

The Minister for Works: That was done.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: What rebate have they been allowed?

The Minister for Works: Each case was dealt with on its merits. I cannot give you the details in every instance.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: My experience is that when such matters are left in the hands of the officers of the Department the people get very little consideration. I would like to know more definitely how much has been written off the rates in the aggregate.

The Minister for Works: I cannot tell you.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: I would like the Minister to tell us what his intentions are in regard to placing the water supply in the hands of local authorities. Is he genuine in this matter, or is it only so much bluff, and keeping us on the string year after year? Will he hand over the control to some authority which will be capable of giving us what we want in the way of a good water supply at a reasonable rate? Will the Premier give us this opportunity?

Hon. W. C. Agwin: Will he hand over that £80,000 profit that has been made?

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: No doubt that profit would be used in the direction of reducing the rates. As things are at present, the Department has absolutely failed to supply us with potable water. Not only that, but it is adopting a dog in the manger policy. They will not allow the people to assume control, though they cannot manage it themselves. Year after year we see a paragraph in the Governor's speech relating to the water supply, but it proves to be nothing but a pious expression.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 13th December, 1922.*

|   |     |      |
|---|-----|------|
| Questions: S.S. "Kwinana" Sale                      | ... | 2167 |
| Hospital for Insane, Appointment of Chief Attendant | ... | 2167 |
| Treasurer's Advance, Expenditure                    | ... | 2168 |
| Soldiers' Settlement, Dependants                    | ... | 2168 |
| Assent to Bills                                     | ... | 2168 |
| Bills: Interpretation Act Amendment, 1A.            | ... | 2168 |
| Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, 1A.       | ... | 2168 |
| Licensing Act Amendment, Assembly's Message         | ... | 2169 |
| Esperance Northwards Railway Extension, 3A., passed | ... | 2168 |
| Agricultural Seeds, Com.                            | ... | 2168 |
| Closer Settlement (No. 2), Com.                     | ... | 2169 |
| Jarnadup-Denmark Railway, 2A.                       | ... | 2174 |
| Land Tax and Income Tax                             | ... | 2180 |
| Dog Act Amendment, Com., recom.                     | ... | 2180 |

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

### QUESTION—"KWINANA," SALE.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, What was the price for which the s.s. "Kwinana" was sold? 2, What were the conditions upon which the sale was effected? 3, Who were the purchasers?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, £12. 2, "Tenders will be received at the office of the State Steamships up to noon on the 7th August for the purchase of the hull of s.s. 'Kwinana' as she now lies at Rockingham." 3, Mr. Owen Carlon.

### QUESTION—HOSPITAL FOR INSANE.

#### *Appointment of Chief Attendant.*

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has the position of Chief Attendant at the Hospital for Insane been filled and, if so, is the present occupier of the position junior to several others in the service? 2, What position in relation to the Chief Attendant's office does Attendant O'Brien occupy? 3, What are the reasons for not making the appointment according to seniority in the service? 4, What is the cost to the department, and to whom are salaries paid, in connection with the Chief Attendant's office? 5, How long is it since Attendant O'Brien was on annual leave? 6, What leave is now due to Attendant O'Brien?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, None; but part of his time is occupied in drawing up duty sheets under the Chief Attendant. 3, The best man was selected. 4, Chief Attendant, £318; Deputy, £300. Part of Attendant O'Brien's salary for time spent in drawing up duty sheets. 5, April, 1919. 6, Two years' annual leave, 56 days.

### QUESTION—TREASURER'S ADVANCE, EXPENDITURE.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Minister for Education: Will the Minister supply the details of the expenditure under the Treasurer's Advance for the last financial year?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: Yes, probably on Tuesday next.

### QUESTION—SOLDIERS' DEPENDANTS, SETTLEMENT.

Hon. J. MILLS asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay on the Table of the House a return giving the number of dependants of deceased soldiers, the price of whose conditional purchase land has been reduced by one half under the terms of Section 11 of the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1918, giving (a) names; (b) area of land; (c) the district in which the land is situated?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: There are about 2,500 cases of reduction. The only way to find which are dependants is to search all the files, which is not practicable. Papers for any particular case quoted can be produced.

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Western Australian Bank Act Amendment. (Private.)
- 2, Companies Act Amendment.

