

almost exclusively. to land which had been surveyed before selection. It said that a surveyor could not have an interest in any land which he had surveyed. That would not prevent Mr. Riches, for instance, taking up land which he had not surveyed. Pastoral country was only surveyed after it had been applied for, and sometimes a long time afterwards. If the clause meant anything it meant that a surveyor could not take up land on the survey of which he had been employed, and if a block of land was surveyed before selection he could not acquire an interest in it. The clause, therefore was worth retaining because a surveyor would undoubtedly have the opportunity which would be superior to that of anyone else in the State of selecting a block of land in a particular area. In surveying it he could survey a block just to suit himself. Surveyors, he admitted were a worthy body of men who were entitled to every privilege of citizenship.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21, 22, 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Board may sue and be sued :

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was his desire to get a little more information about this clause and the following clause. His desire was to know, if a surveyor who considered that he had been harshly treated by the board by having his name erased from the register, proceeded to litigation to recover his rights, what position would the board be in with regard to funds? Where were the funds to come from? He had listened to the remarks of the Minister when introducing the measure, but it had not been made clear what funds were likely to be possessed by the board and where they were to come from.

The PREMIER: The board would not have any funds. The fees for registration would be paid into the Consolidated Revenue, and in the event of an action the Government would consider whether they would be justified in asking the assistance of the Crown Law Authorities to defend or prosecute as the case might be.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 30—agreed to.

First Schedule:—

The PREMIER moved an amendment that in the third column, after "17," the words, "and in Section 166 the words 'and the survey shall be performed in all other respects as therein directed, and the map shall be declared to be accurate by a statutory declaration, in the form of Schedule 27 of this Act, of a licensed surveyor.' be inserted.

Schedule 27."

The amendment would provide for the declaration the Leader of the Opposition referred to the other night.

Amendment passed: the schedule as amended agreed to.

Second and third Schedules—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 9th September, 1909.

	PAGE
Papers presented	252
Questions: Furniture for Government Institutions	252
Abattoirs at Kalgoorlie	252
State Batteries, Erection	252
Miners' Phthisis at Day Dawn	252
Goat Straying Nuisance	252
Companies Act Administration	252
Mining Development, Expenditure	252
Return: Machinery Permits	253
Bills: Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 1R.	253
Mining Development Act Amendment, 1R.	253
Licensed Surveyors, Recommittal	253
Sea Carriage of Goods, Com.	253
Abattoirs, 2R.	255
Opium Smoking Prohibition, 2R.	260
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, 2R.	262
Vaccination Act Amendment, Com.	268
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	268
Redemption of Annuities, 2R.	268
Public Education Endowment, 2R.	269
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Com.	270
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2R.	275
postponed	275
Motion: Immigration system, to inquire	275

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Goldfields Water Supply Administration—Annual Report, 1908-09.

By the Premier: By-laws of the Midland Junction Municipality.

QUESTION — FURNITURE FOR GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. GILL asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to call for tenders this year for the supply of furniture required in Government offices, schools, and other institutions? 2, If not, by what means will the required furniture be procured?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Tenders have already been called for portion of the requirements and further tenders will be called next week. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—ABATTOIRS AT KALGOORLIE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How long did it take to construct the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie? 2, What date were they completed? 3, What was the cost of same? 4, What number of cattle and sheep have been slaughtered there up to date? 5, Under whose supervision? 6, What is the cost per head?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The building contract was let in October, 1907, and the building completed in May, 1908. The contract for machinery was let in September, 1908, and installed and tested in the beginning of May, 1909. 2, Building was completed and ready for use in May, 1909, 3, £13,900. 4, Ten bullocks at the beginning of May, 1909, to test the works. 5, The superintendent of abattoirs. 6, All killing was done by the master butchers themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR: Then it is not working?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

QUESTION—STATE BATTERIES, ERECTION.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Mines: Under which section of "The

Mining Development Act, 1902," was the £24,931 1s. 8d. expended on erection of State batteries?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: Section 19, Part IV.

QUESTION—MINERS' PHTHISIS AT DAY DAWN.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has he perused the report of Dr. Blanchard on the prevalence of miners' phthisis at Day Dawn? 2, If so, what action has been taken in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, Further investigations are being made by the Mines and Medical Departments.

QUESTION—GOAT STRAYING NUISANCE.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Works: 1, Does the existing Roads Act give sufficient power to roads boards to deal with the nuisance of predatory goats? 2, If not, will provision be made for granting such power in the new measure?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—COMPANIES ACT ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. ANGIN asked the Attorney General: 1, Is the Minister aware that Section 3 of "The Companies Amendment Act, 1897," is not complied with by several companies carrying on business in the State? 2, Will the Minister take any action required to enforce the provisions of the Companies Act if notified what companies are not complying with such Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, No. 2, The matter will be considered upon information being given as to the direction in which the section referred to is not being complied with.

QUESTION—MINING DEVELOPMENT, EXPENDITURE.

Mr. COLLIER asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What were the dates of appli-

cation for approval of the following expenditure under the Mining Development Act for the year ending 30th June, 1909:—Callion G.M. Coy., £1,000; Coolgardie Redemption G.M. Coy., £1,000; Jourdie Enterprise G.M. Syndicate, £1,000. 2. What were the dates of approval of the following:—Desdemona State battery erection, £1,637 8s. 10d.; Yerilla condenser, £162 16s. 4d.; Mt. Ida water supply boring, £218 9s. 11d.; Menzies cyanide plant erection, £1,237 18s. 11d.; Callion battery water supply, £215 10s. 5d.; Menzies slimes plant erection, £2,744 3s. 11d.; Desdemona battery water supply, £276 5s.; Siberia cyanide plant erection, £377 15s. 3d.; Mulwarrie cyanide plant erection, £88 4s. 10d.

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Callion Co.: application, 10th September, 1908; approval, 16th October, 1908; Coolgardie Redemption: first application, £750, 22nd April, 1908; approved, 20th May, 1908; second application, £250, 3rd March, 1909; approved, 9th March, 1909; Jourdie Enterprise: application, 3rd July, 1908; approved, 22nd August, 1908. 2, Desdemona State battery erection, 27th April, 1908; Yerilla condenser, 21st March, 1908; Mt. Ida water supply boring, 30th June, 1908; Menzies cyanide plant erection, 18th August, 1908; Callion battery water supply, 18th September, 1908; Menzies slimes plant erection, 15th December, 1908; Desdemona battery water supply, 4th December, 1908; Siberia new cyanide plant erection, 23rd February, 1909; Mulwarrie cyanide plant erection, 25th February, 1909.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1. Mines Regulation Act (1906) Amendment (introduced by Mr. Seadman).

2. Mining Development Act (1902) Amendment (introduced by Mr. Johnson).

RETURN—MACHINERY PERMITS.

On motion by Mr. Collier ordered: That a return be laid upon the Table

showing: 1, The number of permits granted to persons, enabling them to take charge of machinery, under "The Mines Regulation Act, 1906"; 2, To whom granted and for what purpose; 3, Date when granted and for what period.

BILL—LICENSED SURVEYORS.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Premier, Bill recommitted for amendment.

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

Clause 15—Existing licensed surveyors may apply to be registered:

The PREMIER: It was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition that this clause might inflict a hardship if the name of a surveyor was omitted from the register owing to his absence from the State, and the member for Kanowna had suggested that the period of notice should be extended to 12 months. He had accepted the suggestion and now moved as an amendment—

That in line 6 of Subclause 1 the word "seven" be struck out and "twelve" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

The PREMIER also moved:

That the following be added to Subclause 2:—"Provided that the board may register any such person after the expiration of the prescribed period on proof to the satisfaction of the board that the failure of such person to so apply was caused by inadvertence, the absence of such person from the State, or circumstances not under his control."

Amendment passed.

Bill reported with further amendments.

BILL—SEA CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Application of Act:

Mr. DRAPER: To make the Bill strictly upon the same lines as the Com-

monwealth Act a subclause should be added. The Commonwealth Act contained a provision that it should not come into operation on or before a certain date, so that the business world would have due notice of the provisions limiting the conditions of a bill of lading, and so as to prevent the Act applying to any bill of lading in existence or contemplated in pursuance of any existing contract. He, therefore, moved as an amendment—

That the following be added as a subclause—"Provided that this Act shall not apply to any bill of lading or document made before the thirty-first day of March, 1910."

He was guided by the principle of giving about three months' notice, realising that it was possible this Bill might not be assented to until some time in December.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's amendment could not be accepted. The Committee had already adopted Clause 2, which provided that the Act should commence on the 1st day of January, 1910, and the amendment would be a distinct contradiction to that clause, so far as he could understand from what the hon. member had said.

Mr. DRAPER: It would, perhaps, be better to move it as a new clause. He would do so.

Amendment withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5, 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Implied clauses in bills of lading:

Mr. BATH: Could the Attorney General furnish any information as to what would be the meaning of "manned" and "equipped?"

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member had dealt with this on the second reading, but his remarks probably rose from a misapprehension. The question of seaworthiness would in any case be a question of fact. All the Bill proposed was to prevent shipowners contracting themselves out of their legal liabilities, and any attempt to define seaworthiness in a measure of this kind would be entirely out of place, and would lead to a complication that would not

assist the shipowner or consignee in any degree.

Clause passed.

New clause:

Mr. DRAPER moved that the following be added as a new clause—

This Act shall not apply to any bill of lading or document made before the thirty-first day of March, 1910.

In anticipation of any possible objection he would point out that the same objection could have held when the Federal measure was passed. A clause providing that the Act should not apply to a certain thing did not contradict any clause providing that the Act should come into effect on a certain day, and it was only fair that notice should be given to the public of the coming into force of a law of this nature. It was reasonable that business men should have notice, because it would affect them in their trade, and it was fair to the general public because any contravention of the law would render persons liable to a penalty of £100. A criminal offence of a grave nature was imposed, and even without any precedent from the Federal Parliament the House should not lightly pass a measure without giving notice to the business people and to the public that if they did a certain thing they would render themselves liable to a penalty of £100.

Mr. Johnson: Do we not give that notice under Clause 2?

Mr. DRAPER: No; because a Bill was introduced it did not follow that all the provisions of the Bill would become law, and though it might be notice to the hon. member that the Bill would probably come into force from the 1st January, it was not a notice to the community until the Bill obtained the consent of the Governor. All Bills did not create criminal offences. Giving due notice was a principle which was followed by practically all Legislatures in Australia. If there was to be any interference with the established principles of commerce, or where there was to be an offence proposed, then it was only right and just that the operation of the law, so far as it imposed a penalty, should be restricted.

and should not commence until a date which was definitely fixed by the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The new clause could not be accepted. He had looked carefully through the Bill, and, in his opinion, it was directly at variance with Clause 2, which provided that the Act should come into force on the 1st January, 1910. The new clause virtually proposed that the Act should commence on the 1st April or the 31st March, 1910. The clause the hon. member was desirous of moving, perhaps if it had proposed to suspend only a part of the Bill, would have been admissible, but as it was submitted it would suspend the whole of the Bill, and he, therefore, could not accept it.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment: the report adopted.

BILL—ABATTOIRS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): The Bill which has been submitted by the Minister for Lands for the control of abattoirs, of which we have only one in existence at the present time, is in the nature of a tentative measure and, therefore, it is somewhat difficult to criticise. This is one of the propositions submitted as a means of solving what is known as the question or problem regarding the control of the meat supply by a combine or ring, and since the agitation was set on foot, and a Commission appointed to inquire into the position, we have been looking forward to the time when some redress would be given to us, in order to relieve consumers in Western Australia from the control of this ring. As far as the measure is concerned, the Minister for Lands claims for it that once these abattoirs are going in the various centres of population, it will afford a means for small stock producers to have their stock slaughtered at the various establishments and, therefore, it will be possible to carry on the abattoirs free from the control of a meat ring. But the Minister for Lands must remember this in his appeal to the producers who have stock to sell, that a combine has the best means of assuming

control, because they can come in and take part in the swim, as it were, and secure a higher price for their stock than they would do if they stood outside. While, of course, I hope that the Minister's anticipations will be realised in this respect, I am not so hopeful that the establishment of the abattoirs will solve the difficulty. I think it will be necessary to take more drastic action than that; we will have to either extend the laws or else pursue the combines in such a way that they will find it unprofitable to carry on their operations at least in Western Australia. The Bill is framed for the purpose of controlling the Government abattoirs which are to be established, and there is no provision in it to deal with private abattoirs which are already in existence.

