a balance sheet with the object of discrediting one of the traders in the business.

The Minister for Mines: You have discredited Paterson & Co. as much as you could.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I did not read any balance sheets. If anyone will peruse the "Hansard" report of my speech in moving this motion, he will find scarcely six consecutive lines without interruptions, and I hope the Minister will not now endeavour to make a second speech by way of interjection.

The Minister for Mines: If it is necessary, I shall.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have the right to a hearing, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not permit the Minister to make a second speech by way of interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not anticipate that. I shall see that he gets a fair hearing.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The manner in which my previous speech was punctuated by interjections from all quarters was no credit to the House, and I hope on this occasion I shall be permitted to have my say without undue interruption from the Minister. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) on the previous occasion produced something new—a balance sheet obtained from no one knows where, something that no one else in the House knew existed. The hon. member read it with the object of discrediting my side of the House.

Mr. Mann: That is incorrect.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member read the balance sheet in order to show that one of the traders, who is now going to participate in this business, was not a genuine trader, but was merely an agent for Chinese. He backed up his statement by saying, "Those are the people the Opposition are fighting for—John Hector, an agent of Chinese." Now the hon. member, with equal facility, can turn round and put himself in a position to fight for this agent of the Chinese. To discredit the arguments from this side of the House, the Chinese balance sheet was read. The hon. member, in order to defeat the motion, inferred that we were fighting for the Chinese, but to-night he has not one word to say about Mr. Hector. He has not a Chinese balance sheet at his disposal to-night. He has given us no information as to why this agent of the Chinese should be permitted to participate in the sandalwood business in future. The hon. member has come along and sprung another document upon us. I do not know where he gets these mysterious documents. Instinct, I suppose, enables him to discover secrets and

other things unknown to the ordinary man. The hon. member has presented another document to prove that if a different period of years had been taken, the distribution would have been less favourable to John Stewart. I would like to know where the hon. member obtained that document. I do not know whether he obtained it from the Conservator of Forests, but he is certainly in possession of information enabling him to show the tonnage of sandalwood exported over a period of years, even so far back as 15 or 20 years. That information is not in the tabled files. The Minister, in tabling the files, said they were complete with that exception.

The Minister for Mines: I know nothing about those figures.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not saying the Minister knows anything about them. The files were complete with the exception of the figures of tonnages exported by the different traders. It was considered undesirable to disclose the affairs of the traders concerned.

The Minister for Mines: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But the member for Perth has been able to get somewhere information that other members were unable to get.

The Minister for Mines: He did not get it off the files.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not know where he obtained the figures. For myself I refuse to believe them. I do not accept them at all; they are not worth "tuppence." I do not know of any public document from which he could obtain them, because, when the department decided to apportion the business as they have done, I believe they asked the various traders to supply the information.

The Minister for Mines: For 12 years only.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Evidently the department were not in possession of the information. If they had had it officially, there would have been no need to ask the traders to supply it. If the department were not in possession of the information, I do not know where the hon. member could have got it. I suppose he could get it from any particular trader that cared to supply it, but I am confident that all the traders have not supplied him with their figures. Yet at the last moment he reads the document to prove that black is white. I refuse to accept it as authentic. I consider it is not worth the paper it is written on.

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is how convictions are obtained.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I think it is a document concocted for this evening, just as the Chinese balance sheet was dug up for the vote on the previous occasion. What has the hon. member done with the Chinese balance sheet? Where has he deposited it? Has he now decided to embrace John Hector, a Chinese agent? He is willing now that this man, who for long years, according

