

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

BILL—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council notifying that it proposed an alternative to its amendment No 1 disagreed to by the Assembly, in which alternative amendment the Council desired the concurrence of the Assembly, now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Council's alternative amendment—Add a proviso to Subclause 1 of proposed new Section 20, and re-insert proposed new Subclause 7 as Subclause 6, as follows:—"Provided that in the case of beer (ale, porter and stout) the undermentioned vessels shall contain not less than the quantities stated in the following schedule:—Hogshead 52 gallons, barrel 35 gallons, halfhogshead 26 gallons, kilderkin 17 gallons, 10-gallon keg 9½ gallons, 9-gallon keg 8½ gallons, 5-gallon keg 4½ gallons. (6) This section shall not take effect until the expiration of six months from the commencement of this Act":

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Clause 6 proposes a new section, to stand as No. 20, dealing with sale by net weight or measure, and the first subsection of that proposed section reads—

No person shall sell by retail any article by weight or measure unless by net weight or measure.

The Council now suggest that the proviso contained in the alternative amendment be added to the subsection in question. There is an important difference between this alternative amendment and the amendment first proposed by the Council. The first amendment said that the vessels should be deemed to contain the standard measures. The alternative amendment merely amounts to a proviso that the vessels shall contain not less than a minimum quantity, and of course shall be charged for accordingly.

Mr. Davy: This Bill does not deal with charges, does it?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. Had the original amendment been accepted,

then, if an inspector of weights and measures stopped a cart containing barrels of beer and found that the barrels contained 52 gallons, it would have been all right and there could have been no prosecution. Under the alternative amendment, the invoice would show that the barrel contained only 52 gallons, and the purchaser would know that he was getting only 52 gallons. Thus the principle of the Act would be maintained. I move—

That the alternative amendment be agreed to.

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

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

House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Friday, 3rd December, 1926.

	PAGE
Questions: Workmen's Inspectors of Mines ...	2655
Machinery Inspections, surprise visits ...	2656
Privilege: Unknown Western Australian soldier ...	2656
Bills: Road Districts Act Amendment, Report ...	2658
State Insurance, Assembly's message ...	2658
Lake Brown-Bullfinch Railway, 2a., Com., Report ...	2659
Dairy Cattle Compensation, 2a., Com., Report ...	2672
Rijandling Northwards Railway, 2a., Com., Report ...	2677
Boypup Brook-Cranbrook Railway, 2a., Com. Report ...	2679
Constitution Act Amendment, 2a. ...	2682
Metropolitan Market, Com. ...	2686
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2a., Com. ...	2687
Royal Agricultural Society, 2a., Com., Report ...	2699

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—WORKMEN'S INSPECTORS OF MINES, ELECTION.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Why have not the biennial elections for workmen's inspectors of mines (due in November, as provided under the Mines Regulation Act) been held? 2, On what date is it proposed (a) to call for nominations for these positions, (b) to hold the elections?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The term of the appointment of the present inspectors has not yet expired. 2, (a) and (b), The matter is under consideration.

QUESTION—MACHINERY INSPECTIONS, SURPRISE VISITS.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: What number of working inspections, or inspections without notice, have been made by inspectors of machinery and boilers for the calendar years 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, and 1925 in (a) the timber mills in the South-Western districts of Western Australia, (b) the East Coolgardie Goldfields of Western Australia?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Working inspections: (a) Timber mills in South-Western district—1921, 104; 1922, 105; 1923, 88; 1924, 62; 1925, 88, total 447 (includes working expenses of locomotives; (b) East Coolgardie Goldfield—1921, 5; 1922, 3; 1923, nil; 1924, 10; 1925, 5; total, 23.

PRIVILEGE—UNKNOWN WESTERN AUSTRALIAN SOLDIER.

Incomplete File.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan [3.5]: I rise, under Standing Orders 401, 402 and, I think, 106, to order. It will be remembered that some days ago the Chief Secretary agreed to a motion I submitted asking for the papers to be laid on the Table in connection with a proposal to bring the remains of an unknown soldier from France to Perth. Those papers were laid on the Table in perfectly good faith, but, as they appear on the file, they certainly put me in a very false position. Beyond a few newspaper cuttings, which I will not trouble to read as they have no bearing on the subject, the file contains a cablegram from the Agent General, Mr. H. P. Colebatch, to the Premier, which reads as follows:—

Cable reply my letter 9th June this year unknown soldier. Lovekin anxious.

Then there is a copy of the cable in reply, as follows:—

Unknown soldier proposal not favoured generally.

These are the only two documents on the file and it will be noticed from what I have

read, that the cable message from the Agent General referred to a letter dated the 9th June this year. That letter ought to be but is not, on the file. I do not know what the contents of Mr. Colebatch's letter were, but I do know that I supplied Mr. Colebatch with details regarding the full proposal that I wished to make on this subject, and those details also should be on the file. I wrote practically in the same terms to Sir William Lathlain and he knows what the proposal was. It is only fair to myself that I should state exactly the nature of the proposal. It was not confined to the importation of the remains of an unknown soldier. When I left Perth on a holiday I knew the supreme efforts that had been made, particularly by Sir William Lathlain to raise money for the erection of a national war memorial in Perth, the capital city of Western Australia. I was aware of the very scant support he had met with. When I was on the Continent I saw most elaborate war memorials. I was chagrined at the thought that we in Perth had nothing of that description to commemorate the memory of the men who went to the war and made the supreme sacrifice in order to secure our safety. Those memorials are to be found in different countries. I saw them not only in England but in Belgium, France, Italy and elsewhere. I thought that if I could secure for the State the remains of an unknown Western Australian soldier and add £1,500 or £2,000 to the funds that had already been collected for a war memorial, we might erect a suitable monument. I shall not refer to an obelisk, which I understand it has been decided to erect here and which, to my mind, if I may say so without giving offence, because everyone is entitled to his view on the subject, is a meaningless type of memorial. On the other hand we might have erected a memorial in the form of an arch along the line of the famous Arc de Triomphe in Paris. That arch is a magnificent structure, and is one of the sights everyone is taken to see in Paris. An arch of the description I suggested could have been erected at the entrance to King's Park with the body of the unknown soldier as the keystone resting in the middle of it. I suggested securing the remains of an unknown Western Australian soldier because we in Western Australia conscripted ourselves. We took a great interest in the war and sent more than our quota overseas. We have paid the penalty

in £ s. d. for so doing, in respect of the Federal per capita grant. When the war was over, we planted in King's Park, so far as our funds would permit, a tree for each soldier who had fallen in the war and whose identity was known. Those trees are now not only beautifying the park but are serving to keep evergreen the memory of those who made the sacrifice for us. There were hundreds of others who went to the war and lost their lives, but who remain unknown. Those soldiers cannot be represented by trees in the park, but only, as is done elsewhere, by one who shall be representative of the whole. I thought that if we could get the remains of such a soldier and accord representation to him in an arch at the entrance to King's Park, we would keep alive the memory, not only of those men who fell and were known, but of those who fell and were unknown, and who died unhonoured and unsung.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the point of privilege.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The point of privilege is this, that what I am stating is part of the proposal that should have been included in the file. If it had been I would be entitled to refer to it. As it is not included and I have risen on a point of privilege, surely I am entitled to state what the proposal was! I do not wish to weary the House. What I have stated was part of the proposal. On the other hand, the file as it is made available to the public shows that some proposal, without any rhyme or reason, has been turned down by the Government, who say it is not generally approved here. The file does not show that there was anything to approve or to disapprove. It is confined to the two cable messages, whereas if the whole proposal had been included on the file, perhaps the same attitude would not have been adopted. The scheme has been put forward as a proposal to transfer an unknown soldier's remains to Perth, whereas the real proposal was to erect an arch at the entrance to King's Park, of which the remains of the unknown soldier were to form part. There is some objection in Europe on the score that memorials to unknown soldiers have at their heads "eternal" flames. I am not wedded to that idea; it is one way of commemorating the sacrifices made by unknown men and by this means the torch is kept burning for all time. Of course it is a very

nice idea. I do not care whether it be a Roman Catholic institution or what it may be. Such schemes should be considered on their merits just as any Bill introduced in this House should be considered on its merits, irrespective of whether it is introduced by Mr. Collier or by anyone else. I move—

That when files or papers are ordered to be laid on the Table, it is a breach of privilege of this House if they are so laid on the Table in an incomplete form.

Any hon. member can subscribe to that motion. I acquit unequivocally the Chief Secretary or any member of the Government of the responsibility for putting the file on the Table knowing that it was incomplete. I am sure it occurred accidentally, but the fact that the file is incomplete is an injustice to myself.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.13]: I am somewhat surprised that the hon. member did not see fit to indicate to me last night that he intended to move this motion. He freely discussed it with different members of the Chamber and I learned only accidentally of his intention.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I thought the President told you.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The President did not tell me as President, although I ascertained from the President privately something about the matter.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I would have told you but for that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I had received some indication previously. It was only due to me that the hon. member should have approached me, in order that I might have had an opportunity to investigate the subject. However, I had to look into the matter without even that much assistance, and I made some investigations to-day. The file is complete except that a confidential letter which Mr. Colebatch sent to Mr. Collier is not on the file. That letter should not be on the file. That is the only omission. Mr. Collier could not put that letter on the file without being guilty of a breach of confidence.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—in reply) [3.1]: I am sorry I did not formally tell the Minister about this. I knew the matter had been mentioned to him; otherwise I certainly should have spoken of it myself. In point of fact, I waited some

time in order to get an opportunity to tell him, and then I found he already knew of it.

Question put and passed.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

15
Feb

BILL—STATE INSURANCE.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had not agreed to the Council's amendments, now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2, interpretation of "Workers' compensation insurance business."—Delete the words "or otherwise" in line five and insert the following words:—"and at common law for compensation to employees engaged in mining or quarrying or stone crushing or cutting, or to employees of the State Government or of any State trading concern."

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for not agreeing to this and the subsequent amendments made by the Council is as follows:—"Because the amendments would unfairly restrict State insurance to a class of business that, for the first year, must result in a loss to the State."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I hope the Committee will insist upon the amendment, if only with a view to securing a conference to see if we cannot find some way of overcoming the difficulty. To let the amendment go only means the setting up of a new State trading concern. The Committee will be well advised at this stage to insist upon the amendment.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	10
—				
Majority against	3
—				

AYES.

Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. W. T. Glasheen
Hon. G. A. Kempton	(Teller.)
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. A. Lovekin

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 2. Clause 4, Subclause (3)—Delete "seven" in line 2 and insert "one."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	9
—				
Majority against	3
—				

AYES.

Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. H. Seddon	Hon. W. T. Glasheen
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. A. Lovekin

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 3. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 12, as follows:—

12. This Act shall remain in force until the thirty-first day of December, 1927, and no longer.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. EWING: I hope the motion will not be carried, because this amendment, which I moved, is a saving clause that might enable us to reach an agreement satisfac-

tory to all concerned. During the 12 months' operation of the measure the Government would have an opportunity to obtain experience and consider the matter, and next session they would be in a position to re-submit the question to us after mature consideration.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why did you vote for a seven-years' appointment for the Commissioner?

Hon. J. EWING: That has nothing to do with the question. If my amendment is insisted on, there will be opportunity next session to settle the question satisfactorily.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	11
				—
Majority against	6
				—

AYES.

Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. H. Seddon	Hon. W. T. Glasheen
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. A. Lovekin

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 4. Title.—Insert after "business" in line two the words "as herein defined":

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is a consequential amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

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

BILL—LAKE BROWN-BULLFINCH RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central) [3.37] in moving the second reading said: It naturally gives me a degree of pleasure to introduce a Bill to

authorise the construction of an agricultural railway. This Bill is to authorise the building of a line from the Bencubbin extension at Lake Brown to Bullfinch. The first proposal was that the railway should run into Merredin. What prompted the Advisory Board to make that suggestion in the first instance was that the value of the land as far as Bullfinch had not then been properly tested. They had no records of the actual rainfall and were not quite sure of the suitability of the area for wheat growing. As a result, the report was slightly amended at a later stage. Since the original inspection the Lands Department have thrown the area open for selection, and there is considerable settlement out as far as Bullfinch. Wheat is being grown successfully, as quite a lot of members know, right through the area that the route recommended by the Advisory Board will traverse. The board state that they were greatly impressed with the quality of the soil in the area to be served by the line. The classification shows that about half of the land consists of first-class forest country, and approximately two-thirds is cultivable land, the remaining one-third being suitable for grazing purposes. The board point out that there has been considerable development, especially in the Goomarin and Campion districts, and on the newer area at Geelakin. The settlers in those districts are of a very fine type. In the early stages of investigation the rainfall was considered to be inadequate, but crops are now being grown successfully even as far east as Southern Cross. The results at the Merredin experimental farm have shown beyond doubt the quality of the land. The Merredin farm is not a great distance from the area to be served by this railway, and the results obtained there testify to the suitability of the soil for wheat growing. If any justification were required for the introduction of this Bill, the results obtained in that area would provide it.

Hon. A. Burvill: How long has the Merredin State farm been established?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It might be urged that the suitability of the area for wheat growing has not been definitely proved, but the proof is sufficient to satisfy the board that it is advisable to carry the projected line to Bullfinch. The length of the railway will be about 48 miles and the estimated cost is £3,000 per mile. The railway will serve an area of about 417,000 acres, of which approximately two-thirds is

cultivable land. Those figures show there is ample justification for building the line. Western Australia is a State of vast distances and many of its people, particularly the sons of farmers, are anxious to obtain land. Consequently, any opportunity that presents itself to open up new areas should be availed of to facilitate our young men in obtaining holdings of their own. With the exception of about 9,000 acres, the Goomarin and Campion districts will be brought within a 12½-miles radius of the proposed line. The small area of 9,000 acres is held by nine settlers, and they will be within a 14-mile radius of railway facilities. The only way to bring them within closer reach of railway facilities would be by taking the new line into Merredin, but that route is now considered to be inadvisable. If the railway were carried to Merredin, it would be only about eight miles shorter than the one proposed, and it would serve only 106,200 acres as against 417,000 acres to be served by the extension to Bullfinch. That is the big difference between the two routes. To instigate a battle of the routes would be indeed undesirable. When we are building agricultural railways, a few extra miles do not matter much. The chief consideration is to provide necessary facilities for the greatest possible number of settlers, and the route recommended by the Advisory Board will open up the largest possible area and serve the greatest number of settlers. After the Advisory Board submitted their first report recommending that the line should be extended to Bullfinch, a deputation waited on the Premier and urged that the original route should be adhered to. The Premier promised to refer the matter back to the Advisory Board for further report, and did so. It may be well to read the report that the Premier received from the Advisory Board. That report, in addition to the original report, is available to any hon. member who may wish to peruse it. The report is dated 27th October, 1926, and is as follows:—

The board have again considered the proposal in view of the representations put forward by the deputation on the 13th August last. It does not appear to the board that the deputation advanced any grounds for the alteration of the route. The statement that some Goomarin settlers would be 19 miles from the railway by the nearest practicable route is not borne out by the official plans, which show that the centre of the 9,000 acres outside the 12½ mile radius is only 15 miles from Burracoppin by a surveyed road and about the same

distance from the proposed line. To deviate the line as suggested would mean that a large area of cultivable land would be left unserved for some considerable time. The board consider that their recommendations should be carried into effect.

The previous report is dated the 6th May. The policy of Governments has been that all railways are authorised on the report of the Railway Advisory Board. No exception has been taken to the personnel of that board, and their reports have been generally satisfactory. They are armed with all the requisite information for studying the various phases of each question. They have to take into consideration the area to be served, the nature of the country, and the cost of construction. In all these matters they are peculiarly qualified to form a judgment, hence their reports are entitled to every consideration. In this particular case there was a good deal of opposition. Deputations waited upon the Premier protesting against a certain route, but after full inquiry the board have adhered to their original report. In the circumstances, therefore, we should feel better entrenched than we might have been had there come before us only the original report. I am always pleased when I know that a new railway is about to be constructed. This line will open up a great deal of new country, and will to a great extent prove that the wheat belt can be pushed out still further into country which was thought at one time to be unsuitable for agriculture. There is every reason to believe that this part of the State will ultimately be transferred into a number of smiling wheatfields. In the old days it was believed that the eastern goldfields country was unsuitable for sheep, but every week train loads of sheep are coming from South Australia and stocking up that particular territory. I feel sure that this line will constitute another milestone along the road of progress for Western Australia. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Authority to construct: —

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This line is supposed to serve settlers at Goomarin as well as connect up Lake Brown with Bullfinch. I have received a communication which sets out on behalf of the Goomarin settlers that they were induced to settle in the district on the promise of a railway line. The promise has never been fulfilled, although I believe the line has been surveyed. There is nothing on the map to show where these settlers are.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They are in the Lake country.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The circular sets forth that the Goomarin settlement was formed when Sir James Mitchell was Minister for Lands. Apparently he promised 109 returned soldiers that if they went there they would be placed in communication by rail with the main line within two years. As an inducement to go there, they were shown a large map on which a broad red line was marked indicating the line that was to be built. The railway was surveyed and the pegs are still in existence, the terminus being at Merredin. The soldiers are said to have remarked, "We boys will hop over." In all good faith they started development work and put up a record second to none in the district. There are 80 soldiers settled at Lake Brown, and 50 at Goomarin, half of these being returned soldiers. In 1920 the Advisory Board recommended Merredin as the terminus of the line, but in 1926 the board ignored the previous decision and recommended that the line should go straight across to Bullfinch. This meant breaking a definite promise made and an undertaking given to those soldier settlers. The circular states that the new route proposed will mean travelling a distance of 19 miles to a siding, and that on the average the Goomarin settlers will be 15 miles from a railway. If these circumstances are correctly stated, the settlers will be in an awkward position.

The Honorary Minister: Are you reading from the communication of the member for Avon?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. The Honorary Minister did not refer to the Goomarin settlers. I approve of railway extensions, but if a promise was made to these settlers it should be fulfilled before another line is built in the district. If these promises are not fulfilled it will destroy the confidence of other settlers similarly situated. These settlers would require to travel a long

distance across country to the main line or go up to Lake Brown. To reach Perth they might have to go either via Bullfinch and Southern Cross, or via another point west of Merredin. If Lake Brown had been connected with Merredin, these Goomarin settlers would have been better served. As the route is now proposed, the cost of transport for these people will be considerable. I shall be glad to hear from the Honorary Minister on the subject.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This question dates back a number of years. The proposed line, as I have already explained, will serve an area of about 417,000 acres, two-thirds of which is cultivable. With the exception of 9,000 acres, the Goomarin and Campion holdings will be within a 12½-mile radius of the railway. The small area referred to by Mr. Nicholson would be that which contains nine settlers.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No. There are 109 returned soldiers affected.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I may say I have a copy of the circular sent out by Mr. Griffiths. All the settlers will be within 14 miles of the proposed line, and another railway is within a distance of 12 miles of them. It is correct that the first report of the Railway Advisory Board recommended that the proposed line should be brought to Merredin. In order to clear the matter up, I will read the board's report dated the 6th May, 1926—

The Railway Advisory Board has inspected the country between Lake Brown and Bullfinch, and outside the area served by existing railways, and has interviewed representatives of the Merredin Road Board at Merredin, settlers at Goomarin, Campion, and Geelakin, and Westonia Road Board at Westonia and representatives of the road board at Southern Cross ascertaining the views of all interested persons. The board's inspection was considerably facilitated by the close classification carried out by the Lands Department, plans showing the various classes of soil over practically the whole area being made available for the board's use. The board was much impressed with the quality of the soil in the area to be served, while the classification shows that about one-half of the area is first class forest country, and approximately two-thirds is cultivable land, the remaining one-third being grazing country. Considerable development has taken place in the Goomarin and Campion districts, and on the newer area at Geelakin. The settlers in these districts are a very fine type, and large areas have been cleared and fallowed for cropping this season. Since the board's inspection further areas east of the rabbit-proof fence have been thrown open and applied for.

I now come to the point on which I think Mr. Nicholson is under a misapprehension—

When in 1920 the board recommended Merredin as the terminus of the extension of the Bencubbin-Lake Grace railway, it did so because of the recognised belief at that time that the profitable cultivation of wheat in the districts about and adjacent to Southern Cross was doubtful on account of the recorded rainfall, which was then considered to be inadequate. Since that time, however, wheat growing methods have improved, and in consequence payable crops are now contemplated under much more rigorous conditions than formerly, provided up to date methods are adopted and suitable varieties are used. The results at the Merredin experimental farm, particularly those of last year confirm this belief. This belief is also reflected in the departmental policy, which has caused a large number of blocks to be thrown open for agricultural settlement in the Bullfinch-Southern Cross area. Though the suitability of this area for wheat growing has not yet been definitely proved, still, in view of the settlement which has taken place, the additional area now subdivided for settlement, and the better results which have followed the adoption of improved methods, with the consequent increased possibility of success, the board now consider it would be a wise policy to extend the line from Lake Brown to Bullfinch rather than to Merredin, and recommend accordingly.

I think quite sufficient is stated in that report to remove the objection raised by Mr. Nicholson. In the opinion of those qualified to judge, the route proposed by the Bill is the proper one. The Railway Advisory Board give ample reasons for their altered recommendation.

Hon. G. POTTER: More than usual interest attaches to this measure. The settlers in the district affected are of an exceptional type. Many of them are men who left the goldfields and made good in that agricultural area, proving it to be exceptionally valuable. What induced them to go there in the first place, was the promise of railway communication. If the line is not constructed so as to serve the greatest number of active settlers, the value of the land will be decreased. Two or three members who to-day are absent wish to address themselves to the Bill, and the Honorary Minister might report progress.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 7, Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

BILL—DAIRY CATTLE COMPENSATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st December.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.13]: For a number of years there has been necessity for a measure of this nature, so that the Government may compensate owners of cattle which have been destroyed in the interests of public health. Great sacrifices have had to be made in the past, especially during the unfortunate outbreak of rinderpest. Though some of the cattle then destroyed were of poor quality, others were excellent, and their owners suffered heavy loss with small compensation. Examination of cattle has taken place here for a considerable time; in this respect we have been in advance of some of the Eastern States. While it is perfectly right that diseased cattle should be destroyed, still those who own the stock should receive some consideration when destruction is rendered necessary through no fault of theirs but by unfortunate circumstances. It is all very well to speak, as the Bill does, of owners who know their stock to be diseased. From a fairly long experience of cattle I can certify that it is extremely difficult to determine whether a beast is diseased or not, especially in the case of tuberculosis. How is a layman to decide such a question? As a matter of fact, until the tuberculin test has been applied, the veterinary surgeons themselves can form no idea of the position. Let me give an illustration. Some years ago, during the time I was Minister for Agriculture, I purchased some cattle for the Government on one of my visits to Victoria. I attended to the matter myself, and naturally I provided in the purchase agreement that the cattle must pass the tuberculin test. To the astonishment of the owner of the stock, and equally to the surprise of others, including myself, some of the best of those cattle, worth from 50 to 60 guineas per head, responded to the tuberculin test and had to be rejected. They came from one of the best breeders in Victoria, Mr. Lyon, who was very surprised to find that he had any such disease in his herd. When he found that some of his cattle had been rejected, he had the whole herd tested. Subsequently he was in the happy position of being able to throw out the cattle that were affected by the disease. Had he not dis-