The Minister for Lands: They are under the Health Act.

Mr. BATH: That is a point I want to bring under the notice of the Minister. If we pass this measure we will have two different authorities in control. We provide in the measure before the House, that a staff shall be constituted to control our abattoirs, that is, the Government abattoirs, and as far as private abattoirs are concerned they will remain under the control of the health authorities.

Mr. Jacoby: Clause 7 provides for the avoidance of existing licenses.

Mr. BATH: Even then, as far as the State is concerned, we will have two authorities exercising control over what is one matter, that is the slaughter of beasts for human consumption. I think, both on the score of economy in administration and also on the score of effectiveness, it is essential that we should have one authority controlling the abattoirs and not two, and I would suggest, therefore, that the Minister for Lands should amend the Bill in that direction. If it is considered advisable to constitute a separate administration to control these abattoirs, the Bill should bring private abattoirs, in a district where Government institutions are not in existence, under the same control. Personally, I think it is essentially a matter for the public health authorities, and I fail

to see the necessity for the additional expense that will be involved in constituting an authority as proposed in the Bill. We have another provision which gives to the local authority, or two or more local authorities acting conjointly, power to assume the control of abattoirs erected by the Government in any district, if the Government consider it advisable to hand them over. I would suggest that the Bill should go further. I think there are districts in Western Australia eminently fitted for municipal control. In these matters I like local control, especially where it is a matter affecting a district and not the State generally. I believe in having local government, and bringing the control of affairs as close to the people as we possibly can, and I would therefore suggest not only to give the power to take over abattoirs which may be erected by the Government, but where they have sufficient enterprise and sufficient civic pride to erect abattoirs for themselves, that in the Bill we should give them authority to do so, and control them municipally. The Minister will probably be aware that in Broken Hill, for instance, the municipality there has established abattoirs and is conducting them very successfully; in fact, I heard a comparison made the other day between the institution at Broken Hill and the one erected by the Government in Kalgoorlie and Boulder, very much to the disadvantage of the latter. Personally I am not able to speak, because I have not sufficient knowledge of the question to venture an opinion which would carry any weight, but I think if we have municipalities which are showing enterprise and ability in other directions, such as providing electric light, the control of abattoirs might well be entrusted to them. Under these circumstances I suggest that the Minister should accept such an amendment when the Bill is being discussed in Committee.

Mr. JACOBY (Swan): I, like the previous speaker, would prefer to see the Bill framed in such a manner as to give power to local authorities to provide these abattoirs. I am sure the local authorities would manage them much more cheaply than the Government. A move-

ment is on foot to establish somewhere in the metropolitan area, probably at Midland Junction, abattoirs for the supply of meat for the metropolitan area, and it would be far better if power were given to the local authorities in this area to combine for the establishment of such abattoirs. I do not know that abattoirs are likely to be established in Western Australia for many years to come other than in the metropolitan area, and it would be better to provide in the Bill, or somewhere, for such establishments to be undertaken by the local authorities concerned, acting either separately or combining for the purpose. I see that there is provision made that abattoirs may be placed under the control of local authorities, but I would like to see the local authority undertake the whole scheme.

Mr. Bolton: And then you would never get them. The matter has been in the air too long.

Mr. JACOBY: I think not. It would be better to give the power to the local governing bodies to build their own abattoirs, and I feel, under the circumstances, we would have less friction and trouble. It is purely a matter for the local authorities, and why should the Government come in and erect these works. The question of controlling the meat supply is purely a matter for the local governing bodies. Rather than not have some provision for the establishment of these institutions, however, I will vote for the second reading, but I would prefer a simpler measure, vesting full power in local governing bodies.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I rise to support the second reading of the Bill because I realise that the passage of the measure is absolutely necessary, in order to permit the Government to use the abattoirs which have been erected for some time in Kalgoorlie. I regret that the Bill was not introduced earlier to permit the Government to use those works long ago. We have to realise that we have been paying interest and sinking fund on £13,000, and that those works have been completed for some two years.

The Minister for Lands: Oh! no; only three months.

Mr. JOHNSON: Well, they should have been completed two years ago. It is some considerable time since I visited the works, and they were supposed to be completed then. Even so, too much time has been wasted in the erection of these works. Further, none will deny this fact, that the works have been standing there too long in idleness. Members will welcome the Bill, for it will give us the opportunity to get revenue from these State works. I have also to express my regret that I cannot agree with the Minister when he says the works are equipped second to none in Australia. I am not in a position to say there is not very good machinery in operation: but the way in which that machinery was erected and placed does not reflect credit upon the engineer responsible. The Minister, I think, will agree that when the workings were visited recently for the object of witnessing a trial, and when 10 bullocks were slaughtered, it was ascertained that it would be absolutely impossible to work the particular machinery, or to use the works at a pace, so as to enable them to slaughter enough cattle to keep the people of the Eastern Goldfields going in meat. It was found necessary to alter the works, and perhaps that is why the Minister now says that they have only just been completed. They were completed a considerable time ago, but they were not put into operation until quite recently, and when the test was made it was found they were unsuitable, and alterations had to be made. This is to be regretted, but we trust that those alterations will be final, and that the works will be utilised without further capital expenditure. I desire to express regret also that abattoirs have not been erected in other parts of Western Australia, for, as the Minister says, the only possible chance the producer has to get to the consumer without the intervention of the middleman is by having abattoirs placed at his disposal in the various centres.

Mr. Collier: Where would you suggest?

Mr. JOHNSON: I could suggest many places; but I am not here to-day to advocate any particular place, only to express regret that the people of Western

Australia are labouring under the disability of having to pay more per pound for their meat than is necessary considering the price received by the producer. The extra cost to the consumer is caused by the fact that the producer has not the opportunity of slaughtering his stock or dealing with the small butcher so that the latter can compete with the large butchers now having practically a monopoly. It is often said there is no monopoly; but there is no denying that after the evidence placed before the Commission that inquired into this question. It was then clearly demonstrated that a monopoly existed. We find, however, that while this monopoly was bad then, it has grown stronger since the Commission started. In other words, that Commission, instead of improving the condition of affairs from the consumers and the producers' point of view, has made the position absolutely worse, inasmuch as the wholesale butchers, or the meat ring as they are commonly called, have been able to decrease the price of meat to the producer. They pay him much less now than they did 12 months ago; but still the price to the consumer is exactly the same.

Mr. Daglish: Not out our way, for the price of meat is now less than it ever has been.

Mr. Ware: The reduction has happened only within the last few days.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am not aware of a reduction having occurred during the last few days; but I know from enquiries I made recently that the price was exactly the same as it was 12 months ago. I also know from enquiries I made in the North-West that the producers are receiving less for their stock than they did at this time last year, or even earlier in the year. The position is worse than ever, for while the price to the producer is less, that to the consumer is the same. This applies more particularly to the trade in lambs. There is quite a number of producers to-day who cannot get a quote for their lambs. They have lambs ready for the market, but cannot sell them, and yet the general public are

crying out for that meat. I speak of lambs more particularly as the trade affects the little man, the small farmer who has a few lambs fit for market. But the position now is that he cannot get those lambs to the market. He is told that he must keep them, as the wholesale butchers are not prepared to purchase. If we had abattoirs it would be possible for these producers to have their lambs slaughtered and put on the market direct for the consumer to deal with. As a matter of fact this was done last year in connection with the local markets, but it was done in such a manner that the result was not to reduce the price to the consumer to any extent, nor did it bring great profit to the producer. The procedure was so cumbersome that it was difficult for the parties to operate properly. With abattoirs these difficulties would be overcome and a distinct advantage would result both to the consumer and the producer, both of whom are at present suffering owing to the work of the combine.

Mr. Jacoby: There were no cumbersome methods adopted last year in connection with the markets.

Mr. JOHNSON: I can only speak from what I have heard from producers who have outlined to me the difficulties that existed.

Mr. Jacoby: The difficulty was to find the buyers.

Mr. JOHNSON: I understand that the buyers last year were so numerous that the wholesale butchers started to put lambs into the market themselves. I was told definitely that this was done.

Mr. Jacoby: Make inquiries from the markets and you will get the correct information.

Mr. JOHNSON: I heard this from the producers who dealt with the markets. I may have been given incorrect information; but that does not alter the fact that dealing with the local markets entails the killing of the lambs on the farms, or in some particular centre by private enterprise. Considering that all the slaughter yards are owned by the firms working in the combination, it is some-

what difficult for a man to get his stock slaughtered. The only way is to slaughter on the farms and send the meat up to town in bags. It is then sold at the markets, mostly as half-lambs. Members will realise that a difficulty was experienced in connection with killing on the farm and keeping the meat until it was sent to the consumers. This difficulty would be obviated if we had abattoirs in the different centres, and it is only to urge the Minister to do this that I bring these matters before members. I do not oppose the Bill, as it is absolutely necessary in connection with the abattoirs already erected, and for others that may be erected, I trust, in the very near future. Reference has been made to the fact that under the Bill, so far as I can read it, and others can read it, the Government reserve to themselves the right to erect and establish abattoirs and then desire to obtain power under the Bill to lease them to local authorities. I, with the Leader of the Opposition, believe that this is essentially an undertaking that should be municipalised, and with the object of endeavouring to bring this about I have already given the Clerk an amendment I proposed to move to Clause 4 in order to provide that the Minister can transfer the right conferred on the Government to any local authority. This must be done by the Governor-in-Council. That would provide an incentive to local authorities to enter into the work of erecting abattoirs for their particular districts. I trust when we reach the Committee stage the Minister will not raise any opposition to that amendment, because it may be necessary that this power should exist at an early date and therefore it is just as well that the provision should be inserted in the Bill. The amendment does not suggest that the municipal authorities will have the right to erect abattoirs, but will have the right to obtain authority from the Governor-in-Council in the direction indicated. If that is added the Bill will be more acceptable to me, and I trust the Minister will agree to the amendment. I have very much pleasure in supporting the second reading. -

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I desire to support the second reading, largely for reasons already given and which therefore it is unnecessary for me to repeat. At the same time I cannot understand the desire of members to hand over to the municipal bodies or boards everything which has not been taken from this Parliament by the Federal authorities. It seems to me that the municipal councils, the local authorities, have already had opportunities of undertaking this work and not one of them has indicated any desire to do so. Not one of them has approached this House asking for authority to raise money for the work. Specific authority would be necessary in addition to the general authority given in the Municipal Act. While there has been persistent and continued public complaint as to the non-existence of public abattoirs in the metropolitan area, no public body has made an endeavour to meet the complaint. It is therefore rather absurd that we should be told this work should be left to the local bodies who have shown an utter lack of interest in the question.

Mr. Bolton: It is lack of funds.

Mr. DAGLISH: The local bodies have never asked for authority from Parliament to borrow funds for the purpose. The borrowing power would doubtless have been conferred by Parliament if sought. The powers the member for Guildford wishes to give municipal bodies are, I think, already contained in Clause 11 of the measure.

Mr. Johnson: That is only for the control and management, not for the erection and establishment.

Mr. DAGLISH: It would be dangerous for the Government to give powers to the municipal bodies larger than are at present given by the Municipal Act. Specific power could be given at any time to a municipality. These local bodies already have certain borrowing powers, and Parliament should, in the interest of the ratepayers, see that those borrowing powers are not too great, and they should exercise control over the expenditure of borrowed money by the various borrowing bodies. No attempt

has been made either in the metropolitan area or in any place in the State to establish abattoirs and the Minister who introduced the Bill could tell us if he liked from his own experience at Northam how necessary it is that these public slaughter houses should be provided. At Northam where there is a large quantity of stock raised by the local growers, the need undoubtedly exists. The growers of that district, as well as those in other parts of the State, are in the hands of the large wholesale butchers and slaughterers. The powers conferred by this Bill are needed throughout the State, and I hope they will be availed of, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in all the large centres. I am willing to agree to local municipal control—

Mr. Bolton: After erection?

