

to deal with unprofessional conduct, but the Bill goes further than that. Non-professional conduct means wilfully disobeying the regulations or orders issued by the board. The board may increase the rates of remuneration to such an extent that some architects may think they are too high. If they refuse to carry out the instructions of the board, they may be accused of non-compliance with the laws of the board, and no matter what they may feel, action can be taken on a summons. They would be brought before the board and this board would condemn them for not carrying out orders. The report of the board would be placed before the Supreme Court, and it would be taken as evidence of the facts of the case. The clause dealing with the matter does not say whether the person so charged can defend himself at the Supreme Court, or whether the court has to decide on the evidence placed before the board. If the Supreme Court decides against the architect, his name is removed from the register and he cannot practise, and so loses his means of livelihood. That is a severe punishment for a man who may be doing what he believes to be right in the interests of the public. It is true that no person can be stopped from drawing plans for remuneration, as was provided in the former Bill. He may not pose as an architect, but if he is a contractor or has a knowledge of the work, he can charge for drawing plans and doing similar work. I look upon the Bill as a fair one, which opens the door to everyone who can qualify to practise in the profession. There is an error in the schedule dealing with the question of a quorum. The clause speaks of six members of the board being necessary and the schedule of only five. That is a matter of amendment at a later stage. I have no objection to the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

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

Clauses 1 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Effect of summons by the board:

Mr. A. THOMSON: This clause gives drastic powers to the board, and requires some explanation from the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In order that Clause 10 may be made effective, it is necessary that the board should have power to call witnesses by summons, otherwise they may refuse to appear to give evidence on oath.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many witnesses appear before boards in response to invitations by letter to do so, and they give evidence on oath. As a matter of fact 90 per cent. of the witnesses who give evidence before select committees attend in this way.

Mr. A. Thomson: It seems a drastic power to give to a board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The penalty also is so drastic that such a power should only be given to the Supreme Court. There is no objection to the board holding an inquiry, but if they find that a person has been guilty of unprofessional conduct they should bring that person before the court, and it should then be

for the court to say whether that person should be debarred from practising the profession of an architect.

The Minister for Mines: A person making charges should make them on oath.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is it proposed to vest this board with all the powers possessed by the Supreme Court?

Mr. Pickering: The Legal Practitioners Act contains practically the same clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the clause will be struck out.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 20th October, 1921.

	Page
Paper: Straits Settlements, Ministerial Invitation	1355
Resolution: State Forest dedication, revocation	1356
Bills: Perth Hebrew Congregation Lands	1355
Supply (No. 3), £1,047,000, 3r., passed	1355
Northam Municipal Ice Works, 3r., passed	1355
Wheat Marketing, Com.	1356
Stamp, 1r.	1356
Constitution Act Amendment, 1r.	1356
Auctioneers, 1r.	1356
State Children Act Amendment, Assembly's Amendments	1356

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

PAPER—MINISTERIAL INVITATION TO VISIT STRAITS SETTLEMENTS.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East): As requested by Mr. Sanderson yesterday, I desire to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the invitation to visit the Straits Settlements received by the Minister for Mines (Hon. J. Scaddan) from the Straits Settlements Government.

BILL—PERTH HEBREW CONGREGATION LANDS.

Introduced by the Minister for Education and read a first time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Supply Bill (No. 3), £1,047,000.

2, Northam Municipal Ice Works.

Passed.

RESOLUTION—STATE FOREST DEDICATION, REVOCATION.

Message from the Legislative Assembly requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That the proposal of His Excellency the Governor for the partial revocation of the dedication of State forest No. 5 be carried out.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.34]: The Forests Act, No. 8 of 1919, provides that the Governor may by Order in Council dedicate as a State forest, any Crown land including any area which may have been a timber reserve. Land so dedicated, it is provided, shall not be dealt with otherwise than in pursuance of that Act, and such dedication shall not be revoked or altered except under the authority of the Act. The following section provides that a dedication under the Act of Crown land as a State forest may be revoked in whole or in part in the following manner: "The Governor shall cause to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament a proposal for such revocation. After such proposal has been laid before Parliament the Governor, on a resolution being passed by both Houses that such proposal be carried out, shall by Order in Council revoke such dedication." This is a proposal to revoke the dedication of portion of State forest No. 5, including, in the transfer, location 2716. Locations 2716 and 2717 were previously leased, and the holder was financed by the Agricultural Bank. The blocks were, after a time, abandoned and the Forests Department agreed to take over the debt due to the bank, in view of the fact that there was a considerable quantity of marketable timber on location 2717. The Bank was not prepared to split the authority by allowing the department to take over only the block required, and the whole lot was transferred to the Forests Department. It was then dedicated as a State forest. Location 2716 was partially cleared and ringbarked and, in the opinion of the Government and the Conservator of Forests as well, it is suitable for farming purposes and not as a State forest.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What is the area?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot say. It would probably be about 1,000 acres or it may be less.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: It is not so large as that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Practically the whole expenditure on the block has been incurred in connection with lot 2716, and the applicant is prepared to take over the liability and has made provisional arrangements accordingly with the Agricultural Bank. The arrangement now proposed to be made is in accordance with the views of the Conservator of Forests and the Lands Department. It is the only way

under the Act that this dedication can be revoked. I move—

That the resolution forwarded by the Legislative Assembly be concurred in.

The PRESIDENT: May I ask the Minister if the proposal has been laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, I laid it on the Table some days ago.

Question put and passed.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 8 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Commissioner of Railways may refuse to carry certain wheat:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Regarding the railing of wheat below milling quality which may be sent to Perth, the Commissioner of Railways may block the railing of any such wheat sold in the country by a farmer. He may be able to do that in consequence of the amendment passed yesterday.

The Minister for Education: This provision does not apply to exempted wheat, but only wheat which is subject to Clause 6.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Under the circumstances mentioned by the Minister, would it not be advisable to strike out the clause altogether?

The Minister for Education: Certainly not.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: As a matter of fact, Clause 6 in one sense is not in operation because we have practically changed that aspect.

