NOES.

Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. R. G. Moore	Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. Sir C. Nathan	*(Teller.)*

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

RETURN—MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

Debate resumed from the 13th September on the following motion by Hon. E. H. H. Hall—

That a return be laid on the Table of the House showing—

(i) The total amount of travelling allowances drawn by the Ministers of the Crown during the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1928, 1929, 1931, and 1932, respectively.

(ii) How many visits to the Loan Council were made by the Premier during the above-mentioned periods;

To which an amendment had been moved by Hon. A. Thomson, that all the words after "the" in line 3 of paragraph (i) be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: —"last three years the Collier Government, and the three years the Mitchell Government, were in office."

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—on amendment) [5.58]: I remind the House that the answers given to my questions——

Hon. E. H. Harris: The lack of answers.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: ——were so unsatisfactory that I found it necessary to endeavour to obtain the information by way of this motion. I was careful to state that I had no desire to cause offence, that the information was required by a public body in my province, and that it was information I considered the taxpayers in general had a right to get. The motion deals with the travelling allowances drawn by Ministers of this and of previous Governments. Consequently, it was not directed against any particular Minister or Ministry. I might have mentioned several instances.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I omitted to state that an amendment had been moved to this motion. I must therefore ask the hon. member and other hon. members to speak to the amendment. Until it is disposed of, the discussion cannot be resumed on the motion. The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: In view of what you have said, Mr. President, I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [6.1]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 18th October, 1933.

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

QUESTIONS (2)—ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS.

Water Supply from Bore.

Mr. CROSS asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that the water service to the South Perth recreation ground from the bore in the Zoological Gardens has been cut off? 2, If so, when will this service be restored?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, This is difficult to state. The bore is in disrepair. There are several bursts throughout the system, now over 30 years old and subject to

corrosion by mineral water, and defects can only be remedied as fast as liabilities to the end of last June of £8,233 will permit. Meanwhile, first consideration must be given to the Zoo as a national asset rather than to private clubs upon the adjacent Class "A" Reserve.

Slaughtering of Horses.

Mr. CROSS asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that the disgusting practice of slaughtering horses in full view of women and children at the Zoological Gardens still continues. 2, If so, will he make representations to the proper authority to ensure its discontinuance?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The practice has never existed and, therefore, it cannot continue. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—FRUIT DISEASES ACT, PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it the duty of the different inspectors or supervisors of the Department of Agriculture to recommend prosecutions for—(a) failure to observe the requirements of the Fruit Diseases Act in connection with orchard practice for the control of fruit fly; (b) failure to observe the provisions of the Plant Diseases Act in the transmission of fruit from infected to clean areas? 2, If so, will he state approximately how many prosecutions have been launched from 1st July, 1932, to 1st July, 1933, and with what result?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, (a) and (b), Yes. 2, So far as can be ascertained, none.

MOTION—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.33]: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, the 25th October, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as on all other days.

This is a motion that is usually moved at the present stage of the session. There has been fairly ample opportunity to discuss and consider motions submitted by private members and I think that at this stage, Government business might take precedence. I undertake to give private members, before the session ends, full opportunity to discuss any motion not yet disposed of, or any new motion that may be brought forward.

Question put and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Doney, leave of absence for one month granted to Mr. Warner (Mt. Marshall) on the ground of ill health.

BILL—ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Railways (for the Minister for Health) and read a first time.

BILL—LAND.

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTION—FRUIT FLY PEST.

Debate resumed from the 4th October, on the following motion by Mr. Lambert (Yilgarn-Coolgardie)—

That in the opinion of this House, owing to the prevalence of fruit fly, it is advisable for the Minister for Agriculture to call for a report by a competent authority as to the advisability of destroying all stone fruit and other trees, which are acting as a breeding ground for this pest, within a given radius of the metropolitan area in the interests of the fruit-growing industry of Western Australia.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [4.36]: Members are indebted to the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) for having introduced this matter, and I believe the resultant discussion will have a beneficial effect. I propose to move an amendment, and shall ask members to agree to striking out the words "within a given radius of the metropolitan area in the interests of the fruit-growing industry of Western Australia" with a view to inserting the following—"in all instances where the trees are not receiving the attention required under the Plant Diseases Act." The reason I intend to move the amendment is that I consider only in instances where it can be shown that the provisions of the Act have not been carried

into effect, should the owners be compelled to have their trees destroyed. It would be atrociously vicious to pass a motion, the effect of which would be to destroy, in the metropolitan area, the whole of the stone and other fruit-producing trees that are subject to the depredations of the fruit fly. At the same time there is no doubt that the metropolitan area does provide a fruitful field for the fly. On the 12th November, 1930, I asked the then Minister for Agriculture the following questions—

1, Is he aware that a claim has been made by a metropolitan resident that over 4,000 fruit flies, apparently 80 per cent. female, were recently trapped in an Adelaide-terrace home orchard, the lure being clensel, an insecticide now used in some orchards as a fruit-fly lure? 2, If previously unaware of the foregoing, will the Minister take steps to ensure that efficient measures are immediately taken to deal with fruit fly in both non-commercial and commercial orchards in the city, as well as in country areas? 3, In the absence of sufficient inspectors, has consideration been given to the advisableness of engaging a number of suitable members of the unemployed in order effectively to inspect orchards and trap fruit flies throughout the metropolitan area?

To those questions the Minister for Agriculture gave the following replies—

1, Yes. 2, Efficient measures are being taken to control the fruit fly. 3, This is not considered necessary.

Unfortunately the position is bad each year with regard to the fly, and I am hopeful that some good results will follow upon the effort that is now being made. The fly, apart from stone fruits, mostly favours the pear as a host, but there is a wide variety of fruit, including some indigenous shrubs, that provide a host for the fly. The indigenous growths include the Apple of Sodom and other wild fruits, which enable a carry-over to be maintained.

. . attack: The fly attacks citrus trees as well.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. The orange is fairly popular with the fly, and it has been found in the lemon as well.

. r Patrick: The fly is especially bad in mandarines.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have not heard of it being found in the pomelo or grape fruit, but the fact that the fly is found in lemons says a lot for the industry of the pest, and it i een natural desire to propagate its species. The growers in fly-infested areas are the principal sufferers from the depredations of the pest. The price of fruit from such districts during the fly season is always less than otherwise it would be. Among the fruits grown in Western Australia, the apricot and the peach produce very early crops. The object is, apart from securing the early markets, to produce mature fruit before the fly is bad. Many of the growers combat the fly by means of baiting and spraying, picking up fallen fruit and generally practising orchard hygiene. In orchards where the proper practice is not observed, the fly develops and multiplies. The destruction of all fallen fruit is an important matter, and that work is frequently neglected, with the result that increased trouble follows. Many refer to the codlin moth as the greatest pest attacking fruit trees, but there are others who are equally emphatic regarding the fruit fly. I agree with the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) that the fly is possibly the greater of the two pests, and in this State it is far worse than the codlin moth. When the moth made its appearance in this State, there was at once a vigorous and praiseworthy effort to stamp it out. The greatest possible activity in that task has been shown by the Department of Agriculture, whose staff have been successful in keeping the State clean. That is a great tribute to the department, particularly when we consider how widespread the pest is in some of the Eastern States. In view of the position there, we should not hesitate to express our appreciation of what has been done by the department. In accordance with the regulations, it is not competent for fruit grown in an infected district to be sent to the south and south-west portions of the State. However, the regulations are, to a large extent, a dead letter. It is impossible for every vehicle that traverses our roads to be examined in order to check the spread of infected fruit. I am doubtful whether the fly can live in the rigorous climate of the south and south-west. In California nothing is left to chance by the Department of Agriculture. Rigorous and careful efforts are made to prevent the arrival of fruit fly, whether by train, airplane or other means of transport, and inspectors have been appointed to carry out that duty. In Florida as well as in California, tremendous sums are being expended to control the fruit fly. Wherever the country included jungles containing wild fruits or other plants liable to propagate the fly,

the jungles have been cleared and the indigenous fruit-bearing growths that host the fly have been destroyed. I recall having read in a report of the Californian Department of Agriculture that a sum of 20 million dollars had been spent in one year to control the fly. I hope to show that in spite of the most praiseworthy efforts by our Department of Agriculture to combat outbreaks of codlin moth, they are unable to do what is essential to combat the fruit fly. Let me make it clear, however, that I do not blame the department. My complaint is rather that the Treasurer has failed to find the funds necessary to provide for the employment of sufficient inspectors. Complaint has been made and repeated time after time that the inspectors or supervisors of the fruit districts are not provided with means of transport. They are restricted mainly to train travelling, and thus their work is limited. It is quite impossible for any supervisor to reach the whole of our orchards by train. The orchards are located in the hills and valleys and in parts far distant from railways. If inspectors are to carry out their work, it is essential that they be provided with means of transport. I hope the Treasurer will be able to make available the necessary funds in order to staff the department and enable this essential work to be undertaken. I am prepared to admit that the destruction of non-commercial orchards in the infected area would probably be a helpful step.

Mr. Thorn: Your amendment is better.

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe it will be better. Certainly the destruction of all orchards is not desirable, particularly as the growing of stone fruits has been largely discontinued in the southern areas owing to the difficulty of getting soft fruit to market in good condition. Unquestionably there is need for more thorough inspection and strict enforcement of proper control practices, backed up, wherever necessary, by prosecutions. It is all very well to deal with people kindly, but love and kindness will not get as far when dealing with the fruit fly pest. The attitude of kindly consideration too often practised has the result of influencing people along lines which mean that the fruit fly is not controlled. To-day I submitted a question, and the Minister for Agriculture replied that it was the duty of inspectors or supervisors of the department to recommend prosecutions for failure to observe the requirements of the Fruit Diseases Act in orchard practice for the control of the fruit fly, and for failure to observe the provisions of the Plant Diseases Act in the transmission of fruit from infected to clean areas. I also asked approximately how many prosecutions had been launched from the 1st July 1932, to the 1st July, 1933 and with what results. I understood him to answer that no prosecutions had been launched. If that is so, it is a complete justification of the charges so often made regarding lack of administration of the Plant Diseases Act. It has been said over and over again that if the provisions of the Act were administered, all would be well. There is plenty of law on the statute-book but unfortunately there is not the necessary administration. Lest it be thought that I am casting an aspersion upon the officers of the department, let me say they are quite unable to do what is essential because they lack the necessary transport. It should be quite easy for action to be taken. The trouble is that many growers, finding prices are low, lose all interest in their crops, and the fruit falls to the ground so that the fruit fly multiplies and the trouble is intensified. In the fruit section of the Queensland Department of Agriculture there is a staff of 35 inspectors, including one senior inspector and five market inspectors in Brisbane. The fruit branch of the New South Wales department has a staff of 60 officers including an inspection branch staff of 33 officers. If we could induce successive Governments to do what is necessary, the fruit-growing industry would be much more valuable than it is. Under existing conditions, fruit-growers are discouraged because of the lack of administration of the Fruit Diseases Act. A departmental leaflet published under the names of L. J. Newman, Ento. F.E.S., and B. A. O'Connor, B.Sc. Agric., contained the following—

> The most vulnerable period to attack the fruit fly is between the months of July to December. Unfortunately, most growers take little or no interest in the pest until it again appears in plague form.
>
> In view of the known facts concerning the fruit fly in this State, it behoves all growers, large or small, to continue the warfare throughout the whole year, whenever weather conditions will permit. The reduction brought about by the destruction of the winter and spring flies is most important in any control of this pest. The captures may be few, but it must be remembered that these are the progenitors

of the myriads which appear in the mid and late summer.

Once again it must be repeated that orchard sanitation must be strictly practised, which means the keeping clean of all litter and rubbish and the daily picking up and boiling of infested fruits.