Mr. DAGLISH: Yes, after erection; but also with proper superintendence by a Government officer who shall be virtually in charge of all the abattoirs that may be erected throughout the State. Above all things we want scientific control and scientific management of these places, and I do not think that can be got without a thorough superintendence over any establishment that may be managed locally for local purposes. I congratulate the Minister on having introduced this Bill, and trust that it will early be given practical effect to, particularly in the metropolitan districts.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): In view of some of the statements made I would like to explain that this Bill is altogether additional to the Health Bill, which will simply exercise control over the work. The work will be subject to the usual inspection. It would be expensive if it were not so, because we only propose to control where public abattoirs are established. Fear has been expressed that under this Bill it will be necessary for the Government to erect the works. I think it will be found that under Clause 4 the power is given to allow a municipality to erect works. However, before the Bill goes into Committee I shall discuss this with the Attorney General, in order that I may be able to inform the House definitely on the

point. I entirely agree with those hon. members who say that the erection of abattoirs is a municipal duty. I consider that the larger municipalities should immediately concern themselves with this work, for it seems to me that the health of the people is of quite sufficient importance to justify the municipalities in expending money in this direction. The hon. member for Guildford said that these works had been tested and found wanting. All I can say is that these works are not experimental; they are based upon the Queensland methods of killing, which are the most satisfactory to be found almost anywhere in the world. We follow these methods and it will be proved that these works will act satisfactorily. We have had a test, the results of which were eminently satisfactory. I do not know that there is anything more to be said in connection with this matter beyond asking hon. members who may desire to move any amendments that they should make use of the Notice Paper. It is a little embarrassing to be faced with amendments practically without notice. However, if members will put their proposed amendments on the Notice Paper I will be glad to consider them. In respect to the Bill I may say that all I wish to do is to help the people of the State, whether they be producers or consumers.

Mr. Angwin: Last session a member of the Ministry took advantage of amendments being put on the Notice Paper.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Well that charge cannot be laid at my door. All I desire to do is to make the Bill as perfect as possible. It is, I think, a step in the right direction, and when we have finished with it in Committee I fancy it will work satisfactorily indeed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—OPIMUM SMOKING PROHIBITION.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: If hon. members will look at

the Bill they will see that it is not what we may call a comprehensive measure, and will probably find that it is not a controversial measure. Its object is a very simple one: it is to prevent the smoking of opium in Western Australia, and the Bill provides means in order to make that prevention effective. Legislation of this kind has been in force in the eastern part of Australia for some years past. This Bill is substantially a copy of the Victorian Act, an Act which has also been adopted in Tasmania, while I may say very similar provisions are to be found in the Police Offences Act of New South Wales and also in the Queensland legislation.

Mr. Walker: Has legislation stopped opium smoking there?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I cannot say: I am not informed on that point, but the possibility is that in those States opium smoking had perhaps obtained a stronger footing than it has yet obtained in Western Australia. I am not sufficiently informed as to whether opium smoking is very largely practised in Western Australia, and I may say that the introduction of this Bill is mainly due to a request by the Commonwealth Government, who no doubt think that it will assist them materially in preventing the importation of opium for smoking purposes, if they have these provisions making it almost impossible to deal in opium for the purpose of smoking, supposing the Act to be strictly administered. The Bill provides that no person shall deal in or manufacture opium in a form suitable for smoking; nor shall any person have opium in that form in his possession. And the Bill further says that no person shall have opium in any form in his possession without a permit from the Colonial Secretary; and if there be any reason to suspend that permit or to withdraw it, it may be suspended or withdrawn at any time. The purpose of allowing opium to be sold under certain very restricted conditions is, of course, to allow it to be obtained for medicinal purposes. For some purposes opium is a valuable drug, and it would not be advisable—indeed if I suggested such a thing I am sure it would not be sanctioned by

the House—to pass a Bill to prevent opium from being used for medicinal purposes. If hon. members will look at Clauses 6 and 7 of the Bill they will find provision made for allowing opium to be sold, under necessary precautions, for this purely legitimate purpose, notwithstanding which the Bill is sufficiently strict to prevent, or at least to make it an exceedingly difficult matter for persons to have opium in their possession for smoking. If it be argued that there is but very little opium smoking practised in this State, I cannot but think that that may be regarded as an additional reason why we should pass the Bill. I do not suppose a single member of the House is prepared to defend the practice, and I doubt if there be a single member who is not aware of the terrible nature of that vice if it obtain a hold over a person. So, on the principle of locking the stable door before the steed is stolen, and on the principle of prevention being better than cure, I confidently recommend the Bill to the favourable consideration of hon. members. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): As far as the prohibitive measures which are contained in this Bill are concerned no one can make any complaint about their brevity. But while it may be a very easy thing for the House to enact that no person shall smoke opium, or sell, or deal, or traffic in it, I think it is likely to be found by those who take on the work that it will be a much more difficult task to administer such enactment. The evidences brought forward from time to time with regard to the importation of opium, notwithstanding the very strict searches exercised by the Commonwealth authorities to prevent that importation, gives one the impression that there are those who are clever enough to elude the vigilance of the Customs officials, and are able to provide a supply of opium for those to whom it has become an indispensable drug. I have no intention of opposing this legislation which will by State enactment, and by penal measures on the part of this State, assist the Commonwealth

authorities in stamping out the use of the drug for smoking purposes. But it seems to me we will never be able to deal effectively with it until we take more drastic measures. We know that those who are chiefly instrumental not only in importing it, but also in providing it for their own compatriots and for those Europeans addicted to its use, are the Chinese residents in Australia, probably in collusion with Chinese outside of Australia; and in my opinion we ought to take power in this Bill whereby after any Chinese has been convicted of importing the drug against the Commonwealth laws and of providing it for smoking purposes against this law, we should be entitled to provide for the deportation from the State of the men so convicted. And it will only be by rooting out these men and sending them from the Commonwealth that we shall root out the use of opium and effectively assist the Commonwealth in suppressing the practice. I would suggest, therefore, to the Attorney General that he should draft an amendment providing for the deportation of those who come within the scope of this measure.

The Premier: Is not that a matter for the Commonwealth?

Mr. BATH: I think not; not so far as this State is concerned.

The Premier: But it would come under the Minister for External Affairs.

Mr. BATH: We have a precedent in the fact that Canada and the United States and other countries take authority to themselves—

The Premier: Yes, the Commonwealth could take it, but I do not think the State could.

Mr. BATH: Well, these countries I have mentioned take authority to themselves to deport criminals; and whether it be a State or a Federal matter, whichever has the proper authority should take that power to themselves and act upon it. In my opinion, it is the only way to deal effectively with the question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I am convinced that all the opium brought into Western Australia is brought in by those black-labour boats that come down the North-West coast: and one of the best possible ways of preventing

the use of opium in Western Australia is to prevent those black-labour boats trading on our coasts. When it comes to a question of whether this is State or Federal business, let me say that those boats were allowed to trade on this coast as a concession to Western Australia; and if this Parliament was to protest against these boats being allowed to carry Asiatic labour I am certain they would be stopped in a few weeks by the Federal Parliament; because it was at the special request, I think, of Sir John Forrest, and the members for Fremantle, and Dalgety and Co., and others that these boats were allowed by the Federal Parliament to trade on this coast. A protest from this Parliament to the Federal Parliament would prevent their running; and once we prevented the use of black-labour on these boats trading along the coast we would, to a great extent, prevent the importation of opium. I have studied the question to a certain extent, and I am positive that there is no possible chance of securing customs officers with sufficient intelligence to cope with the cunning of the Chinese who trade on these boats. I know that shearers and other men working in the North-West have had offers made to them to bring opium ashore, and I am confident there are some white men who are in league with the Chinese sailors on these boats and bring opium ashore regularly. A shearer coming down the coast can get off at any port and go ashore and carry his swag without being questioned by the customs officer, and inside his swag he can carry a hundredweight of opium. A thoroughly reliable man told me that a Chinaman came to him on one of these boats and made him an offer to take opium ashore. The Chinaman said, "You have bicycle, water-bag. You put opium in water-bag, take it ashore; take covers off bicycle, and put opium in tubes and take bicycle along jetty; no trouble." The customs officer has no chance of coping with the cunning of these Chinese, and seeing we cannot cope with their cunning let us stop them coming here. If the Premier would bring forward a motion

to ask the Federal Government to prohibit black-labour on these boats it would do more to prevent the smoking of opium in Western Australia than all the Bills we could ever pass.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE.

Second Reading.

Resumed from the 7th September.

Mr. BROWN (Perth): I move—

That the debate be further adjourned.

The PREMIER: It would assist the passage of the Bill if members could go on with the second reading to-day to some extent and then adjourn it.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. SWAN (North Perth): I shall endeavour to oblige the Premier by filling in time till the tea adjournment. The Minister for Works in moving the second reading expressed the opinion that we were to be congratulated on the fact that we are drawing near finality in the matter of providing the metropolitan district with water supply and sewerage, and I think we can all agree with him that it is quite time these important questions were dealt with. We are not likely to have measures of more importance, few at any rate, to the community to claim our attention this session. But while I agree with the vast importance of the questions dealt with in the Bill, seeing that the health, comfort, and general welfare of a large proportion of the population of the State are dependent upon the successful carrying out of the measure, I do not agree with the methods adopted by the Ministry in dealing with them. First of all I may refer to the remarks of the Minister when he said that he thought all personal bitterness and party feeling should be eliminated from the discussion of a measure of such great importance. I agree with him; I think from all parts of the House we should set ourselves the task of producing the best measure possible

in the interests of the people ; but there are principles embodied in the measure that make it absolutely necessary for some of us to look at a portion of the Bill from a party standpoint. In the first place there is the big question of the method of control. The Bill provides that the control of the water supply, sewerage, and drainage of the metropolitan district shall be vested in a board. I am opposed to the control of any works of any consequence being vested in a board of this description. I have always been and always will be in favour of matters so closely affecting the people being retained in the hands of the Ministry, so that the interests of the people affected may be, to some extent, safeguarded by their representatives in this House.

The Premier : Are you in favour of nomination ?

Mr. SWAN : I am in favour of Ministerial control. I oppose a board of any description.

Mr. Daglish : That means generally "controlled by an officer."

Mr. SWAN : I understand that. It would be controlled by an officer under a Minister in touch with the representatives of the people in the House.

Mr. Underwood : The chairman will be the same.

Mr. SWAN : Quite so ; but the difference between a chairman and an officer is that the chairman will have certain powers vested in him that will not be vested in the engineer in charge under Ministerial control. The Minister for Works said that it was quite impossible for the Minister controlling a large department, such as the Public Works Department, to deal with the various details and minor matters that would crop up in connection with the administration of water supply and sewerage.

Mr. Heitmann : He does not deal with the details of his own department.

Mr. SWAN : I am of opinion that there is very little detail dealt with by the Minister for Works in connection with his department, or by the Minister for any department at the present time.

The Minister for Works : You should be in office for a time.

Mr. SWAN : I do not want to discount the work done by the Minister, nor to convey the impression that the Minister has nothing to do. At times I find it necessary to bring matters of detail under his notice, and I would be pleased if he would give consideration to them. But those are only rare instances where details may claim much of the Minister's time. The chairman of this proposed board is to be paid not more than £1,000 a year. Of course, we do not know who is likely to occupy the position ; some people say they can give a shrewd guess ; I am not likely to try to guess.

Mr. Heitmann : I could pick him in two.