The Minister for Education: Not at all.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Rightly or wrongly, I am very suspicious regarding these powers. If I understood the decision of the Committee aright last night, we took away the discretion of the Minister and within certain limits we have made the trade in wheat quite free. Why retain this clause? The Railway Department are accustomed under the previous measure not to allow any railing of wheat without the permission of the Minister. If a farmer took 10 bags of wheat to a siding and wanted it forwarded, the Commissioner of Railways would not accept it unless it was accompanied by written permission. Now we have provided that a farmer may consign wheat under certain conditions. If we deprived the Commissioner of Railways of any right not to handle the wheat, it would put the department, the consignor and the consignee in a sounder position.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: My reason for asking the question was that this provision has appeared in previous Acts. The Commissioner of Railways has carried to Perth wheat acquired in the country outside the scheme altogether.

The Minister for Education: Quite so.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Then those responsible committed an illegal act.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: That is so. When the representative of the State pool saw the wheat in the Perth yard, he made inquiries and ascertained that it belonged to a man named Berrigan at Three Springs. When questioned the man stated that he bought the wheat from the Westralian Farmers' representative at Three Springs. On sworn evidence tendered, that was not the only truck. Wheat was acquired at Doodlakine and at other places of which the manager of the wheat pool knew nothing. I fully expected last night that there would be a certain amount of whipping by the Leader of the House—

The Minister for Education: I indignantly repudiate such a charge. I have not spoken to any member as to how he would vote. What I have to say I say from my seat in the House. The remark is unworthy of the hon. member, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I accept the statement for what it is worth.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you withdraw it?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I withdraw. After certain members left the House last night to catch the last train—I had to run all the way to West Perth station and almost fell into the train exhausted—as a result of the able manner in which the Leader of the House concluded the debate, three members voted—

The Minister for Education: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in making reflections of this kind? As a matter of fact, I did not conclude the debate. I did not open my mouth after the hon. member left the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw that statement.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I withdraw. Shall I put it this way, that I am only going on the garbled report in this morning's paper. When I left the Chamber last night I was satisfied that the Westralian Farmers Limited would not be the acquiring agents this year. The evidence from which I am reading extracts is conclusive that I had good grounds for objecting to them being the acquiring agents this year. Despite the Minister's statement, I contend that we have an organisation capable of doing the work of acquiring.

The Minister for Education: Is the hon. member in order in reflecting on a vote of the Committee last evening and discussing the clause then dealt with instead of the clause now before us?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member not to reflect on the Committee and to confine himself to the clause under discussion.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am showing that I had good grounds for the attitude I adopted. In the heat of debate one sometimes makes use of expressions for which one is sorry afterwards. Under this clause the Commissioner of Railways will have the

power to refuse to bring wheat in excess of five bags to the market from any farmer in the country. I want to be quite clear that the Commissioner of Railways will not use his authority to block wheat, even though it may exceed five bags, from coming to the Perth city markets. A farmer can get a better price, even for inferior wheat, in the Perth city markets than at the country sidings.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think Mr. Sanderson is a little in error in saying that the Committee altered the purpose of Clause 6. What the Committee did was to make it compulsory for the Minister to make those exemptions which the Minister intended to make. That does not alter the purpose of the clause. The clause prohibits the sale of all wheat except exempted wheat, and the Committee made it mandatory on the Minister to grant the exemptions he intended to make. Subclause 1 of Clause 6, prohibiting general trafficking in wheat, still stands. Under the general provisions it is necessary that the Commissioner of Railways should have this power to prevent attempts to defeat the general principle of Clause 6. It has nothing to do with the particular classes of wheat which have been exempted. I can quite understand wheat, which should not have been railed, being brought down without any protest on the part of the Commissioner. The Commissioner would not interfere unless asked to do so, and he would not be asked unless the railways were being used to defeat the purpose of the Act. The clause is not mandatory, but permissive—"The Commissioner may refuse." The Commissioner will not be expected to have any special knowledge as to where the wheat is coming from or to whom it is being sent. If the scheme found that the purposes of the Act was being defeated, the Commissioner would be appealed to and asked not to carry the wheat. The clause is designed to enable the Commissioner in such cases to refuse to carry the wheat; otherwise he would be unable to refuse. The provision would be exercised only to prevent a breach of the general principle of the Act. It would never be applied to exempted wheat sent down. Wheat has been sent down when it should not have been sent. The clause will relieve the Commissioner of the obligation to carry wheat, no matter for whom.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Minister's statement so far as it goes is quite accurate, but I want to take away the power from the wheat scheme and the Commissioner of Railways to interfere with what we have authorised. I appreciate what the Minister has said with regard to Clause 6 and Clause 11, but it does not deal with the case I put forward. If we once clearly understand what we are discussing and take a vote, the actual draftsmanship to give effect to our intention is not our business. We should not be called upon in the course of the debate to draft clauses to carry out our wishes legally and accurately.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Cannot you specify "excepting in regard to wheat covered by Section 6"?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I just wish to make it clear that I am not going to attempt anything in the way of expert draftsmanship while I am on my feet. We have established that we shall have free trade inside the State. The intention of the Committee last evening was clear enough. My object is to assist the railway people. If anyone tries to take advantage of what we have passed in order to achieve something of which we have not approved, the pool should have ample opportunity to check such attempts. But I object strongly to the Railway Commissioner being given carte blanche to stop all wheat that is not consigned to or by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. Let us understand what we intend to do, and let us get the Parliamentary Draftsman to carry out our wishes. I desire to dissociate myself from any criticism of the leader of the House with regard to either the influencing of votes or the conduct of business.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss that matter.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I hope I am permitted to say that after considerable dealings with the Leader of the House I have nothing whatever to complain of regarding the conduct of business here. Still, I hope the Committee will not be misled by the lines of argument of the Leader of the House.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have no wish to mislead anybody. If members are doubtful whether the clause as it stands would exempt wheat which is exempted by Clause 6, it is an easy matter to insert in this clause, after the word "wheat" in the fifth line, the words "subject to such section." That amendment would make it absolutely certain that the only wheat which the Commissioner of Railways could refuse to carry would be wheat subject to Clause 6.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggested, by way of interjection while Mr. Sanderson was speaking, that after the word "bags" in the fifth line there should be inserted "except wheat exempted under Section 6 hereof." However, in accordance with the suggestion of our Leader, I move an amendment—

That after the word "wheat," in line 5, there be inserted "subject to such section."