The commercial orchardist practises those principles, but his efforts are seriously discounted by the large number of growers who produce a little fruit as a side line, by weekenders and by backyard orchard owners not dependent on fruit-growing for a living. Those growers are often neglectful of the interests of others, and in such instances it should be quite easy to obtain convictions. If there were a few convictions in the court for non-compliance with the provisions of the Plant Diseases Act, it would have a wholesome effect on other growers and the whole position would be improved. Yet month after month passes and indifference seems to be the keynote. As indicated by the question I asked some months ago, 4,000 fruit flies were caught in an Adelaide Terrace home orchard. They would be sufficient to contaminate the whole of the orchards in districts subject to the fly. It is a shocking indictment and that one instance should have been sufficient to inspire the greatest possible energy on the part of those responsible for administering the Act. I am hopeful that the Premier realises the seriousness of the position, the need for more inspectors and the need for administering the Plant Diseases Act, and will take steps to ensure that the law is enforced. May I recall a community effort made in certain fruit-growing districts in 1927. At that time the fruit fly was particularly bad and, following on a largely-attended public meeting at Gosnells, it was decided to inaugurate a community-baiting organisation in an endeavour to stamp out the pest. At the outset a number of growers held aloof, but later most of them became members and for some years the trouble was kept largely in check. For over 12 months not a single case of fruit sent from that district to the Perth markets was infected by the fly. The association then extended the efforts to Kelmscott and afterwards to Armadale and the same happy result followed. Assistance was also rendered to the Agricultural Department by way of a resident inspector, Mr. Simmons, who policed the district. The operations were particularly successful. After the campaign had been in existence for three or four years and the fruit fly in those districts had been brought under control, those engaged in the effort unfortunately slackened off. That is what so often occurs. When it appears that the fly has been effectively dealt with, some of the growers lose interest, and fail to carry out the practice of baiting, trapping and picking up fruit as they did before. At Gosnells and Armadale many of the growers engaged workmen to bait and pick up the fruit and do all that was essential. This work was done at a low cost per tree, and the result was wonderfully good. I wish to pay a tribute to the late Mr. Simmons, the fruit inspector for those districts. The Gosnells Fruitgrowers' Association carried a vote of thanks to him when he was alive, so that my reference is by no means merely a posthumous one. This gentleman was very energetic and capable, and all felt they were under a debt of real gratitude to him for what he was doing. Unhappily Mr. Simmons died. The association then appealed to the Agricultural Department for the services of an equally good man. I am not reflecting on the new inspector, but it is clear that he had too large a district adequately to supervise, and the results secured were not as good as was the case before. I have here the cost of the work in the Gosnells, Kelmscott and Armadale districts. The Gosnells Fruitgrowers' Association was formed in January, 1926. During the first season, 1927-28, when the work was started, the association baited only 29,086 trees, the bait cost £8, the wages £58, and the cost per tree was .51d. During the second season, 1928-29, the effort was extended to Kelmscott. The number of trees baited was 137,847, the cost of the bait was £37 7s. 6d., the wages amounted to £129 10s. 6d., and the cost per tree was .29d. That is a little over ¼d. per tree, and was a wonderfully economical proposition. In 1929-30, the work was extended to Armadale. The number of trees baited was 146,269, the bait cost £33 12s., the wages came to £138 9s. 8d., and the cost per tree was .28d. In the fourth season, 1930-31, the number of trees baited in the Kelmscott and Gosnells district was 115,640, the bait cost £22 6s., the wages came to £150 13s. 10d., and the cost per tree was .36d. During the fifth season, 1931-32, the number of trees baited in the Gosnells and Kelmscott districts only was 56,098, the bait cost £15 10s., the wages amounted to £47 8s.,

and the cost per tree was .26d. In the sixth season, 1932-33, affecting the Kelmscott district only, the number of trees baited was 22,337, the cost of the bait was £6 14s., the wages came to £24 11s. 6d., and the cost per tree was .33d. These figures and the number of trees baited show how the interest died away. It was a voluntary community effort. When success had been secured, a few growers dropped out, and in the following year more dropped out. The number of trees baited decreased from 146,000 odd to 22,000 odd. There is every justification for the carrying of the motion, subject to the acceptance of an amendment. The industry is a valuable one, and worth saving. Seeing that this House has passed legislation which will enable fruit to be produced without fruit fly domination, it is important that everything possible should be done to save the industry. I move an amendment—

That the words "within a given radius of the metropolitan area in the interests of the fruit-growing industry of Western Australia" be struck out.

If that amendment is carried, my intention is to move to insert the following words:—

"In all instances where the trees are not receiving the attention required under the Plant Diseases Act."

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

Ayes	19
Noes	13
Majority for	6

Ayes	
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hawke	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hegney	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. North	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Doney
Mr. Piesse	*(Teller.)*

Noes.	
Mr. Clothier	Mr. Needham
Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cross	Mr. Willcock
Miss Holman	Mr. Wise
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moloney	*(Teller.)*

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: I now move—

That the following words be inserted in lieu of those struck out:—"In all instances where the trees are not receiving the attention required under the Plant Diseases Act."

On motion by Minister for Railways, debate adjourned.

MOTION—LEGAL COSTS.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the 4th October on the following motion by Mr. Raphael (Victoria Park):—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into legal costs in this State, and also into the Legal Practitioners Act.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [5.13]: The subject matter of this motion comes under three headings, namely legal costs as they apply in this State, the position of those who are going through a course of law, and the question of protection being afforded to the public. I will deal with these headings separately. Had it not been for the death of the former Attorney General, this matter would not have called for the consideration of the House by a motion of this kind. The late Attorney General promised to have an inquiry made and a report submitted to the House, so that members might then decide what was best to be done, either with respect to an amendment of the law, or amendments to the Rules of the Supreme Court, or the judges could have been asked to amend the rules or to take some action, and the House could then have dealt with the matter after it had received consideration at the hands of some competent authority.

Mr. Marshall: A good deal of time passed after the assurance to do something had been given, without anything being done.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The late Attorney General promised to give attention to the matter, and I am sure he intended to do so. Whilst he did not appear to be in bad health, he was not actually in good health, and was therefore not in a position immediately to fulfil his promise. Therefore we can excuse any delay in the carrying out of the promise made to the House. This matter has been before the Chamber three or four times during the past five or six years, in different ways. So far as I am concerned and the House is concerned, it appears that there is no difference of opinion as to the need for alteration. Everyone agrees that there are some items in the Legal Practitioners Act and its administration which need amendment. A select

committee is not necessary to ascertain that fact, which has not been contradicted by even the legal members, or the Barristers' Board, or legal authorities. In those circumstances it is hardly necessary to appoint a select committee, for all that its members could do would be to establish an admitted fact. Therefore I suggest that, particularly at this stage of the session, and the matter having been considered here so many times, the House would not be warranted in appointing a select committee. That body would take three or four weeks to report, and upon the presentation of the report it would be necessary to have statutory amendments prepared, and probably the end of the session would arrive before anything could be done. Thus we should be left in the same position as we were in last year and in previous years when the matter was considered. Accordingly, my view is that the best course would be for the Government to refer the subject to a man with the necessary knowledge and experience to formulate a report, particularly on the matters which have been discussed here. That report can be submitted to the House, and the necessary action taken. With all due respect to a select committee, I do not think the members of such a body would be competent to advise as to the exact manner in which the existing law should be amended.

Mr. Marshall: Select committees inquire into matters much more important than this.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is so. Perhaps two or three of our legal members might be on the select committee, but even then they would hardly desire to be associated with recommending amendments of the law unless they were supported by, say, the Barristers' Board.

Mr. Marshall: Why should a select committee appear to you as incompetent to amend this Act? Members of Parliament make laws every session.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The burden of the speeches made on this motion, and on many similar motions—though these were worded somewhat differently—is that amendment is needed in regard to legal charges and procedure and formalities, as well as necessary technical matters under the rules of court.

Mr. Marshall: Have you read the motion?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, I have.

Mr. Marshall: Your argument does not imply that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have read the motion, and all the speeches made by hon. members this session, last session, the session before last, and during the sessions of 1925 and 1924. Irrespective of what anybody says, in discussing the general terms of the motion one could only declare that we must have, or that we must not have, a select committee.

Mr. Marshall: The scope of the select committee is limited to two matters—firstly costs, and secondly the Legal Practitioners Act.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It has been definitely demonstrated to the House that there is need for amendment. The motion asks for an inquiry, but why have an inquiry when all are agreed that amendment is necessary? That aspect of the question has gone by. Nobody takes up the attitude of saying that everything is absolutely all right and that therefore there need be no inquiry whatever. Everybody has said, on each occasion when the subject has been discussed, that there is need for alteration of the existing practice. The select committee no doubt would ask for evidence from somebody who would say that the law should be altered, and then the select committee's report would be that the law should be altered. I submit that a person of considerable experience in the law should be asked to report as to the directions in which the law should be amended.

Mr. Marshall: The select committee would report along those lines, just like any other select committee.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The select committee would call a witness of experience, and question him as to how the present law and rules and procedure operate. I assume they would ask such questions, because I take it they do not thoroughly understand the matters referred to.

Mr. Marshall: All necessary evidence in that respect could be obtained from the Supreme Court.

Mr. Sleeman: On the Minister's argument a Bill should be brought down straight away, without inquiry.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member may understand all that is

necessary as to alteration of the law and procedure and rules of court, but I consider that there are other aspects. I do not wish the motion to be carried merely because of what has been stated in the House. I repeat, there are other aspects; and it might be well to have an inquiry into those other aspects and deal with the whole subject in a definite, comprehensive manner. When the hon. member interjecting brought the subject up last session, the only aspects he mentioned as requiring amendment——

Mr. J. H. Smith: Why not let Parliament do something about it now?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Parliament is not going to do anything definite by passing the motion, which asks for the appointment of a select committee to take evidence about something as to which we are all agreed. After having taken evidence for three or four weeks, the select committee would submit a report, and thereupon somebody—I do not know whether a member of the select committee, or some other hon. member, or the Government—would have the onus of preparing a Bill. In five or six weeks, however, the House will adjourn, and so nothing will be done.

Mr. Patrick: Are the Government prepared to carry out the promise of the late Attorney General?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, the Government would be prepared to do that.

Mr. Sleeman: That would get us nowhere.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not know that the hon. member is right in saying that. He cannot know whether or not a report by an absolutely competent authority would get us somewhere. I think the better course would be to secure the opinion and experience and knowledge of some competent authority who has been engaged for a number of years in the administration and practice of the law—possibly the Master of the Supreme Court, the authority who taxes bills of costs and deals with procedure, or perhaps a Supreme Court judge, or a magistrate, or a King's Counsel. Thus we might obtain an expression of opinion which would guide Parliament in taking action. That would effect what the mover of the motion desires. The people would obtain better legal service than they have been getting, and at less expense. I think hon. members will agree that the outstanding need in regard to the administration of the law relating to legal practitioners is that it should ensure good service at reasonable cost. Surely we can find someone competent to advise us in that regard. The members for Fremantle, Victoria Park, and Murchison and other hon. members have detailed to the House bills of costs containing items which are obviously absurd, and which obviously should not be allowed. But, unfortunately, such items are backed by statutory authority or regulations or rules allowing the taxing master no option but to pass them as sanctioned by custom and usage.

Mr. Stubbs: On what you say, is it not time that those things were altered?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not say merely that they should be altered. I say it has been demonstrated that they should be, and we do not want a select committee to tell us so. The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan), speaking on this subject last week, said that while he practised not as a solicitor but as a barrister, he knew and agreed that some items of costs and of procedure allowed by the rules of court should not be allowed to continue. The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) in an illuminating speech dealing with this subject agreed that there was necessity for amendment. The hon. member gave some information regarding the work done which other members seemed to have lost sight of, but he did not defend the existing practice in its entirety. Like other members, he agreed that there was need for alteration. That being so, why not let us, as in most other matters, obtain the services of a competent authority to suggest the best manner in which alterations can be made? If a technical railway question is involved, though I have had many years of railway experience and have worked on the railways for over two decades, and consequently know a great deal about railway matters, I do not rely on my own knowledge but consult with the departmental experts. Ministers are not expected to be technical authorities on the matters under their administration. Ministers obtain the views of the departmental experts for the purpose of advising the House and the country to the best advantage.