Mr. SWAN : I would much prefer the appointment of an additional Minister to enable this department to be controlled directly by a Minister in this House. I prefer that to the proposal to have a chairman. This is not the only water supply ; it may be about the only sewerage business we have to deal with, but it is not the only water supply we have to deal with. We have now the Goldfields Water Supply Department, and I am not satisfied that everything is as well as it might be in that department. I think it would be infinitely better from the standpoint of the best interests of the State if an additional Minister were appointed to take control of the whole of water supply and sewerage matters. It would not be more expensive. The actual allowance for the salary of a Minister would not be greater than the salary proposed for the chairman of this board, while there could be a system of amalgamation carried out, whereby the Minister could control the Goldfields Water Supply Department as well as the department that would be brought into existence under this Bill. It would tend to much more economical management than will be brought about if we have this proposed board brought into existence. It appears to me that after all the success of the greater portion of the administration in connection with the carrying out of this scheme will depend

upon having a capable engineer for that purpose, and I see no reason why the same engineer cannot control the water supply generally and the scheme of metropolitan water supply and sewerage under direct Ministerial supervision. My idea is that we should have a more satisfactory state of things. Our professed object is to give effect to the will of the people, to carry measures on and administer them in such a way that the majority will be best suited, and I think we will get nearer to that by having a Minister in charge of the department where the representatives of the people may get directly into touch with him.

Mr. Heitmann: And then have a change every seven years.

Mr. SWAN: The people would have the opportunity then of effecting a change in the administration of that department if it were not carried on to their satisfaction. I am satisfied that up to the present the best has been done in the early stages of the construction of this scheme. I believe that if the system of departmental construction had been adhered to right through it would have given far more satisfaction all round. I am thoroughly satisfied that we have engineers in the Public Works Department quite capable of carrying out this work and giving more satisfaction to the people of the State than has been displayed under the contract system. I think it is one of the first essentials in dealing with a big scheme of this description that uniformity should be secured, and while we have a contractor here and another there, and a piece of departmental construction somewhere else, we are not likely to get in this great scheme anything like uniformity of construction. It would have been to the credit of the Government if they had shown sufficient back-bone to pursue the course which they began in the earlier stages of the work, namely by carrying it out departmentally.

The Honorary Minister: The first work was carried out by contract.

Mr. Heitmann: More shame to you.

Mr. SWAN: I may be wrong in a de-

tail of that description, but I know the departmental system was adopted to some extent, and notwithstanding the criticisms that may have been levelled at the work, it will bear favourable comparison with anything carried out under the contract system. I know we have engineers in the department sufficiently competent to carry out the work, and I think the appointment of a Minister to deal with the departments I have named will not entail the appointment of so many new men as will be the case if a board of control is appointed. The Bill, even though it provides for control by a board, at the same time provides in various places for dual control. I do not think this is desirable if the principle of control by a board is to be adopted.

Mr. Collier: Some of the clauses are contradictory with regard to the powers of the Government and the board.

Mr. SWAN: While the Government are prepared to hand over this scheme to the control of a board they make provision in various places for Ministerial control. If they cannot trust a board absolutely and completely they should not trust a board at all. I am convinced that Ministerial control should be adhered to. Scarcely a Government work comes along without a suggestion being made of some kind that a board should be appointed. This heaps up expense, multiplies the number of officers necessary to carry on the work, and does not give the best results. I think if a Minister were appointed to take charge of the whole of the Government water supplies of the State, and the sewerage scheme as well, we would get the most economical administration. And as I said before, I think if departmental construction had been adopted we would have had the work done economically as well as efficiently. At the present time there are certain provisions in the Bill which, if carried out, will necessitate a staff of some kind being retained in connection with the management of the scheme by the Minister. It will also necessitate unquestionably the maintenance of the staff under a board, and either that or there will be a continual change of officers or engineers from the

Government department to the board, and so on. I consider that sort of thing is altogether objectionable. The Bill provides that the Minister may maintain certain works, whereas generally speaking it is understood that the board will control these works. It will be seen that Clause 36 provides for the dual control to which I have alluded, and I think on consideration the majority of the members of this House will be of the opinion that that is undesirable.

The Minister for Works: That is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SWAN: I am reading it differently from the Minister. I admit he has had more experience, but I will risk the interpretation that I have put upon it. The Bill also provides for the imposition of meter rents. Unless I am very much astray a majority of the House has already decided against the imposition of meter rents in any shape whatever, and if that is the case I cannot understand the Government, in spite of a decision of that description, attempting to provide in this measure for the imposition of meter rents again. The Minister claims that he has improved on the old Bill by making the owner responsible for the cost of the connections. Now that is all very well, and I do not think any one will argue that the owner should not be made responsible for the cost of the connections, but I do think the Minister for Works need not have shown so much solicitude for the landlord by making provision to enable him to recover a certain amount of interest from the tenant in consideration of these connections having been put in.

The Minister for Works: Is it not fair and reasonable that the tenant should pay something?

Mr. SWAN: I am absolutely sure that the majority of members will agree with me that the average landlord is well able to protect himself. We could quote any amount of instances where the landlord gets the worst of it, but we could quote as a general thing that the tenant gets a long way the worst of it. It is provided that the owner must pay the cost of the connection, and he will even-

tually be responsible for that cost, and the Bill secures to the landlord or the owner 8 per cent. in addition to the rent the tenant would be paying in order to cover the cost of installing the connections. I think that is fairly clear in the Bill. I contend there is no necessity for that protection to the landlord. We all agree that the landlord should pay for this connection, because it is a permanent addition which enhances the value of his property, and it is correct that he should be obliged to pay; but I do not think there is any necessity to fix any particular amount of interest that the landlord should secure from the tenant by virtue of the improvement having been put in. It would have been safe to leave it to the landlord to raise the rent to a sufficient extent to cover the cost of the connection.

The Minister for Works: What about the case of a lease for five or six years?

Mr. SWAN: The Minister has a slight point in his favour in that particular, but there is no reason why a tenant should be called upon to pay it even in that case. Granted that the point raised by the Minister is good, this one is not, that in making provision for deferred payment whereby the Government expend money necessary to put in connections, it is provided that the owner shall pay to the Government 5 per cent. of the money that they are standing out of, whereas the owner of the property is to receive 8 per cent. of the money that he stands out of?

The Minister for Works: There is depreciation going on.

Mr. Bath: What about the depreciation of the Government?

Mr. SWAN: I have not the slightest doubt, knowing the Minister for Works as I do, that he would put up a very good case for the landlord, and it will be for the House to say whether he has put up a logical case.

The Minister for Works: I have put up a good case for all.

Mr. SWAN: I only wish the Minister would go half as far towards giving the tenant, or the small man, as fair a deal as he has done for the landlord.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. SWAN: Before the tea adjournment I was dealing with the question of occupiers being made responsible under the Bill for the cost of the connections for the sewerage system. The Minister for Works pointed out that where a lease of any length was in operation the owner would be at a disadvantage, unless some provision of this description were inserted. I can quite understand that the Minister would look at the question more from the standpoint of the owner than from that of the occupier.

The Minister for Works: Why?

Mr. SWAN: Because he comes more closely into contact with people who own property than with those who are merely tenants; just as in the same way I come more into contact with people who are in the position of occupiers. I do not find fault with the Minister for looking at the matter chiefly from the owner's standpoint, for it is just as natural for me to look at it from the point of view of the occupier.

The Minister for Works: There is protection for the occupier.

Mr. O'Loughlin: He has to pay 8 per cent., and the Government get their money for 5 per cent.

Mr. SWAN: Yes; that is so. The Minister for Works proposes to look after the owner in the way I have pointed out, but that is only the case where a lease is in existence. But what about the case where an occupier might be called upon to pay the cost of installing the works, and perhaps be turned out of the house by the landlord the next day. Has the Minister looked at the question from that standpoint and realised the position of the unfortunate tenant? It is also provided that not only can the cost be recovered from the occupier, but that failing other means distress can be levied. As a matter of fact, it would be possible for an occupier to be turned out of the place the day after he had put in the improvements, and distress be levied upon his goods and chattels in order to pay for the work.

The Honorary Minister: There is a similar provision with regard to municipal rating.

Mr. SWAN: That may be so, but I hope that by the time the measure goes through Committee this provision will no longer be included in it. In my humble way I desire to protest against a provision of that description.

The Minister for Works: You are taking rather an extreme case.

Mr. SWAN: I do not think I am stretching the position at all, but in dealing with a measure of this description one must consider possibilities. It is my duty, on behalf of the people who sent me here, to try to look at the question from their standpoint, just as the Minister looks at the question from the standpoint of the people he represents.

The Minister for Works: I must look at it from all standpoints.

Mr. SWAN: I do not say the Minister does not do that to the best of his ability, but he cannot realise the position of the occupier as I can. Even supposing that the Government were entitled to give this protection to the owner, why should it be provided in the Bill that the owner should receive 3 per cent. more than the Government ask for the use of their money where there is deferred payment. I can see no reason whatever for that. Again, dealing with the provision for rating, it is provided that the principle of rating on unimproved land values may be adopted. I am one of those who believe that should be made compulsory, and that the rates should be on the unimproved value of the land without any other provision. I hope that when the Bill is in Committee such a provision will be secured. If the proposed control of this water supply and sewerage is altered to Ministerial control, it will necessitate the striking out of a large number of clauses in various parts of the Bill, especially those from Clause 153 onwards, which deal with the powers to borrow, and financial questions generally. Should the principle of control by the board be adopted by this House, the ratepayers in the various districts should elect the members of the board. When the Minister for Works

was moving the second reading of the Bill, the member for Subiaco asked, "Why should the ratepayers not elect the members of the board?" The Minister replied, "That would be a cumbersome and expensive method." Many of our methods of electing boards, and also members of Parliament, might be cheapened with advantage. The Minister also said, "It is not desirable to bring the people directly into contact with their representatives on this board." I view this question in an entirely different light. I am one of those who believe that in all questions of public control, whether by the Government of this State, or by the Commonwealth, or by local bodies, the desire should be to get as closely into contact with the people as possible. I am not afraid to trust the people on any and every occasion. As I have said, if the principle of control by a board is adopted, then all the ratepayers of the districts affected should be able to vote for the members. I am still hopeful that the principle of control by a board will be struck out. The Minister for Works looks at the question from the standpoint of the property owner, but we want to look at it from the standpoint of the citizen generally. We should not even stop at the ratepayers, for every man, woman, and child in the community is affected by this measure in some way or other. The health, comfort, and general well-being of the members of the community depend on a measure of this description. The operation of the Bill is not confined to ratepayers, for many of our people who will be affected by the measure are not ratepayers, but in the very least we should have a provision inserted of a sufficiently democratic nature to ensure that the members of the board are elected by the ratepayers. Not only in questions of this sort, but also in legislative matters generally, my chief complaint is that they are too far removed from the direct control of the people. We will obtain more satisfactory legislation, and a better state of affairs for all concerned, when we get more closely into touch with the people, and are not surrounded by so much inadequate legislative machinery as to-day.

The Honorary Minister: Holding such views, how can you advocate control by the Government?

Mr. Bath: The members of Parliament control the Government.

The Honorary Minister: Members are not elected on that issue.

Mr. Bath: It is presumed that they can administer that sort of work.

Mr. SWAN: The people send us here in the belief that we are capable of dealing with the questions that come before Parliament. This question has come before us for decision, and we should make provision for the voice of the people to be heard. There is no attempt in the measure to give expression to the will of the people who find the money to carry on this and every other work. The people utilise the facilities provided for them by the expenditure of the money and, therefore, in such an important question as this, for the control of the water supply and sewerage, the voice of the people should be heard, their opinions considered, and their wishes given effect to. I intend to fight to make the election of this board as democratic as possible. There are certain provisions in the Bill for the election of members of the board, but I am sure I cannot understand how they will operate; it is hard to realise that from the information contained in the Bill. We find, too, the subdivisions and the area to be controlled by this measure are not even the boundaries of the various electorates, and so far as I can understand there is no provision for a large section of the people in one place having an equal voice with the people in another place in the election of the board. I need not detain members much longer on this question. There is no doubt that this is a Bill most members will wish to express an opinion upon, and my only regret is that I had not longer time in order to consider the details of the Bill, and be better prepared to speak to the second reading. It is one that cannot be considered in all its bearings in one day, which is practically all the time I have had for the purpose. I would have been very pleased if the debate had been adjourned earlier in the afternoon. How-

ever, I have had to do the best I could in the circumstances, and I sincerely hope that many necessary amendments will be made in Committee. As I have intimated, I will be very pleased indeed to see the principle of control by a board knocked out and provision made for Ministerial control, which is the most democratic, and the most likely to give good service to the State, and prove satisfactory to the people concerned.