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: It seems to me that the matter would be made clearer by the addition to the clause of the following proviso:—"Provided that this section shall not refer to produce exempted by Subsection 4 of Section 6."

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am prepared to accept either amendment. There is no attempt now to block this affair. However, I hope the Minister will consult the best legal authority at his disposal, so that the matter may be placed beyond all doubt. Two

of the best business men in the Chamber do not agree on the matter. The question is one of legal interpretation; and the interpretations placed by the courts on our enactments have frequently been utterly different from what was intended by this House. This thing is regarded with fear and irritation and suspicion by the consumers.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is my invariable practice, the first thing in the morning after a sitting of this House, to consult the Crown Law authorities with regard to amendments put up here, and to make sure that those amendments carry out the intention of the House. If they do not, I tell the House so at the report stage.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I do not like the clause at all, because it seems to establish a system of legal boycott. However, there is a danger of certain farmers who are under obligations to the Industries Assistance Board getting their wheat away if they see a chance of doing so. Therefore I support the clause, subject to the amendment.

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

• Clause 12—Corusacks:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: This clause affords me an opportunity of showing that I have no particular feeling of antagonism towards our farmers. The clause appears to need some addition. No doubt a great deal of wheat will be garnered which the farmer knows has no chance of getting through as f.a.q. milling wheat. For such wheat the farmer should be allowed to use secondhand bags when he sells it as poultry feed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: After the farmer has garnered his wheat, such wheat as he wishes to tender to the pool he must put in new bags; and that is quite right. Such wheat as he does not wish to tender to the pool, he can put in his hat, or in anything else he likes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—Price of wheat for local consumption:

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am puzzled as to the London parity, because I go about and ask farmers to say what the London price is, and I put the same question to prominent business people, without being able to get an answer. I also look at the cables to see what the London price is, but cannot obtain the information. I am under the impression that the price of wheat is actually published in every number of the "London Gazette." Certainly that used to be the practice. The matter is treated as one of great importance in London. I consider that the wheat board should officially publish to the whole of Western Australia every week what the price of wheat is in London, so that all of us may be clear on the point. I hope the Minister will accept the suggestion. There is no need to alter the Bill for that purpose.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In pre-war days the London price was published in the Press, if not every week, very frequently.

Hon. J. Duffell: It is published pretty well every week now.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Then for a long period wheat was controlled, and during that period there was no such thing as price or parity, and accordingly there was no publication of London wheat prices, save very intermittently. Now that the control has been removed, the London price of wheat is published practically every week in the Press here.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: To pick up the paper and get a quotation for wheat as one gets a quotation for stocks and shares does not seem the same thing as the wheat board taking the responsibility of making their official statement, here in Perth, as to what the price of wheat in London is. That would be a great deal more satisfactory to the public than quotations without official authority published in the Press.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Undoubtedly, when a new price of wheat for local consumption is published, the figures on which that price is based will be published also. Those figures can be checked by anyone who likes to do so.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Why not have that information published every week?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The price of wheat will be altered only from month to month.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Nobody could take the responsibility of publishing once a month the prices of wheat or wool. If we get the information as to what the sales have been, we can form our own opinion.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: We get in the "West Australian" every week a report of the London sales of commodities of importance to Australia. The prices given represent the London parity. It might easily be arranged with the Agent-General that he cable every Monday morning the prices of certain commodities. However, I think the information published in the "West Australian" is quite sufficient to guide us as to London parity.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The clause prescribes that the price to be charged shall be based on the local equivalent of London parity. Sir Edward Wittenoom, the best authority we have on the point, says it would be difficult and even dangerous to give a definite figure. Apply that argument to the clause, and see where we find ourselves.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: But we only want an average.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: We do not require to be experts to know the extraordinary fluctuations that occur. Since the price has to be based on London parity, it is of the greatest importance that we should have a weekly official statement as to what London parity is.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you mean to fix it every week instead of every month?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I would put on the advisory committee the responsibility of saying every Monday morning what London parity is. At present it is practically impossible to arrive at the price.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It can be got every month.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: But one cannot say what the price of wheat is on any particular day; one can only say what it has been sold for. I should be content with an assurance from the Minister that the advisory committee will publish each Monday morning what they consider the London price is.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you want to fix the price for local consumption every week?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: No, certainly not. I am content to accept the clause as it stands, but I ask that the advisory committee shall publish the London price every Monday morning.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What can be the value of that?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: People will be able to estimate what the price is likely to be in respect of their individual transactions.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: On the second reading I pointed out that this clause was an impossible proposition. What good can be derived from the publication every Monday morning of advice received from London? Apart from the impossibility of at all fixing the price of wheat for local consumption, is the further difficulty that the fixing of such price at the beginning of each month will leave us in a most interesting position towards the close of each month. The wicked part of the clause is that it is to be London parity up to 7s., after which the farmer is not to get London parity; whereas if the parity falls below 7s. the farmer has to foot the bill. If the farmer is to have London parity at all he should have London parity all the way through, whatever it may be. If any member cares to move an amendment in that direction it will have my support.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I enter a protest against two features of the clause. One is the London parity. Having agreed upon a pool and compelled all farmers to pool their wheat, there is only one logical thing to do in the fixing of the price for local consumption, namely to ignore world's parity, decide upon a price which will be fair to the farmer, and flat-rate it. We have tried it during two years. Last year it worked out in the interests of the consumer, and this year it was to the interests of the grower. Under a flat rate we would have to give and take; it would cut both ways. These variations are inevitable. A miller may buy flour forward on the first January and the price may fall a month