covered the trouble, he would probably have gone on breeding from those animals for many years. While it is reasonable that something should be done for the protection of the public, what is done should be reasonable. While I regard legislation of this description as a step in the right direction, I consider some of the provisions quite unreasonable. They throw the main responsibility on to the unfortunate stock owner. Under the powers provided in Clause 5, if a veterinary officer merely suspects that cattle are suffering from disease, they will have to be destroyed! That is hardly fair.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But has not the owner the right of appeal?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There is the right of appeal regarding compensation, but there is no such right regarding the decision to destroy any of his cattle. An inspector may not be efficient, but merely because he says he has reason to suspect that cattle are suffering from a disease, the cattle will have to be destroyed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that not the position to-day, without any compensation at all?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is so, but if we are to legislate regarding this industry, let us be reasonable. The clause provides that in no case shall the value of an animal exceed £15. Many of the cattle that will be destroyed will cost more like £50 a head. I am not cavilling at the value fixed at £15 alone, but when we examine the Bill further we find that the owner will receive only 90 per cent. of the determined value of the cattle. That makes a cut into the £15 straight away. On top of that, the cattleman has to find the bulk of the compensation that will be paid. Sub-clause (4) of Clause 5 sets out that three-fifths of the amount of compensation shall be payable out of the compensation fund and two-fifths of the amount of such compensation shall be payable by the State. That means that the cattle owner will have to find three-fifths of the compensation and the State only two-fifths. If the value fixed at £15 per head is low and 90 per cent. only of that amount is to be payable, while the cattleman has also to find three-fifths of the compensation, it will mean that the ultimate compensation will be reduced to about 30 per cent., and that is not reasonable. The destruction of the dairy stock will be for the purpose of protecting public health, and surely to goodness the people should be prepared to pay for that protec-

tion. Why should the unfortunate cattleman, because of circumstances beyond his knowledge and control, be asked to suffer the loss of such a high percentage? The whole position is unreasonable. On top of that, we find that the carcass of any animal so destroyed shall become the property of the State, and will go to help to make up the two-fifths that the State will have to find.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What will the registration fee amount to?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The registration fee is to be sufficient to provide the three-fifths compensation, and goodness knows what it will amount to! Every head of stock over 12 months old that the dairyman owns, has to be registered at so much per head to make up the compensation fund. When I state that fact, hon. members will recognise the unfortunate position cattle owners will find themselves in.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They are in a worse position now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: They are in a position that they should not be in, and that has continued for many years. Why should these men be made to suffer in order to protect the health of the public? If there is any negligence on the part of the cattle owner, let him pay for it, by all means. It will be difficult to prove negligence on the part of the stock owners, for it requires a veterinary officer to decide whether cattle are affected or not.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Don't you want the dairyman to take any risk at all?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member was not in his seat when I explained my point of view, and I do not think he has read the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I have not read or heard of a single protest from any dairyman.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are quite satisfied.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is evident that Mr. Holmes has not been in touch with the dairymen, or he would have heard of their protests. The dairymen desire some compensation, but they are alarmed at the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: People are always alarmed if they are asked to pay.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What will be the position of the dairymen when they have to pay registration fees in respect of their full herd, a proportion of which will be non-productive? The dairymen have to breed

up, for they cannot purchase a good dairy cow at an average price of £15.

Hon. A. Burvill: This will not encourage the group settlers on the Peel Estate.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I suppose they will be outside the proclaimed area.

Hon. A. Burvill: Will they not be brought under this legislation?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That area may or may not be proclaimed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: To protect the metropolitan milk supply, the Peel Estate area must be proclaimed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It will not matter much to the majority of the settlers there, because they will not come out on the right side, and the Government will have to should the burden.

Hon. A. Burvill: The Bill will make it worse for them.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of course it will. Then there is another point. It will be necessary to register herds in a proclaimed district, but what will happen regarding stock outside proclaimed districts? Stock from outside those districts will be brought into the markets for sale. The Bill contains nothing to deal with that position. Will the stock owners in the outside area be called upon to register their animals? There are many people like myself who are engaged in breeding stock. I take it that the wheat districts will be outside the proclaimed areas.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What happens now when such stock are brought to market?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If they are condemned, that is the end of it, but that does not justify the inclusion of provisions in the Bill to which I have referred. We should not make provisions that will mean robbing the cattle owners.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is it robbing the cattle owner if he sends diseased cattle to the market, and the cattle are condemned?

Hon. E. H. Gray: The cattle owner ought to be hung for sending them in!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: How is the cattle owner to know that his stock are diseased? If he were possessed of that knowledge and sent them in, the position would be different. How would he know that a cow was suffering from tuberculous, which is the most important of these diseases? To a certain extent that disease may be rampant in our dairy herds, but how is an individual stock owner to know whether his stock are affected? Notwithstanding that his dairy herd may be wiped out and his livelihood

taken from him, all he gets is compensation amounting to about 30 per cent.! If we are to foster the dairying industry, surely we must give the stock owners reasonable treatment instead of extending such scant consideration to their interests? The percentage of diseased beef cattle that are slaughtered in the markets is very low, and is scarcely worth considering. When it comes to the dairying industry, however, if these necessary steps are to be taken for the protection of the public health, then the people should be prepared to pay reasonably, and the stock owners should receive adequate compensation. When we ask the dairymen to find about 70 per cent. of the compensation themselves, what will be the position in the future? Will men embark in the dairying industry? Of course they will not. They will take up other occupations where there is no risk, and where they will be on safe ground.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.28]: I support the second reading of the Bill. I have looked through it, and I regard the proposals as equitable. Hitherto the loss respecting a destroyed animal has fallen on the individual. It is now proposed that it should fall upon portion of the industry concerned. How Mr. Baxter can suggest that the dairymen will be in a worse position subsequent to the passing of the Bill than they are in now, is beyond my comprehension.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I did not say that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I claim they will be in a much better position.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: They will receive a little compensation, but not much.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Let hon. members contrast the position of the dairymen with the cattlemen in the far North. At the present time, owing to the Navigation Act and sundry other Acts, the cattleman in the North has to pay £7 to transfer a bullock from Wyndham to Fremantle. The cattleman has to pay freight and all charges, and yet he has to stand the total loss if he loses an animal.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What is the percentage of stock destroyed in the markets?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is a good percentage.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is very low.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: After paying £7 to get the stock to market, the animal may be condemned, and all the cattleman in the

North gets is £2 for the hide and the carcase. On top of that, the cattleman has to refund the balance of the money handed to him by his agent.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: We brought down many lots and had not one condemned.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In view of these circumstances, hon. members can contrast the position of the cattleman in the North, far removed from the market in the South, confronted with the possibility of loss on the way down the coast, a loss that has sometimes amounted to 50 per cent. of the stock sent down, but with the responsibility to pay the charges just the same, with the position of the dairyman who is to receive the assistance specified in the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Have you ever known a dairyman retire with a fortune?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I support the proposals of the Government, which I regard as quite equitable.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [4.30]: We have had a most extraordinary speech from Mr. Baxter, a gentleman who, although he was in charge of the Department of Agriculture for five years, never took any steps in this direction. During his period of office a number of cattle were destroyed, the owners getting no compensation whatever, whereas under the Bill they will get a measure of compensation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: A very small measure.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He asked how could a layman form any idea as to whether his cattle had tuberculosis. The owners themselves are not expected to form any idea. It is provided that all dairy cattle shall be inspected by a Government veterinary officer before the first registration thereof, and any person applying for registration of cattle, knowing or having reasonable cause to suspect such cattle to be diseased, shall be guilty of an offence. Also it is provided that any person who buys or sells, or attempts to buy or sell, any cattle, knowing, or having reasonable cause to suspect, such cattle to be diseased, and with the intention of making a claim for compensation under this Act, shall be guilty of an offence. The hon. member suggested that the owner must know for certain whether or not the cattle are diseased.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I did not discuss that; I discussed Clause 5.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member also said the Bill throws the main responsibility on the unfortunate stock owners, who are to be victimised. The Bill simply provides a measure of insurance; in fact, the appearance of the Bill before Parliament is due to the circumstance that the dairy owners approached the Minister for Agriculture, not once but several times, and asked for a Bill on these lines. The hon. member also complained that the owner is not to have a say in respect of the destruction of his cattle. Why should he have anything to say, if they are infected with disease? Under the Stock Diseases Act he has no say at present.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I was then answering an interjection.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The cattle are destroyed and no questions are asked. The hon. member declared that a great many cattle worth more than £15 each will be destroyed. That is highly probable. Some of them may be worth as much as £50 each. But this is an insurance scheme and the fee is in proportion to the insurance to be paid, namely 2s. per head of cattle. It is all an experiment, and it is necessary that we should go slowly when experimenting. The hon. member complained that under the Bill the compensation would be only about 90 per cent. of the value of the cattle. That is so. If it were not so, the insurance premiums would have to be very much higher than is proposed. The hon. member took the point that the owners will have to pay the major part of the compensation. The owners are quite prepared to do that, for they will get something under the Bill, whereas they got nothing whatever under the hon. member's administration. Then the hon. member contended that the value of the carcase would go to the State. That is not correct. Sub-clause (5) of Clause 5 prescribes that the carcase of any cattle so destroyed shall, subject to this Act, become the property of the State; and paragraph (b) of Clause 8 prescribes that the net amount realised by the sale of the product of destroyed cattle shall go into the dairy compensation fund. The hon. member has tried to create the impression that this will go into the Treasury for the benefit of the Government. Nothing of the sort: it is to go into the compensation fund. Then the hon. member declared that the dairymen were protesting. Where are those dairymen that are protesting? They have been protesting, not against the Bill, but against the delay in its introduction.

That is all they have been protesting against. The hon. member asked whether diseased bullocks sent into the market from the country and destroyed would come under the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I said dairy cattle, not bullocks.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Suppose they do not come under the Bill. On reaching the market they will be inspected, and if found to be infected with disease they will be destroyed without compensation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is the question I asked.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Why should any compensation be paid if these animals are not under the insurance scheme?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Can they be insured outside of this scheme?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not outside the scheme. Those are the principal points raised by the hon. member, and I do not think they should weigh heavily with any other hon. member in his consideration of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In the definition of "dairy cattle" the age of a bull is prescribed as being over nine months, and that of a heifer as being over 12 months. I do not know why those ages have been selected. I move an amendment—

That in line one of the definition of "dairy cattle" "nine" be struck out and "eighteen" inserted in lieu.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has not given any reason at all for the amendment. This question has been discussed by the dairymen in the metropolitan area, and the Bill has been framed to meet their wishes. I should like to hear some argument in favour of the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If these ages of nine months and 12 months respectively are retained, the effectiveness of the measure will be seriously impaired, for both ages are altogether too low.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I presume that Mr. Baxter's contention is that if any cattle under these specified ages are de-

stroyed, no compensation will be paid for them. That would be the effect of it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It may be all very well to raise the prescribed age of a heifer; but if a diseased bull is allowed to reach the age of 18 months, he will in the meantime produce a lot of diseased stock. I should say the sooner he is dealt with the better.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: If he is destroyed before reaching the prescribed age, no compensation will be paid for him.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: On behalf of Mr. Stewart, I move an amendment—

That the words "in any municipal district" be added at the end of the definition of "dairy cattle."

I presume Mr. Stewart's idea is to confine the registration to municipal areas rather than have it apply throughout the wider areas.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Then under the amendment there could be no registrations in road board areas, such as Osborne Park, Armadale and the rest.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is hardly necessary for me to say anything on the amendment, for an effective reply has already been given. Under the amendment about half the metropolitan area would be excluded from the operations of the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Districts:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Will it be possible to make provision for the registration of herds outside a district if their owners so desire?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The measure is largely experimental and for a start will be restricted to the metropolitan area. If it were extended to the country, an army of qualified inspectors would be required. Any extension must be made gradually.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Much of the milk consumed in Perth comes from outside the metropolitan area. A diseased herd would not be subject to inspection and thus the purity of the metropolitan milk supply might be jeopardised. Owners of herds who wish to register should have an opportunity to do so, and if their stock has to be destroyed they should receive compensation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Inspections of cattle are made from time to time and diseased beasts are destroyed. If there was a dairying district adjacent to the metropolitan area, I daresay it would be included.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: The metropolitan dairyman would be compensated, but the outside dairyman would not.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Application could be made for the provisions of the measure to be extended outside the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It would be extraordinary if milk were found to be impure and the owner of the herd from which it came could register his cattle and get compensation. Such a man should be prosecuted for supplying impure milk. Dairy herds are inspected periodically!