### BILL—INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Hon. A. Lovekin and read a first time.

### BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to amendments Nos. 3, 5, 7, 27, 30, 42, 44, 47, 49, 50, 54 and 56 and had agreed to amendments Nos. 9, 25, 26, and 37 subject to modifications in which it desired the concurrence of the Council.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the message be taken into consideration in Committee at the next sitting of the House.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Will members be able to get a copy of the schedule before they are asked to consider the amendments to-morrow? Otherwise we shall not know the effect of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT: They will appear on the Notice Paper to-morrow.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Shall we be able to get a Notice Paper early to-morrow?

Hon. J. Duffell: You can get it at midday.

Question put and passed.

### BILL—ESPERANCE NORTHWARDS RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Read a third time and passed.

### BILL—AGRICULTURAL SEEDS.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: During the debate on the second reading I referred to Subclause 2 which states that the Act shall not apply to any sale of seeds by the grower to a seed merchant or by a farmer to another farmer. It is not intended that a farmer should be at liberty to go into business in a general way as a seed merchant and not comply with the Act. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to Subclause 2:—"so far as such sales are, by regulation, exempted from the operation of this Act."

This will mean that a regulation will be promulgated providing that casual sales shall not come under the provisions of the Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: In view of the statement that palm seeds do not germinate for from 12 to 36 months, does the Minister propose to retain the reference to palm seeds in the definition of "agricultural seed"?

The Minister for Education: That does not matter. It is known that palm seeds take time to germinate.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: But a claim might be set up in 90 days.

The Minister for Education: It could not be substantiated.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Sale of agricultural seeds:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (d) "and" be struck out.

This is in view of a further amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move a further amendment—

That “and” be inserted at the end of paragraph (e), and that the following be added:—“(f) subject to the regulations, the country of origin.”

In connection with a great number of seeds the country of origin does not matter, but there are seeds—I understand, particularly lucerne—where it is of great importance that the country of origin should be stated.

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

Clause 7—Power to submit samples of seeds for examination:

Hon. A. BURVILL: Subclauses 2 and 3 seem to me unnecessary. How are they to be complied with if seeds are sent to, say, Broome? Subclause 4 gives full protection.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the seed is to be tested, it is only fair that the vendor should be notified, so that he may be represented.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Would it not be fair to have the seeds tested before being put on rail or on board ship? A change in the condition of the seeds might be set up in transit.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That Subclauses 2 and 3 be struck out.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I hope the amendment will not be carried. The two subclauses protect the vendor of the seeds. Botanists are not to be found all over the country.

Hon. H. STEWART: In connection with Subclause 2 it seems to me very necessary there should be a time limit as to examination of seeds by a botanist. A purchaser should not be entitled to demand an examination three months after making the purchase.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—Meaning of sample of seeds:

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 after “bulk,” in the last line, there be inserted “parcel or bag.”

A whole consignment should not be condemned because of one wet bag, for instance.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This measure will have no reference to seed damaged in transit. The object of the subclauses which the hon. member moved to strike out is that the owner should be present or represented at the sampling. In connection with this clause, the owner or his representative would insist on a sample being taken from the normal stuff, and not from the damaged portion. The sampling would cover the whole purchase.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 22, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT (No. 2.)

In Committee.

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

Clause 7—Acquisition of land (partly considered):

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That in the second proviso after “assessment,” line 4, there be inserted “in which the Act commences.”

The proviso refers to “the current year of assessment,” which seems to me to require closer definition. This measure will probably come into operation during January next, and then the year of assessment would be last year. “The present year” practically applies to the previous year, and so the Act may be made retrospective unless we have the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There can be no necessity for the amendment. There is no room whatever for doubt as to what the proviso means.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: A number of people will have put in their returns to the Taxation Department. Their figures apply to the previous year, not to this year. They go along to amend their assessments 30 days after the commencement of the Act, and those statements will be made to apply to the previous year. The amendment will clear the position.