afterwards. It is these vexatious fluctuations in the price of flour, which lead to similar fluctuations in the price of bread, that cause so much trouble. A flat rate is an infinitely better plan to adopt. Most farmers would be prepared to sell their wheat forward if they could get the present price. It should be easier to fix a reasonable flat rate this year than it ever was in the history of the pool. I am opposed to the clause as it stands.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I hope later on to move an amendment to the effect that the clause shall cease to operate after the 31st December next. This reservation in regard to price fixing is in the interests of the consumer and not of the grower. It provides that the consumer shall not pay more for his wheat than the London parity in London. To obviate the possibility of that it is stated that the advisory committee shall as nearly as possible on the first day of each month settle the price. The Bill will, therefore, do a great deal for the consumer, the miller and the baker. With regard to Mr. Sanderson's suggestion, it is dangerous for prices of any articles to be published, as the particulars may be misleading. It would also be difficult to arrive at an exact statement on the point.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Every week the papers publish, in the cables from London, what is called the middle price, and the public can satisfy themselves as to what, approximately, the London parity for wheat is. If, therefore, the Minister makes these notifications monthly it is quite enough. If we are to have London parity let it be fair all round. I do not see why a maximum price should be fixed for the sale of the farmer's product when the minimum is left unfixed. I would point out that there are fluctuations in the price of bags and in the rate of wages that have to be paid in connection with the growing of wheat, and it is, therefore, to be expected that there will be variations in the price of wheat. If anyone will move to strike out the proviso I will support him.

Hon. J. E. DODD: One hon. member said that the farmer should only get outside parity for his wheat. I think the price mentioned in the Bill is a fair compromise. Why should the farmer be restricted to London parity? Are there other goods produced in Australia that are restricted to the price given in London? Is the London parity charged for boots or clothes? The same thing holds good in regard to mining requisites. They do not adhere to the London parity. Why should the farmer have the price of his wheat fixed on the basis of what he can get for it in London? If we protect one individual we should protect all. We have some favoured individuals in the community we protect up to the hilt, while the farmer and others have to get what price they can. Sir

Edward Wittenoom said he would give 5s. a bushel for wheat, and I asked if he would be prepared to give the same price for gold. We should give the farmer, the miner, the fruitgrower and other people on the land a fair chance of success. I shall support the clause. I hope the farmer will get a fair deal.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 the words "Provided that such price shall not exceed 7s. a bushel" be struck out.

Five shillings per bushel is a fair price for wheat for local consumption. A guarantee of not less than 5s. per bushel will mean that the farmer will get that as a minimum. To-day we are paying 9s. a bushel for wheat and 6d. for a 2lb. loaf in Perth. With wheat at 5s. a bushel bread should be 4d. a loaf.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It will not be long before we are eating bread made out of South Australian flour.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There is a feeling in the House that members are not prepared to do what is a reasonable and a fair thing. They object to the maximum. I am not prepared to say that we should be a party to the position that would result in the farmer growing wheat under present conditions for less than 5s. a bushel. With regard to price fixing, if that is to be part and parcel of the policy of the State, it should be general in character.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is going to be wiped out.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we pass the clause as it stands, it will mean that price fixing will be wiped out in every case except in regard to the sale of wheat. If we are not going to re-enact the Prices Regulation Act do not let us have price fixing in this clause.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This is a pooled article.

Hon. J. CORNELL: To what extent is it pooled? The man who puts the wheat in the pool pays all the expenses. Do not tell me that the State is backing the pool. It never has done so. The pool has always paid, and paid to the last shilling.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have no objection to the first portion of the amendment. The words were not included in the Bill which was brought down by the Government, but were inserted in another place in opposition to the wishes of the Government. I cannot agree to the latter portion of the amendment because it is open to two objections, one that it is unfair to ask the farmer to take something less than world's value, and the other that the minimum cannot be applied. If we had an Australian pool it would be possible to fix a minimum, and by imposing import duties on wheat it would be possible to fix that minimum, no matter how low the wheat fell elsewhere. But with a purely Western Australian pool, we cannot fix a minimum, because directly the price of wheat out of control fell below our

minimum, our markets would be flooded with flour and our mills would be placed out of operation. The position of the farmers then would be worse than ever. The purpose of the Bill is to place the farmers in the matter of selling for local consumption, and the local consumers, as nearly as possible in the position they would be in if there were a free market, so that the wheat sold for local consumption shall be sold and used by the consumer at as nearly as possible the rate that would prevail if there were no pool.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am of the same opinion as the Leader of the House, but I do not intend to cover the ground which he has traversed. I strongly oppose any system of price fixing. It is far better to fix the price of wheat from month to month on London parity, and then both the grower and the consumer will get what is the true value.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I desire to see the clause remain as it is. If I understand things rightly, this Bill has been framed solely in the interests of the farmer, and every farmer's representative who has spoken in this House and in another place has been most anxious that the Bill should be passed for their protection. If it were not for the agitation of the farming community I am satisfied that we would have no Bill before us to-day. Because of the pool the farmer has at his back the whole of the resources of the State, and whilst the farmer has this protection, there is another section we have to protect, viz., the consumers. All the clause asks is that the consumers will at least know that they will not pay more than 7s. a bushel for their wheat. The farmer has not much to grumble at. It is rather astonishing to hear members say that the only product the worker has to sell is his labour and they tell him to go to the Arbitration Court and to get his wages fixed. When another producer comes along, a producer of a different type, and he has the product of his labour to sell, there is no desire to fix the price of it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You will not let us pay the worker what he is worth.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: We would not allow payment to be made on the hon. member's estimation, not by any means. The Bill sets out that the farmer is going to get London parity up to a certain point.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Because he is not likely to get more. The hon. member knows that the farmer is not likely to get 7s. a bushel. Nevertheless I understand that the clause is there for the protection of the consumer, and to reassure the consumer that he will not pay more than 7s.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: The world's parity is the farmers' Arbitration Court.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: It has not been in the past, because we know the farmer has been getting a good deal more than the world's parity. I understand 5s. a bushel is the minimum which it is proposed shall be fixed. The amendment, however, is impractic-