On motion by Mr. Draper, debate adjourned.

BILL—VACCINATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: Hon. members will see that the Bill is one of two clauses only. The Bills of Sale Act Amendment Act which was passed in 1906 and was not then made perpetual, will by this measure be made perpetual, subject of course to the ordinary power of repeal possessed by Parliament. When the original Bill left this Chamber no provision had been made for its being other than perpetual, but when it reached another place—so I gather from reading the debates, for I was not in the State at the time—some doubt was expressed as to whether it would prove satisfactory in its working, and a provision that it would need renewal after a certain time was inserted in the Bill. We have heard nothing outside in opposition to the Act as it stands at present, and the Bill before the House has already passed in another place. Therefore I am confidently expecting that the Bill will pass its second reading and subsequent stages and thus the Act of 1906 will be made permanent.

Mr. Bath: That is, until we seek to amend it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Of course so, it may be amended at any time. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—REDEMPTION OF ANNUITIES.

Second reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: I may perhaps explain that this Bill is intended to be the means of allowing certain annuities that have been made a perpetual charge on land to be redeemed; in other words, to allow an annuity to be converted into a capital sum and dealt with as a Judge of the Supreme Court may direct. Certain estates have been burdened by a charge of this nature, and in cases where such charges exist very great difficulty is felt in dealing with the land. To give an example: there is a large estate in the Eastern district which is burdened by a small charge of £20 per annum, payable to the Anglican clergyman for the time being at York. It is impossible to sell any part of this estate because the charge extends to the whole, and if one acre in this estate were sold, the charge would remain over that acre as well as over the portion unsold. In England the Legislature has found it necessary to provide the means that we are now providing in the Bill. The need for this was recognised in England so far back as 1853 when by 16 and 17 Vic., Chapter 137, similar powers were passed; and again in that great measure of reform, the Conveyancing Act of 1881, similar provision was made. Hon. members will see that the course provided is a simple one. The owner of the land may require the person who enjoys the annuity to surrender such annuity, and discharge the land of it subject to various conditions

which are set out in Clause 3 of the Bill. The procedure, in a few words, is simply that the matter has to be brought before a Judge in Chambers and an order made directing that the cash surrender value of such annuity shall be ascertained and that on payment of this cash surrender value the annuity be redeemed and the land discharged of it. Now on the hearing of the summons, as I say, the Judge may either grant or dismiss it. In the former event it will be for him to fix a valuation; or if he does not feel himself prepared to arrive at a valuation he may direct that the Master of the Court, or an actuary, or some other qualified person may value the land. And, the value having been fixed, the amount is either to be paid to the person who enjoys the annuity, or into Court to abide such order as the Judge may think proper to make. In a case such as that I have mentioned, where the annuity is one paid to the holder of an office, provision no doubt will be made as allowed under the Bill for the capital sum raised to be reinvested and the income derived from the investment of this capital sum to be paid as heretofore. All that would happen is that the land would be freed from the charge and the moneys so raised would be invested in another channel. I do not anticipate any possible objection to this Bill; it probably would have been the law long before this in Western Australia had there been a larger number of estates labouring under the particular disability to which I have referred; and possibly there would be more of these charges created had we had in force the legislation which I am now asking the House to agree to.

Mr. Hudson: What gave rise to the Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: An estate in the Eastern districts. That, I believe, is not the only one similarly circumstanced. I am given to understand that there are other estates in similar case, and no doubt if this Bill be passed people will not be so loth to make a charge of that description when they find that means are provided for the redemption of the annuity and the reinvestment of the amount involved in some other more suitable channel.

Mr. Hudson: Contrary to the intention of the testator.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The intention of the testator was that a certain sum of money should be paid to a certain person or holder of office. It cannot matter to the testator one penny what the investment may be so long as it be a safe investment.

Mr. Hudson: That would be a speculation on the part of the Judge as to whether it would provide for all time the particular income named by the testator.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We may, I think, have sufficient confidence in our Judges in these matters. When we remember that a precisely similar provision has been in force in the old country since 1853, and has given no cause for complaint, I think the House will be perfectly safe in passing the Bill. If it can be shown that it will inflict hardship upon any individual or class of individual I will be very glad to have the fact brought forward, so that it may be inquired into. But I do not fancy the hon. member will seriously advance the argument that this Bill is capable of inflicting a hardship, whereas it is an absolute certainty that it will prove a very great advantage. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Hudson, debate adjourned.

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION ENDOWMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL AND MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: It will be within the recollection, no doubt, of hon. members that some years ago a Bill was passed by the Parliament of this State providing for the setting apart of certain lands for the purpose of endowing a university in Western Australia; and it has appeared to the Government, seeing that very rapid growth of the educational needs of the State, that we should make similar provisions for educational requirements generally. We know that in other States, when times of

financial stringency have happened, that one of the first economies made has been in regard to public education. I think I am correct in saying that in Victoria, after the collapse of the land boom, when the State was experiencing a time of great financial depression, which severely reflected itself on the public finances, large economies were made in regard to the public education system of the State. Those were probably only economies in a monetary sense, and while a certain amount of money was saved no doubt a considerable amount of harm was done through restricting the facilities for imparting education. Happily in Western Australia, though in the past few years we have been also passing through a period of restricted public finance, we have not been compelled to economise in regard to elementary education, though I am perfectly free to admit that had money been more plentiful we would possibly have launched out more than has been done, more particularly in regard to technical education, and what may be called continuation schools. The Bill, in providing an education endowment, will not provide us with much that will be of very immediate benefit. So far as I am aware, the revenue brought in to the university trustees from the land set apart and endowed for a university is so far a very insignificant quantity, and we may assume that the same thing will probably be the case in regard to the endowment made under this Bill; but at any rate we can feel that as year succeeds year the endowment we provide to-day will become increasingly valuable; and if it should happen that at a later period the State is undergoing a period of great financial stringency, it will be a great satisfaction to all of us who happen to be in the State at the time, and to those who come after us, that this provision has been made. The Bill does not in itself call for any lengthy comment on my part. As far as I remember, the powers given under it are practically the same as those given under the University Endowment Act.

Mr. Bath: With the exception that the university trustees are prevented from selling.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not think it is necessary to say more to recommend the Bill to the House. I content myself, therefore, with moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Bath, debate adjourned.

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Daglish in the Chair; Mr. Bath in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Qualification of managing clerks:

Mr. FOULKES: Apparently some words were omitted. He moved an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (b) after "final" the words "a managing clerk" be inserted.

Mr. DRAPER: The words the hon. member proposed to have inserted would make the clause more explicit and less in doubt than at present. Possibly it was unnecessary to insert these words, as everything was covered by the words "fit and proper person," but there was a doubt, and it was desirable to make Acts of Parliament as little as possible open to litigation. There was no definition in the Bill of "managing clerk"; it would be, in fact, difficult to give a definition off-hand; but none were more competent to give an opinion as to what a managing clerk was than the Barristers' Board. The board probably knew all the managing clerks of the State, and could easily ascertain the duties they discharged in their respective offices, and also their qualifications. In fact the promoters of the Bill intended that the Barristers' Board should decide the question, but considered that it was already covered by the words, "fit and proper person." However, to make it clear, we should pass the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: The amendment did not go far enough. The qualification mentioned in paragraph (a) required

more than the mere qualification of being a managing clerk. It provided that the applicant should be a managing clerk for 10 years. He, therefore, suggested that it would be better that the Barristers' Board should certify that the applicant was "possessed of the qualification required by paragraph (a)," and at the proper time he would move an amendment to that end.

Mr. FOULKES was prepared to accept the amendment suggested by the member for Dundas.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. HUDSON moved an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (b) after "final" the words "possessed of the qualification required by the last preceding paragraph and" be inserted.

Mr. BATH did not intend to offer any objection to the amendment.

Mr. ANGWIN: Was there any possibility of the Barristers' Board agreeing to a fit and proper person without a qualification? That was the condition laid down on which the Barristers' Board would have to give a certificate. When there was such unanimity among the legal gentlemen in the House there might be a possibility of some words being put in the clause such as those proposed, which would have the effect of making it inoperative. The hon. member who introduced the Bill had provided in paragraph (a) of the clause, that any person who had been for at least five years employed in the capacity of managing clerk should be qualified to be admitted as a practitioner. Now the member for Dundas was trying to insert what were practically the same words again. He hoped hon. members would not agree to the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: The Bill had received his support on a previous occasion, and he had no objection to it now, but what he wanted to do was to make it explicit. He had a recollection of somewhat similar circumstances having arisen in connection with the admission of practitioners in this State when there was a doubt as to what was meant by "a fit and proper person." To obviate disappointment or

litigation arising out of this particular clause, he proposed to insist upon the amendment, especially as it had been accepted by the member in charge of the measure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for East Fremantle was striving after the unattainable when he asked that something definite should be put into the Bill. There could not be anything definite enough to bind the Barristers' Board or lawyers generally. Existing Acts of Parliament had been thought to be pretty definite, but Judges had declared them to mean something else.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Qualifications of clerks and Bachelors of Law:

Mr. DRAPER: The fact that a man had been a clerk in a lawyer's office did not necessarily fit him for admission to the legal profession; and the fact that a man had obtained the degree of bachelor of laws in any university did not of itself fit that man to practise as a legal practitioner in this or in any other State.

Mr. Bath: What about his experience as a clerk for 10 years?

Mr. DRAPER: If he were a managing clerk, then the matter would be different; but the clerk mentioned in the clause was not the managing clerk; he might be the office boy, or the accountant, or even the typist—perhaps not the lady typist, because a lady would not apply for admission. Certainly the word clerk did not in any degree imply a knowledge of the legal profession. It was of importance to the community that people should not be allowed to practice the profession of the law unless they were duly qualified.

Mr. Scaddan: But they do.

Mr. DRAPER: The mere fact that some individuals did practice could only emphasise the objection to more people being permitted to practice. The Committee should reject the clause, because it was not in the original Bill which was sent by the Assembly to another place. It was inserted in the other Chamber for reasons which need not be gone into. He was not in the House at the time,

and hon. members would correct him if he were wrong, but he understood that the Bill was returned from the Council with the present Clause 3 inserted, and the clause was rejected by the Assembly. It appeared to him to be a clause which could only apply to one individual, whom he understood had now left the State.

Mr. Angwin: Is that a Fremantle man?

Mr. DRAPER: There was no desire to mention names, but he thought the hon. member knew the individual.

Mr. FOULKES: Although a man might be a clerk in an office for many years, he had not the same opportunities of learning much about the law as the managing clerk had. In the old country men had acted as clerks in offices for about 25 years, doing nothing else but copying, and at last doing their work quite mechanically. These people of course would never try to secure admission. For many years past there had been a strong feeling amongst the managing clerks, particularly in Perth, to obtain facilities to be admitted as solicitors, and if it was sought to enlarge the scope of the Bill in any way it would mean that managing clerks would suffer a certain amount of injustice. The only people who had tried to secure admission as lawyers were managing clerks. He had not come across a single case where an ordinary clerk in an office had asked to obtain admission; but he had met many managing clerks who were anxious to have this facility given to them. There was no doubt also, that there were many managing clerks in Perth who were well qualified to act as solicitors. Later on we might see what effect the Bill was having, and then if we saw no great harm in adding to its provisions it might then be possible to do so.