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

|              |    |    |    |
|--------------|----|----|----|
| Ayes         | .. | .. | 11 |
| Noes         | .. | .. | 10 |
| Majority for | .. | .. | 1  |

### AYES.

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Hon. C. F. Baxter | Hon. E. Rose           |
| Hon. J. A. Grefg  | Hon. H. Seddon         |
| Hon. V. Hamersley | Hon. H. Stewart        |
| Hon. J. J. Holmes | Hon. F. E. S. Willmott |
| Hon. A. Lovekin   | Hon. A. Burvill        |
| Hon. J. Mills     | (Teller.)              |

### NOES.

|                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Hon. F. A. Baglin    | Hon. J. M. Macfarlane |
| Hon. H. Boun         | Hon. G. W. Miles      |
| Hon. H. P. Colebatch | Hon. G. Potter        |
| Hon. J. Duffell      | Hon. A. J. H. Saw     |
| Hon. R. J. Lynn      | Hon. J. Nicholson     |
|                      | (Teller.)             |

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That subclause (3) be struck out to the end of the second last paragraph, and the following inserted in lieu:—“(3.) The compensation to be paid for all such land or of the interest therein of the persons entitled thereto with the fair value of all improvements thereon shall be—(a) such price as may be agreed upon between the owner and any mortgagee and other person having any interest in the land and the

Board, or if no agreement be made. (b) such price as may be determined by arbitration under 'The Arbitration Act, 1895.' "

The object is to make the ascertainment of compensation as simple as possible. Under the clause it is provided that compensation shall be based on the unimproved value and the fair value of the improvements. Then there is a proviso relating to the returns made by any land owner under the Land and Income Tax Act as being *prima facie* evidence, with 10 per cent. added, of the unimproved value of the land; and the further proviso which we have just amended. I propose to strike out both those provisos. Amongst land owners making taxation returns it is a common custom to insert the minimum value.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is that not dishonest?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not see anything dishonest in it.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: What is the minimum value?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would be the price at which the land was purchased from the Government.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you say this is a taxing Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It amounts almost to a taxing Bill. It has the effect of increasing compensation in an improper manner.

Hon. A. Burvill: The Taxation Department does not allow the minimum value to be put in.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If they are not satisfied they can assess at a higher rate, and the taxpayer can then appeal. So the department does not suffer in any way, and consequently there is no reason why there should be imposed on the land owner this condition that his income tax return shall be *prima facie* evidence, with 10 per cent. added, of the value of the land for the purposes of compensation. There is no need for this proviso. Moreover it is unfair, and so I am moving the amendment, which represents a fair method of arriving at valuation for compensation purposes. If the clause is passed as printed, on every claim for compensation we shall find the Government seeking to contend that the owner shall receive no more than the value mentioned in his return, plus 10 per cent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is not that a fair thing?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No. He should receive what is the fair value of the land, to be determined by agreement or by arbitration.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is the difference between your amendment and the clause?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The clause provides that compensation shall be based on the unimproved value, etc., and my amendment provides that the owner shall get compensation without any reference to any return he may make. Furthermore, I would strike out both provisos. This would mean that the Government would have no opportunity of raising the question of the return that might

have been made by the owner. There is no reason for introducing a reference to the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act in this Bill. When an owner makes his return, he naturally bases the unimproved value of his land on its minimum value, because of the difficulty he has in ascertaining its actual value.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Nicholson's amendment means nothing more than striking out the provisos. The striking out of the unimproved value merely gives him some justification for deleting the basis on which the value is arrived at. Any unbiassed man listening to Mr. Nicholson's remarks would say, "Let us do something to stop this sort of thing." If any owner is basing his return on the minimum value of the land, as suggested by Mr. Nicholson, he is committing fraud.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Our Land and Income Tax Assessment Act provides how the value shall be arrived at, and the owner shall pay a tax on the unimproved value of the land, which has to be ascertained in that way. Mr. Nicholson now suggests that a land owner may know that his property is worth £2 an acre but will put in his return on the basis of 15s.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Not at all. He may find it very difficult to ascertain its value.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The objection to the clause must be due to fear that the people who have been escaping their just tax may be compelled to pay up.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not suggest that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A charge of fraud should not be laid at Mr. Nicholson's door, or at the door of any land owner.

The Minister for Education: I am not charging him with fraud.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister says that the land owner who does this sort of thing is guilty of fraud. Both the Federal and State authorities reserve the right to amend an assessment, and give the owner the right of appeal. If an owner cannot amend his return after 30 days, as under this Bill, he may not get any other opportunity of doing so.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He does not get an opportunity under this Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the owner is not to be given an opportunity of amending an assessment, he is fixed as to the unimproved value of his land on the passing of this Bill. Both the Federal and State departments may increase the unimproved value from year to year and the owner will have to pay the higher rate of tax, but in the event of the land being resumed, the Crown may base the amount of the unimproved value on the return made by the owner, which he was unable to amend on account of lack of time. He should be allowed to amend his return every year.