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The inspection is continuous.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When cattle are found to be diseased, they are slaughtered and no compensation is paid. If the measure is restricted to the metropolitan area, the metropolitan dairyman alone will contribute to the compensation fund.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Strict supervision is exercised over all the herds from which milk is supplied to the metropolitan area, and for many years Perth has had one of the purest milk supplies of any city in the Commonwealth.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Question!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The measure is in the nature of an experiment, but after experience I believe the Government will be glad to extend its operation to districts outside.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Milk is being brought into the city from distances up to 100 miles and an inspector is employed constantly testing herds for tubercular trouble. In a few years I believe seven-eighths of the milk supply will be drawn from the South-West line. The clause might well be adopted in its present form.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am pleased at the chorus of approval with which this Bill has been received. The measure is on all fours with the State Insurance Bill that members have so mangled. The only difference is that that was a scheme of insurance for workmen, whereas this is a scheme of insurance to compensate cattle owners whose cattle are destroyed.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If cattle owners in an outside district desired to come under the Act, could they make application?

The Chief Secretary: All they would have to do would be to convince the Minister of the necessity.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 10, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—EJANDING NORTHWARDS RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

HON. J. EWING (South-West) [4.58]: I am pleased that the Government are introducing so many Bills for the authorisation of railways to open up and develop the country. This particular line is to serve a portion of the northern areas that are utilised for cereal and stock production rather than dairying. It is gratifying, however, to find the Government proposing material railway development for the South-West also. I understand that this railway, instead of going north from Ejanding, was to have started at a point on the Wongan Hills line, and the reason for adopting the Ejanding northwards route is that a larger area will be served. No doubt settlers in that part of the State will be delighted at the prospect of securing railway facilities. It is proposed to link up the Mollerin settlement where a number of returned soldiers are engaged in agricultural pursuits. The line will be 70 miles long, and will provide much needed facilities in the areas extending well up towards Mullewa. I support the Bill, and I trust that the railway will aid materially the advancement of that portion of the State.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.0] I do not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but I would like the Honorary Minister to tell us how many miles of railway have been authorised by this and other Parliaments, and how many miles have not yet been constructed. There is an understanding that railways have to be constructed in accordance with the date on which they were authorised. I have a clear conception

of a big fight in the House over the construction of a railway from Pemberton to Denmark, some five years ago. It was said to be a matter of great urgency. The whole line was to be constructed right through, or it was deemed to be of no use at all. This House in its wisdom authorised the construction of a section at each end. It was pointed out that the Pemberton traffic would go to Bunbury, and the Denmark traffic would go to Albany. So far as I know that railway and many others have not yet been built. We borrowed six millions of money with which to build railways, but we spent it in paying revenue accounts. If we go on borrowing money we shall have to authorise more railways in order to justify the State in going upon the loan market. These railways are not for immediate construction, but are designed to justify the Government in going upon the London market for money with which to build railways, but they then take the money to build railways that have already been authorised. That system of financing does not appeal to me. The construction of railways is always desirable, but as a system of finance it does not attract me.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.2]: Had I been in the Chamber I would have spoken on the Lake Brown-Bullfinch Railway Bill. Mr. Holmes has raised an important point concerning railway construction, and what it means to authorise the building of further railways. He also referred to the raising of money for works of this nature. One point I wish to clear up on the general policy of railway construction. Many people are under the impression that those who authorise the construction of a railway are the Advisory Board, whereas the only people who can say that a railway shall be started are those who comprise the Government of the day. The Advisory Board do not come into the question until the Government have issued a request to them. The function of the board is then to fix the route of a railway, but the policy is determined by the Government. I have taken out a list of railways that have been authorised since I entered Parliament.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Strategic and otherwise.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In 1912 a 4ft. 8½in. gauge railway was authorised from Merredin to Coolgardie. That occurred 14 years ago, but nothing has yet been done

with it. The approximate cost of the construction, which was given by the then Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) was £676,000. It is safe to say that we can multiply that by two now. Then there was the Hotham-Crossman extension of 25 miles, and the Newcastle-Bolgart which were passed; the Norseman-Esperance line which was lost; the Esperance Northwards line which was ruled out of order; the Wagin-Bowelling line; and the Wyalkatchem-Mt. Marshall line. These were authorised in 1912, practically in the first year of the Scaddan Government. In 1913 the purchase from Millars of the Flinders Bay-Margaret River railway was authorised, and the Esperance Northwards railway was again introduced and lost; so that in one year only the repurchase of the Flinders Bay-Margaret River line was authorised. In 1914, when war broke out, the Scaddan Government went to the electors. The following railways were on the Notice Paper of another place, but were dropped: The Boyanup-Busselton, the Dwarda-Narrogin, the Esperance Northwards, the Katanning-Nyabing, the Kondinin-Merredin, and the Wagin-Kukerin-Lake Grace. In 1914-15, after the return of the Scaddan Government, some of these railways were resurrected and authorised. These were: the Boyanup-Busselton, the Esperance Northwards, the Katanning-Nyabing, the Pinjarra-Dwarda, the Wagin-Kukerin-Lake Grace, and the Yilliminning-Kondinin lines. In 1915 the Newcastle-Bolgart railway further extension was authorised. The Scaddan Government then went out of office. Their regime was prolific in the matter of railways. In 1916-17, 1917, 1917-18 and 1918, during the Wilson and Lefroy Governments, one railway Bill was passed. That was to confirm the purchase of the Flinders Bay-Margaret River line. During the Mitchell regime in 1919 the Wyalkatchem-Mt. Marshall extension of six miles was authorised. In 1920 a private railway, which had nothing to do with the Government, was passed to connect Meekatharra with Horseshoe for the development of the manganese ore deposits at Horseshoe. The Piawaning-Northwards was authorised in that year. In 1921 and in 1921-22 no railways were authorised, and in 1922-23 an election was pending.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What did that do?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know. During that year the Jarnadup-Denmark Railway Bill was introduced, but was lost.

A special session was held in order to reinstate the Bill, but the line was reinstated by splitting it into two, one being the Albany-Denmark extension and the other the Bridgetown-Jarnadup extension. In the same year the Busselton-Margaret River railway, the Esperance Northwards railway extension of six miles, and the Wyalcatchem-Mt. Margaret extension of six miles were authorised. In 1923 we were on the eve of a general election.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why mention these general elections?

Hon. J. CORNELL: There were then authorised the following railways: the Busselton-Margaret River deviation, the Flinders Bay-Margaret River deviation, the Lake Grace-Newdegate line, the Pinjarra-Dwarda extension and the Yarramony Eastward railway. The Norseman-Salmon Gums railway was the only one passed by the present Government. Although the following railways were authorised when the present Government came into office, namely the Merredin-Coolgardie, the Albany-Denmark, the Bridgetown-Jarnadup, the Yarramony Eastwards, the Lake Grace-Newdegate and the Pinjarra-Dwarda extension, the only one completed was the Lake Grace-Newdegate. The authorised railways that await construction are the Coolgardie-Merredin, Albany-Denmark, Bridgetown-Jarnadup, Yarramony Eastward, and the Norseman-Salmon Gums railway which is now under construction. I have quoted the strategic needs of the past, and I will now deal with the strategic needs of the future. On the Notice Paper we have three new railways, and I understand more are to come. Those we have are the Lake Brown-Bullfinch, the Ejanding Northward and the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook lines.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They are not all in the one electorate, are they?

Hon. J. CORNELL: During my membership of this House I have never yet opposed a railway, but after taking a retrospective view of the past, and as this may be a guide to the future, I ask whether it is wise to authorise railways many years ahead. No doubt this will serve a purpose, and will perhaps buoy up the hopes that have almost died within the hearts of certain settlers. I will be honest, and I think my colleagues are with me, and say that it is only through sheer persistency on the part of certain members that a start was made with the Esperance Northwards railway. This was done by resolution of both Houses of Par-

liament that railways should be constructed in the order of their authorisation. The Esperance railway had been jettisoned time after time in favour of other railways. If the advice in the hands of the Government shows that a railway is necessary, that and other railways ought to be introduced in the order of their necessity and constructed in that order. I trust that the people this particular line purposes to serve will be given some indication as to what the policy will be with regard to it, and whether it will be built in the order of its authorisation. The Yarramony Eastward line has been due for about 20 years, whereas in the case of this particular line it has been due for about four years. Even if my own province is affected I cannot be a party to saying that people who have waited only four years for a railway should, under our present system, get one in advance of those who have waited patiently for 20 years. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—BOYUP BROOK - CRANBROOK RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

HON. A. BURVILL (South-East) [5.19]: I support the second reading of the Bill. This railway has been promised for about 20 years. The country to be served really needs two lines. Some people are of opinion that the two lines should go in the same direction; others think the lines should follow different routes. The Railway Advisory Board have reported in favour of both lines. The route of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway is as recommended by the board. The rainfall at Cranbrook is about 20 inches, and it increases towards Boyup Brook. Thus the district has one of the most assured rainfalls in the State. Some 12 months ago I attended a deputation to the Government concerning this particular railway. The people were then promised that their request would be favourably consid-

ered, and they were informed that the board's report approved of the line and that the grade would be 1 in 60. The line passes through three electorates—Kataning, Albany and Nelson. Mr. Cornell this afternoon quoted certain statistics relating to railway construction, and I wish to take this opportunity of repeating some figures I obtained in 1925. During that session I asked a question relating to railway construction in this State since the year 1896, and I was informed that in the last 30 years 59 railways had been authorised; that within the ambit of the port of Albany five authorised railways had been constructed, and that their total mileage, after the completion of the Denmark-Nornalup section, would be 186 miles, and their aggregate cost £555,000. I was also informed that the total mileage of railways built in the State during the 30 years was 2,679, and the aggregate cost £8,417,084. From these statistics it is evident that the southern part of the State has been neglected for the past 30 years. Reporting on the harbours of Western Australia, Sir George Buchanan said—

Albany is one of the finest natural harbours in Australia. Its development is naturally dependent on Government policy.

I am glad that the present Government are at least recognising that it is the right policy to develop Albany harbour. Sir George Buchanan also said—

It is certainly a matter for regret that such a fine natural harbour as Albany should not play a more important part, and be a great trade centre. On the face of it, it would appear to be reasonable to develop communication behind Albany and make it an oversea port.

The point I wish to stress with regard to the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook line is that it will induce a large population, inasmuch as the average farm need not be more than 600 acres. Within 15 miles of the junction of the line with Cranbrook there are, according to the Government Statist, 152,657 head of stock. The land around Cranbrook is good, and approaching Boyup Brook it is even better. Fourteen miles from Boyup Brook, at Wilga, there is a coal deposit; and once the line has been built to Albany on the proposed grade it will be possible to transport that coal to Albany. The power works in Perth obtain their coal from Collie, and I am looking forward to the time when State coal will be conveyed to Albany, thus enabling power to be supplied to the existing

woollen mills, and to the flour mills which will be established at the port when the wheat grown within the ambit of Albany is brought there. Further, under such conditions, fertiliser works and engineering works should be established at Albany. Wilga, when this proposed line has been built, will be 188 miles from Albany. The distance from Collie to Perth is 133 miles. Therefore, if it is possible to have power works in Perth, it should be possible to have them at Albany. I believe another railway Bill affecting Albany is to come forward. On that measure I shall have something more to say about the possibilities and the accessibility of Albany, and the very small cost at which Albany can be made one of the principal harbours of this State, if not of the Commonwealth.

HON. J. EWING (South-West) [5.25]: The major part of the proposed railway will be in the province represented by Mr. Mann, Mr. Rose and myself. The line has been advocated for many years, and especially by the member for Nelson, Mr. J. H. Smith, whose representations to the Government on the subject have proved highly successful. This remark also applies to another railway which will come before the House later. I congratulate the Government upon having listened to Mr. Smith, and upon having inaugurated a system of railway communication between the Great Southern and South-Western lines. According to a report read by the Honorary Minister when moving the second reading, it is estimated that between those two lines there is an available area of 1,800,000 acres. Although the whole of that land is not first-class—

Hon. V. Hamersley: Is it poison land?

Hon. J. EWING: No, indeed not. I doubt whether the area contains any poison land.

Hon. A. Burvill: The area has an assured rainfall.