Mr. Sleeman: You did not agree with the expert who advised you last year.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: All members who have spoken, including the members for Nedlands and West Perth, are

agreed on the need for amendment of the law.

Mr. Marshall: The numbers were against it last year.

Mr. Latham: The late Attorney General did undertake to appoint one of the Supreme Court judges a Royal Commissioner to adjust these matters.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We had not then the evidence we now have. All are prepared to admit that there is need for alteration.

Mr. Marshall: Yet they were all prepared to sit quiet last year.

Mr. Sleeman: Notwithstanding that the then Attorney General said that lawyers doing certain things ought to be ashamed of themselves, no action was taken.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Undoubtedly alterations are needed. Something should be done right here and now. But if the House agrees to the appointment of a select committee, much delay will be involved and the session will have passed before anything can be done. Then we shall have this discussion all over again next year, in a futile effort to remove anomalies and abuses in the administration of the legal profession. I agree the time has arrived to take decided action. That being so, let us get someone competent to advise us as to the action to be taken, and let us get on with the job, and carry it out. But whatever we do, let it be done on the soundest advice that can be given by legal experience. Then we shall have made a sincere and honest effort to improve the position. If we pursue this idea of a select committee, I am confident we shall get nowhere, and no improvement will be made. Everybody has indicated a desire for improvement, and there is no obstacle in the way of that improvement, provided we get sound advice as to how the improvement should be made. Then we can go on with it.

Mr. Stubbs: Are you prepared to bring in a Bill to amend the present state of affairs?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Undoubtedly. Surely the hon. member does not think I would be a party to an inquiry and——

Mr. Stubbs: But you say the inquiry would be futile.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. I say that an inquiry by a select committee would mean so much delay that the session would be over before anything could be done. Only to-day the Premier moved that Government business take precedence of private members' business, which of course is an indication of the approach of the close of the session. If a select committee were appointed, they would not start their investigation until next week, and two or three weeks would elapse before they brought down their report. I am in favour of more rapid and effective methods. These anomalies have been in existence for hundreds of years, and so we cannot hope wisely to alter them without first having an examination by competent persons. While members may think that certain alterations are desirable, we must have advice as to the effect such alterations would have.

Mr. Sleeman: You have had the advice of the leading legal member in this House. If the Minister were to bring down a Bill on those lines, he would be pretty safe.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The member for Nedlands said he would like to hear what the Minister for Justice had to say about it.

Mr. Marshall: And you read his speech because you wanted to know what he had to say about it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Certainly I was interested in what the member for Nedlands had to say.

Mr. Marshall: He admitted everything.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: He admitted that certain alterations were desirable.

Mr. Sleeman: But now you want to judge what is right and what is wrong.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, but I want those we appoint to make an inquiry to suggest the alterations which should be made. If the hon. member thinks that he and the member for Nedlands in collaboration could bring down a Bill, he can do it next week.

Mr. Sleeman: I think that is what we had better do.

Mr. Marshall: And the Minister can go on with his inquiry just the same.

Mr. Stubbs: Some lawyers have robbed their clients.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I would not say they have robbed them.

Mr Hegney: Merely overcharged them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Some have charged costs to which they were not entitled, and which their clients ought not to have to pay.

Mr. Marshall: What about the misappropriation of funds?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I would be prepared to bring down next week a Bill dealing with that. And the Barristers' Board are quite prepared to get on with that aspect of it.

Mr. Wise: Why not term such lawyers rogues and vagabonds?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Considerable improvements have been made during the last few years. We now have the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act, which has given many people opportunity to take legal advice and have their affairs properly settled in the courts. In that regard I want to pay a sincere tribute to members of the legal profession for the wonderful assistance they have given the Crown Law Department in the administration of that Act. Had it not been for the assistance rendered by the legal profession generally—many of them giving their services gratis, and others charging only about one-tenth of the recognised legal costs—the operation of the Poor Persons' Legal Assistance Act could not have been nearly so successful as it has been. Many members of the profession have rendered wonderful assistance in respect of that Act. Then last session we amended some of the processes of the law. The procedure has been altered in such a way that we can now take actions up to £250 in the local court, and so avoid the expenses of a Supreme Court action. Again, members of the legal profession tax themselves in order that young fellows may be educated with a view to entering into competition with them a few years later.

Mr. Sleeman: And after those young fellows have passed their examinations, they are not allowed to practice.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not want to say everything in favour of the legal profession.

Mr. Marshall: You have gone a long way towards it.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: After the war, when prices rose so high, the legal profession were allowed to charge 25 per cent. above their costs. Then, when the Financial Emergency Bill was passing through this House, I put it up to the then Attorney General that he should provide for a solid reduction on that extra 25 per cent. But we met with much opposition, and it took a good deal of pressure before that was agreed to. It was in existence for only a comparatively short time. On the other hand, some members of the legal profession, in view of the depression reduced their charges, whilst others continued to charge to the full. When I took over the department I found that the 15 per cent. reduction on the extra 25 per cent. had been abandoned, and I endeavoured to get it into operation again. The rules were altered, reverting to the 15 per cent. reduction on the 25 per cent. extra charge. But a strong effort was made to limit it to two or three months. I would not agree to that, and now that reduction will remain so long as the Financial Emergency Act remains. I agree with the member for Nedlands that the conditions in Western Australia do not call for the distinctions and differences existing in other countries, where there are all sorts of procedure and charges because the profession is divided into two distinct branches. However, in this State the two are practically amalgamated, and so there is no need for many charges made elsewhere, under the practice of a solicitor instructing a barrister. I do not think it necessary here, that when a solicitor briefs a barrister he should also pay a fee for the barrister's clerk. That is an archaic proceeding which should not be continued. It should not be necessary to ask a client to pay three or four times for the transmission of a document say from one room to another. The question of the taxing of costs has been dealt with fully by members. My opinion is, that if a solicitor puts in a bill and that bill is not upheld by the Taxing Master, the solicitor should be made to bear the costs. The Taxing Master might say that a bill of costs is unreasonable, and should not have been put in. The bill of costs might include something which in the opinion of the Taxing Master was not allowable.

Mr. Stubbs: Suppose I receive a bill of costs and I dispute it and declare that I am not going to pay it. Then the solicitor adds 25 per cent. to the account which goes to the Taxing Master. Is that a fair deal?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That will be altered.

Mr. Stubbs: It is time it was altered.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: With regard to taxing costs in an action for damages, I might sue a person for £100

dence before the select committee? A select committee, you know, has great power.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I am aware of that, but I consider that a man who has had considerable experience of the administration of justice should be the person to deal with the question.

Mr. Marshall: There are lawyers in this Chamber and they would not be excluded from the select committee.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I think we would get much further if we appointed a competent authority.

Mr. Hawke: Are you giving an assurance that the Government will proceed with the inquiry?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. As a matter of fact I intend to move an amendment before I resume my seat. The effect of it will be that the Government should appoint a qualified person to inquire into and suggest legal reforms in relation to the basis and method of charging costs by legal practitioners for professional services and the conditions of entry into the legal profession. Regarding the latter, I do not consider a university course and degree the only thing necessary for a man to practise as a legal practitioner. In the Dental Bill it is provided that experience and practical examinations shall count. For the legal profession it is necessary to have an academic knowledge of law, but it is also necessary to have a knowledge of business transactions, and these you do not get in an academic way. We do not say that just because a person can study and pass a law course at the university, that gives him the right to practise as a lawyer.

Mr. Sleeman: Some are allowed to do that at the present time.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Then it is time we stopped it. It is a radical alteration from the general idea of theory and practice. Theory is necessary, but practice is of ever so much more value. An ounce of practice as we know, is worth a ton of theory. There is a lot of sense and truth in that saying.

Mr. Latham: If a man has the theory, the practice is easier.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, but the practical experience is essential.

Mr. Sleeman: Would you suggest giving the legal student some practical work?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, I would be prepared to allow him to engage in work, and permit him to be paid for it. I know that hardships have been experienced under the existing conditions. The fact remains, however, that practical experience is indispensable in connection with the practice of law. That applies to the work of a solicitor, but, of course, if the individual desires to practise as a barrister, it is a different matter altogether. The system by which barristers are admitted to the bar in England, after which they are permitted to practise, is one that should receive some consideration from the standpoint of legal practice in this State. At present they can be admitted to the bar here and can practise in the ordinary way. If they were to practise as barristers only, it might be all right, but if they desire to practise as solicitors, then I think they should have some practical experience before being allowed to follow that branch of the profession. Consider the position of University graduates. If we are to continue to allow English barristers to be admitted to the bar in this State, and to allow them to practise as solicitors, then I think the University graduates should be allowed the same privilege. For my part, I do not agree that either should be placed in that position. Each should possess the necessary practical experience before being permitted to embark upon the work of a solicitor. Take the position of our Education Department. Persons go to the University, take their Arts degree and probably remain there for a further year in order to secure the Diploma in Education. When those people apply to the Education Department for positions, the department say, "You have the theoretical and academic knowledge regarding teaching, but you have had no practical experience. We will allow you to go to the Training College for a year or two, so that you may gain some practical experience in teaching, and be able to impart that knowledge to children." In the medical profession it is necessary that a doctor shall have the knowledge of what should be done and how to do it when the occasion arises. The same applies to other professions.

Mr. Marshall: In the medical profession, as soon as a man secures his diploma, he can practise.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is not so. A medical man cannot practise

until he has walked the hospitals for a specified period, so as to see what is done and to do the work himself.

Mr. Sleeman: The lawyer has to take his lectures.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: But he does not actually do the work. In the medical profession, a man has to do a certain amount of practical work before he can obtain his degree and earn the right to practise. In all trades, practical experience is essential and technical education is recognised as subordinate to the practical side. Of course, the technical side is immensely important, and I do not wish to depreciate the value of that branch of training. The outstanding feature regarding the practise of any profession is the necessity for practical experience. In the Public Works Department, there are a number of cadets who are going through the engineering course. They are made to go out on road work as part of the practical experience that is regarded as necessary before they can secure their degrees. The position is much the same with regard to doctors and dentists; they must have practical experience. We should insist upon it in connection with the legal profession, too. I should not think of fighting with the object of letting loose on the public an individual possessing a little academic knowledge and permitting him to engage in legal work. Such a man might cause the loss of thousands of pounds to another individual because, through lack of practical experience, he went about his work in an incorrect way. Take the position in the building trade. An architect knows all about it and can set down on paper all the necessary work that has to be carried out. He can draw up all the necessary plans, but we would never think of asking an architect to undertake the construction of the building he had planned. We would call in a building contractor who had made that work his life's study. The contractor knows exactly how to go about the job. Similarly with the legal profession. A lawyer may know all about the theoretical side, but practical training is absolutely essential. Without the necessary experience an ordinary doctor would not dream of undertaking a major operation. Even in Perth, many doctors, who have the necessary academic knowledge, would not perform such an operation. If they were asked to do so, they would refuse and recommend the patient to place himself in the hands of some other doctor who had the necessary experience. Even in the country areas, doctors will not carry out operations, unless it is a matter of life and death, but they prefer, in the interests of their patients, to advise them to secure the services of an experienced surgeon. Then there is the question of remuneration to be paid to those who are gaining their experience. That point is debatable. My own opinion is that students should be allowed to earn money while going through their course. I see no reason why they should not be allowed to do so. A distinct hardship might follow if they were not permitted to do so. An articled clerk does render some service to his employer, and should be paid accordingly. Some contend that the articled clerks who are in their employ are gaining experience and should not be paid, but others pay their clerks according to the value of the services rendered. I know that they need not do so unless they so desire. It simply means that if the individual cannot provide for his maintenance, he may be deprived of the opportunity to become a legal practitioner. He should be able to undertake work that is more or less in consonance with the profession in which he desires to embark. I think it was the Premier who interjected, when this matter was under discussion some years ago, to the effect that he would not agree to such students embarking on employment that kept them up all night, or that enabled them to act as bookmakers' clerks or milkmen, and so on. I agree that work of that description should not be permitted where the students are engaged in law studies. So long as the work in which they engage is in keeping with the status of their prospective profession, they should be permitted to do it. For instance, they should be able to do musical, literary, accountancy or other work in that category. Unless they have parents or someone else able to maintain them during their course, the bar on outside earnings might prevent brilliant young men from attaining their ambition. There should be no such bar. A young man's parent may be in business or may rely on investments, and, because of the depression, his substance may have disappeared so that the son cannot carry on his studies. The lad may be clever and have every prospect of