The Minister for Education: So he can under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That would be all right.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The point referred to by Mr. Holmes is fully provided for in the proviso.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In many cases land values go down. The owner has the right, then, to reduce his valuation. In the event of the value going up, it is his duty to furnish a return based on that increased value. The Act contemplates that every year the true value of the land must be returned.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Leave it to the department to fix.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What is before the Chair, the striking out of the proviso or Subclause 3?

The CHAIRMAN: The question is the striking out of portion of Subclause 3 down to and inclusive of the second proviso.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am more interested in Mr. Nicholson's amendment on the Notice Paper. The subclause is much preferable to that amendment, for it gives a specific direction to the Government, and if Mr. Nicholson's amendment were agreed to, that direction would be struck out.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am more concerned with the remarks of Mr. Miles and his dishonest reflection upon people who make out their land tax returns.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not use words such as "dishonest reflection." He is not in order and he must withdraw the expression.

Hon. H. STEWART: I withdraw. The use of the words was not intended to apply to Mr. Miles, but to those who make out their returns. Mr. Miles called into question the honesty and integrity of those who make out returns, indicating that dishonest practices were being followed by those furnishing them. It is most unfair to suggest dishonest practices against these people. I can give two illustrations which came under my notice to show what has happened. In 1909, a person took up farming and when he purchased the property he found that the previous owner had never sent in a land tax return. It was not that that man was dishonest but that he was ignorant, and the department never called upon him to furnish a return. The man who bought the property, forthwith made out his return and the Commissioner was able to assess the value of the land on which the purchaser paid his taxation. From year to year notices are sent out by the department stating that it is not necessary to provide the information unless the taxpayers' holdings have been altered. I am referring, of course, to the State land tax. In many instances the values may not have been altered. Whatever the morality of the individual may be, it is not easy to determine what is the unimproved value of land. I do not know of any Act which calls upon the individual land owner to alter each year the unimproved value of his land.

The Minister for Education: He would do it quickly enough if he wanted to knock the value down.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Commissioner has power to alter valuations, and there is no call upon the individual to do it. In another instance, the land owner had never put in a return and when the property changed hands, the purchaser communicated with the department to learn whether there were arrears of tax owing. He was informed that no returns had ever been furnished for that property. In that case also, the purchaser sent in his returns and the Commissioner fixed the valuation. In both these instances the purchasers were perfectly reasonable. I put that up as a reply to the suggestions against land owners. In some instances the land owner may put a premium on his property, because he regards it as his home. We have no equitable system of land valuation in this State giving a fair deal to the department and to the owner. It is unfair, therefore, to impute to a section of the community dishonest practices when new legislation is brought forward.

Hon. G. W. MILES: After listening to Mr. Stewart's remarks, I think it is about time that the Minister who controls the operations of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act issued instructions to the assessors to at once put up the values of lands by 50 per cent.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What nonsense! Why blame the lot for what a few may have done?

Hon. G. W. MILES: After Mr. Stewart's explanation, I am convinced that the only way to get at the true value of land would be for the Government to put up the unimproved value 50 per cent. and allow the owners to appeal against that decision. They would thus arrive at the true value of the land. Mr. Stewart's explanation shows that the State and the Commonwealth have probably lost thousands or hundreds of thousands of pounds through land owners not paying a fair tax. If I were a Minister controlling the Act I have mentioned, I would put up land values at once.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How would you assess the unimproved value of land?

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is explained that these people have not paid a fair tax, because they have not been asked to put in their valuation.

Hon. H. STEWART: On a point of order, I object to the statements of Mr. Miles.

The CHAIRMAN: What words do you object to?

Hon. H. STEWART: I object to Mr. Miles' statement as to what I said and what I conveyed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Miles may proceed.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I have indicated clearly to the Minister that it is about time the State and Commonwealth got a decent return from these lands.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How would you assess the unimproved values?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am replying to the arguments of Mr. Stewart.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But you throw the onus on people who are paying on proper valuations.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The arguments used show that this State must have lost considerable revenue because the true value has not been placed upon the land.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The chief objection to what has been suggested is that in many cases agricultural lands are assessed at their proper value in accordance with the Act. In the Avon Valley the land has been assessed at 68s. per acre and when the expenditure necessary to bring the land up to its present condition is taken into consideration and the unimproved value of 68s. is added, a total value is reached giving a figure as high as anyone would be prepared to go.