Hon. J. EWING: It is estimated that at least 1,000,000 acres of this land is either first or second class. The first class land may be used for all descriptions of agriculture and for orchards, and the second class land for dairying and sheep raising. Mr. Burvill just now quoted statistics relating to stock. It is well known that in the area in question there are, besides cattle, about 141,000 sheep, 2,000 horses, and 1,000 pigs. From Cranbrook 30 miles westwards the area is

pretty well settled, and this also applies to the country from Boyup Brook 20 miles towards Cranbrook. No Crown lands are available in those districts. But in the territory to which I have referred there are huge acreages of first and second class Crown lands, and also magnificent timber lands covering about 250,000 acres—good jarrah country awaiting development. I recollect very well that Sir Newton Moore, when advocating in another place the construction of a line from Donnybrook to the Preston River, said the railway was quite justified by reason of the timber available. I think it was largely on that account the Bill passed Parliament. The line was a huge success from the start. The timber paid the cost of construction, and has furnished considerable traffic ever since. The 250,000 acres of good jarrah country available on the route of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway means that the line will prove payable from its inception, and that in authorising it we shall be doing something to advance the interests of the timber industry. Apart from that aspect, once the land has been opened up and the timber has paid for the railway, the district will be rapidly settled. To judge of that, one has only to see what is going on in the Lands Department. There is a great rush of applicants for land. Never in the history of this State have applications been more numerous. Mr. Burvill, who probably knows the southern part of the State, especially towards Pemberton, better than I do, has referred to this as a wonderful territory. It will be further opened up by a line which is to come before us during the next week or two, a line from Manjimup to Mt. Barker. The two lines will prove wonderful assets to the State.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: When they are constructed.

Hon. J. EWING: Both Mr. Holmes and Mr. Cornell have said, "All these lines have been authorised, but when are they going to be constructed?" I am sure the Honorary Minister's reply to that question will be that under the land settlement and migration policy of Australia, and especially Western Australia, a large amount of money is available at the very low rate of 1 per cent. per annum, so that the Government will be able to go ahead with these railway lines. There is very little use in authorising lines and holding them out as a bait for settlement, and then letting the people wait from ten

to twenty years before furnishing them with means of conveying their produce to market. That is the crux of the question, as was suggested by Mr. Holmes and Mr. Cornell. Mr. Cornell read out a long list of railways that had to be constructed, and now is the time to do it. The opportunity is in the hands of the Government to greatly advance the migration policy and to demonstrate the value of the land that is to be opened up by railways of the description we are now discussing. This, with another line we shall have before us for discussion shortly, will open up a million acres or more of land where a great number of people will be settled in the future. When that happens we shall see something worth while in the South-West. I hope the policy of any Government that may be in power in Western Australia will be to take advantage of the cheap money that is available, and thus open up a vast territory that is at present almost a terra incognita. People here do not really appreciate what we have in Western Australia, and we should rejoice when we know that the Government propose to build such lines as that now under discussion and the Mt. Barker-Manjimup railway that will open up similar country. On behalf of my colleagues who are absent today, and on my own behalf, I congratulate the Government upon their policy of opening up the South-West. The Minister for Lands is doing excellent work and is admirably following the footsteps of Sir James Mitchell. My hope is that Sir James will soon be in a position to play his part in this work again.

The Honorary Minister: He is playing his part all right.

Hon. J. EWING: The Government have not neglected the South-West, but have continued the policy that Sir James Mitchell laid down some time ago. The Government have advanced that good work and we have evidence of the fact in the Bill before us. The Government have gone right ahead and are doing work that will be of advantage to the whole community.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.35]: It had not been my intention to intervene in this debate but after the speech of the Leader of the House in introducing the Bill, the measure nearly slipped through the second reading stage, or, perhaps I may be justified in forecasting that it might have slipped out, without any discussion. I thought that a Bill of this importance should be debated and that someone who was opposed to the measure should put up arguments that, at any rate in his opinion, justified him in opposing it. I understand that the Government have another horse in the stable, which is eligible for this classic event, the Constitutional Stakes. That horse is the well-known performer, Redistribution, by Justice out of Honesty—a popular favourite, the idol of the masses, a very Manfred in fact!

Hon. J. Cornell: Not Windbag?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Perhaps not. When it last ran it did not rival Windbag because, although speedy, it did not prove itself to be a stayer. I do not think that was due to any defect of the horse itself or of its trainers, one of whom was, I believe, the Chief Justice. That failure was due to some negligence on the part of some of the stable lads. The Government have chosen not to enter this horse. In fact, I understand it has been turned out to grass. In view of the fact that a general election will be held within the next three months, its services might have been of great utility.

Hon. J. Cornell: It has broken down.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Instead of starting that horse, they have brought out another horse—Dilution, by Havoc, out of Intimidation. This is an aged horse that, although it has often sported silk, has never run into a place. It does not carry the people's money and is, in fact, of no interest whatever. The Bill proposes to strike out paragraph 2 of Section 15 of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, which gives as one of the qualifications of an elector, that "he is a householder within a province occupying any dwelling house of a clear annual value of £17 sterling," and to substitute a new subsection setting out as a

qualification that a person may be "an inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling house." In the Bill a "dwelling house" is defined as "any structure of a permanent character, being a fixture to the soil, which is ordinarily capable of being used for human habitation, and includes part of a building when that part is separately occupied as a dwelling." Sub-clause 3 abolishes plural voting. The question naturally arises as to why there should be any difference between the franchise for the Legislative Council and that for the Legislative Assembly. In other words, why should the Council not be elected on the adult franchise?

Hon. E. H. Harris: One vote there has a greater value than one here.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I will deal with that point later on. To answer the question I have put, one has to consider what the purposes of the Legislative Council are, what object this House serves, why it should be a different House from the Legislative Assembly, and why, consequently, it should be elected on a different franchise. Without going into details or wearying the House, I may state that the purposes for which the Legislative Council exists is to prevent any violent or sudden changes whereby the machinery of government may be thrown out of gear, or whereby the usual life of the people may be suddenly changed to their detriment. Another function is to review Bills from another place, in order to do away with anomalies or inconsistencies, and, occasionally, if the Bills are bad, to throw them out. Generally speaking, the function of this Chamber regarding a majority of the Bills is really to act as a pruning knife in order that the measures may bear better fruit in the future. Another of the objects of this House is to ensure that every Bill shall come within the knowledge of the people before it is passed, and to ensure that if it is a Bill embodying any far-reaching changes that may possibly imperil the prosperity of the people, it shall be passed only when it has received the express sanction of the people, as their deliberate and settled opinion. It is obvious that if this House is to fulfil these functions, it must not be a facsimile of the Legislative Assembly. The framers of the Constitution of the Legislative Council adopted for this purpose the property qualification, and although it is called a property qualifica-

tion, it does not merely include property owners. It embraces those who occupy houses as well. It does not mean in the least that because persons have property qualifications, they have either more intelligence or more honesty than persons who do not own or occupy properties. On the other hand, what the property qualification does ensure is that an elector shall have a material stake and interest in the prosperity and good government of the country. Again, the property qualification, either as occupier or owner, is an easy one to verify and so is suitable for the compilation of the electoral rolls. The objection to the property qualification that is often raised is that certain very desirable persons are excluded from the franchise. That is undoubtedly true. The argument has been used that Shakespeare might possibly have been excluded. That is not true, for Shakespeare possessed considerable interest in a theatre in London, and also held fairly extensive property in Stratford-on-Avon. Then it is said that Burns might have been excluded. That is not true in respect at least of one portion of his life. But even if Burns were excluded I do not know that he would have been a very desirable elector for a perfectly respectable Chamber such as this. I am sure that certain sections of our community, as for instance, the National Council of Women and the Women's Service Guild, would not have been inclined to give a vote for this House to Burns, however fine a poet he may have been. Then it is said that even statesmen might be excluded. In that connection Mr. McCallum, the Minister for Works, has revealed a very grave defect in the franchise of this House in that he has not, and never has had, a vote for this Chamber. Without wishing to pry into the private affairs of Mr. McCallum, all I can say is I do not think it would be at all a bad qualification for a Cabinet Minister that he, being a married man, should either occupy a house of the value of £s. 6d. per week or, preferably, own one. In order that such a hard case as that of McCallum might be justly met, I should be willing to see a new clause inserted in the franchise for the Upper House. I have frequently seen Mr. McCallum driving a very fine motor car. I do not know anything about his private affairs; I do not know whether he owns that car, or whether it is a Government car that he drives; I am not concerned with that, but I would willingly see this

clause inserted in the franchise:—"That any one who either owns or occupies constantly a high powered luxurious motor car shall be entitled to a vote." Thereby I think the very hard case of Mr. McCallum might be met.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You be careful that he does not meet you outside.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Not at all. I am quite sure he would not object to a simple remark like that. It is only Mr. Holmes who is so sensitive on these points.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: It is pretty rough on the West Province candidates that Mr. McCallum should not have a vote.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: May I say a word in reference to plural voting. Exception has been taken by certain people to the fact that some electors have more than one vote. I think the number of people who have more than one vote is not very considerable. I do not know whether there are any recent statistics dealing with the matter, but I believe there were some a few years ago, and they showed that only a few thousand people in the State had more than one vote, whilst only 900 had more than two votes. So that grievance I do not think is a very real one. Even if it were, plural voting can be justified. It must be remembered that an elector can have only one vote in one province, although he may have one in each of several provinces. But, bearing in mind the difference between this House and another place, I think it quite desirable that a man who has shown considerable activity and, whilst residing in one province, has acquired station property or farm property or orchard property or household property in another province, should be entitled to a vote in that province. I cannot see that there is there any real grievance at all. Plural voting, probably, makes for the greater stability of this House.

Hon. A. Burvill: A man owning property in two or more provinces is taxed in each of them.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: And this House being the guardian of those with the greatest interest in the country, I think he should be entitled to a vote in each of the provinces in which he has property. When one comes down to the Bill, one finds there is nothing in it of a very revolutionary nature. I would describe it as an ass's milk-and-water Bill. In spite of that opinion, I think I am entitled to examine the proposals of the Bill, whither they lead, with what purpose they are introduced and what their ultimate effect on the House would be. In the first

place this Bill emanates from a party pledged to abolish this Chamber. It is a plank in their platform, and I understand every member of Parliament on the Labour side, either in this House or in another, subscribes to the plank and so subscribes to the abolition of this House.

Hon. J. Cornell: The word "ultimate" qualifies it.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Still, it is their objective. That being so, it is a legitimate assumption that the object of the Bill is that, by whittling down the franchise now, and perhaps in a few years whittling it still further, ultimately a condition of affairs will arise in this House whereby Labour will have a majority here; and then the ultimate objective in reference to this House may be achieved and this House abolished by vote of another place and by this House committing hari-kari.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Not while they are getting £600 per annum.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: You do not know the calibre of the men on the Labour side who occupy seats in this House. Nothing so paltry as £600 per annum would weigh with them for a moment. But I think it is a legitimate assumption that by this whittling down of the franchise, finally we may find this House abolished. So I object to the very first step in the whittling down process. I do not think members of this House, seeing that undoubtedly that is the ultimate objective of the party at present in power, should do anything whereby that result may be achieved. I agree with the Chief Secretary that, considering the influence the Labour Party has in this country and amongst the people of the State, they do not at the present time return as many members to this House as they are entitled to do. But I disagree with the Minister when he assumes that this is due to the restricted franchise on which this House is elected. I think the reasons why there are only five Labour members in this House are far different, and not far to seek. I think they are these: First of all the split that occurred in the Labour Party over the conscription issue during the war. That, I think, is the greatest factor. Then there is another one, the inglorious record of the political Labour Party during the war. I am not referring to individual members of that party who went to the war and fought; because I know a great number of them did so, whilst a great number of those opposed to Labour did nothing of the

sort; but I am speaking of their political attitude and recalling that in the very darkest hour of the war a congress was held in Perth representing the political Labour Party of Australia, and that congress passed a resolution demanding the withdrawal of the Australian armies from Europe unless an inconclusive peace was made, a peace without victory. The public have not forgotten that, nor have I.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The public never will.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am afraid the public have a very much shorter memory than have you or I. Another reason is the fear of that communism, which we learn even from the mouths of prominent Labour leaders in other States has penetrated into the Labour Party.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is a bogey.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Well, Mr. Theodore said so, and so, too, have numerous other Labour leaders. Someone is always saying so, and I have no doubt it is true. Another thing that reacted against the Labour Party at the last elections for this House were the threats against this House that Mr. McCallum indulged in. It is largely due to that fact that some of the Labour members who formerly occupied seats in this House—personally I am sorry they were not returned, although I welcome those who have taken their places—it was largely due to Mr. McCallum's denunciations of this House that those members lost their seats. But all these causes are ephemeral and will pass away when Labour returns to saner counsels. I am glad to see that in this State Labour is returning to saner counsels, largely owing to the influence of Mr. Collier, of Mr. Angwin and of the Leader of this House. Having introduced Mr. Angwin's name, may I congratulate him on his having been selected to go to England as Agent-General? This is merely a little personal congratulation to Mr. Angwin. I am sure every member of Parliament recognises the good work Mr. Angwin has done in this State for many years in his public capacity. The reward he is now to get is, I think, a very fitting one, although I am sorry that Mr. Colebatch, who formerly led this House with such marked ability, is vacating the position in London. Because, from advices I have had from various people, both Englishmen and Australians who have been in London, I find that on all hands Mr. Colebatch is acclaimed as doing extremely fine work in