able, because we shall find that South Australian wheat will be brought into Western Australia. I heard last night that a big parcel of South Australian wheat has been bought for early delivery next year in Western Australia. It was purchased at a very low figure, too. If this is so, this provision will not afford any protection to the farmers. If we say they shall get 5s. and not less, the South Australian farmers may be able to despatch wheat at 4s. 6d. This will show how impracticable the amendment really is. It would be all right if there was a Commonwealth pool, for then no wheat could be sold under the fixed rate. With open, free competition wheat can be imported from another State at a lower figure.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Members when deciding upon the amendment should bear in mind the gristing mills which are operating in this State. During the past 12 months the millers of Western Australia have had a particularly bad time. I have some fears as to what will happen before 31st December, when I remember that the price of 9s. a bushel is fixed till that time, and flour is offered at a lower price from other States. What chance will local millers have of supplying bran and pollard for the various industries in this State, if they have to compete against such conditions in other parts of Australia. I do not know that we need be alarmed by the statement of Mr. Baglin regarding the South Australian parcel of wheat, but if the amendment is carried, we will place a further obstacle in the way of the millers. I am opposed to the amendment but I will not be able to record my vote because I have paired with a member who is absent.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The amendment and the discussion go to the root of the whole subject and I can understand why some members are somewhat annoyed and irritated at what they consider unnecessary delay in the passage of the measure. If we had an assurance that this is to be the final pool, I would consider the matter in that light too. After listening to the remarks of Mr. Cornell and Mr. Baglin, I am convinced that this is a matter which will have to be discussed throughout the country to decide whether these pools are to be continued. Members of the Country Party will not speak on this subject; they appear to think that we are holding up this year's harvest. I admit we are interfering with that aspect and if I am given an assurance that this is the final pool, I will be prepared to accept anything they like. They will not give that assurance and the Labour Party will not give any such assurance but for very different reasons. It is an outrage that we cannot discuss this matter at great length because we cannot get an assurance from the Minister, or from the Government, as to the finalising of the pool.

The Minister for Education: They either can't or won't.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: There we join issue. It should be one of the easiest things in the world for the Minister or the Govern-

ment to say they will stop the pools at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Minister for Education: That would be a very difficult assurance to give.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Will they give us that assurance?

Hon. G. W. Miles: If they did, what would it mean?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Well, let us have that assurance at any rate; I do not ask for it off hand. I intend to support the amendment; it has not the ghost of a chance of being carried. Mr. Cornell's views are easily understood but it has puzzled many men as to how effect can be given to them. So far as I can understand, according to the statements of Labour members this is an attempt to give effect to those views. Mr. Cornell referred to the old bad system of competition. I think that was one of the most excellent systems.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is discussing an amendment to strike out certain words.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Suppose we strike them out, will I have a further opportunity of putting forward my views?

The CHAIRMAN: The clause will be before members for discussion still.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I move a further amendment—

That the following be inserted: "Provided that such price shall be not less than 5s. nor more than 7s. per bushel."

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 17—agreed to.

Schedule:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Clause 3, the words "except with the written consent of the Minister" be struck out.

If the words I suggest are struck out, the clause will coincide word for word with Section 3 appearing in the schedule of the 1920 Act.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member has not given any reason for striking out the words. He merely says that the amendment will result in uniformity compared with the 1920 Act. If that is a good argument, I would be answering him sufficiently if I say that if the words are left in the clause will be in conformity with the schedule of previous measures. It was always in the previous Acts until last year. The reason for the words is that it may be desirable to acquire wheat for seed purposes. The Committee should have some better reason for striking out the words.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I think the Minister will agree that it is bad to have an agent trafficking in the goods of the principal unless there is some special reason for it. Will he tell us what special necessity there is why the acquiring agents should operate in seed wheat?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not proposed to give the acquiring agents a general right to operate in seed wheat, but circumstances may arise when the Minister may consider it the best way in which the operation can be carried out.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I support the amendment. I am strongly of opinion that the Minister should not have the right to give this permission. The present Minister controlling the wheat scheme owes his position as a member of Parliament and as a Minister to the Country Party. The acquiring agents are the Westralian Farmers Ltd., and they are a political body. Do members seriously think that if the Minister for Agriculture dared to withhold consent, he would be allowed to remain in office? The Westralian Farmers Ltd. are strong enough to say that, if he did not give his consent, he would be removed from office.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is hardly in order in making those remarks.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: A former Honorary Minister offended certain persons and he is not in office to-day. It would be very difficult for the Minister controlling the pool to refuse to give his consent.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member not to discuss that point.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I support the amendment. I want to see the Minister for Agriculture kept quite outside any political or other influence. We must not run away with the idea that the Westralian Farmers Ltd. commend themselves to all farmers. I have been doing my best to voice the opinions of the people I represent, but I have been astonished at receiving by post, from people unknown to me in places as far apart as Dangin and the Arthur River, letters protesting as strongly against this organisation as I am doing. An Arthur River farmer writes protesting against the Government compelling him to trade with a firm who are obnoxious to him. I do not claim that this represents the whole of the farmers, but it has come to me quite unsolicited from a person unknown to me and indicates his opinion. The letter from Dangin contains a very strong protest indeed against the Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You will always find some dissatisfied people.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I admit that, but these letters seem to have some small significance, though I do not wish to emphasise them too much. If it is a question of giving permission to deal in seed wheat, make the permission specific.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Why only seed wheat?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Because the Minister said so. The agent should be debarred