Mr. BATH: There was one thing that he congratulated himself upon in connection with the introduction of the measure, and it was that he had developed a deep interest on the part of some members in their legislative duties. It only confirmed him in the opinion he had long held, that the legal profession

would adopt the scriptural injunction of making it as difficult for a camel to go through the eye of a needle as for an individual to enter the kingdom of law. He would not mention any more unpleasant place than that at the present time. Whatever might be said by the member for West Perth with regard to the lack of qualification which would be entailed by the clause under discussion if it were passed, he would just like to mention that one of the most brilliant members of the legal profession—at least brilliant as far as his brief career in this State was concerned—was a graduate of, he believed, the Dublin University, and came to Western Australia and practised on the goldfields, immediately taking a leading part in the profession; and that profession sustained a great loss when the gentleman in question died some years ago. In Western Australia the legal profession could stand the admission of brains, character, and capacity, as much as in any other part of the world, and if the time came when we had a university in Western Australia, the degrees of bachelor of laws or doctor of laws would be a basis of admission to the legal profession, and the member for West Perth would then have to consent to a clause of the nature of the one under discussion. Owing to the difficulties presented to candidates in Western Australia at the present time because of lack of facilities, there were very few cases—the hon. member for West Perth said there was only one. The Adelaide university offered opportunities for students here to obtain a degree if they were willing to submit to the obstacles presented to students in one State to qualify for a degree in another State. With the desire of meeting the expressed wishes of members on a previous occasion, and to give managing clerks who had fulfilled the qualifications specified in Clause 2, an opportunity of being admitted, that the Bill had been introduced. As he had no desire now to jeopardise their chances, as had been the case on previous occasions, he would offer no objection to the deletion of the clause.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	31

Majority against	..	24
------------------	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Gill	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Bath	Mr. Layman
Mr. Bolton	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Collier	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Draper	Mr. Price
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Ware
Mr. Gregory	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Holman	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hopkins	(Teller).

of them, like geography, British history, Australian history, and a certain amount of classical knowledge, took a man of mature years much longer to acquire than when he was a youth. The result of this was that a student of mature years had to spend long hours in working up these subjects which might be much better spent in other directions. He would have been glad to see a provision giving facilities for laymen to tax solicitors' costs. Unless the Leader of the Opposition particularly desired to pass the Bill that evening, he would ask for progress to be reported, in order to frame an amendment in the direction he had indicated. There were many people here who complained very bitterly about solicitors' costs.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss that question in dealing with this clause.

The PREMIER: In the case of a man who had matriculated say at 13 years of age, it was very likely that he would become rusty by the time he went up for a law examination, and there was no reason why it should not be necessary for him to show that he was then proficient in those subjects which he had passed so many years previously. The clause gave a great advantage to a man who had a university education over another one who had not been so privileged.

Mr. BATH: The fact that a student had passed a matriculation examination at some time in his life showed that he had the general education deemed necessary for a candidate for the legal profession. To pass in the subjects set out was not really a portion of the legal training which a man was called upon to undergo before being admitted. It seemed absurd that he should have to spend a good deal of time at that work. For instance, the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) had to pass such an examination at the outset of his legal training, and spent many hours in working up those subjects. If the proposed law had been in force, the time he spent in this direction would have been better occupied by him in studying law. As to the desire of the member for Claremont that

Clause thus negatived.

Clauses 4, 5, 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Preliminary examination not required of article clerks who have matriculated:

The PREMIER: Under the clause would any time be taken off the articles of students? What would the subjects for such an examination be?

Mr. BATH: The clause would not provide that time would be taken off the articles. If a candidate had passed a matriculation examination in a university either in Great Britain or Australia, he would not be required to pass the preliminary examination needed under the existing laws. The subjects the student had to pass in were Latin, history, mathematics, and those subjects usually found in an ordinary matriculation examination.

Mr. FOULKES: The clause was a good one, for there were many men, particularly when they had reached mature years, who had a difficulty in passing an examination such as the one now necessary, as it included many subjects they learned when they were young, and some

progress should be reported, he would suggest that the Committee stage be proceeded with now, as there was no knowing when he would get another opportunity to go on with the Bill. If the hon. member gave him a copy of his proposed amendment, he would see whether he could accept it and have it inserted at a later stage.

MR. DRAPER had no intention of opposing the clause. The necessity for the preliminary examination was to prove that the student had a good general education. The principle in the clause was recognised in the old country, although not in just the same form, but still as regards certain legal qualifications. He could well understand that it was recognised in other States as a proper examination for those who had not passed the preliminary examination.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was possible that better results would be secured if a larger amount of discretion were to be placed in the hands of the barristers' admission board in regard to this preliminary examination. He could see the force of the argument advanced by the hon. member for West Perth in regard to articulated clerks of comparatively immature years. But in the case of a gentleman like the member for Kanowna who was entering into the legal profession at a time when he had already made his mark in the world; when by reason of his abilities he was one of the shining lights in the House and was occupying a position of great importance in the public life of the State—in the case of such an applicant it seemed like carrying cast-iron regulations to the verge of absurdity to compel a return to Caesar's Commentaries and the first three books of Euclid, with algebra and other subjects of which he could probably only have a very hazy recollection, and which were not in themselves calculated to assist him in his legal studies, nor calculated to assist him when he should reach the proud position of being called upon to address a jury in order to save some fellow citizen from unmerited, or possibly very well merited punishment. In the United Kingdom, although there were very many things not

done so well there as they were done in Australia, and particularly in Western Australia, yet in regard to this preliminary examination there was, under the regulations of the combined Inns of Court, a very considerable latitude allowed. And where the gentlemen who administered the affairs of these Inns of Court were satisfied that someone wishing to be called to the Bar had the necessary general educational qualifications and was of an age that would make it an unnecessary hardship to compel him to go back to the studies of his boyhood, there was power given to the benchers of the Inn to whom the applicant had applied, to exempt him from this examination. While he (the Attorney General) did not wish to suggest anything that would imperil the Bill, yet it seemed to him so eminently reasonable that some amount of latitude should be allowed that he did not know that the chances of the Bill passing would be in any way lessened were this amount of discretion to be given to the barristers' admission board. There could be very little doubt that if any gentleman applied to the board to be exempted from that examination the board would insist, and quite rightly so, that the applicant should bring very clear evidence of the reasonableness of his demands. Therefore in dealing with a board that had natural interests in maintaining the high standard of the legal profession it could not well be feared that harm would result if a provision were inserted to the effect that no person who had matriculated at or graduated from or passed a matriculation examination of any university of Great Britain, Ireland, or Australasia, or who was exempted by the barristers' admission board, should be required to pass the preliminary examination required by the rules framed under the principal Act for articulated clerks. He did not propose to move that amendment himself, because this was a Bill in the discussion of which he had taken no active part. But he put the suggestion forward for the consideration of the hon. member for Brown Hill in case the latter should think that on his own side of the House there were any hon. members who, like the member for Kanowna, had thoughts of entering the

legal profession, and who, although their abilities admirably fitted them for such membership, would be put to a great deal of unnecessary trouble in passing what was, after all, a schoolboy's examination rather than an examination for a mature man of affairs and experience.

Mr. HUDSON: The attitude taken by the Attorney General was one that would not commend itself to the Committee. The Attorney General had said that it should be left to the Barristers' Board to say whether or not a preliminary examination should be required. As a matter of fact, the preliminary examination was fixed under the rules made by the Barristers' Board; so that it would be leaving it to the board to decide upon that which the board had already resolved. There was no possible reason why those who had passed a matriculation examination should be called upon to pass a preliminary examination requiring qualifications inferior to those required for the matriculation itself.

Mr. BATH: It might be that there was a great deal in what the Attorney General had said in regard to the clause. It was very gratifying to him (Mr. Bath) to find members of the legal profession holding such democratic aspirations in regard to the future of that profession, but he was afraid that an opportunity so favourable as the present might not again be presented for the passage of the measure; and seeing that the Attorney General had expressed a desire to enter on a reforming mission in regard to the legal profession, it would be unfair to deprive him of the excellent opportunities he would have of putting into practice his democratic ideas and carrying out a reform in regard to the profession which he adorned.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day for resumption of debate read.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson): As the Bill involves a very important alteration in the policy of the country in regard to workers' compensation, and as the second reading was only moved yesterday and consequently the Government have not yet had time to look into the measure, I move—

That the Order be postponed.

Question passed.

MOTION—IMMIGRATION SYSTEM.

To inquire as to effect.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. Price): When my remarks were interrupted yesterday I was pointing out to the House that, according to the view of hon. members opposite, the only possible remedy to be applied to the present condition of affairs is to abandon the system of assisted passages altogether. That, I believe, would meet with disapproval right throughout the State. There is not the slightest doubt that numbers of the most useful settlers we have in Western Australia, especially on the land, have been assisted by the Government to transfer their homes to the State. The hon. member for Cue yesterday gave an instance of what he considered wrongful assistance by the Works Department to one of these immigrants. He claimed that undue preference of employment had been given. Now I cannot help thinking that sometimes the hon. member trots out these cases without sufficient investigation. At all events I am perfectly certain in this particular instance that had he known the whole of the facts we would have heard nothing of it in the Chamber. If I cared to do so I could mention the man's name, because I have asked the hon. member outside the House if my surmise is correct, and I find it is so. However, I do not want to expose any private affairs. But I would like to inform the House that this man was sent to the Premier by, I think, the member for Brown Hill, who was acting on

behalf of another hon. member on the Opposition side of the House. The Premier recognised that the request that this particular immigrant should be assisted to work was a legitimate one. When I was in charge of the Works Department the Premier forwarded the applicant on to me with the request that I should do something for him. This man had been a colour-sergeant in the British Army and had retired on a pension, subsequently taking up a position as storekeeper. And according to information which he gave me his total earnings at Sheffield amounted to some £250 a year. He there met someone who told him that Western Australia was a suitable field to immigrate to with a view of going on the land; and according to the information which he gave me, he commuted his pension for a sum of money, sold his belongings and came to the State some 12 months or more before he saw me, with some £200 or £300 in his pocket. I believe he took up land in the environments of Perth, and ultimately failed; that is to say, he did not make a success of the thing; and when he was forwarded to the Premier he and his family were practically in a state of distress. Though an able-bodied man he was not fitted for the class of work available at the time in the Works Department; he was not capable of taking on hard manual labour. I asked him if he had any sons, and he said, "Yes." I asked him whether they were used to hard work, and he said, "Yes." He said that one of them had been working in a Sheffield factory employed on the work of rolling armoured plates. This young man was sent to me, and I then sent him to the engineering department with a suggestion that if they found he was suitable for the class of work they might send him to the Black Range railway construction work. But that is only one of scores of instances brought under my notice while I was in the Works Department. I made a rule on the matter; I did not care if a man had wrongfully obtained a passage or not; but I made it a point if there was work offering to get it for the man. There are hon. members who know that on several occa-

sions I have helped other than assisted immigrants to obtain employment; but so far as I know, this was the only case of an assisted immigrant for whom I obtained work. In view of the fact that the father of this man was recommended to the notice of the Premier by the Leader of the Opposition, I am somewhat surprised that the member for Cue should make it a cause of complaint against me for finding that man employment.

Mr. Heitmann: I would not care if it was my own brother who recommended him.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think I made it clear yesterday evening that my desires on this question ran on all-fours with the line adopted by the Government, to take every step to secure that only those men are assisted to the State who are prepared to go on the land, who have sufficient capital to do so, or will take employment with the farmers; and I say no doubt there are hundreds of those who have gone on the land who have been successful. I have a return of those who have been landed in the State on assisted passages. There are 162 on the list, and a perusal of the return will show that in all cases they were taking up some agricultural vocation, or were desirous of obtaining positions as domestic servants.

Mr. Bath: Is the name of Alfred Stearn on the list?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The names are not supplied; they are simply indicated by numbers. Furthermore, to show the extent of the reckless statements—I may call them reckless—

Mr. Heitmann: Yes; we want a few reckless statements with the reckless policy of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member need not lose his temper.