Hon. E. Rose: What about the Harvey and Roelands areas, where the values run out at from £5 to £6 per acre?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There are many bona fide users of land who have spent a lot of money to bring their properties into their present stages of development, and they have been called upon to pay a fair amount in accordance with the Act.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have listened to the arguments of Mr. Stewart. Mr. Holmes said the other day that I was not so dense as I made out. I confess I am dense enough not to see the application of Mr. Stewart's remarks to Mr. Nicholson's proposal. Mr. Stewart's statements may have been some reply to the assertion that land owners had been guilty of wilful deceit in regard to their taxation returns. Certainly, however, his statements had nothing to do with the amendment suggested by Mr. Nicholson. Mr. Nicholson has apparently been able to find something that he calls a "minimum unimproved value." I asked him for a definition of that but he did not provide me with anything which was satisfactory to me. I do not know if he has given a satisfactory definition to the Committee. So far as I can understand it, the unimproved value means that after the value of land for selling purposes is taken, and the value of improvements on the property deducted, the balance represents what is the real unimproved value.

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. V. Hamersley: You are wrong.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The Minister says I am right, and Mr. Hamersley says I am wrong!

The Minister for Education: The Act sets it out specifically.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But the Act is not too clear.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have made up returns of land values as often as other hon. members and that is the basis on which I have always worked. Unimproved values will always fluctuate in accordance with the movements of the market. During the war, land values decreased. A little while ago we expected to see land values rise because

of the Premier's immigration scheme. Land values went up and so the unimproved values went up too. I consider this is a perfectly just basis for fixing the unimproved land values. There is nothing to prevent a person when submitting his land tax return, altering it, and whenever the land is taken, the unimproved value will be the value based on the returns, not necessarily on the value which has been put in. When you have given a person due notice that this is to be the basis on which the valuation is to be made, you have done everything that can legitimately be done.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: The question of deciding the unimproved value of land is one of the most difficult problems I have ever considered. For years I paid land tax on what I considered the unimproved value, and to guide me I took the value placed on the land by the Government surveyors and classifiers.

The Minister for Education: Before selection?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: Yes. After having paid the tax for a number of years, I came to the conclusion that the value was too high. I appealed to the Lands Department and on a block of 800 acres they reduced the valuation by one-half. That proved that I was over-valuing the property. I was paying double. I believe in allowing a man to value his own land and paying tax on that valuation. I sold that property later on at the best market value I could get. The Lands Department asked me for a statement of the value of the improvements, and the unimproved value. I had a list made out and it transpired that I had sold my place for less than the value of the improvements and the rent paid on it.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The question of the value of land in an unimproved state has exercised the minds of people all over the civilised world. It cropped up in one of the courts of England and the judge said that there was no such thing, and that the land had no value that could be fixed. Take 10,000 acres in the Sahara Desert. What value has it? Nil. But let there be some irrigation scheme started 20 miles away and water taken to that property. The value of that land is altered altogether by being made fertile. But what was the unimproved value of it? Nil. Therefore how can you try to fix the value of X when we have not the slightest idea of what the value of X is. The way we arrive at it is to start at the top and work down. Take a property of a thousand acres on which £10,000 is spent. It is sold for £11,000 and we immediately say that the unimproved value is £1,000. Can anything be more ridiculous. I had land valued by the Government at 10s. an acre, and I improved it considerably. Then I bought the adjoining block which was better land, and the department valued that block at half the price of my first block. Would I have been wrong in putting in my taxation return half the value?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Of course.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Why? The Government in their wisdom considered that the original price of 10s. was too high, that it was second class land and therefore valued it at a lower amount. In my opinion it is only possible to arrive at the unimproved value of land, after it has been improved. To suggest that all land should be put up 50 per cent. in the assessment, and then let the landowner appeal against it, is one of the most extraordinary proposals I have ever heard. Most of us when we send in our returns quote the assessment of a local authority. A more costly method of dealing with land taxation has never been formulated. The clause, with the provisos as they appear in the Bill is equitable.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I prefer the clause as it is for the reason that it allows the owner the right to the added value given to the land by the improvements effected on it. The Lands Department have valued the water supply on a thousand acre holding at £50. The holding was useless without the water supply. To bring a pipe line to the block would cost £50 a year. The capital value of the water supply brought through a pipe line would be about £1,000; yet the owner was allowed only the £50 actually spent to provide his own water supply. Many people are suffering from injustices of this kind. There is a difference of pounds per acre in land separated only by a wire fence.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have moved the amendment because there is a right of appeal, which is enjoyed by every taxpayer. It is not the duty of the department to raise all assessments throughout the State by 50 per cent. and leave it to the people to appeal. If the clause is passed in its present form, the Government would have a great lever when claims for compensation come before the board.