from dealing in the article for which he is acting as agent. If the Westralian Farmers Ltd. are going to act as agents let them be agents and nothing else. I do not intend to reiterate my statements regarding the intimate connection existing between the Country Party and the Westralian Farmers Ltd., but to my mind it is absolutely established. The Minister for Education was righteously indignant this afternoon when Mr. Duffell suggested that he had been trying to find out or arrange the voting of members. One reason why our discussions in Committee are somewhat lengthy is that, for good or ill—I think for good—we have no parties in this House, and no one attempts illegitimately to influence votes. We come here and vote after discussion has taken place. It would certainly shorten the discussions if we adopted the caucus method and had to vote in a certain way, but our discussions and decisions are much more valuable. The only argument in favour of the retention of the words is the Minister's argument regarding seed wheat. Very well, let us specify seed wheat. We know the enormous pressure that could be brought to bear on the Minister by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. to get their own way. They could say to the Minister "If you will not do this we will do our best to put you out."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in reflecting on the Minister.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am not reflecting on the Minister but on the Westralian Farmers Ltd. No Minister could get rid of that influence. We could not have a more striking example than what has happened within the last six months. Did the former Honorary Minister voluntarily retire? I thought we would have had an explanation but we have had none and so we must draw our own conclusions. If it were put to me "Do this or we will use pressure to get you put out of office," what would I do? It would be no reflection on me that these people exercised such pressure. If these words are struck out, the Minister will be left free and unhampered.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is a business principle that a man may be either an agent or a salesman—one or the other, but not both. As the decision regarding the Bill has gone against me, my desire is to make the best use of the measure. The wheat is held in trust for the farmers by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. To give the Westralian Farmers Ltd. the right, even with the consent of the Minister, to traffic in seed wheat, to the exclusion of all other business people, strikes me as a monstrous proposition. The advisory committee, we hear, have to do with the sale of wheat. If there is any seed wheat to be sold, why should not the advisory committee sell it, with the incidental result that the profits from such sales would go into the pool instead of to the Westralian Farmers Ltd.? Agents should not traffic. Seed wheat represents a big

question. At Mingenew I once saw two stacks of wheat. One of them it was expected would be held for a considerable period, and that stack was well protected. The other stack, representing seed wheat, was without dunnage or covering. A few weeks later I was at Mingenew again, and saw men shifting the stack of seed wheat. I saw the men handling bags of what I believed to be blue-mouldy superphosphate. I knew it was the wrong time of the year for superphosphate, and so I went over to the station to have a look. Then I found it was not superphosphate, but seed wheat, which was not required, being despatched to I do not know where. If the acquiring agents can make one stack seed wheat and another stack pool wheat, and can subsequently sell seed wheat, an obvious danger arises. We should carry the amendment. If another amendment is then required to give the advisory board power to sell seed wheat, we can pass that too.

The Minister for Education: The advisory board has power to sell wheat.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In that case why does the Bill propose to give the acquiring agents the right to traffic? I really would like to have that question answered.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The attitude of various hon. members surprises me. The wheat is the farmers' wheat, and there is no reason why the farmers' company—

Hon. T. Moore: Are all the farmers in the company?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I cannot say. The complaint of hon. members all along has been that the price charged for wheat supplied to poultry breeders and pig raisers has been too high. The reason for the high price is, in my opinion, that the farmers' own company have not been allowed to trade with the poultry farmers and pig breeders. However, there will be free dealing in wheat in all directions, and inferior wheat will be disposed of. If the acquiring agents are not allowed to trade in inferior wheat, the result will be to compel the poultry and pig raisers to pay higher charges in other quarters. The individual wheat grower probably will not have a whole truck load of inferior wheat to sell to the pig raiser. It is only the acquiring agents who will be able to purchase and handle inferior wheat in larger quantities, and therefore at cheaper rates.

The Minister for Education: That is not contemplated.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I am sure instances will crop up where such a course will be necessary. Dalgety and Co., who were the one firm authorised to deal in inferior wheat had not the necessary organisation to handle the business, and in consequence the purchasers of the inferior wheat had to pay higher prices. If free dealing in Western Australian wheat is hampered, there will be free dealing here in wheat from South Australia.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Hamersley suggested that advantage would

arise from permitting the Westralian Farmers Ltd. to deal in inferior wheat. I think it only right to tell the House that the Minister for Agriculture has informed the Westralian Farmers Ltd. that he will not give any such permission. The Minister considers that it would be wrong to do so, because the Westralian Farmers Ltd. or their representatives, are the people who decide whether wheat is inferior or otherwise. I hold the same view, having regard to the possibility of undesirable complications.

Hon. J. CORNELL: One of the reasons urged in favour of the amendment is that the Minister for Agriculture owes his political birth and all his political opportunities to the farmers and settlers of this State. It is argued that to give such a Minister the authority here sought would not be right. The charge can be dismissed, however, in view of its not being specific. It is merely a general charge levelled against every Parliamentarian who becomes a Minister. I regard the Minister for Agriculture as an honourable man, and one who, if he finds himself in a position where it is a question of honour against wealth, will surrender his portfolio. The wheat will come within the purview of the Minister only after it has been delivered by the farmer to the pool. Only in wheat that has been put into the pool can there be any dealings by the agents. An earlier clause of the Bill provides that no person in this State may sell or deal in wheat otherwise than through the Minister. If the Minister decides that persons or firms other than the Westralian Farmers Ltd. shall deal in inferior wheat, additional expense will be incurred, and there will be charges of profiteering.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I will vote for the amendment because throughout the Bill there have been too many points left in doubt. This is one of them. The other night, on the question of "may" or "shall" the Minister informed us that it was the intention of the Government to interpret that clause as though the word were "shall." But he would not give me an assurance that that would be done, nor would he accept an amendment to insert "shall" in lieu of "may." Mr. Baxter, an ex-Minister, told us that in the judgment of Ministers "may" meant "shall." It showed that the issue on that point was not clear. Now it is intended to give the Westralian Farmers Ltd., at the discretion of the Minister, the option of dealing in wheat, and we are told that it is intended to limit that to seed wheat. Considering the delicate relationship between the Minister for Agriculture, a member of the Country Party, and the Westralian Farmers Ltd., it is too dangerous to leave this at the discretion of the Minister. Better to make it clear that the Westralian Farmers Ltd. are debarred from dealing in wheat.