becoming a successful lawyer, but because of his new circumstances, he is compelled to seek the authority of some autocratic body to engage in outside work during the period of his training. If I remember aright, the former Attorney-General, the late Mr. Davy, said that had it not been for the fact that he was a Rhodes Scholar, he would probably not have been able to become a lawyer. He was a man everyone respected and was recognised as possessing one of the brightest intellects in the State. Any position was open to him, and if he had become Chief Justice or had attained the highest office in politics, no one would have been surprised. Yet, had it not been for the fact that he was a Rhodes Scholar, he would probably have been unable to complete his legal training, despite the possession of attainments that were beyond those possessed by the average individual. I do not think that any intelligent young man should be debarred from supplementing his earnings, just at the whim of an autocratic body. That autocratic body—I do not desire to be offensive—might be actuated by snobbish instead of practical motives, and accordingly might debar a young man from completing his legal training. In Australia, it has been our boast that everyone can aspire to occupy the highest positions in the land, but here, in relation to the legal profession, the position arises that one cannot enter it unless he has sufficient money to maintain himself while undergoing the course. An autocratic body, as I have already pointed out, might effectually debar him from pursuing his studies. That is an unreasonable power to give anybody, however representative and whoever the members may be. Parliament should take away that power, which might be exercised—I do not say it has—to the detriment of individuals worthy of a very bright future. The question of an insurance fund has been discussed. That matter has received considerable attention, and the legal authorities, including the Crown Law Department, the Barristers' Board, the Law Society, and others, are in agreement that a fund should be established, to which the legal fraternity would contribute. Fortunately our experience in Western Australia is such that there have been very few instances of solicitors defaulting with their clients' funds. The very fact that they can be reported to the Law Society and the Barristers' Board for inquiry, and that they can be brought up with a round turn, has had a marked effect. Apparently it is thought necessary in other places to have an insurance fund, and, as those concerned themselves in this State do not raise any objection, I think Parliament should well consider legislation that would have the effect of protecting people and preventing them from being taken advantage of by some dishonest lawyer. In other professions, those who handle cash are compelled to take out a fidelity guarantee bond, and consequently lawyers who have to handle trust funds representing a great deal of money, should be prepared to contribute towards some such scheme. It may impose a tax upon many honest people, but, generally speaking, it should appeal to the House as necessary. It could take the form of a trust fund at the Treasury into which yearly contributions by practitioners could be paid. Having said so much, I shall ask the House to amend the motion. I think the Government should be invited to appoint somebody competent to advise, to investigate the position, and I move an amendment—

That all the words after "that" in the first line of the motion be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"the Government appoint a qualified person to inquire into and suggest legal reforms in relation to (a) the basis and method of charging costs by legal practitioners for professional services, and (b) the conditions of entry into the legal profession."

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—on amendment) [7.30]: I will oppose the amendment, for it is taking away from the original motion all that I considered of any value in it. The Minister was quite right when he said that all sections of the Chamber and of the community agree that amendments to the Legal Practitioners Act are essential; but he omitted to give any reason why the Chamber and the public generally, and even members of the legal profession, should oppose an inquiry of a certain kind as against the attitude adopted by the Barristers' Board on the last occasion a similar motion was before the Chamber. On that occasion the motion was opposed by those deemed to have a full knowledge of the working of the Legal Practitioners Act, on the ground that there was no justification for any amendments whatever. Yet within 12 months we find a

readiness on the part of members of the legal profession, and—if I correctly judge the speeches of the members for West Perth and Nedlands—the Barristers' Board, of which they are both members——

Mr. McDonald: No, I am not.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, I am still 50 per cent. correct. Whether the hon. member be or be not a member of the Barristers' Board, he is a member of the profession controlled by that board. From speeches which were in the main in favour of an investigation, I gather that the Barristers' Board did not support the motion of last session. The then Attorney General compromised with the mover of the motion by agreeing to an inquiry, provided the inquiry was made by a competent authority—presumably the same competent authority as is proposed in the amendment now before us. What is a competent authority to inquire into the subject, whether of the motion or of the amendment? The motion itself is concerned only with an inquiry into legal costs and the Legal Practitioners Act—two items of investigation. That would be the full scope of an inquiry by select committee. The Minister elaborated the necessity for having a competent authority to make the inquiry. If it is proposed to ask the legal fraternity to supply a competent authority to inquire into their own activities, I am going to oppose it.

The Minister for Justice: The best man that ever inquired into the mining industry in this State was Mr. Kingsley Thomas, himself an experienced mining expert.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so, but Mr. Kingsley Thomas did not inquire into his own administration, did not inquire into and report upon his own management. So that is entirely different from what the Minister now proposes.

The Minister for Justice: I did not propose that.

Mr. MARSHALL: If I judge the Minister's speech correctly, the competent authority referred to in the amendment means someone with legal experience, both theoretical and practical; for the Minister took trouble to explain that theoretical knowledge was not complete without practical knowledge. Therefore I am entitled to assume that the amendment proposes to appoint a lawyer to make the inquiry.

The Minister for Justice: A judge of the Supreme Court is not merely a lawyer.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course he is not a lawyer at all. He has never had the theoretical education of the lawyer, nor has he ever practised as a lawyer!

The Minister for Justice: The hon. member is trying to make me look ridiculous, but is merely making himself ridiculous.

Mr. MARSHALL: Everyone knows that each of our judges is a lawyer.

The Minister for Justice: Mr. Kingsley Thomas was an experienced mining expert.

Mr. MARSHALL: That was entirely different. Mr. Thomas, who had achieved distinction in his own profession, was brought thousands of miles to inquire into the gold mining industry of Western Australia which, at the time of his appointment, he knew nothing about. Our judges have graduated out of the environment of legal practice on to the Supreme Court bench. I am not challenging the probity of our judges, but we are all more or less humanly parochial, and if we grow up in a given environment, naturally we can appreciate more highly the viewpoint most familiar to us than could another who has never been associated with that particular walk in life. As I say, Mr. Kingsley Thomas knew nothing of the mining industry in this State when he was appointed, and did not know any of our local mine managers until he arrived here after a journey of many thousands of miles. The amendment proposed by the Minister contemplates something very different from that; because even if one of our Supreme Court judges were appointed to make the inquiry, it must not be forgotten that each of our judges has been directly associated with all those who are interested in the proposed reforms in the Legal Practitioners Act.

The Minister for Justice: And they do not disagree with those proposed reforms.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course they do not. Can the Minister show me an industrial organisation that would disagree, when it came to investigating wages and conditions of labour, if one of their own number were appointed to make the inquiry? It is to be assumed that the whole of the legal fraternity would be overjoyed at the appointment of one of their own members to make the proposed investigation. It is inevitable that an inquiry shall take place, for the inquiry is fully justified on the facts placed before this Chamber on two occasions. The

legal fraternity would welcome the inquiry, provided it be made by an ex-member of their own fraternity. That, presumably, is what is meant by the competent authority referred to in the amendment. If we are to be consistent, we have a few reforms that we can immediately proceed to initiate. Some years ago a man who never knew what it was to enter an industry was appointed to adjudicate the welfare of the industrial life of the State.

The Premier: Who was that?

Mr. MARSHALL: Mr. Justice Rooth. He never knew a thing about the industries of this country, yet he was appointed President of the Arbitration Court. Nobody objected to that. But the lawyers are not to be asked to suffer the indignity of having their practices inquired into by a select committee of this House. The sanctity of their fraternity is not to be violated. Members of this Chamber are deemed to be competent to make laws, or amend laws, or to make investigations into the administration of the biggest departments of State, and to deal with most important questions appertaining to individuals; but seemingly we are not competent to inquire into the matter of legal costs and as to what amendments should be made to the Legal Practitioners Act, notwithstanding that there are in this House lawyers who, if they desired to protect the interests of the legal fraternity, could be members of the select committee. What competent authority do we require when we have at our disposal all the officers of the Supreme Court to give evidence and make suggestions to a select committee, who in turn could make recommendations to Parliament? We have piles of evidence showing injustices in the way of legal charges levied in the past. Surely with the correspondence at our disposal and without calling the persons responsible for making up the accounts, we have enough to investigate. Would not a select committee be competent to report what reforms were necessary? Of course it would be. Years ago in the times of snobbery—I say this without disrespect to the legal fraternity—a lawyer in his wig and gown was considered a wise man. In those days whiskers were wisdom; hence the wig and gown. Few or no amendments have been made to the Legal Practitioners Act for 40 years, and the statute was taken mainly from an old Imperial Act. The Minister contends that we are not competent to make the investigation and recommend necessary amendments to the Act, but that if we are going to have an investigation, it must be made by a competent person. By that I assume he means a lawyer. I do not know what has caused the Minister to change his attitude. When a similar motion was moved last session, the then Attorney General made the self-same promise as the Minister for Justice has made to-night, save that the then Attorney General went a little further and said he would prefer to have the investigation made by a judge of the Supreme Court. Had the then Attorney General lived, I believe he would have carried out his promise. When the division took place, however, the present Minister for Justice voted for an inquiry by a select committee. A few months ago he did not contend that a competent authority was necessary to make the inquiry. To-day, he does. A great change in a very short time! Last session we were promised what the Minister now promises, and he voted against it; he voted for a select committee. I shall oppose the amendment. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon lawyers as individuals or as a body, or upon any of our judges, but it is only natural that anyone trained in a certain environment must understand and admire it and be favourably inclined towards it and more or less biassed in favour of it. We who have graduated from the rank and file and who maintain association with the rank and file see things from their viewpoint. Other members who have not graduated in the same school cannot appreciate our viewpoint. Hence the difference between us. Although we are competent to make laws, amend laws and repeal laws, and conduct investigations in a hundred and one directions—by means of select committee—we are not competent, according to the Minister, to inquire into the activities of the legal profession. My remarks are no more a reflection on the legal fraternity than were the Minister's remarks a reflection on members of this Chamber. An investigation made by impartial individuals would be more satisfactory, but I would go so far as to say that the two legal members in this House could sit on the select committee. Though, to my way of thinking, they would not be partisans and though they would keep before the select committee the viewpoint of the profession, the other mem-

bers of the committee could remain neutral and sift the evidence. If lawyers and their wrongs are to be investigated by a lawyer or an ex-lawyer, let us give the principle general application. When the conditions of employment and rates of pay of other sections of the community are to be investigated, let them be investigated by one of their own class. Then we shall be consistent.

Mr. Hawke interjected.

Mr. MARSHALL: If we are going to be consistent, something like that must be done.