London for the State. In fact one gentleman who has known the Australian Agents General for the last 30 years told me there had never been a finer Agent General for Western Australia than Mr. Colebatch. Other people have said that he speaks with greater authority for Australia than does any of the other Agents General. So I am sorry that Mr. Colebatch cannot continue, although I certainly think that Mr. Angwin thoroughly deserves the position. However, I am not quite sure whether Mr. Angwin possesses those showy qualities that some people may consider as artificial trappings, but that perhaps do make for some success in the office of Agent General.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is straying somewhat from the question before the House.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I admit it. I am sorry, Sir. I will leave that and proceed with the Bill. The franchise, although it is proposed in the Bill to lower it, has already really automatically lowered itself since 1899. Because the value is still at £17 per annum, or 6s. 6d. per week and, owing to the depreciation in the purchasing power of money, what to-day is worth £17 would have been worth only £12 in 1899. Consequently the franchise has really automatically lowered itself. The urgent problem is not to lower the franchise but to get the voters to take an intelligent interest in the elections. If this Council is not to be a mere replica of the Legislative Assembly, then I think the present franchise is quite low enough. The more the franchise is whittled down, the more closely will this House resemble another place, until finally, if we attained adult suffrage, the Council would be a ghostly image of another place shorn of all corporeal attributes. It may be said that the Federal Senate is elected on adult suffrage and why not have adult suffrage for this House? But the Federal Senate does not stand in the relationship to the House of Representatives that this House stands to another place. The Federal Senate has very much more power in legislation and in controlling finance than this House possesses, so I do not think that is a fair argument. I make bold to say that many of us consider that the Federal Senate is not the success we thought it was going to be. I think the real reason for its partial failure is that its members are elected on the same suffrage as are members of the House of Representatives. So far as this Bill is concerned I have

described its contents as asses' milk and water, but there is nothing wrong with the title of the Bill. The title is all right, but the contents are all wrong. What should be contained within the covers of this measure is a Redistribution of Seats Bill. If there were such a thing as political morality—and I am not sure at all that there is—the Government would blush for shame to go to a general election on the present distribution of seats in another place. I have before me a return of the enrolment for the Legislative Assembly as on the 30th June, 1926, and on going through it I find that there are 15 small constituencies which between them have only 14,548 votes, and they return 15 members.

Hon. A. Burvill: One member per thousand voters.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The constituency represented by Mr. Clydesdale, that of Canning, has 15,116 voters. That is to say the district of Canning has more electors than the whole of those 15 constituencies can muster in the aggregate. I do not think that is a fair thing. One of the 15 constituencies is that of Menzies, which has only 307 voters.

Hon. J. Cornell: It has about 250 now.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am quoting from the latest return issued by the Electoral Department. In other words, an elector in Menzies has 50 times the political power of an elector in Canning. That is surely not a fair thing. Menzies, with its 307 voters, is represented by that sturdy democrat, Mr. Panton, and I have no doubt that Mr. Panton subscribes to the doctrine of one man one vote, one vote one value. Yet his electors have 50 times the value of an elector in Canning, and in his eyes I have no doubt they have. I have been comparing those 15 constituencies and their 14,548 electors with five districts in the metropolitan area, namely Canning, Leederville, Subiaco, Guildford, and Claremont, which together have 57,480 electors who return only five members. Furthermore, I find that the 88,961 voters in the Perth area—I am excluding Fremantle—return only nine members, whereas the 14,548 voters to whom I have referred return 15 members. In each of those 15 electorates one elector has ten times the voting influence of an elector in the metropolitan area. It undoubtedly can be contended that it was the duty of the Government to introduce a Redistribution of Seats Bill, and not the Bill that is now

before us. It may be said that Sir James Mitchell, when he was Premier three years ago, introduced a Redistribution of Seats Bill and failed to get it passed. That is perfectly true. It failed to pass on account of the opposition of the Labour Party and also because of the opposition of certain mal-contents in his own party. But the position to-day is infinitely worse than it was at the time Sir James Mitchell introduced his Bill. To any Government that would bring in a Bill of this kind when we shall not have an election for this House for eighteen months, and when there is an election for another place only three or four months off, I would apply the words that come from a well-known source—

Thou hypocrite! First cast out the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have done some good. You have silenced Mr. Gray and driven him from his seat.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I could wish he had remained in order that he might hear some more home truths. I should like to call the attention of the leader of the House to an anomaly that exists in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. Sir William Lathlain, the Hon. H. A. Stephenson and I represent 21,000 voters out of a total of 69,000 voters for this House; that is to say the Metropolitan-Suburban Province returns only one-tenth of the members of this House while its electors are only a little less than one-third of the total number for this House.

Hon. J. Cornell: They go for quality.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: And they get it. They know good men when they see them, and invariably return them by thumping good majorities. This discrepancy of voters to members is undoubtedly a grievance against the constitution of the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. In conclusion I would say that so long as the motive of a Bill like this is to gain a means to an end and that is the abolition of this House, so long as members of the party that introduced this Bill are pledged to abolish this House, so long as a Minister of the Crown threatens this House, it is idle to expect us to whittle away the franchise of this House. In vain is the net set in sight of the bird. I oppose the second reading.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN MARKET.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 1st December. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Metropolitan area:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause says that "metropolitan area" means the municipal district of the City of Perth, except the eighth ward (Victoria Park), and the lands included within the boundaries of such district by the City of Perth Endowment Lands Act, 1920. The proviso says that the Governor may by proclamation extend the boundaries of the metropolitan area to include other land. Is it intended that the proviso should nullify the clause?

Hon. G. POTTER: I would go further than Mr. Lovekin. The proviso might be construed to mean the whole of the State. Markets at Fremantle are functioning to the satisfaction of the producer, the consumer, and even the maligned middleman who searches for a market at his own expense and bears the loss, if any.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Who conduct the markets there?

Hon. G. POTTER: The municipal council, who have a system of leasing stalls.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I hope members will note that.

Hon. G. POTTER: The proviso threatens grave danger.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Why is the eighth ward, Victoria Park, to be excluded? Leederville and North Perth are included, and the eighth ward is not entitled to greater consideration than any other part.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Does not the Honorary Minister intend to reply to my question? If not, I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have a prior amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

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

I should like to have a little more time in which to consider this matter, and see what

the effect of the clause really is. At present it would seem to be desirable to strike out these words. Would the Honorary Minister agree to report progress? There is not a full attendance of members to-night, and if amendments are carried it may lead to the recommittal of the Bill on Tuesday, when more members will be present.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I agree that perhaps a little more consideration is required, and that it might be better to wait until more members are present. I hope that on Tuesday next the Committee will be prepared to go right through the Bill.

Progress reported.

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st December.

HON. J. EWING (South-West) [7.35]: Dr. Saw secured the adjournment of the debate, and we should all like to hear what he has to say. Mr. Nicholson said the Bill was for the purpose of establishing a faculty of law at the University, and that certain barristers were prepared to subscribe between them £500 a year to forward this object. Mr. Lovekin said he intended to move an amendment which would allow of a larger amount than this being subscribed. I hope he will do that, and give the profession every opportunity to help the fund as much as possible. The cost is to be in the region of £1,300 or £1,400. I understand this is not the only faculty that should be represented at the university, and that the medical and other professions may soon be expected to come to the fore.

Hon. J. Cornell: We want a faculty of political science.

Hon. J. EWING: No doubt. I understand that local students who are now at certain Inns of Court in England would, if the Bill is passed, be able to practice on their return without going through the probationary period of two years. At present a barrister from England has to serve two years as an articled clerk or in some other way before he can become a fully-fledged barrister. I congratulate Dr. Saw and those connected with the University upon the excellent work they are doing, and on the amount of money they seem to be successful

in obtaining from the Government. The Premier, on every occasion when he has been approached by the Chancellor and Senate of the University, seems to have given them a warm-hearted reception, and generally ended up by bestowing something upon them. I do not know to what extent the purse-strings of the Treasurer have been opened for this institution.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: He has a deep heart but a small purse.

Hon. J. EWING: The University authorities are steadily improving the institution and the educational facilities offering in this State. I congratulate them upon the receipt of the wonderful Hackett bequest, and hope it will result in great benefits for the University. There should be no limit to what the institution will be able to do in the future. It may be a long time before it is endowed in the same way that the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne are endowed, but possibly more public-spirited and wealthy local men will emulate the fine example that has already been set them. Further bequests of this nature would undoubtedly set the University permanently upon its feet. Again I congratulate the authorities upon the work they are doing, and have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.40]: In supporting the second reading of the Bill I congratulate the legal profession upon the public spirit they have manifested in this measure. The Bill is one which the legal profession have put forward to allow themselves to be taxed to the extent of £5 per annum individually, for all time, or at any rate so long as the Act remains in force, for the purpose of establishing a Chair of Law at the University, as well as for additions to the library which will not only serve them but the University undergraduates who are studying law. We should approach this Bill from a somewhat different angle to that from which we approach most Bills. Seeing that the measure really represents the views of those who belong to the legal profession, as well as the views of those who are responsible at the University, I hope the House will allow it to go through without any amendment. For some time past the University has been hoping that a chair of law would be established. One of the first things I did when I became Chancellor of the University was to ap-

proach Sir James Mitchell, then Premier, with a view to seeing if we could not get an additional grant with which to establish the chair of law. I am not one of those who think a chair of law unnecessary. I do not even subscribe to the views of Mr. Brown that the legal profession is perhaps a superfluity. I regard it as a very important profession.