Hon. J. Stewart: You mean it will be oppressive.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, as regards many landholders whose land might be taken. Men in country districts do not take the interest in making up their land tax returns that business men in the city do. The latter follow the course of legislation much more closely. New settlers require some years to become acquainted with our laws, and they usually base their ideas of value on the valuation of the local authority. The road board valuation has been regarded as fair and reasonable to return for land tax. If the department think it unfair, they can assess at a higher value and the taxpayer then has an opportunity to appeal. That, however, is no justification for including provisos which will make the land tax return the basis for arriving at the value of the land. The true method of ascertaining the value of land is by agreement between the parties or by arbitration. It should not be determined by the land tax return. The land tax return plus 10 per cent. would be accepted by the board as *prima facie* evidence of value. In every instance

the land tax return would be called for by the board.

The Minister for Education: Why not?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is not a fair method of arriving at the value.

The Minister for Education: Surely it is good *prima facie* evidence.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is not a method which should be employed to determine the value of land.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is it *prima facie* evidence of the character of the man?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, because many men in the country make up their returns in accordance with the values fixed by the local authority. If the department consider the value returned is inadequate, they can add to it.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Do not you think the road board valuations generally exceed the true value of the land?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Certainly.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In many cases they do, but people pay on those values, and regard them as a sort of standard. I am prepared to omit the opening portion of my amendment, but the two provisos should be struck out, because they are unfair.

The CHAIRMAN: One of the provisos has been amended and the hon. member cannot move at this stage to delete it. That can be done on recomittal. The hon. member may withdraw his amendment and move it on recomittal.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have no objection to adopting that course. I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Leave refused.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Nicholson's objection to the clause is that it is unfair. That is my objection to the whole Bill. I want to make the measure as fair as possible, but Mr. Nicholson's amendment will not have that result. He argued that the unimproved value is the value at which land will be resumed. That is wrong. The unimproved value will be accepted only as *prima facie* evidence of the value.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It will be a very strong factor.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: So long as the owner has the right to amend his assessment every year, little harm can be done. Dr. Saw, who has not had the land transactions I have had, characterised the point I raised as absurd.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: No.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Well, something to that effect. I shall instance what happened during the war with the Federal authorities. I was interested in a property which cost £1,414 but I was paying on an unimproved value of £4,040. There was a proposal to allow under the War Profits Act so much per cent. on the capital invested in the business. I put up a plea that the capital invested in that land was £4,040, the figure at which the unimproved value was assessed, plus improvements. For years land tax was paid on £4,040. When the Federal authorities came to fix the war

profits tax, they took £1,414 as the amount of capital in the concern, plus improvements. When I put the case up to the Commissioner, he admitted that it was unfair, but said he had to take those values under the two different Acts. That is one of the reasons why I raised the point in connection with this clause. We are working under two different Acts and some difficulty might arise.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This is one of the most important clauses in the Bill. I have no desire whatever to hamper the progress of land settlement, with which the prosperity of Western Australia is bound up. But if the country needs to acquire land, the land should be acquired on a fair and equitable basis. No man has a greater set than I have on the liquor trade, but even on the Licensing Act Amendment Bill I took up the position that the members of that trade, if interfered with, should be amply compensated. Indeed, I said that the compensation was insufficient. I fought for equity on that Bill, and so I fight for equity on this Bill. But certain hon. members, who were prepared to put up a barbed wire entanglement around the pub of a licensee with a yearly license, who has had 10 years' notice, under this Bill have started out to grab freeholds. Some men will protect beer and steal land on the same day. The objection to Mr. Nicholson's amendment is that it does not provide for the increased value due to money spent by the owner. I have given particulars of a property which I had improved, while the man on the other side of the fence did nothing in the way of improvements. He was left with his original valuation. It was never intended that owners should be continually putting up the valuation of their land. The original valuation is agreed upon between the owner and the Taxation Department. If then the Taxation Department consider that the valuation should be increased, they increase it. The owner has the right of appeal. It is not the customer who puts up the price, but the trader. To say that the land owners of this country are robbing the Government of hundreds of thousands of pounds in taxation is utterly absurd, and those who say it deserve the hard words uttered concerning them by Mr. Miles recently. When the board start out to resume land, the first thing they will refer to will be the land tax return, and that return will be prima facie evidence of the value of the land. But the owner should be entitled to prove what money he had spent in increasing the unimproved value, and he should be entitled to raise the valuation accordingly. For that Mr. Nicholson's amendment does not provide; therefore I cannot support it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 8—Default by owner after election to subdivide for sale:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Is there a consequential amendment to be made in this clause?