to his statement, has been merely a tool of the Chinese trading in this business, shall participate to the extent of 10 per cent. of the total output. There is the inconsistency of the hon. member! What is the value of the arguments put before us by one who can take up such an attitude as he has during the past few weeks? What is the value of any statements he may advance, or any documents he may read to the House? The Minister did not touch the question at all. To change the phraseology of the newspapers who refer to his "usual vigorous style," I would say that the Minister, in his characteristically clever style, waltzed all round the question, side-stepped it, and evaded the real points. He claimed that this was not a true co-operative company. It may have none of the principles of true co-operation—but I am not concerned about that. Like the flowers that bloom in the spring, it has nothing to do with the case. How the shares were allotted, and how the 200 odd shares were paid for by the getters, has nothing to do with the real issue. We get back to the position we on this side of the House have maintained from the inception of this business. The protest against the policy first adopted by the Government, but which has now been changed, has been going forth from the very hour when the announcement was made of the Government policy. We have not shifted our ground one inch. The Government have entirely somersaulted and right-about-faced. The Minister was emphatic in declaring that the industry could be handled only in one way. He was backed up by the Leader of the Official Country Party—on that occasion he was not the official Leader—when he said he was convinced this was the only way to handle it. He now says the only way we can handle it is the other way, which is not the way he believed it could be handled a fortnight ago.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Is not that the usual Country Party attitude?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like to see the new party start off well.

Mr. Johnston: He is not speaking for the party in this matter.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should like to see it exhibit some degree of consistency.

Mr. Corboy: There are only two members of it here.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Black was right a few weeks ago, and to-day white is right. The Government have departed from their original policy, although they had a majority in this House supporting them. They now say they have discovered this can be done in another way. This only occurred to the Minister at the last moment because of the suggestion of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum).

Mr. McCallum: I did not make it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is attributed to him. It was only at the last moment that

someone else suggested this other way out. The Minister then sat up and began to take notice, although he had studied the question at the University for some weeks. He now says, "I told the House it could only be done in one way. Possibly I misled the House although the majority believed me. I now find it can be done in another way." The Conservator first thinks of five years, and then of 10 years. I do not know why he did not then take another five years, but he only took two. He went on to 12 years. If that was the line of reasoning running in the mind of the Conservator, one would have thought he would have taken another five-year period, namely five years before the war, five years of war, and five years subsequent to it, making a total of 15 years. I do not know why "two" entered his mind after he reached the sum of 10, but he had a brain wave and said, "I am going too fast; if I keep on multiplying by five each time I consider the question, I shall be going right back to the last century." When, therefore, he reached 10 years he added only two more, and that was how we are told it occurred. There has been a pretty mess over this matter for some months. We are told that only those who had trading interests in past years were to be allowed to trade. Burrige and Warren, however, who have never traded, have been apportioned a small part of the business, because of their former or present interest in Paterson & Coy. If that is so, why is this agent of the Chinese, who on the statement of the member for Perth (Mr. Mann), which was applauded all round the House, and met with general endorsement, permitted to have 10 per cent. of the business? Why not cut out that subtle Chinese influence referred to by the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering)? There was something in that statement; the subtle influence of the Chinese is not entirely wiped out. The man who has been a Chinese agent for many years is still in the trade.

Mr. Pickering: Perhaps that is where the figures come from.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If an agent of the Chinese is to remain in the trade, why not allow the Chinese themselves, for they were genuine traders in former years? Mr. Hector was not trading for himself but was acting only for Chinese, according to the famous balance sheet read out to the House. I have done with the matter, and I hope the House has done with it for some time. Subject to the royalty, that is now fixed, and the price to the getter, which the Government have fixed, and with which I agree, every citizen shall have the right to trade freely in the natural products of the State. There should be no monopoly to anybody. The talk of stabilising the industry is all moonshine. The industry will stabilise itself over a number of years—not from year to year, I admit, but over a period of years, say, five or six, just according as demand is made for sandalwood in the countries in which it is sold. We have a right to say to these four persons, "You can continue in the sandalwood trade, but any

other citizen who contributes to the taxes of the country and conforms to its laws will have the right, if he so desires, to enter into the business as well as those who have engaged in it in former years, and as well as the individual who has merely been an agent for Chinese."

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

Ayes	17
Noes	22

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Corboy
Mr. Lutey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Carter	Mr. Piesse
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.