Hon. T. MOORE: Mr. Cornell says that only the wheat in the pool could be dealt with under the clause as it stands. As a

matter of fact, the Westralian Farmers Ltd. could say to a farmer, "Bring in your inferior wheat and we will find a buyer." It would be the thin end of the wedge. Generally logical, Mr. Cornell is wrong in his reasoning to-night. Mr. Hamersley blew the gaff when he said these people wished to trade in wheat. Clearly he does not agree with the Minister, who says they wish only to trade in seed wheat.

The Minister for Education: I said the Minister intended that they should trade only in seed wheat.

Hon. T. MOORE: One would imagine that the only people looking after the wheat were the Westralian Farmers Ltd. That is not so. We have a State staff inspecting the wheat, and so the State could easily do the whole of the work.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And make another State trading concern of it.

Hon. T. MOORE: It is a State trading concern now. The fact that we are considering the Bill proves that. To allow the clause to remain as printed would be highly dangerous. We have our inspectors going about—

Hon. V. Hamersley: And the wheat is paying for it.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes, the wheat is paying for the State inspection, and paying again for the work of the Westralian Farmers Ltd. I would obviate the double inspection. We have had evidence that trucks of wheat have been sent down here for the Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Hon. J. Duffell: Evidence concerning the truck referred to was brought out by the select committee of 1918.

Hon. T. MOORE: Well, I have been misinformed. I thought it was more recent. However, if we are to keep a staff, let us give them something to do. The inspectors should be asked to look out for the best seed wheat. Seed wheat should not be left to the Westralian Farmers Ltd. Indeed, the Westralian Farmers Ltd. should not be permitted to deal in seed wheat or any other wheat. Our advisory board should be asked to look after the sales of inferior wheat. The Minister should not be exposed to the risk of having pressure brought to bear upon him by the acquiring agents.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

Motion put and passed.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That "directly or indirectly" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out. This will give expression to the wish of hon. members, and strengthen the position of the Minister if he should require it. The addition of the proposed words will make the position very clear.

The Minister for Education: What will those words mean?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That the acquiring agents shall not by themselves directly, or indirectly or through the medium of a second party, deal in wheat. I refer members to Section 6 of the Act. The purpose of the Bill is to prevent others buying and selling wheat and to vest in the Government all property and ownership in wheat, and that no person in Western Australia shall, except as prescribed, sell to or buy wheat from any other person in Western Australia.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: How much is this dealing in wheat worth to the Westralian Farmers Ltd.?

Hon. J. Cornell: You should give notice of that question.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I thought I should have found this information in the return of the Agricultural Department. The amendment is intended to tie things up as tightly as possible. To that extent it has my approval. In order to estimate the full importance of this question, I want to know how much this agency is worth to the company, and how much this trading in wheat is worth to them. I should be obliged for that information.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think the words will make any difference at all. I have no objection to them. If Parliament desires that this company should be prohibited from dealing in wheat, then they should be so prohibited.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: In connection with paragraph 6, there appears to be no power of appeal from the decision of an inspector.

The Minister for Education: Yes, there is.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: If a farmer brings in 50 bags of wheat and the inspector takes off £4 from the value and the farmer thinks it should only be £1, he should have some right of appeal from the decision of the inspector. I should like to see the following words added:—"Where the wheat is subject to deduction by the inspector, the owner shall have the right of appeal to the advisory committee."

The Minister for Education: That is already provided for.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Very well.

Hon. G. W. MILES: In paragraph 21 the penalty with regard to an infringement of Clause 3 appears to be altogether too low. Have there been any breaches of this agreement in the past?

The Minister for Education: I do not think so.

Hon. G. W. MILES: A penalty of £10 is not sufficient. An agent can handle 100 trucks of wheat and make a profit of £100,

and may be very ready to pay a £10 fine. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph 21, line 8, "ten" be struck out and "one hundred" inserted in lieu.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In Subclause 2, of Clause 6, if a person is guilty of a contravention of that clause he is liable to a penalty not exceeding £500.

Hon. J. Cornell: We should not make the advisory Committee both judge and jury.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Certain consequential amendments are necessary in the Bill as it has come down to us. Paragraph 10, for instance, refers to Clause 12, (1), (c), whereas there is no such paragraph in existence in that clause. In another place Clause 4 was put into the schedule and that altered the number of the subsequent clauses. There is also provision for a penalty for breach of Clause 21, but that applies to another clause. These alterations should have been made in the Bill before it came to us.

The CHAIRMAN: They will be attended to.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I presume the reference to Clause 3 is in order?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: It is, I presume, possible to alter the penalties referring to other clauses at a later stage?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I move a further amendment—

That in line 8, "two" be struck out and "twenty" inserted in lieu.

If an agent does not comply with the labour conditions set down, he should be made to pay a higher penalty.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If there is any deliberate attempt on the part of the agent to go outside the law, I take it is the intention of the Committee to impose a pretty severe penalty. If, however, the breach is accidental the penalty should be very low. There may be a technical breach of some of these clauses. In the circumstances I think the Minister should give us an opportunity of perusing all these amendments before the third reading stage is taken. For my part, I want to be able to read the Bill through most carefully before that stage is reached.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Bill must go to another place before we read it a third time. I am quite sure that the penalty prescribed for a breach of Clause 4 has no reference to the matter to which Mr. Baglin referred. When Clause 4 was inserted in another place it was considered that the clause carried its own penalty. Another place omitted to provide for a penalty, and the penalty as it appears in regard to the present Clause 4 in the Bill, was intended to apply to what was originally Clause 4. I have no objection to a penalty being provided for what is now Clause 4.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I want to know whether the Committee will have an opportunity, before we send the Bill to another place, to carefully peruse our own amendments, and to read the Bill as a whole, and perhaps bring forward other amendments. My idea is to protect our own standard or workmanship.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The procedure will be that when we complete the consideration of the Bill in Committee the Chairman will report to the President and ask leave to sit again when the Bill is returned from another place. I shall then move that the report be adopted, and it will be competent for an hon. member to move that the consideration of the report be made an order for the next sitting. Then it will be possible for the hon. member to recommit the Bill. It is important however that the Bill be got through as quickly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like hon. members to understand that no penalty at present is provided in connection with Clause 4. If the amendment is carried there will be a penalty to the extent of £20 in connection with the breach of that clause.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I suggest that Mr. Baglin withdraw his amendment, and move to add a new line to Clause 21 of the agreement similar to the other lines already there, providing for a penalty for a breach of Clause 4.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: I am willing to do that and withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I move an amendment—

That in Clause 21 of the agreement the following line be added—"For every breach of Clause 4, the sum of £10."