Mr. Patrick: The member for Northam might let us hear his interjection.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am of opinion that under the Minister's proposal, the most glaring cases of injustice would not be investigated at all. A competent authority making an investigation would probably take the schedule of costs that lawyers are permitted to charge, and, following the dictates of the member for Nedlands and the member for West Perth, say that it was necessary to alter the schedule in certain directions. Consequently, we should finish up with a schedule as full of loop-holes as is the existing schedule. Such a competent authority, I believe, would not investigate wrongs and sift the evidence to prevent the perpetuation of wrongs and anomalies, but would be more concerned to produce a schedule acceptable to the legal fraternity. I wish to show how sincere are the legal fraternity since their position has been explained by two speakers who are members of the profession. When a similar motion was moved last session, opposition was offered to it, but notwithstanding the opposition, it was rumoured that the Barristers' Board admitted that amendments were necessary. Yet they made no move whatever to secure such amendments, and they would never have made a move had it not been for the determination of certain members of this House to secure reform. Now that they realise reform must come, they say in effect, "Very well, our next job is to bring the Government to our way of thinking and secure a competent authority to make the investigation." In other words, they want one of the fraternity to make an investigation and in no circumstances to have inquiry by an independent individual who might sift the evidence and make too drastic recommendations.

The Minister for Justice: They may have done it by telepathy; they did not do it by direct representation.

Mr. MARSHALL: The speech of the Minister this afternoon was sufficient to convince me that not only did they get his ear, but that they got very close to it. They were in direct communication with him.

The Minister for Justice: They were not.

Mr. MARSHALL: Through some of their members, they got to the Minister without doubt.

The Minister for Justice: In your opinion.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am entitled to my opinion.

The Minister for Justice: It is only your opinion.

Mr. MARSHALL: Last session the Minister voted against the appointment of a competent authority and in favour of the appointment of a select committee, and I expected him to justify his change of attitude

Mr. Latham: There has been an election since last session.

Mr. Sleeman: And well you know it.

Mr. MARSHALL: In the words of Billy Hughes, the Minister might say, "What does it matter what I said yesterday?"

Mr. Thorn: Of course the Minister is entitled to change his mind.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course he is. The spokesman on behalf of members of the legal fraternity admitted there were glaring cases of overcharging.

Mr. McDonald: I do not think that was ever said.

Mr. MARSHALL: That may be an exaggeration and I will tone down the statement for the hon. member. The spokesman in question made a nice speech, a faultless one in itself, but he did to an extent suggest that some lawyers had overcharged even to a slight degree.

The Minister for Justice: He said the Act required amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister's idea is that he came to the conclusion amendments to the Act were necessary though no wrong had been done: not that they were necessary because something wrong had been done and it was essential that the Act should be amended because lawyers persisted in overcharging their clients. I would like to quote a case in which I was interested. The lawyer in question is still practising. As I paid the penalty, I am entitled to call the tune. This was a case in which my wife was concerned.

It was one of alleged misrepresentation. My wife was the defendant. The plaintiff lodged with my wife's lawyer a sum of money, I suppose without prejudice, money which he owed. The case went to court. In the course of the hearing the judge said to the plaintiff, "Are certain things you have said correct and true," and the plaintiff replied, "Yes." The judge then said, "I dismiss the case with costs against you." My wife naturally went to get what was her money, then being held by her lawyer. Not only did her lawyer take his fee from my wife's money, but he also deducted the fee of the plaintiff's lawyer, and paid him out of the money.

Mr. Sleeman: A case of brotherly love.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member can accept that as being the positive truth. I lost the money.

Mr. McDonald: I am sure there was a mistake somewhere.

Mr. MARSHALL: My pocket felt the mistake to the tune of £10.

Mr. McDonald: That could not happen to anyone outside Claremont.

Mr. Latham: The hon. member does not live there.

Mr. MARSHALL: I can give the hon. member the name of the lawyer, and he can ask him whether what I have stated are facts or not. If he denies my statement, I will go with the hon. member, and confront the lawyer with it.

Mr. Stubbs: What other calling could do that and get away with it?

Mr. MARSHALL: This lawyer succeeded in doing what he did because I was then 600 miles away. For certain reasons my wife could not proceed any further with the case, and it was allowed to drop. Had I been in Perth I would not have allowed it to drop. I believe the lawyer is still practising. There is another lawyer of the same name, and I am not now sure which man it was. What trouble would a competent authority go to in an inquiry into the necessity for amending the law to prevent that sort of thing?

Mr. Latham: There is something radically wrong there. It should not require an amendment of the law to put it right.

Mr. MARSHALL: These things should not be allowed. A law that protects the lawyers, and gives them a monopoly of the business, should be so worded that when anything happens of the kind I have quoted, the penalty should be the striking off the roll of the name of the man in question. If I had complained to the Barristers' Board, I am doubtful whether anything more would have been done than my being given a refund of the money, and then the plaintiff would have had to pay the lawyer. I cannot imagine anything more dishonest than that an individual who possesses money belonging to a second party should pay out of it, without the courtesy of asking for permission, something due to a third party.

Mr. Latham: Did you not investigate the matter on your return to Perth?

Mr. MARSHALL: No, because I did not return to Perth for several years.

Mr. Hawke: That was lucky for the lawyer.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have seen the lawyer since, but my anger had subsided. The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) argued that it is not possible for lawyers to charge more than the rates laid down in the schedule by the Supreme Court. Whether he himself adheres strictly to that schedule in his professional work is best known to him, but we have evidence that all lawyers have not done so. In order that they may be well paid, and often overpaid, for their work, lawyers have insisted on making a charge for every little thing possible, many of which, I venture to suggest, are not even mentioned in the schedule. Where the schedule is silent, the vultures pick. "Here is a carcase," they say, "we will get the flesh off it, and leave the bones to bleach." That practice has been followed in order to keep their costs within the bounds of the schedule and enable them to deal with any individual who may have the knowledge that he can get his bill of costs taxed. Very few people know that they can get a lawyer's bill taxed before the Taxing Master. In all probability, those who do know it now would not have known it but for the discussion on the subject, both this session and last session. I do not think 10 per cent. of the people in the State were aware of the fact that they could get a bill taxed in this way. If members of the legal fraternity had been honest in their intentions, they would have advertised the fact themselves. In any other form of business, the costs are elaborately advertised, because the people concerned are in the unhappy position of having to compete with others. In the case of the legal fraternity, they are protected by law, and the outside world cannot trespass upon their monopoly.

How would a competent authority conduct an investigation into these matters? He would not worry about what had happened or what was going to happen. His greatest concern would be in recommending to Parliament what, in his view, would be necessary to bring the schedule of costs and the Act up to date. Any thought of preventing exploitation of the public for the future would not concern him. He would pay more regard to the interests of the profession to which he once belonged. If a select committee were appointed, those members who are lawyers of note and repute could take their place upon it, as partisans, if they desired to take up that attitude, and could jealously care for the interests of their profession. Incidentally, they would be of untold value to the laymen who would probably take up the other side. Both sides would thus be represented, and a close investigation of the practices followed by lawyers would be ensured. Evidence would be demanded and sifted, and recommendations made to prevent occurrences of this kind for the future. Nothing could be more objectionable to my legal friends sitting opposite, both of whom are men of repute and honesty of intention, than for them to hear instances of what has been done by members of their profession, in the way of wrong-doing. A strict investigation by an independent tribunal should be conducted into this question. It should not be conducted only by someone associated with the profession. The tendency of such a person would be to give sympathetic consideration to the fraternity in any suggestions that were made to amend the law. It is not fair that the matter should be submitted to an individual who has been associated with the profession, or that he should be given the right to rule the destinies of those concerned, as well as their conditions and rates of pay, without at least someone being with him who represents those who suffer at the hands of members of the profession and have experienced exploitation as the result of being in their hands. I disagree with the amendment of the Minister for Justice, just as he disagreed last session with the proposal that was put up then, and I will vote accordingly.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

MOTION—COLLIE COAL.

Use by Government Railways and Utilities.

Debate resumed from the 27th September on the following motion by Mr. Wilson—

1, That this House recommends that 100 per cent. of native coal be used on all lines of the railway system, except the Marble Bar-Port Hedland line, and that 100 per cent. of native coal be used in other Government utilities requiring coal.

2, That a board of experts be appointed from all interests identified with the production, selling, and using of Collie coal to determine the basic standing and equitable value from every standpoint of the native coal versus the coal imported from Commonwealth States, and that such standard have currency for 10 years.

3, That in order to avoid importing coal and to safeguard the Railway Department from under supplies, roof-covered store dumps for Collie coal be constructed at convenient depots throughout the State.

4, That the Railway Department adopt a scheme whereby the mixing of the hard and soft coals shall show a financial improvement on the cost of native coal as at present supplied to the department.

5, That the covering with tarpaulins of wagons of coal at the pit's mouth be initiated.

6, That the cost of the tarpaulins, etc., be refunded from the royalty paid on local coal.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [8.18]: This is a comprehensive motion set out under various headings, and I propose to address myself somewhat briefly to each of those headings. As regards the first of them, asking that 100 per cent. of Collie coal be used, that of course is the policy of the present Government, as it has been of practically all Governments, and has been given effect to very largely for the last 15 or 16 years at least. It has been the aim of all Western Australian Governments, and is especially the aim of the present Government, not only with regard to coal but with regard to other commodities, to give preference to local production even though it be at some cost to the country. The only departures from this policy as regards coal are those rendered necessary by regard for the ability to obtain regular and constant supplies, and to obviate fires from sparks during harvest time. For the year ended on the 30th June, 1933, the total quantity of coal used by the Railway Department was 271,933 tons, and of this 261,693 tons came from Collie. To build up reserves of Collie coal throughout the railway system would

be highly expensive. Huge bins would have to be roofed at all depots, and one of the serious faults of Collie coal is that it deteriorates rapidly, especially when exposed to the air.

Mr. Latham: And then there is always danger of fire.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. In fact, we have had experience of coal stacks catching fire in the depots. The advantage of bins is highly problematical, and their adoption does not seem advisable, particularly in view of the fact that the Government have almost invariably been able to obtain sufficient supplies of fresh Collie coal. There has been an understanding until lately that no matter what occurred at Collie in an industrial way, the miners would not stop the mines so as to embarrass Government coal supplies. Thus we have always been able to depend on a supply of fresh coal, which is admittedly better than stored coal. Again, the expense of bins is unwarranted in view of the fact that the stoppages which have occurred over 25 years in the Collie industry do not amount to more than two or three weeks. The mover quoted certain figures relating to the year 1932. In that year there was industrial trouble at Collie, not altogether by reason of the miners themselves; there seemed to be a degree of embarrassment between the Government and the proprietors of the mines, which might have led to a shortage of supplies. In order to keep transport going, the Government did consider it advisable in that year to obtain a fairly large stock of Newcastle coal. That coal has been in stock, and some of it has been used. In 1932 there were doubts about the continuity of supply from Collie, and there was some industrial trouble. However, 1932 is the only year in which there has been any considerable importation of Newcastle coal. As regards the second part of the motion, suggesting the appointment of a board of experts to determine the value of Collie coal in comparison with Eastern States coal, I may point out that there have been numerous Royal Commissions and committees of inquiry, involving the expenditure of thousands of pounds. The mover himself was a member of one Royal Commission. Moreover, exhaustive railway tests have been taken over a period of 20 to 25 years. As a result of these investigations and tests it was determined that as nearly as possible the basis of value was about 150 tons of Collie coal to 100 tons of Newcastle, or three of Collie to two of Newcastle. During last year an eminent authority on coal, whatever he may have been on accountancy—I refer to Dr. Herman—having before him all the data and all the tests gathered over a number of years by the Railway Department and by Royal Commissioners, including Dr. Jack and Professor Woolnough, eventually arrived at the conclusion that it took 155 tons of Collie coal to equal 100 tons of Newcastle. Thus the rough-and-ready calculation adopted, of about three to two, seems to be borne out by actual facts. The definite opinion I have quoted is to be found in paragraph 168 of Dr. Herman's report. The mover mentioned a matter which is rather outside the scope of the motion but which I think it well to refer to. The hon. member seemed to imply that New South Wales railway rates for coal were cheaper than the corresponding rates here, but that is not so. It is possible that when legislation for co-ordination of transport is introduced and enacted, there may be a reconsideration of freights on our railway system. If that is so, the Collie coal industry will receive consideration as well as other industries. There have, however, been reductions in wool and timber freights, as mentioned by the mover. The object of these reductions is to enable the industries to combat the bad times from which they are suffering. However, at the reduced rates, wool now returns 3.08d. per ton-mile and timber 1.73d., as against the return from coal, which is only 1.11d. It appears, therefore, that Collie coal is carried over our railways ever so much more cheaply than either of the two commodities which have been granted reductions. Of 186,000 tons of paying coal hauled, 112,000 tons were used by the Electricity Supply. In New South Wales the huge tonnages railed for shipment allow of a lower rate for export coal; but the New South Wales rate for local consumption is higher than the corresponding rate here—14s. 4d. for 125 miles in New South Wales as against 11s. 10d. in Western Australia. The mover was perhaps slightly confused on this point inasmuch as New South Wales mining companies own considerable numbers of trucks, and use these for the transport of their coal, thereby securing a cheaper rate than with the use of Government rolling stock.