Mr. Heitmann: I am not losing my temper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The HONORARY MINISTER: As an illustration of the reckless statements made in connection with this matter, it was said yesterday that the Government had abandoned the system of granting

assisted passages to the wives and families of residents here when the wives and families resided in the East. Since 1902 there have been 2,500 wives and children brought over from the East in this way, and last year the Government assisted some 150 such persons to come to the State. It is absolutely and entirely incorrect to say that the Government have abandoned the system of assisting the wives and families of those of our settlers to come here from the East.

Mr. Gill: Have you assisted any since the reduction of the vote on the Estimates?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am informed by the Immigration Department, from whom I have made inquiries, that the system is still in vogue and that the Government are still prepared to assist. I say it is still in vogue.

Mr. Gill: But not in practice.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The reduction of the vote may have had the effect of diminishing the assistance; but so far as the funds placed by Parliament at the disposal of the Government go, the system of assisted passages for wives and families residing in the East has not been abandoned and is still in practice. We can get figures from the different departments, and figures can be used to prove almost everything, but I prefer practical experience to a ton of figures. On more than one occasion it has been my lot to see a number of assisted immigrants from the old country. In more than one instance men have come from parts where relatives or friends of mine reside, and they have come to me with letters. I have seen most excellent immigrants brought into Western Australia as a result of these assisted passages, and it is totally unfair and illogical, I could go so far as to say, to condemn the system because in some cases undesirables have managed to get into the State. Supposing this inquiry is held, what will be the result? We know beforehand what it will be. The Government's assurance in this direction is perfectly well known, and members know that the Government have endeavoured to carry it out, and that they

have not in any way attempted to induce artisans to come to Western Australia by means of assisted passages. If anything is known in London that the intended immigrants were artisans, and that they were coming out for any purpose other than agriculture, there has been a block to any assistance for passages. Undoubtedly, if the inquiry be held it will be shown that some have squeezed through, and that some undesirables have come to the State; but everyone knows that, in dealing with the large numbers brought here, this is bound to happen, whoever has the administration of the matter. Suppose one or two individuals such as I have described did squeeze through, it is a pity, and we do not wish it, we do not want to see it; but I believe the country is big enough and great enough to absorb all. I have sufficient confidence in the State, and I desire to see it occupied by people of a white race, and I believe the Government cannot put forth too much exertion to secure the introduction of a suitable class of immigrants.

Mr. Seaddan: What about stopping those who are going away?

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the hon. member looks at our published reports he will see that we are distinctly on the upgrade.

Mr. Seaddan: But we are losing our best men.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member does not mean that. It is one of those arguments used to bolster up a bad case. It is easy to assert a thing: it is often difficult to prove it. If the inquiry be held the Government have nothing to fear. Their hands will be shown to be clean, and it will be seen that they have honestly endeavoured to carry out the desires of the House and, I think, the wishes of the people, that the immigrants we bring out should be those only that are desirable.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): I intend to support the motion, because in the first place I believe the statement that the member for Subiaco made in regard to the introduction of immigrants who, eventually and frequently, and just after

they have been admitted, find themselves in positions in the metropolis, often in Government positions, at the expense of those who have been previously employed. In order to fill positions at Government workshops, or in the railway yards, or in fact in any Government department, it is quite unnecessary for Parliament to place any sum on the Revenue or Loan Estimates, and go to the trouble of bringing out immigrants. If we want to fill them we have in our midst those from whom we can make a selection, and whom we can place in the positions at the minimum of expense. We have always had it claimed that our policy is for the purpose of settling our lands, but I am strongly convinced—and it has been demonstrated by the remarks of those who are interested in immigration leagues, and by the reports of employers—that there is another and a deeper object, and that is for the purpose of introducing those who will work at cheaper rates than will be accepted by those already in the State. If any immigration policy has for its ultimate design the supplying of cheap labour to employers in this or any other State, it is one that should merit the objection of every member desirous of seeing the State progress. That this is not an unfounded charge is demonstrated by the report which was submitted by the special commissioner of *The Times* who came to Australia to inquire into the immigration question. In the course of his articles in *The Times*, he said—

“Farmhand immigrants are given no guarantee; but everything possible will be done to obtain them a job on a farm or a station at £1 a week and their keep. That may sound a huge sum to the English labourer; it is, in fact, not unreasonable pay for the young unmarried labourer, if he gets it. On a station he may; the big landowner, though he may want his lands unoccupied, usually pays and treats well the men he does employ. But for him there is enough labour offering locally. As a rule the immigrant will be sent to the small agriculturist—and the small farmer we have with us now is as bad an employer as can well be imagined.

His own family, especially in the dairying districts, he works to death. I could fill many columns with our school inspectors' descriptions of the hopeless dragging fatigue which besets whole classfuls of children between seven and ten years old, who have worked from before daylight, and will work until long after dusk, and find the few hours of school time their only chance for sleep. The man who treats his children like that, how will he treat his hands? He treats them so as to make a great many of the best class of farm-hands go northwards to the Queensland canefields, where they do much more unpleasant work under a hotter sun, and get wages only slightly higher, but where their hours of labour and their food are to some extent supervised and made tolerable by Federal law. To supply the gap they leave, the New South Wales Government imports its ‘men with £S’ who are easy to suit, and disposed to take what offers. A further evil follows. The farm-hand must have no ‘encumbrances.’ In this the small farmer and the station owner are agreed. Here in Sydney at the present moment are two families, sent to one of our immigration leagues with special recommendations; in one family there are four children, in the other an infant only. Both are *tabu*. In each case the man and wife could find employment at once: there have been many applications for their services; but the mention of the children put the applicants off. And in the course of the trouble we have been told, on the authority of an officer of the local intelligence department (which looks after immigration here), that the Agent General's officials in London have instructions to refuse married couples with ‘encumbrances,’ and that officials here suggest to young childless married couples whom they are placing in positions up-country that they had better remain childless for some time. It seems a queer way of increasing our population. The local man has as large a family as possible, and stunts it physically and intellectually with premature drudgery;

the immigrant has to do without a family altogether—the sort of immigrant, at least, that the New South Wales Government delights to honour. He could have a family if he were going on the land—the bigger the better for him. But the 2,000 skilled farm-hands who are coming out to the New South Wales Government's order must be childless and content to remain so for several years: unless, that is, they care to take the advice which has certainly been given to some of them and leave their infant children wherever shelter can be found for them in England—surely a new reading of the 'mother country.'"

Now there is more of this in the report, and if hon. members want to know whether the same thing is done in Western Australia, I recommend them to peruse the "situations vacant" column of our daily papers; keep an eye on that and they will soon find that there is a great demand for married couples without encumbrances. In Australia we have land worth cultivating and developing; we need population, and our efforts should be directed towards securing the best population possible. The policy of the Labour party, not only in Western Australia, but throughout the Commonwealth, is to secure that end by sensible means, first by assuring the immigrants that when they come to Australia they will be able to go on land suitable for their purpose; not to be drafted to arid areas of the back-blocks where life is a constant struggle against drought except perhaps in a few good seasons; but on that land which is in the zone of a fair average rainfall, which is also contiguous to good markets. Under existing circumstances in Australia we are not able to assure that foundation to the immigration policy. The object of the Labour party is first, to have the land made available and second to secure farmers capable of going on the land and cultivating it, causing a natural demand for labourers to work on that land, and later on to provide opportunities for industries to spring up and for artisans to be employed to supply the needs of the farmers and farm labourers settled on the land. That is a popular policy and one which

would secure the settlement of Australian lands at a minimum of expense and to the best possible advantage. But while we pursue the policy of expending loan moneys and a great deal of energy in inducing settlers to come out here in competing with other countries, of bringing them here and then finding a difficulty in providing them with suitable land to settle on, so long is our policy going to be unpopular, and so long shall we find Ministers sending minutes from one department to another asking, "For heaven's sake find a job for so-and-so to close his mouth and prevent a complaint being made." The Honorary Minister has referred to the case of Mr. Charteris, and has made a statement that I gave this gentleman a letter to the Premier, on the strength of which the Honorary Minister took it upon himself to find a job somewhere in the State for the man's son. If I sent a letter to the Premier it was through the member for Murchison, with a request not that this man should be found a job, but rather that the injustice done to him should be rectified in some way or other. I have the full particulars of the treatment which was meted out to this man, and I am going to read a statement to hon. members to give some indication of the way in which our immigrants first are deceived and then are treated when they arrive in Western Australia. Mr. Charteris called on me and complained of the treatment he had received, and in order that I should be fully seized of the facts I asked him to set out his complaints in a memorandum, and this is the memorandum which Mr. Charteris has prepared. It is as follows:—

"With reference to our conversation this morning, I beg to state that about June or July, 1907, an advertisement appeared in the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, stating that a Mr. Lane would be pleased to interview intending emigrants to Western Australia, at Messrs. Dean & Dowdon's, Haymarket, Sheffield. I accordingly sought an interview with Mr. Lane, and informed him that I had a large family and was anxious to emigrate to one of our colonies, if there was any chance of suc-

cess, and that I would only have a capital of about £150 to start with. He replied that there was every chance of success in Western Australia. He spoke in most glowing terms of the colony, and among other things, informed me that a knowledge of farming was not absolutely necessary, that I could go in for sheep, that it required very little knowledge for sheep farming, and that within five or six years I could double my present income. At the time, I told him I was in receipt of an income of about £250 per annum, and he advised me to go with a party that he was about to take out in the s.s. "Omrah." I told him that I could not go then, as I would have to commute a portion of my pension in order to raise the necessary capital to take myself, wife, and family out, and that this would take some time. He then took my name and address and informed me that on his return to London he would request the Agent General to forward me some books and pamphlets relating to Western Australia. In due course I received the books and pamphlets. Mr. Lane also advised me to write, or better still, to have a personal interview with Mr. E. T. Scammell, the Emigration Commissioner. Towards the end of September, 1907, I wrote to the Agent General in London, informing him that I was desirous of being assisted to emigrate to Western Australia. I gave him full particulars, informing him that I was an army pensioner, married, with eight children, six sons and two daughters; that both myself, wife, and children were quite ignorant of everything pertaining to agriculture. Shortly afterwards I had a personal interview with Mr. Scammell, and told him that in order to raise the necessary capital, I would have to commute a portion of my pension, and that it would be a very serious thing for me, with a large family, the majority of them very young, should there be any risk of failure. He replied that there would be no risk whatever, that I was just the class of emigrant the Government wanted, and that I should certainly do well in Western Australia.