Hon. J. R. Brown: I did not interject.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The hon. member has not interjected the whole of this sitting, nor did he do so even yesterday.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He could not be here long before he was heard.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I do not look upon the legal profession as a superfluity. I look upon the work it is doing in the community as very important. I welcome anything like the creation of a school of law that will increase the ability, the education and the prestige of that profession. I believe that the better lawyers we have, the better will it be for the community. To my mind there is no greater danger in the community, except perhaps an unqualified or badly qualified doctor, than a poorly qualified and incompetent solicitor, or a bad one. It is very important, therefore, that we should have a chair of law at the University. Some four years ago, when I became Chancellor, I approached Sir James Mitchell to see if he could possibly do something to assist in the establishment of a chair of law. At that time the finances of the State were in a deplorable condition, and the then Premier found himself unable to do anything. I have since made a similar request to Mr. Collier, but up to the present it has not seemed possible to secure our desire. With the incentive now given to us by members of the legal fraternity, and the knowledge that the members of the profession are prepared to tax themselves to the extent of £500 a year, no doubt the Government will be prepared to do the rest by providing the sum that will be necessary for the establishment of this chair. The present proposal is not finalised. It is really a matter of general discussion as between the University and the legal profession, represented by the Barristers' Board and some others who were appointed to work on the committee. The proposal is that we should have a professor of law engaged the whole of his time, and that he should undertake a large part of the studies

that will be necessary, and should give lectures on such subjects as constitutional law, Roman law and others which make up the foundations of the legal practice, and that then we should have half-time lecturers drawn from the members of the legal profession in Western Australia, who will give lectures and receive a small remuneration therefor. Further, it is hoped that we shall be able to give a fairly complete course to persons who intend qualifying for the legal profession. That course will be open to those who matriculate and are qualifying for the degree of bachelor of laws. It is also to be open to those who, while not wishing to take a degree in law at the University, intend to pass through the usual portal of a solicitor's examination. They also will go through the same course of lectures as those who are taking the degree of LL.B. But those who are taking the LL.B. course have to do a two-years preliminary course in arts before they are allowed to sit for the degree of LL.B. Further, the proposed course will be open not only to undergraduates of the University, but also to anybody who is seeking to qualify as a member of the legal profession. I hope that ultimately everybody who seeks to enter the legal profession will find it desirable, and I hope it will be compulsory, to acquire a qualification through the portals of the University. To my mind, the admission of legal students to the University will make for the good of the University and also for the good of the legal students themselves. Nothing can be better for men who are going in for one branch of study than to have to rub shoulders with, and meet in everyday life, students of other avocations. So that I am sure the proposal now before us is going to make not only for the good of the University and for the good of the legal profession but also ultimately for the good of the people of Western Australia as a whole. As I have said before, this is really a Bill in which the legal profession have agreed, of their own volition, to tax themselves to the extent of £5 per annum individually. I hope that we shall accept the Bill as it stands. There is one amendment which Mr. Lovekin has foreshadowed and which says that the contribution shall be "not less than" £500 annually. There may not be any harm in the words "not less than," but the legal profession have said, "We will give £500." Surely, if they desire to give more, the authority should come

from them. No other body of men in Western Australia are doing anything of this nature. So I think that in the first place we should accept the offer of the legal profession to contribute £500 annually towards the establishment of a chair of law at the University. If in future years they wish to increase the contribution, I am sure that no member of this House, or of the other place either, will object to the insertion of the words "not less than" in order that the contribution can be increased if that is thought desirable. The other suggestion mooted by Mr. Lovekin is that we should reduce the period of study in a solicitor's office from two years to one year. That, again, surely should be a matter for those who are responsible for legal training, and not a matter for this House.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A barrister at Home does not do any of it.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: But the students here are not going to be barristers. At the present time our solicitors and barristers are combined, and a barrister in this State as a rule graduates as such after having served for a time as a solicitor. His forensic knowledge and skill eventually select him to go into the courts and conduct cases. With the exception of Mr. Keenan, who is at present out of the State, and Mr. Pilkington, who was here formerly, there has not been so far as I know, anyone attached to the legal profession of Western Australia who has practised purely as a barrister. I do not think that either Mr. Keenan or Mr. Pilkington practised entirely as a barrister. They may have taken up that branch of the profession, almost excluding the work of a solicitor; but I do not know that either of them would refuse to do a part of the work that falls to the lot of a solicitor.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Mr. Keenan only practises as a barrister to-day.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Then it is only within recent time that he has done so. I think he still has a brass plate, and I think on that plate will be found "Norbert Keenan, Barrister and Solicitor." The majority of barristers here start as solicitors, which proves to me that a period of two years is not too long to serve in a solicitor's office. To my mind the work in a solicitor's office is analogous to the work which a medical student has to do in a hospital. A considerable part of the medical student's time is spent in preliminary studies that lead up to medicine, and it is

quite right for him to devote a large part of his attention to lectures and so on connected with the practice of medicine; but it is also very necessary for him to spend a large part of his time in the practical work of a hospital. That practical work usually takes him three or four years. From what I know of the medical profession and from what I know of the legal profession, I cannot see that a term of two years in a solicitor's office for those who will be entitled to practise as solicitors, no matter whether or not they say "I am going to be a barrister," should be too long. In any case I claim that surely this is a point which should be determined by those responsible for legal studies, and not by this House. Consequently, I hope that when we go into Committee the Bill will not be altered in any direction other than those directions which have been noted by Mr. Nicholson, who is responsible for this Bill to the House. I hope the House will accept the measure as it stands, subject to those amendments. Once more I express the hope that the example set by the legal profession will be followed by other sections of our community. I hope that our commercial men will do something towards the establishment of a chair of commerce, which I am sure would make for the benefit of the community as a whole. I hope also that the time will not be long before we have a medical school here; and I trust that when that time comes, the medical profession will show as much public spirit as the legal profession are showing. Whether they will do it in the same way as the legal profession I do not know, but I do hope they will do something towards the establishment of a medical school. I will say this much, that in the medical schools of the Universities the medical men give very liberally of their services without reward. Moreover, when they do receive payment, the reward is as a rule very inadequate to the services they render. The time is approaching when we shall have to consider the establishment of a medical school, and when that time comes I hope the medical profession will follow the example which has been set by the legal profession.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [7.53]: I join with those who have gone before in praising the legal profession for having agreed to make a levy on themselves as a step towards the establishment

of a chair of law. The legal profession has been described as "The Devil's Brigade," but by this act of benevolence the lawyers have demonstrated to the community that they are not such devils of devils after all. One phase of the debate has appealed to me, apart altogether from the aspect touched upon by Mr. Lovekin. That is the phase which has reference to our present methods of education. The donation of the legal profession is for the purpose of establishing a chair of law so as to enable the young men of this State to become proficient in and qualified for the practice of the law. Speaking as a parent whose only offspring has gone through practically all stages of our public schools up to the junior examination, and as a parent who has taken an interest in the schools his son has attended, and speaking also from an acquaintanceship with the headmaster of one of our largest public schools, I may say it has been brought home to me that though in this State we have what is called free education from the kindergarten to the University, yet very much remains to be done before we can obtain for the community that level of mentality which is desirable. Though we have free education from the kindergarten to the University—

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is not a general debate on the education system of the State.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The point I want to lead up to is that it is a great pity we cannot get some benefactor or benefactors to create a fund whereby not only higher education can be rendered available to the young people of this State, in the manner proposed by the Bill, but whereby a brilliant young lad whose parents cannot maintain him at the University will be afforded some measure of assistance. This Bill, after all, will only benefit young men who can be maintained by their parents while attending the University. The point I wanted to make is the desirability of assistance of that nature. I am sorry I digressed. However, it has been brought home to me that assistance such as I have suggested is a factor lacking in Western Australia's education system. With the further establishment of a chair of commerce and a medical school as suggested by Dr. Saw, we shall have gone a measurable distance towards perfecting the education sys-

tem of this State. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. J. Nicholson in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause: "and shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation."

Those words are necessary because of the preliminary steps which will have to be taken before the measure can actually come into operation.

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

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a misprint in the clause, "certified" appearing where obviously "certificated" should be inserted. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 "certified" be struck out and "certificated" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 7:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I agree with Dr. Saw that it is advisable to make as few amendments as possible. The one I will suggest will be more helpful than otherwise. The clause provides for the payment by the legal profession of £500 in each year towards the establishment and maintenance of a Chair of Law. As time goes by the students at the University may be doubled and that would halve the contribution. The clause could be amended to provide for a larger contribution in the future. While I will not press it if Mr. Nicholson is not favourable, I move an amendment—

That in line 7 after "the sum of" the words "not less than" be inserted.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I did not reply to the complimentary and kind speeches of hon. members during the second reading debate, but I wish it to be understood that I appreciate their references very highly indeed. I refrained from replying to the debate because it is the desire of the

Leader of the House to make progress. On behalf of every member of the legal profession, I thank hon. members for their appreciative references to the Bill. When Mr. Lovekin raised this point earlier, I said I did not think there would be any objection to an amendment such as he has moved, but having spoken to a number of those associated with the committee of the Barristers' Board, I have ascertained that they think it would be better to leave the clause as it stands for the present.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then I will not press the amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Committee can rely upon it that the legal profession are desirous of doing everything to make that profession a worthy one in the highest sense of the word and to add to the education of our law students so that they may be made, as we would wish them to be, monuments of strength, honesty and courage.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 14:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 6 to 8 the words "Western Australian residents who at the time of the coming into operation of this Act shall have already entered themselves" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "Persons who are domiciled in Western Australia, but who at the time of the coming into operation of this Act, or within one year thereafter may be temporarily absent from Western Australia, and who shall be entered."

I explained the position regarding the inclusion of the proviso during my second reading speech and I shall not repeat it now.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Will this affect the position of English barristers who, under existing conditions, may be admitted here after a residence of six months? Will they have to wait for a longer period?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. English or Irish barristers will have to wait for two years, whereas in the past it was possible for them to be admitted after a residence of six months only.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is that desirable?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The reason for the change is that in Western Australia the two branches of the legal profession are combined, whereas in England, for instance,

they are quite separate. Barristers are confined to barristerial work or advocacy in the courts, while solicitors perform the functions that are peculiarly the duties of solicitors. In England, as in Western Australia, a solicitor has to go through much training extending over so many years. If he then takes his degree he has to serve articles for, speaking from memory, three years. It is considered essential that such a man should have a practical training and serve a period under articles so that he may be more fully fitted to discharge the duties that he will be called upon to undertake. It is only by serving a period under articles that he is able to get that practical training.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Other States admit English barristers after six months' residence.

Hon. J. R. Brown: In Victoria, is not a barrister also a solicitor?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The two branches have been amalgamated in Victoria. Despite that however, the barristers there recognise the importance of retaining the distinction between the two branches and to-day, although they are admitted to the bar in the same way as solicitors are, they practice exclusively as barristers and adhere strictly to the rules that regulate that branch of the profession in England, Ireland or Scotland.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If an English solicitor came here, would he have to wait two years?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No. I have tried to explain the position regarding barristers. In England there is a body known as the Incorporated Law Society that deals with solicitors. In England a solicitor must serve articles for five years, or for three years if he takes his degree.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What happens to that solicitor if he comes here?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If he has the qualifications and has served the necessary period under articles, he will be admitted on the production of the necessary evidence regarding his qualifications.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Has he to serve a period here before admission?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, beyond waiting for six months in order to afford an opportunity for the necessary inquiries and investigations that are so essential, prior to his admission. Section 14 of the Legal Practitioners' Act of 1893 relates to the admission of both barristers and solicitors. It provides that no person shall be admitted

a practitioner unless he is a natural born or naturalised subject, and is a barrister admitted to practice in the High Court of Justice of England or Ireland. It is there the amendment will come in, reading "of at least two years' standing." Then, before he can be admitted to practice here, he must be a barrister of at least two years' standing. A barrister goes through no training in a solicitor's office, but simply performs certain duties and functions, attends certain lectures and passes certain examinations, after which he is admitted to the practice of the law.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What would happen in the case of a returned Rhodes scholar?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He is provided for; he will not suffer any disadvantage. If a man wished to become qualified in this State he would serve a period of articles to a solicitor here. When a man is admitted here he is admitted to practice both as barrister and as solicitor. If a man is to be called upon to perform the duties of a solicitor, it is necessary for the public safety and for the benefit of his clients that he should have had practical experience in the law, so as to be able to discharge his duties satisfactorily.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where is it provided that a man from England may be admitted after six months?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is in Section 15. He must be resident in the State for six months before being admitted. The idea there is to permit of essential inquiries being made. That has been the recognised principle throughout. As I have said, a barrister does not require to undergo any office training. A student who qualifies here by taking the regular course is trained, not only as a solicitor, but as a barrister as well. He gets the advantage of the combined training, but in the past he has been minus the advantage of completing his education by a suitable University course. Because a barrister coming fresh from his barristerial studies in England or Ireland has never been trained in an office, it is suggested that he should be a barrister of at least two years' standing, so that he shall have had some practical experience in the law. It is for the benefit of the public.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I do not see that that cuts any ice at all.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Could not a barrister, coming out from England, practice here as a barrister?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, after six months, but we provide that he must be a barrister of two years' standing, acquired either before he comes here or after his arrival. He can go into an office here for two years and gain a knowledge that would equip him to discharge the duties he would be called upon to perform. The period is necessary for the gaining of practical experience.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Suppose he had had two years' practice as a barrister at Home; would he still have to wait two years here?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: All that he would require to do would be to reside here for six months.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would not give him any experience in practice as a solicitor.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would be necessary then to put the impossible on him, and say we were going to exclude all barristers. A man gets certain practical experience in two years, although he would get a better knowledge of the practice of the law by spending a period in a solicitor's office.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the words "or Ireland" be added at the end of Subclause (1).