Amendment put and passed, the Schedule (agreement) as amended, agreed to.

New Clause—Supply of Cornsacks:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the following new clauses be added to the Bill:—(1) The Minister may make advances to any wheat grower whose wheat is or is intended to be acquired to enable such wheat grower to purchase cornsacks; and such advances shall be repayable to the Minister on demand, with interest at the prescribed rate and shall be a charge on the wheat in priority to all other encumbrances. (2) The amount of such advances, with interest, to be certified by the Minister, may be deducted from the certificate to be issued in respect of the wheat acquired and a certificate may be issued to the Minister for the amount so deducted.

For the past three years the pool has financed farmers with regard to the purchase of their cornsacks from merchants. In 1918-19 there was a saving of approximately 4d. a dozen to the farmer by operating in this way. In

1919-20 the saving was 3d., and in 1920-21 the saving was again 3d. When the Bill was drafted it was thought that there would be no necessity for the provision, but since then corn sacks have advanced and the advisory board recommend that this power be given.

New clause put and passed.

Schedules A, B, C—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILLS—FIRST READING.

1, Stamp.

2, Constitution Act Amendment.

3, Auctioneers.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; Hon. A. Lovekin in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 4—Strike out the clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Clause 4 permitted members of the court to visit institutions. The clause was originally struck out by the Committee and when I produced two letters from Archbishop Riley and Archbishop Clune, it was reinserted. The lower House has seen fit to delete the clause. I am sorry, because, speaking from experience, the department and the institutions themselves will regret that the clause is not included in the Bill. I do not propose to press the matter and I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2—Insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 12:—"Whenever any child who has been committed to the care of the State or who has been committed to an institution or who has been convicted under this Act attains the age of 18 years, the fact of such committal or conviction shall not be admissible as evidence in any court of law. Any official or other person who wilfully makes public, or is privy to making public, the fact that any child has been committed or convicted under this Act shall be deemed to be guilty of an offence. Penalty: One hundred pounds."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I propose to move an amendment upon the Assembly's amendment. The Assembly's amendment is somewhat similar to the clause which I asked

members of this Chamber to insert in the Bill. It is varied a little in the form received from the Assembly and for that reason I propose to ask members to agree to a slight alteration. The clause which I proposed was taken from the New Jersey Act. I can give hon. members two concrete cases to show the necessity for the amendment. The Minister knows of one of the cases. Boys were released on probation from the Children's Court and obtained employment. One of the owners of a car which had been stolen was probably very aggrieved because the car was much damaged. This individual, however, went to the employer of one of these children and pointed out what the boy had done with the result that one of the boys concerned lost his position. In the second case, a girl was released on probation and secured employment. Some busybody informed her employer about her trouble and she lost her position. Within the last few days the State Children Department received a letter from the mother of this girl asking whether a child who had once fallen was not to be given some chance in a Christian country. It was intended that the clause should prevent malicious injury to children on probation. The Assembly's amendment does not quite meet the case, and in the circumstances I move an amendment—

That in line 6 of the Assembly's amendment the words "be admissible" be struck out and "be maliciously disclosed to any person nor be admitted" be inserted.

Amendment on the Assembly's amendment put and passed; the Assembly's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with a modification to the Assembly's amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 20th October, 1921.

	Page
Rs: Stamp, 3s.	1367
Auctioneers, 3s.	1367
Constitution Act Amendment, 3s.	1367
Supply (No. 3), £1,047,000, returned	1369
Northam Municipal Ice Works, returned	1369
Annual Estimates: General Debate concluded, Votes discussed	1367
Resolution: State Forest dedication, revocation, Council's Message	1369

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

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1. Stamp.
 2. Auctioneers.
 3. Constitution Act Amendment.
- Transmitted to the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1921-22.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £975:

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [4.36]: My attitude towards the Budget is one of sincere sympathy with the Premier, in that he has had to submit a forecast so serious to the State. We are faced with a deficit of over half a million on the year. It is also very serious in view of the fact that the State demands many urgent works which, under existing conditions, it would be difficult to carry out. I am afraid some of the ill-effect will be passed on to the district I represent, inasmuch as I understand that the Vote passed by the House for extending and widening the Busselton jetty is likely to be jettisoned.

The Minister for Works: It is entirely your own fault.

Mr. PICKERING: It is not! The conditions imposed by the Minister were entirely opposed to the spirit in which the Vote was passed.

The Minister for Works: I say it is entirely your own fault that you have lost that Vote.

Mr. PICKERING: I deny that. The files show that any extension of the jetty without widening was opposed by the department. I regret very much that it has been found necessary to withhold the money passed by this House.

The Minister for Works: If you had not interfered the work would have been in progress now.

Mr. PICKERING: I regret that such an occasion should have arisen, and I regret it also for other constituencies; because if it is found necessary to cut out expenditure in one electorate, presumably the same necessity will apply to other electorates. On the Address-in-reply I said that if we were to recover our financial position in the near future, it would be incumbent upon the State to make large sacrifices, that we would have to go in for increased taxation, drastic retrenchment, and the cutting out of non-essential public works. The Leader of the Opposition, the other evening, said that the only possible remedy for our financial troubles would be found to lie in unimproved land values taxation. In a restricted sense that particular form of taxation obtains to-day. To increase it to any appreciable degree would be to impose a hardship on the prim-