Mr. Wilson: I knew that. What about Queensland?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have not gone into all the rates throughout Australia.

Mr. Wilson: In Queensland coal is hauled over 300 miles for 14s. And what about Durban?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am talking about Australia, not about Africa. The hon. member referred particularly to New South Wales rates for coal.

Mr. Wilson: I quoted the New South Wales rates.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The figure I have quoted is to be found in the New South Wales rate book, and is correct unless New South Wales has adopted the Victorian expedient of permitting the department to make freight agreements with anybody who comes along, so as to overcome transport difficulties. From that aspect the Victorian ratebook has been described as being as dead as Julius Caesar. It is said that Victorian railway officials can make any rate they please, to obtain business. Now with regard to the mixing of coals, the fourth item of the motion. Such mixing would be highly expensive, coal would have to be hauled from each mine, and an expensive central mixing plant would have to be erected. When transporting coal to the various depots, there would be loss in value; and soft coal sent to the goldfields would deteriorate more quickly than hard coal. In fact, the Railway Department do not desire to use what is termed soft coal at all. Whenever contracts have expired, the department have made an endeavour to cut out the use of soft coal except in close proximity to where the coal is mined. Soft coal is all right if used within a day or so of being mined but if after having been mined and exposed to the atmosphere for four or five days it is sent a long distance, it deteriorates so as to be highly expensive to use. Therefore the Railway Department have endeavoured, whenever possible, to eliminate the use of soft coal. They do not desire it because the calorific value is not as great as that of hard coal. However, because soft coal mines have been opened up and a certain amount of capital has been invested in them, and also because there are communities near the soft coal mines dependent upon employment in them, and, further, because the present Government, like other Governments, have been subjected to a certain amount of pressure, the use of soft coal has been continued. It is the desire of the proprietors of these mines, naturally, to retain their capitalisation; but that is a capitalisation which really should not be existent in an industry run on business lines.

Mr. Latham: But that remark refers to other mines besides this one. Is not the Cardiff mine a soft-coal mine?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I was not referring to any particular mine. The mover was a member of a Royal Commission which made tests showing that better results would be obtained from the use of mixed coals.

Mr. Wilson: Dr. Jack said the same.

Mr. Stubbs: Do the mines charge the same price for soft coal as for hard?

Mr. Wilson: No.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The method of ascertaining the fair price of Collie coal is based on calorific value. Whatever the calorific value, that is one of the main factors in price. The Railway Department, while agreeing to pay on calorific value, have endeavoured as much as possible during the past eight or ten years to get away from calorific value and get on the firebox test; that is, the actual results obtained from the use of certain coals in the fire-box. However, that has not even yet been carried into effect.

Mr. Wilson: Yes, it has.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The firebox is not the only test as regards the price to be paid for coal.

Mr. Wilson: Yes. The Cardiff Collie people get 2s. more per ton.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is based not on an actual calorific value or actual firebox test, but on a mixture of the two.

Mr. Wilson: Calorific and firebox?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. The concluding paragraphs in the motion relate to the covering of coal in wagons with tarpaulins, the cost of which is to be taken out of the royalty paid to the Government. That is all very well. It may be of some advantage to cover the coal with tarpaulins, but whether the advantage is sufficient to cover the cost is quite another matter. The Railway Department consider that when the coal is sent over long distances, such as to Kalgoorlie, Leonora, Laverton, Meekatharra or other places that entail

four or five days' travel, it might be economical to use tarpaulins. Over short distances it is not considered commercially sound to cover the wagons in that manner. The department haul the coal at their own cost for their own purposes, and they should be at liberty to do what they think is best.

Mr. Latham: Do you think the royalty the Government receive should be used to pay for the tarpaulins?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is another point at issue. I do not know why, simply because the State owns the land which has been leased for mining purposes——

Mr. Latham: And pay for the coal they require from the mines.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is another point. Because the Government own the land that is leased for mining purposes at a very cheap rate, surely the State has some right to secure royalty on the coal produced from their own property.

Mr. Wilson: What about the royalty on gold?

The Minister for Mines: We pay £1 an acre for our land, and you pay about 2s. an acre.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: They pay 6d. an acre.

The Minister for Mines: They do not pay £1, at any rate.

Mr. Wilson: And you get £8 an ounce for your product.

The Minister for Mines: And you got nearly as much as that per ounce for Collie coal until a little while ago! You are getting an amount in excess of its value now.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Collie companies pay 6d. an acre for the lease of the land and they are supposed to pay 6d. a ton royalty on all coal produced, but the latter payment has not always been made. We know that in the past all sorts of stuff was mixed up in the coal and there was a lot of clinker. Conditions have vastly improved since then.

Mr. Wilson: They have improved very much indeed.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I can pay a tribute to the miners in that respect. A conference was held with the engine-drivers and it was insisted that the coal provided for use on the railways must be of good quality. An arrangement was made so that if the coal produced was inferior, it would not be paid for, and the Collie miners themselves were to take steps to see that the coal supplied was clean and an adequate commercial proposition. The State is entitled to some royalty because it has made available to the company on a leasehold basis, an asset that is most valuable. The member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) considers that that money should be spent on tarpaulins.

Mr. Wilson: I suggested that some of it should be spent in that way.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We have not received much in the way of royalties.

Mr. Wilson: You have had £40,000 out of the companies.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: And that is £40,000 too little, because we have never been paid the 6d. in royalty.

Mr. Wilson: You make it 1s. and that would be fair.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That would be taxing the Railway Department to the extent of two-thirds of the coal the mines produce. The railways would, in effect, have to pay another 6d. per ton. As the railways use 300,000 tons of Collie coal a year, and the average price was 18s. per ton until recently, it would mean the expenditure of an additional £7,500 per annum. There is no reason why we should mulct the railway earnings to the tune of £7,500 a year merely to make tarpaulins available, as the hon. member desires. Owing to certain circumstances, an arrangement was made some time ago that the royalty should not be collected. In view of the circumstances I refer to, we do not desire to collect the full amount of the royalty. If people desire tarpaulins, the Railway Department will make them available. If it does not pay those people to use tarpaulins, it will not pay the Government to set aside some of the money we have received by way of royalty and invest it in tarpaulins for the use of other people. The price of Collie coal has been reduced considerably during the past year or two, and if people think they can get better results with the use of tarpaulins, they can procure them, but there is no reason why the Railway Department should pay for them.

Mr. Wilson: Would not the Railway Department benefit as a result?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Railway Department, as I have pointed out, consider that the use of tarpaulins may be warranted when the coal has to be hauled for long distances involving four or five days in transit, but where the coal has to journey for 24 hours only, and arrives in a comparatively fresh condition, the expenditure on tarpaulins is regarded as needless.

Mr. Latham: And over the shorter distances the journey is usually done at night.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is generally considered unnecessary to sheet coal over short distances, because it suffers no deterioration.

Mr. Wilson: But sometimes the coal is on the road for five days.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: And in those circumstances sheeting might be advantageous. The Railway Department have free use of their own tarpaulins and mainly condemned sheets are used for that class of work. In view of the expense involved and the damage that would be done to tarpaulins, the Railway authorities do not consider sheeting necessary. While the member for Collie is to be commended for moving his motion, he must realise that the position boils itself down to the consideration of what is best to be done from the commercial standpoint. The railways are not run on sentiment. If something is shown to be profitable, it will be given effect to. If the expense involved in some reform that is advocated is not warranted by results, that reform cannot be instituted. We try to run the railways as a commercial proposition whenever possible, and if the department consider the use of tarpaulins advantageous, the tarpaulins will be used, but not otherwise. I reiterate my statement that Governments have invariably set themselves out to use 100 per cent. local products whenever possible.

Mr. Patrick: You would still have to protect certain districts in summer.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A small quantity of Newcastle coal must be used in the agricultural areas where there are heavy grades. Considerable trouble has been experienced in the Toodyay district and the hon. member knows a spot not far from his farm at Northampton where there is a grade of one in forty, involving a very heavy pull. In that part the countryside was set alight year after year.

Mr. Latham: I wish you would use some Newcastle coal between York and Greenhills.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We desire to use as much Collie coal as possible, but we are not looking for places where we will use it when it has been demonstrated with sickening monotony, year after year, that the countryside is set alight. Where that is likely we use Newcastle coal during certain periods, but otherwise we use upwards of 99 per cent. of Collie coal throughout the year. Now that the member for Collie has drawn attention to the position, and the matter has been debated, I do not think there is any necessity to carry the motion.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.40]: The motion involves the consideration of an important question upon which members are asked to vote. Before members are required to express their opinion on such a motion, I would like the Minister to give us some idea when the report of Dr. Herman, the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the Collie coal industry some time ago, will be made available. The Minister quoted from that report but members have not had an opportunity to peruse it. If I remember aright, the report was printed before the previous Government went out of office and there does not seem to be any reason why it should be hung up so long. The investigation was embarked upon because of a motion passed in the Legislative Council, and a preliminary report was subsequently presented dealing with one portion of the inquiry. As regards the investigation into Collie coal matters, we have not had an opportunity to ascertain what the report of the Royal Commissioner contained. I would like to have that knowledge. I understand some most important matter is contained in the document. Some of it was published in the "West Australian." I do not know how much or how little of it was published.

The Minister for Railways: I think that was in January or February, long before the Mitchell Government went out of office.

Mr. LATHAM: I remember the report being sent to the Government Printer but at that time there was a rush of work. It was thought that the report would have been available for presentation to Parliament when it next met.

The Minister for Railways: Your Government must have made the report available to the Press.

Mr. LATHAM: No doubt that is so, but I think members should have the report for their perusal. On one occasion I asked the Premier when we would receive a copy and he promised we should have it. I would like to see a copy before the Estimates are dealt with.

The Minister for Railways: You know that an arbitration case is proceeding.

Mr. LATHAM: Is that the reason for not tabling the report?

Mr. Wilson: Yes.

The Minister for Railways: I do not say that.

Mr. LATHAM: Even so, I think that particular matter should have been cleaned up before now. It must be seven months since the arbitrators were appointed.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think they will ever report?

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. LATHAM: Have the arbitrators submitted any report?

The Minister for Railways: The position is that the arbitrators have taken evidence for 10 weeks and have reached the stage at which they have recommended that an umpire should be appointed. Action will be taken on that matter this week. The arbitrators have not agreed.

Mr. LATHAM: It was a simple matter that was referred to the arbitrators, merely a question of price.

The Minister for Railways: But there have been many other matters brought into it.

Mr. LATHAM: Did they go over the whole of the work done by Dr. Herman?

The Minister for Railways: No.

Mr. LATHAM: They have taken a long time over the investigation.

The Minister for Railways: The matter is entirely in the hands of the arbitrators.