As I still had doubts about obtaining employment out here, I called again at the office in Victoria Street, London, early in November, 1907, a few weeks before sailing, and asked to see Mr. Scammell. I was informed that he was out. I was then handed over to another gentleman, I do not know his name—he was rather tall with a pointed beard. There was also present a short, smooth-faced gentleman, apparently an employee of the agency. I informed them that I did not intend to take up land for some time after arrival, not until my two eldest lads had gained some practical experience in farm work, and that during the period of waiting would it be possible for me to obtain suitable employment, telling them at the same time the class of work I was capable of performing. They distinctly informed me that the Agent General could not guarantee work for anyone, but that with my credentials, which they perused, there would not be the slightest difficulty in obtaining employment, and that it would be my own fault if I were not employed within a week of landing in the State. I sailed from Tilbury, England, in the s.s. "Ormuz" on the 29th November, 1907, and landed in this State on the 2nd January, 1908. On arrival at Fremantle, I received a letter of welcome from the Government, enclosing a list of coffee palaces at which I could stop. The next day, the same gentleman who gave me the letter pointed out to me the Treasury office, where I was paid the money (£125) I had given to the Agent General in London. Four days after landing, I purchased on terms a sandy patch, called a pig and poultry farm, about a mile and a half in the bush off the end of Beaufort-street. I was advised to do this by some old colonials residing in the same coffee palace with me. I then started to try and find employment, assisted by Mr. Scammell for a few days. He had come out with me in the same boat. Of course I failed to obtain employment of any sort. I then obtained a letter of introduction to the colonial under-secre-

tary, who handed me over, with my testimonials, to the chief clerk, Mr. Neville. Although I waited for a couple of months he failed to assist me in getting employment. In the meantime, the horse I had for carting pigwash—I had four sows and some young porkers—began to fall away in condition, as I could not afford to give him sufficient food. I was advised to sell him, and buy a smaller one, which would answer the same purpose, and cost a deal less to feed. This I did; but within a couple of months horse No. 2 died. I then had to hire a horse for six weeks at 15s. per week, when I managed to borrow sufficient money to purchase a third horse. This one also died within a couple of months of purchase. No. 4 horse, the one I have at present, will die too, if I do not soon obtain employment. I was employed for three weeks in June last as an electoral canvasser. In September last I received about £98 in commutation of 6d. per diem of my pension. After paying off all my debts, over £50, I purchased another half-dozen sows and some porkers, but ill-luck still dogged my footsteps, two of the sows died with their litters, another ate the whole of her litter, and another injured her spine that much that she had to be killed. On the 2nd October last, my youngest daughter, aged eight years, was taken to the Perth Public Hospital suffering from diphtheria. She died the same night. Her funeral expenses, £9, are still unpaid. On the day she died I had one solitary sixpence. During the following month, November, 1908, I obtained employment as orderly at the Government Hospital, Southern Cross. This job I could only keep for about three months. I tried my level best to do the work, but failed, as some of the duties were of such a filthy nature my stomach revolted against the work. On 1st March last, when I returned home, I found my wife ill, her illness being brought on by semi-starvation. On the 19th of the same month she was admitted to the Perth Public Hospital, suffering

from a varicose ulcer on the leg. By the end of the month I had expended the few pounds that I had received for my month's wages when I left Southern Cross. My son then tried to earn something by carting wood into the woodyards, but the work was too much for the horse—the poor animal broke down. At the most we could not earn more than 20s. or 25s. per week, and out of this amount the horse's feed had to be paid for, about 14s. per week. I was in such dire straits that on several occasions I had to cut away the mildewed part of some of the stale bread purchased for pig feed, and feed myself and children on the balance, which very often did not amount to more than one loaf for six of us in the day. On the 15th ultimo I had an interview with the Premier, Mr. Moore. I gave him a brief statement, in writing, of the circumstances under which I was induced to come to this State, and my situation since arrival. He very kindly promised to do what he could to help me. The following day, meeting me in St. George's-terrace, he informed me that he had got a job for me as tally clerk at Millar's Karri and Jarrah Company, Yarloop. I left for Yarloop on the 20th ultimo. Prior to leaving I received from the Charities Department £1 and a railway pass. The money I left with my wife, who had come out of the hospital the day previous. On arrival at Yarloop I was informed by the accountant at Millar's that no one knew anything about me, and that they required no tally clerk. I could not see the manager, Mr. Driver, as his wife was dangerously ill at the time. I started the following day working in the labourers' gang at 7s. 9d. per diem. Several times the manager promised to find me a better job with more pay, but failed to carry out his promises. On the 11th instant, because I could not move heavy pieces of timber with the same dexterity as my fellow workmen, the yard foreman told me that I had better go up to the office, which, of course, meant dismissal. Before leaving, the manager promised that

if anything better than labouring turned up, he would wire and let me know. Of course, I do not for one moment believe that he will keep his promise, his promises are, like pie-crust, made to be broken. The consequence of having no work is, that to-night I have the large amount of ninepence (9d.) to keep seven of us from starving. The only alternative that I can see, is to apply to the Charities Department for assistance, which I shall have to do to-morrow."

I have no serious grounds for complaint against the Honorary Minister that in circumstances such as those he found a job for either Charteris or his son, as it was time something was done for a man brought out in circumstances such as those. While, perhaps, had he been accustomed to agriculture, he might have been able to do better than he evidently did, according to that letter, the fact of his having told the officials in England that he was not accustomed to agriculture, should have prevented them from informing him that he would do well in this State. The officials made a mistake, and it is one of those mistakes to which I so strongly object as far as our immigration policy is concerned.

The Honorary Minister: It was a mistake Mr. Scammell had to pay for by losing his billet.

Mr. BATH: This afternoon I had a complaint brought before me which, if all the allegations made are true, is a scandalous example of breach of confidence. A gentleman came to me and showed me his credentials, which proved that he has had experience in clearing and cultivating land in America. He told me that after perusing literature dealing with the prospects here, he came out as an immigrant. After consultation with the officers of the Lands Department he deemed it best to go to the South-West, and went to Busselton. Afterwards he proceeded to the Margaret River, and having seen the result of immigration somewhere on the trip down, he decided that if he could get some land and available water to enable him to carry on irrigation—a work of which he had some experience in the United States—it

would be the best opening for him. He secured land, in common with other immigrants, on the Margaret River. He received his first notice of approval of his block, and was afterwards advised to take in a piece of land on the other side of the river which would enable him to square up his block; later on, however, he was informed by the officers of the Lands Department that a mistake had been made, and that all the immigrants would have to take their blocks on one side of the river. The result was that some of the immigrants were forced out into the inferior and useless gravel land, and some of them decided to abandon their holdings in consequence. The gentleman in question, however, secured a block which he considered was quite suitable for his requirements. It was very fair so far as the quality of the land in that particular vicinity went. He proceeded to show that he was a man not afraid of work, for he cleared six or seven acres of heavily timbered land, and erected his house on it. He had a brother and sister with him. After having taken all this trouble he received a communication from the Lands Department to the effect that he had taken a wrong step in carrying out any improvements before survey, and that it was the intention of the Government to declare certain reserves around what were known as "The Pools" on the Margaret River. Later on a plan was sent to him with the reserves marked out, and he found that those on the Margaret River included the good land he had taken up for the purpose of cultivating. He told me that his brother and he carried their swags to Busselton, and sent several letters to the department but could receive no satisfaction, so they came to Perth and he interviewed Mr. Mitchell. That gentleman said it was a bad case, and referred him to Mr. Morris, one of the assistant under secretaries who, after a consultation, suggested that the man's money should be refunded. That was the money he had paid for the block, and it amounted to about £2. There was no thought of refunding the money the man had spent in clearing the land, erecting

the house, and keeping himself while the work was in progress. Since then the only offer made to him was to provide him with land at Wanneru. It is neither redress nor justice that a man who has been put to such trouble and expense—and I believe there are others who are in the same boat, but who have thought it better not to kick up a row with the Government—should be sent down there, involved in the expense of building a house, however humble it may have been, and in carrying out improvements, only to find that owing to the later operations of the Act he could not get the land he had fixed upon. He should certainly be recouped for the expense he was put to. Here is another instance. Some few months ago, on returning to town from my area in the North-East, a lady who was in charge of a boarding-house at Tammin told me that she was employing a young immigrant in doing odd jobs about the premises, merely to save him from starvation and to provide him with sleeping accommodation. She asked me to have a chat with the man. This I did, and he said he was brought out with a number of others from England. When he landed here he had £10, and after some delay he was advised to go to Tammin to have a look at an area of land some distance out from there. He went to this area, only to find that it was reserved and not available for selection. He returned to Tammin and became stranded there without money, nowhere to go to and no one to whom to appeal. As I have said, he was given work to do by the boardinghouse keeper; subsequently, through the efforts of someone up there, a job was obtained for him either on the permanent way or in connection with the Goldfields Water Supply Administration at Bungulla. The fact that an immigrant should have been sent out to a place beyond Tammin to look at a block which was already reserved provides an instance of the wrong manner in which some immigrants are treated. If we bring immigrants out in circumstances like these, the policy of the Government must be condemned. It shows clearly that much greater care should be exercised by the

officials in England in choosing the men to come out here.

The Premier: What additional precaution do you suggest should be taken in choosing these men?

Mr. BATH: So long as we provide loan funds for the purpose of encouraging immigration, and go into the high-ways and by-ways and say we are providing cheap passages to Australia in order to settle the land, we are doing nothing more than laying a trap for the officers in London, many of whom are unsuitable for the work they are engaged in. We should get a better class of settlers and be able to apply our money and energy to a better purpose, here, on the spot, if we put all our energies to making our lands more attractive. By natural attraction we would get here, without the expenditure of money in assisted passages, the very best type of men from the old and other countries.

The Premier: There was nothing very attractive about this country 50 or 60 years ago, when men came out here to make it.

Mr. BATH: The greatest and best influx, the foundation of Australian population, was during the gold discoveries in Australia, and not one shilling was spent to bring them out. We will always get those who perhaps are looking out for some exceptional advantages, and who think that if a State offers these special advantages of cheap passages they will be gaining some great benefit. In other directions, too, this policy is unwise because, undoubtedly, a settler coming from the old country finds a different set of circumstances; the climatic conditions are different, and in many other respects circumstances are altogether opposite from what they are in the old country.

The Premier: They do not like sleeping in bunks.

Mr. BATH: As to that matter, perhaps the remark may seem facetious, but when the Premier tries to compare his past work as a surveyor, and perhaps some of the hardships he has had to undergo, with the conditions these men are expected to undergo, he must re-

member the position is very different. Now so far as surveyors are concerned they have a much better salary than these immigrants are likely to secure in the shape of wages.

The Premier: Fifteen shillings a week was what I got.

Mr. BATH: They have allowances made to them and when they go out they are fairly well provided for in respect to tents and other accommodation. They generally have a man to cook for them, and except in exceptional instances they try so far as they can, having regard to the fact that it is outside work, to fix themselves up as comfortably as possible. Now the men who went to the Premier and complained of the accommodation afforded them were men to whom these conditions, the food and the bed that was provided for them, were part of the wages paid; and when they were provided with inferior beds and inferior food they were being defrauded of portion of their wages. That is the difference between their situation and the situation of the Premier. And if we are going to countenance men who are in a position to pay good wages, if we are going to countenance them in meanly and sneakily taking from other men what is their due and a part of the contract, we are countenancing what amounts to fraud. After all, the wages offered, namely from 7s. 6d. to £1, with tucker and bed, are not so very high that we can afford to see these men deprived of any portion of it. It is time for them to undergo hardships when they are compelled to do so, and we do not want to encourage meanness on the part of employers in doing them out of their wages in this paltry way by giving them inferior food and accommodation. As I said before, I intend to support the motion. When the Premier interrupted me and spoiled the thread of the discourse I was referring to the fact that settlers coming out here from England have altogether different conditions to face. And I want to point out that there are a number of men who have come out and who have got on splendidly and are rising superior to the change of conditions. I have met them in the Geraldton district, and both North and South of Kellerberrin

and in other parts of the State, and I can say that undoubtedly there are men who have come out here, and who are doing splendidly. In some instances, indeed, it might be said that they are setting an example to others on the land. But, taking it by and large, if we want to get the best type of settlers our best energies should be directed to settling our own people, and to settling those of other Australian States who cannot there find land. We should give them the first opportunity. Then, later on, if we find that the speed at which the development is proceeding requires accelerating, and if the time should come when we are in such a position that to anyone who may be looking for land we can offer a chance of getting on our land with the least possible delay and inconvenience, then I say we can afford to extend our invitation to those in other parts of the world. But as a matter of fact we cannot assure anyone to-day that he can go to the central office and secure a block of land within a reasonable distance of a railway, and settle on it without delay.

The Minister for Lands: You come in to-morrow morning.

Mr. BATH: I know of many who have applied, and have been bandied about from pillar to post. I know one who took up land down in the South-West only a short time ago and found that, after all, he could not have it. Under existing circumstances we cannot put men on the land with any degree of facility, and until we can do so we should confine our land settlement efforts to our own people, and not seek by advertisements and lecturers to induce others to come out from the old country. I intend to refer to these advertisements, but I will not do so to-night. I hope the motion which has been moved by the member for Subiaco will result in information being obtained which will perhaps lead to a better system being adopted.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.