Hon. A. Lovekin: Was not this Bill drafted by a lawyer?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: All this amending, I think, is evidence of the necessity for the admission of barristers without let or hindrance. Here we have a Bill drawn by members of the legal profession, and it is scarcely into the Committee stage before a legal member of the House sets about amending it. One thing we are lacking in Australia is barristers of high standing who can bring intelligence to bear on practical cases. We need go no further than the attempted deportation of two citizens of Australia to find to what extent we are lacking amongst the legal fraternity.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will connect his remarks on deportation with the words "or Ireland."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Here is evidence of what some of our own legal fraternity may do when a Bill of seven clauses requires so much amending! But that in a round about way we were able to extract from Mr. Nicholson, late in his address, the fact that provided an English barrister before coming

here had served two years elsewhere, he would have to serve only six months here before being admitted—but for that I would have fought the last amendment. If it is necessary to amend the Bill as it is being amended, it is evidence that we ought to admit men of higher intelligence without let or hindrance.

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

Clauses 6, 7, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

Second Reading.

Order of the day read for the resumption from the 1st December of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Registration of agricultural societies:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Is there any limit to the fee that may be charged? In the course of time the fee may be increased and it will become increasingly difficult for new societies to start.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The fee has to be prescribed by regulation and approved by the Governor in Council.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Shows in contravention of this Act may be restrained by injunction:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Exhibitions are held that include an agricultural section. Would such an exhibition come within the scope of the measure?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Clause 2 gives the interpretation of "agricultural show."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I raised a somewhat similar question with the Solicitor General, who wrote—

An agricultural show commonly exhibits products of horticulture and viticulture, but a horticultural show would not exhibit wheat.

Agriculture is a general term. Horticulture and viticulture are specific and branches of agriculture in the wide sense of the art of cultivating the land. I do not think any amendment necessary. An exhibition of horticultural produce would not be properly described as an agricultural show.

I also had in view exhibitions of agricultural produce and flowers in connection with schools. I wrote to the Director of Education as follows:—

I understand many country schools organise displays of produce raised in the school gardens. Kindly peruse the accompanying Bill and, if the efforts of the schools will be restricted, please ask the Solicitor General to draft an amendment exempting the schools from its operation.

The Director of Education wrote to the Solicitor General—

It might be well to include a proviso that nothing in this Act shall apply to any exhibition of school work.

The Solicitor General made the following remarks:—

It could not be properly asserted that such a display is an agricultural show organised by an agricultural society within the meaning of this Act. To insert such an exemption would impliedly extend the Act to all kinds of displays to which, until we begin to express exceptions, the Act could not be applied.

The danger is that if we started to make exceptions, a great number would be necessary.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I am satisfied.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Bylaws of registered societies:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: There are 63 registered societies, and the council of the Royal Agricultural Society is representative of the agricultural area. The Bill provides that uniform bylaws governing all registered societies shall be made, and may be revoked, altered or amended by the council of the Royal Agricultural Society and delegates of the registered societies meeting together at a conference. Thus it is contemplated that each country society should send a delegate. If we concede one delegate to every two societies, it should be fair representation. I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the first paragraph of Subclause (1):—"provided that the number of delegates of the registered agricultural societies shall not exceed thirty in the aggregate."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I direct attention to the expression "uniform by-laws." It is

questionable whether the by-laws could possibly be uniform; there are bound to be variations. Would it not be desirable to strike out "uniform"?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Macfarlane should be satisfied with the Bill as drafted. It gives great power to the Royal Agricultural Society, which it is now his wish should dominate the position. It might be possible to force any body of persons in a small agricultural centre into the Supreme Court unless it became affiliated with the Royal Agricultural Society. All agricultural societies must be governed by uniform by-laws, hence it is necessary they should have equal voting power at the conferences. The by-laws are to be framed for the country societies, and they should all be represented at the conferences. Already many of the big societies are working hand in hand with the parent body.

The CHAIRMAN: Subclause 1 of Clause 3 places no limitation on the number of societies that may be registered, whereas the clause under discussion deals with the representation at conference of the registered societies. The effect of Mr. Macfarlane's amendment would be in the nature of a negation of Subclause 1 of Clause 3 as to the number of societies which may be represented.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There are 64 small agricultural societies, but Mr. Macfarlane now proposes to limit the number of representatives to 30. Who is to say how these shall be chosen? Some societies such as Wongamine have no permit to hold a show. Every society should be entitled to be represented at the conference and to hold its own show. These annual gatherings do a great deal for the advancement of the agricultural industry.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: District groups have been formed to assist the Royal Agricultural Society and these represent a certain number of societies. Delegates could be appointed from the groups. It is not to be expected that men would come up from the country once a month to attend these conferences, but if they did the country delegates might upset the work of the parent body.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Will the Royal Agricultural Society be registered?

The Chief Secretary: The Bill does not deal with that.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: So that the conference will have no power to pass by-laws

governing the parent body. This seems to be an attempt to permit the Royal Agricultural Society to prenominate over all the registered societies; in other words, the Royal Agricultural whale will swallow the little agricultural minnows.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The parent body is composed of many representatives of agricultural societies in the country. There are 24 members of the council who are already members of country organisations. The council has always been in sympathy with the country districts. There will be only one set of rules governing both the parent body and the branches, whether the clause is passed or not. Permits have not been granted in some cases, because it is deemed that the interests of other societies already established might be jeopardised. The Wongamine society is a case in point, although it has received a permit to hold a show for three years in succession.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Older societies near Wongamine have objected to that centre having its own show. In other districts societies will spring up which will also object to the youngest bodies being allowed to have their own show.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is whether the number of delegates at the conference are to be restricted or not.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There is nothing to prevent the Royal Agricultural Society from increasing the number of its council—which now stands at 30—and thus swamping the small societies.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope no member will be misled by the appeal to the Minister. The appeal relates to refusal to register in the first instance. After that, however, by-laws will be made. As the Royal Agricultural Society will be allowed to predominate, the by-laws may raise the standard of shows to such a height as the small societies cannot possibly live up to; and if by-laws are passed, the Minister cannot possibly supersede them. In my opinion there is a danger that many small shows will be extinguished, not only by the Royal Agricultural Show, but by the larger country shows. The leading societies in the country are in sympathy with the Royal Agricultural Society, and have no time at all for the small societies.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the position is as stated by the Minister, this Chamber should limit the number of delegates which the parent body can send to the conference.

The Chief Secretary: I think so too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Otherwise the small societies are very liable to be outvoted.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In my experience the Royal Agricultural Society have always been most sympathetic to the small societies, and the work of the Royal Agricultural Society has been for the up-lifting of agriculture generally. That work has been done chiefly by the gentlemen on whom Mr. Hamersley has reflected. Of the 30 members of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society, 24 are members of country agricultural societies and therefore not likely to do anything of the kind suggested here to-night.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It strikes me that the Royal Agricultural Society and their advisers have not studied this clause. What is wrong with the other agricultural societies framing their own by-laws in the same way as the Royal Agricultural Society do? The by-laws to be framed by the conference are to govern all the small societies but not the Royal Agricultural Society. Why should the latter dominate the whole position? I agree that the number of members on the council of the Royal Agricultural Society should be limited.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The country societies have their own domestic by-laws, with which no one interferes. Under the Bill there are to be uniform by-laws governing both the Royal Agricultural Society and the country societies.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But the Royal Agricultural Society will still have their own by-laws.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No. I emphasise that 24 of the 30 members of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society are also members of country societies.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: While I agree that the Royal Agricultural Society can be trusted with the great powers proposed in the Bill, yet I think the amendment had better be withdrawn. The conference will not interfere with the Royal Agricultural Society's by-laws.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am putting up the case which the council of the Royal Agricultural Society have asked me to submit. If the Committee take the view that the Royal Agricultural Society purpose doing something quite contrary to the spirit of their actions hitherto, I feel that it would be wrong for me to press the amendment. The council regard the proposed

arrangement as so cumbersome that very little good work can be done under it.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Subclause 1:—"Provided that the council of the Royal Agricultural Society shall not exceed 30 in number."

That proviso will prevent the parent body from crowding its council and outvoting the country societies.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: If the country societies send down two delegates each, they will be two to one.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If 30 members of the parent body are present, that will be pretty fair representation.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This Bill deals with subsidiary societies, and by it we are now proposing to regulate the creation of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society.

Hon. G. W. Miles: No; only to limit the number who will confer with delegates from country societies.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Suppose the conference grows and grows, as has been suggested; then there may be confusion and trouble. The converse of the case which has been instanced would then occur. I doubt whether the Committee have power to insert such a proviso, in view of the constitution of the Royal Agricultural Society. We are asked to alter the society's whole constitution.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If you call that a legal opinion, it is nonsense.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We must see what the council have to do under the sub-clause. The subclause empowers them to make, revoke, alter, or amend any by-laws. The council are the council as created under the constitution of the Royal Agricultural Society, and it does not matter whether the council consist of five members, or 30, or 50. It would be unwise to embody any such reference to the representatives of the council in a measure that will deal with branch societies.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Here is an opportunity for the rich intellect of those associated with the legal fraternity to redraft a clause and make it apply to this particular conference to frame by-laws, and not to the operations of the society!

The CHAIRMAN: The contention raised by Mr. Nicholson might apply to the amend-

ment moved by Mr. Holmes. It would be advisable to move the amendment in the following form, "That the following words be added to Subclause 1: 'Provided that the representation of the council of the Royal Agricultural Society at any such conference shall not exceed 30 in number.'"

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will accept the suggestion and move the amendment in that form.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I cannot support the amendment. It appears the contention is that the Royal Agricultural Society became a little too greedy and tried to stint the clothing of the smaller agricultural societies. Now by way of revenge Mr. Holmes proposes to snip the cloak of the Royal Agricultural Society. I do not think that altogether fair. I do not see why these two bodies should not remain on a fifty-fifty basis, as, apparently, was the intention. In that event neither body would predominate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am beginning to have a little sympathy for the Royal Agricultural Society. The Bill was drafted by that body.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Not this particular clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This clause was redrafted under instructions from Cabinet.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: By a barrister or by a solicitor?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Both, I think. I suggest that we give the Bill a trial. In view of the circumstances, I do not anticipate that the Royal Agricultural Society will be too severe.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: With the consent of the Committee I will withdraw my amendment. The discussion will probably be an indication to the Royal Agricultural Society of what will happen should there be trouble in the future.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The clause contains references to "open voting." What is the explanation for that? It might be desirable to take a vote by ballot.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Surely there would be no necessity for a secret ballot in connection with the framing of by-laws. The duties of the conference will be confined to the preparation of by-laws, and why should there be any necessity for a ballot?

Hon. E. H. Harris: But why the reference to open voting.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is a very old phrase and suggests ordinary voting as against proxy voting.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and then report adopted.

House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 7th December, 1926.

Question: Group Settlement	268
Papers: Worker's Home, J. R. Davis	268
Bills: Road Districts Act Amendment, Recon.	268
Lake Brown-Hullfinch Railway, SR.	268
Dairy Cattle Compensation, SR.	268
Elmading-Northwards Railway, SR.	268
Boyup Brook-Cranbrook Railway, SR.	268
Royal Agricultural Society, SR.	268
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Report	268
Timber Industry Regulation, Com.	270
Shearers' Accommodation Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	271
Weights and Measures Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	271
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	271
Jetties, Assembly's Message	271
Public Works Act Amendment, LB.	271
Dentists Act Amendment, LB.	271
Loan, £4,370,000	271

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

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENT.

Hon. A. BURVILL (for Hon. H. Stewart) asked the Chief Secretary: 1, The number of settlers living on the groups as at 30th June, 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1926? 2, The total number of persons comprised in the families of those settlers for the same years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 30th June, 1923, 1,278; 30th June, 1924, 2,296; 30th June, 1925, 2,229; 30th June, 1926, 2,244. 2, 15th October, 1923 (date of first complete census), 4,765; 30th June, 1924, 8,829; 30th June, 1925, 8,874; 30th June, 1926, 9,405.