Mr. LATHAM: I want an assurance from the Minister that we will have an opportunity to peruse the Royal Commissioner's report before we deal with the Railway Estimates.

The Minister for Railways: I will see about it.

Mr. LATHAM: We should have an opportunity to peruse that report before we deal with any transport Bill. We should have some knowledge as to whether we have reached bedrock regarding the price of Collie coal. The inquiry was to definitely decide that issue. I hope there will be an opportunity to peruse the report and know exactly what the arbitrators have decided, after which we may be in a position to give an intelligent vote on the issues involved. The member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) has raised an important point with regard to the use of 100 per cent. Collie coal. I presume he would make some allowance for the use of Newcastle coal, where necessary, during harvest time to prevent the occurrence of fires, or consider whether we ought not to use some of the Eastern States coal if we are going to save a substantial amount of money by it.

Mr. Wilson: We shall save nothing at all.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member follows closely the coal situation, and so he will have seen the tremendous reduction in the price of New South Wales coal at the pit's mouth. Of course we want to use Western Australian coal and so keep our own people employed, but we do not want to pay an unreasonable price for that coal.

Mr. Wilson: Hear, hear!

Mr. LATHAM: I know the hon. member agrees with that. As a matter of fact there is a strong desire to economise and save money, and so before the House votes on the question, I should like that report to be made available. I do not know what effect it can have on the arbitration case. I certainly hope we shall have that report before the House has to consider the Railway Estimates.

On motion by Hon. W. D. Johnson, debate adjourned.

MOTION—DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

Debate resumed from the 4th October on the following motion by Mr. J. H. Smith—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should give urgent consideration to the position of dairy farmers in the South-West in their relations to the Agricultural Bank, and more especially in the Bank's relations to the group and soldier settlers.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [8.47]: The mover of the motion gave a sad account of the plight of many of the group settlers engaged in dairy farming, and was followed by various other members who have a knowledge of the position. I am sure every member is deeply interested in the subject, if

only because of the enormous amount of capital that has been invested by the State in this scheme. Some ten or twelve years ago I remember Sir James Mitchell, the then Premier, speaking of the development of the South-West and comparing it with the fertile districts of the northern rivers in New South Wales, and with the Gippsland and western districts in Victoria. He said the soil in the South-West was equal to the soil in those Eastern States districts, and that it was only a matter of time when the South-West would be able to produce butter of equal quality to that produced over there. That, he remarked, would keep within the State 1¼ million of money that was annually going to the East for butter and other dairy products that could be profitably grown in the South-West. Time has not proved the success of the venture that was so lavishly pictured by the Premier of the day; the only thing that time has proved is that it has been a very expensive process. In fairness to the Government that embarked on that scheme, it must be said that in the Eastern States a similar experience befell those who endeavoured to pioneer Gippsland and other thickly timbered portions of Australia 30 or 40 years ago, districts that are now under rich pasture and producing great wealth. I also remember being one of those who pointed out to Sir James Mitchell—it is recorded in "Hansard"—that side by side with the establishment of the scheme in the South-West, if the Government of the day would establish group settlements in many portions of the Great Southern and the eastern wheat belt, very much quicker results would be obtained, and that any loss occasioned by group settlement would be counteracted by the wealth that could be produced in quick time by the establishment of group settlements in districts within an assured rainfall, but one much less than that in the South-West. Ten years ago land in big holdings could have been purchased for a couple of pounds per acre, land occupied by one family, but which would carry 20 families, but unfortunately the Government of the day could not see their way to establishing group settlements in the wheat belt. To-night we find ourselves discussing a pious motion that the Government should give earnest consideration to the position of the dairy farmers in the South-West in their relations with the Agricultural Bank. It is only within the last three or four years that the Agricultural Bank has had anything to do with the group settlers of the South-West. Whether the Agricultural Bank's experience in the carrying on of the farms under that scheme of settlement ought to have been brought into being ten years ago, I am not in a position to say. At all events, every Minister who during the last few years has had control of the Agricultural Bank, has been faced with the problem of how much more he would have to write down in the amount spent in an endeavour to make the South-West pay its way.

Mr. J. H. Smith: That applies to the wheat belt as well.

Mr. STUBBS. I guarantee that any losses sustained on the wheat belt have not been at all comparable to those made in the South-West.

Mr. J. H. Smith: I know of one wheat farm that cost the Agricultural Bank £14,000, and the bank could not get £1,000 for it.

Mr. STUBBS. One swallow does not make a summer. Similar illustrations could be found in some parts of the South-West, where £40 or £50 per acre has been paid for the pulling down of the trees and the rooting up of the sour ground. If the hon. member is going to use as a comparison that farm which he says cost the bank £14,000, I can prove that the wheat farming districts have justified every penny spent in their development. I admit the prices of wheat and butter have fallen below the cost of production, but I should like the hon. member to tell me what object he has in going on with this motion since a Royal Commission has now been appointed to inquire into the Agricultural Bank and into group settlement. I hope that before long the scheme that was started 10 or 12 years ago will get round the economic corner. I am with the hon. member in endeavouring in every possible way to do the best we can for the settlers down there, but I say that far too much money was expended there in the early stages of the scheme without sufficient supervision in seeing to it that the improvements effected represented value for the money spent. But what is the use of labouring that question, since the money has gone west and millions of pounds have been lost? I hope the House and the Government will be able to evolve from the experience of the past something to the advantage of the State,

and that we shall have no recurrence of a huge expenditure of money with so little to show for it. I believe we have in the South-West, districts similar to those in Victoria and in some parts of Queensland, which have taken 30 or 40 years to develop. In nine out of ten instances over there it was not Government money, but private money that was spent. I have watched the development of heavy lands on which it has been left to the grandchildren to reap the benefit arising from the toil of their parents and grandparents. I do not complain that the development of the South-West was started by a previous Government, but I repeat that want of supervision has been responsible for the wasting of a huge sum of money. I hope that before long some of the settlers who have stuck manfully to their jobs in the face of difficult circumstances will get some reward for their labour. But it has been a very expensive experiment for the State.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [8.58]: The motion sets out the urgent nature of the question with which it deals. It has now been on the Notice Paper for at least three months, and so if the question was urgent three months ago, as I believe it was, it must be ever so much more urgent now. Whether the carrying of the motion will speed up the application of the necessary remedy, remains to be seen. It is questionable whether detailed post-mortem examinations of the tragedy of group settlement will assist to find a solution. In my opinion the group settlement scheme has suffered from two main initial blunders. The first was the grand slam basis on which the scheme was commenced. There can be no doubt that the ideas of its founder or founders were far too great to ensure the successful development of the scheme. It was commenced on an altogether too wide-spread basis. Great areas were surveyed in all parts of the South-West without any close examination of the soil value of the land and without any serious consideration being given to the question whether one portion of land surveyed was more suitable for settlement than another. All the blocks were surveyed of one size, which showed that the whole thing was taken on the face. Had there been the necessary soil survey preliminary to settlement, a great deal of the land that was settled and upon which much money was expended would not have been taken up. That contention has been proved by subsequent results. Whole groups have been completely abandoned, but they were abandoned only after much expenditure had been incurred upon them. The blocks on the abandoned areas were cleared, fences were erected, houses were built, dairies were constructed, and other heavy expenditure was incurred, and after the expenditure of thousands of pounds in that manner, it was found that the soil was entirely unsuitable for the purpose and, as a result, settlers had to be removed, not in ones and twos, but in twelves and twenties, and they had to be removed to other portions of the South-West where better land existed and better opportunities for success were available. The second initial mistake was in the selection of the people to settle the groups. In making that statement I cast no reflection on the sincere desire of those that were chosen to make a success of the undertaking. I believe every man and woman who went on to group settlement went there filled with the greatest possible hope. They went there inspired with the belief that, after a few years of labour and effort, they would be able to establish for themselves a farm that would maintain them and their dependants in a reasonable state of comfort. Nevertheless, the dairying industry is such as to make it impossible for every Tom, Dick and Harry to succeed, and it was absurd to select people from the big cities of England, bring them to Western Australia, place them upon dairy farms or upon holdings which it was proposed to make into dairy farms and expect them to succeed. My experience leads me to the opinion that the dairying industry is a family industry. By that I mean, it is necessary for people to grow up in the industry to make a success of it. They have to understand so many phases of dairying activities. They have to understand the development of pastures, the treatment of cattle and a hundred and one other difficult questions that only a life's training can supply. Yet when this scheme was launched, people were brought from England, some of whom perhaps—or I might say certainly—had never seen a live cow.

Mr. Marshall: And very few had seen a dead one.

Mr. HAWKE: That was the second great mistake. Comparisons have been made regarding the growth of the scheme, and some members have been at pains to compare the

expenditure during the first three years of the scheme with the expenditure of the second three-year period. The comparison has been made mainly to endeavour to load the responsibility for the huge expenditure incurred on to the shoulders of the Government in charge of the scheme during the second three-year period. Although the comparison between the two three-year periods shows that the second period was the one of greatest expenditure, the comparison does not prove that the Government in control during that period were responsible for the expenditure. Any person possessing an ounce of logic will clearly understand that in the development of a huge scheme of this kind each succeeding year would bring an increasing expenditure of money. It is something like the building of a house: a certain amount of money has to be expended on the foundations, but it is the later portions of the building that necessitate the greater expenditure. So it was with this scheme. In the initial stages it was mainly a question of landing the people in all parts of the South-West, and building shacks of a very poor description for the people to live or exist in temporarily until better accommodation could be provided. A certain amount of expenditure was also incurred in the first three years on clearing operations. In the second three-year period, expenditure had to be incurred for additional clearing, the construction of permanent homes, the erection of fences, the purchase of stock and in numerous other directions. It was only reasonable and logical, therefore, that in the second three-year period the expenditure should have been greatly in advance of that of the first three-year period.

Mr. Marshall: It was absolutely necessary to carry on the scheme.

Mr. HAWKE: Some people will argue that when the Government came in during the second three-year period and found that things were not working out as well as was anticipated in the first instance, they should have held up the whole scheme and conducted a searching investigation into it. They should have done that. Had it been done, a tremendous amount of money would have been saved to the State. Still, I can imagine what would have happened had that been done. It would have given the launchers of the scheme the opportunity to discharge themselves from all responsibility. They would have had open to them the excuse that a succeeding Government were unsympathetic to the undertaking, had stopped its progress, and had detrimentally affected its chance of success. Consequently the Government of that time were in a very difficult position. The scheme has been continued. Some people tell us it has justified its existence or, if it has not justified its existence up to the present, the passing of time will bring every justification. I sincerely hope that will be so, but it will depend to a great extent upon some definite change of policy, not only in this State, but in the Commonwealth and, indeed, in every country in the world. Some members offer as justification for the expenditure on the scheme the fact that a large quantity of butter has been produced, but that may not be a justification for the expenditure and for the very great loss that has been incurred. I have endeavoured to ascertain from several sources how much per pound the butter produced under the group settlement scheme has cost the taxpayers of this State. Nobody has been able to hazard a guess, but if the information could be obtained, it would be found that the dairying industry in the South-West, or the group settlement portion of it, has been the most highly assisted and the most highly bonused industry, primary or secondary, in the whole of the Commonwealth. If the products of some secondary industry were being produced at a similar cost, I know a number of men in the political life of this and other States who would be howling to high Heaven about the disgrace of producing secondary products at such tremendous cost to the taxpayers. They would be advocating that the whole industry be wiped out, and that we be allowed to import our needs from other countries at world parity. I mention this in the hope that such individuals will endeavour to be at least consistent and logical in their treatment of secondary industries as compared with their treatment of primary industries. When the change of Government occurred three and a half years ago, the then Premier, Sir James Mitchell, in all earnestness developed a scheme which he believed would save group settlement. Under his scheme the settlers were to engage in a system of intense cultivation. They were to be supplied with those things necessary to produce not only butter fat, but pigs, eggs, vegetables, etc. The then Premier worked out on paper that every group settler under his scheme would be able to receive an income of, I think, £400 per annum. Although

the Premier who drew up the scheme earnestly believed it would succeed, I could not find at the time more than one or two group settlers who had any faith in the scheme. It may be thought that they did not wish to have any faith in it, but by that time they were practical men who knew the productive capacity of the land they had cleared and knew that the market in this State to absorb the products they were expected to make available was already over-supplied. They saw that a great increase in the production of pigs, vegetables and other articles would only burden an already overloaded market, and bring about a further reduction in the low prices then ruling. The scheme was forced upon the settlers against their better judgment, and they were compelled to make the attempt. It did not take many months to bring the scheme crashing down in absolute failure. When the then Premier saw his well constructed scheme crashing to the ground, he seemed to lose hope in his ability to solve the problem. From that day onwards the whole scheme and the responsibility for the control of it was passed on to the Agricultural Bank. From then on the scheme seemed to go rapidly down hill. I do not altogether blame the officers of the Agricultural Bank for the rapid decline of the scheme. Falling prices perhaps assisted more than any other factor.

Mr. Latham: What assisted was that the Government had not the money to pour into it that had previously been poured into it. You have only to look at the returns to see that.

The Minister for Mines: It was a hopeless expenditure.

Mr. Latham: You poured enough money .nto it.

The Minister for Mines: In the hope of saving the scheme. We should have left the South-West to grow jarrah.

Mr. HAWKE: The excuse offered by the Leader of the Opposition is not the main reason for the decline of the scheme. It may be those factors had a good deal to do with it, but at that time the settlers were at the productive stage and were producing all kinds of commodities. If those products could have been marketed at a reasonable price, or at prices which ruled three years previously, a good many of the failures that have occurred would have been avoided. It seems to me that from that time onwards the Agricultural Bank officials, instead of grappling with the problem and trying to evolve some constructive method to save the scheme, rather concentrated on the endeavour to recover interest payments due by the settlers to the bank.

Mr. Doney: Are you in part blaming the officials for the decline?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes.

Mr. Doney: You said you did not blame them entirely.

Mr. HAWKE: I do blame them in part. When they concentrated on gathering in interest payments due from the settlers, they were engaging in an almost impossible task, for not one in ten settlers was in a position to meet the interest charges that were demanded of them.

Mr. Doney: You realise they were in all probability carrying out instructions?

Mr. HAWKE: I believe they were.

Mr. Doney: You cannot therefore blame them.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the Leader of the Government was putting pressure upon the general manager of the Agricultural Bank to meet interest charges due to the Treasury. In turn, the general manager was probably putting pressure upon his officers to recover interest payments due to the bank so that he might make the necessary payments to the Treasury.

Mr. Doney: In which case you are wrong in blaming the officials.

Mr. HAWKE: Not at all. The actions of some of the Agricultural Bank officials in attempting to achieve the impossible from the settlers had a tremendously disturbing effect upon them. Week in and week out, month in and month out, payments were being demanded of them that they had no chance of meeting. They were threatened that unless by a certain time they met the charges due from them, they would be forced off their holdings and would lose the benefit of their life's work.

Mr. Doney: You are only showing that the blame must lie upon those controlling the bank, and not upon the officials who were merely carrying out instructions.

Mr. HAWKE: A great deal is left to the discretion of the officials directly in touch with the settlers. If the official who is directly in touch with them has the necessary balance, and is able to use his discretion, he often achieves better re-

sults than would be achieved by those who persist in these payments being made for interest, and in issuing threats of eviction and other drastic actions against the settlers. To the extent that tact was not shown, and all this discretionary power was nullified the officials were very much to blame. I watched the growth of the scheme, and had the painful experience of watching its rapid decline. In 1929 and 1930 I saw newly established towns that were thriving and prosperous, and in 1932-33 I saw them again the shadow of their former selves. That is a condition which exists to a great extent not only in the dairying country but in the wheat country, and possibly also in the pastoral country. In the South-West new towns have declined in the group settlement area just as they have declined in the wheat belt. It is difficult to say what should be done to recover the scheme from the position into which it has been forced. Without bringing politics into the question I can say that the administration of the present Minister for Lands (Hon. M. F. Troy) was the most successful of any of the Ministers charged with the responsibility of carrying on the scheme. It may be said he was in the best position to achieve success.

Mr. Thorn: He poured a few millions into the scheme while he was in control.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not know whether the hon. member has followed my remarks but I particularly dealt with that aspect of the question, and proved to the satisfaction of every other member the reason for it.

Mr. Thorn: Let me tell you that if any Minister had the millions he had, he would administer the scheme fairly well, too. That is for your information.

Mr. HAWKE: I am pleased that my friend should say that with a smile. Since the Hon. M. F. Troy has resumed control of the department, he has not had the opportunity to visit the groups, but has undertaken to do so in the near future. That is perhaps the best that can be done for the present. It is essential that the Minister in charge should personally inspect these holdings and meet the remaining settlers Only by such methods can he hope effectively to deal with the situation. A Royal Commission did make a detailed inquiry into the scheme not long ago. Up to date the report of the Commission does not seem to have been carried out to any great extent. Whether some of the recommendations would be of benefit to the settlers if put into operation, I will not say definitely now. The sooner the Minister visits the settlements, the better it will be. Every member knows many of the original settlers have now left the areas. Some have left of their own accord because of the hopelessness of the situation, but a greater number have been evicted as they were unable to meet the interest and other payments. Those who have remained have proved that they are determined to hang on to the death. They have shown they have the necessary courage and perseverance. Many of these settlers have also indicated that they have developed a deal of ability in an industry that was absolutely new to them 10 or 11 years ago. The remaining settlers are entitled to every consideration the Government and Parliament can give them. It would pay the State to concentrate on the land already developed and at the productive stage in the South-West. There has recently been a tendency to launch out in new schemes of development, certainly not on the widespread scale that was originally done in connection with group settlement, but on a scale far too big considering all the circumstances. There never was a time in the history of the State when the consolidation of existing settlements should be more persevered in than at present. It seems to me dangerous to endeavour to force new settlements into existence whilst established settlements are threatened with disaster. A good deal of the money that has been expended on attempts to establish new settlements in the South-West during the last three or four years could better have been expended on saving and securing those group settlements which have been hanging on for so long.

Mr. Doney: Do you include the Napier settlement?

Mr. Latham: He is only guessing. He does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. HAWKE: The Leader of the Opposition may possess a tremendous amount of knowledge, although people would not know it unless they were told.

Mr. Latham: They will soon know the extent of your knowledge.

Mr. HAWKE: I think I possess as much knowledge, if that is possible, as the Leader of the Opposition, concerning this scheme.

Mr. Thorn: Although you say it yourself.

The Minister for Mines: He has been over it more often than has the hon. member.

Mr. Latham: Does he know where the Napier settlement is?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, and I know it should never have been started.

Mr. Latham: Is that so?

Mr. HAWKE: It should never have been started while other areas were in such a precarious position, and while the markets for the products to come from the Napier settlement were unsettled.

Mr. Doney: Are you alleging anything as to the non-success of that settlement?

Mr. Latham: So you would rather we paid the men £2 a week and left them in idleness in the city?

Mr. HAWKE: Of course the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to make a charge of that kind, but he will probably find that the outside public places very little reliance upon the statements he makes in this Chamber, just as little as they placed upon his statements at the last general elections.

Mr. Doney: Are you levying a charge of non-success against the Napier settlement?

Mr. HAWKE: I am sorry to have to tell the hon. member a second time my opinion of the Napier settlement. New settlements should have been held back in order that there might have been a concentration of the resources of the State upon the task of saving the land that was already developed in the form of group settlements, and other land settlement schemes already established.

Mr. Doney: You are including the Napier settlement in a general condemnation, whereas everyone knows that settlement has been extraordinarily successful.

Mr. HAWKE: I have told the hon. member twice my definite opinion on the subject.

Mr. Marshall: Take him into your confidence again.

Mr. HAWKE: It would have paid the State handsomely to have held off from any new settlements in the South-West, and concentrated all the available financial resources of the Government on the task of rehabilitating the existing group settlements.

Mr. Doney: You are side-stepping the question.

Mr. HAWKE: Not at all.

Mr. Doney: Why generalise when I put a specific question?

Mr. HAWKE: I shall not tell the hon. member a fourth time what I have already told him three times. If the Napier settlement has met with some success, that success has been achieved at the expense of settlers in groups established years ago. Surely there can be no argument against that. I have already stated that probably the best plan is for the Minister to make a special visit to the group settlements in the near future. It might assist if he took the Leader of the Opposition with him.

Mr. Latham: I would prefer him vastly to you.

Mr. HAWKE: So should I. I feel sure that if the Minister of to-day, who had a great deal of worry in connection with group settlement four or five years ago, pays another visit to the groups, he will see a tremendous change for the worse, a change which has not been altogether unavoidable. However, the Minister may be able to devise some means of improving the situation. It is to be hoped that those remaining can be kept there. I understand from the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) and other hon. members that settlers are leaving the groups week by week. That is a tragic situation, particularly after the State has expended approximately £8,000,000 on the scheme. If the Minister makes the personal visit I have suggested, he may be able to develop an entirely new system of control. The group settlement scheme will have a greater chance to recover if an altogether separate form of control is established. It was utterly wrong to throw the heavy responsibility of controlling and managing the scheme upon the shoulders of Mr. McLarty and other Agricultural Bank officers, whose work previously was great enough to occupy the whole of their time. Better results would have been achieved had a separate form of control been initiated. After visiting the settlements, the Minister may also come to that conclusion. If a new form of control is set up, it should be given a greater local application than has been the case for some years past. By such methods it may be possible still to save a good deal from the wreck, and it may also be possible to enable settlers who have hung on so courageously for 10 and 11 years to carry on until they win success in the industry.

On motion by Mr. Moloney, debate adjourned.

BILL—TENANTS, PURCHASERS, AND MORTGAGORS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Hegney in the Chair; the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Delete this clause:

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Clause 2 refers to Section 24 of the principal Act, which section permits contracting out. The acceptance of the Council's amendment would mean that the Act would remain in operation with Section 24 intact, enabling people to contract out of the operation of the measure. I previously explained the difficulty of administering the Act because of the existence of Section 24, which rendered the measure largely inoperative. Many house agents took the opportunity to force people to contract themselves outside the operation of the Act before they would allow them to go into a house. The Act applies only to persons who by reason of unemployment are unable to pay rent. Such persons have thus in many cases been deprived of the benefit of the Act. If we do not agree to the Council's amendment, the measure will not be re-enacted even with a modified incidence. Therefore, though with reluctance, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2. Title.—Delete the words "twenty-four and":

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: This second amendment is consequential on the first, to which we have agreed. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

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

House adjourned at 9.41 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 19th October, 1933.

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

QUESTION—TOXIC-PARALYSIS.

Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier: 1, Have any decisions been made recently regarding the campaign to be carried on against the toxic-paralysis menace? 2, If so, what is the nature of the decisions made?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The decisions are as follow:—(a) To carry out the advisory or extension of field work amongst farmers. In this connection the Chief Veterinary Officer proposes to conduct a very extensive programme amongst farmers in order to advise them as to the best means of preventing the losses due to toxic-paralysis. An agricultural adviser to assist in this work will take up residence in the district at the end of the month; (b) Laboratory work—Pathological examinations to be carried out by Dr. Bennetts. Dr. Underwood will conduct analyses of representative pastures; (c) Field trials—To be conducted at Avondale—and more particularly on an affected farm in the Meckering district.

BILL—LAND.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1933-34.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 17th October, on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £1,442:

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [4.34]: I have listened with interest, and I am sure other members have listened with interest, too, to the speeches that have been delivered