Hon. H. STEWART: It seems to me that a consequential amendment is required here by reason of the amendment of Clause 6.

The CHAIRMAN: Attention will be given to that matter.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Owner may require the whole to be taken:

Hon. H. STEWART: This clause has been referred to as enabling the owner to require the whole of his land to be taken by the Government in the event of its being subdivided and only portion being sold. That is a misconception. The clause merely enables the owner to require the Government to take the whole of his land in the event of the Government desiring to take part.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 16—agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any new clauses?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have on the Notice Paper a new clause proposing to exempt the Midland Railway Company. There would be a particularly good case for exempting that company if anyone else were exempted by the Bill, which, however, is not the case. Therefore it would not be fair to exempt the company, and I shall not move the new clause.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Owing to the right of appeal now given to the owner, I do not propose to move the new clause which I have placed on the Notice Paper. Certain people interested in stock breeding have a particular reason for not cultivating their land.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question before the Chair.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## BILL—JARNADUP-DENMARK RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 7th December.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [7.45]: I should like first of all to congratulate the Minister on the manner in which he moved the second reading, giving the House practically all the information that any member could give. The section of the line running from Jarnadup to Pemberton was constructed by the Scaddan Government, without Parliamentary authorisation, as a fairly long shunt of 17 miles. It is not an extension of an existing line, but simply a shunt down to a State sawmill. Many settlers were located along that railway. In another place I urged that justice should be done to those people. I am pleased to think it is at last proposed to add that section between Jarnadup and Pemberton to our State railway system. In the past those settlers have suffered



great injustice. They have had to pay excessive freights. For a plough, the freight on which from Fremantle to Jarnadup is £1, those men were charged a further freightage of £1 for the 17 miles between Jarnadup and Pemberton.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Did the Government do that?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: No, but the State Sawmills did. The Minister for Works was responsible for it. Again, when those people cut sleepers along the line, under contract to sell at a certain price at Jarnadup, the State mills always refused to lift the sleepers, and so those people had to cart them right alongside the line. I am pleased to think the settlers there will now get justice. Along that section of the line at the present time there are about 1,000 new settlers; so, clearly, it is not possible to continue running that line as a State Sawmills shunt. It must be brought under the railway system of the State, thus enabling the settlers there to have the same advantages as are enjoyed by people in other railway districts. The proposed railway from Pemberton to Denmark passes through the best karri forests in the State. I speak with some knowledge. I have seen Karriale, Mr. M. C. Davies's old timber mill near the Leeuwin, when it was working in full blast, and I have seen also the Denmark mill working in full blast. I can say without fear of contradiction that the karri on the Warren is the finest in the State. We never had any karri to equal it; that is to say, the loadage per acre is greater there than at either of the other two places. The railway will have certain difficulties in crossing the Warren River, but once across that stream it will have nothing serious to contend with until it reaches the neighbourhood of Nornalup. The Dombakup Brook, a few miles from the Warren River, is in one of the most beautiful forests of karri it is possible to imagine. Along that section of the line, and from there right to the Gardner River, the timber that will be touched is sufficient to keep the line in full use for very many years.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Ought not some of it to be reserved as a park?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I do not think there is any need to do that, because many years ago a number of reserves were made in that country, a thousand acres here and a thousand acres there. Later, a strip of land along the road was reserved so that the magnificent trees adjacent to the road might be left without interference. Tourists going down via Nannup to the Warren River will always have the pleasure of driving through those beautiful karri, and through those big parks, Class "A" reserves. Consequently, I do not think there is any need to reserve any country in the neighbourhood of Dombakup Brook.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Tell us about the land settlement there.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: We shall come to that presently. In the meantime we must follow the line. After crossing the Dombakup we go on to the Merrup River. On that river

we have almost clear plains extending for many miles through to the Gardner River. Those plains consist of black sand, moist all the summer. When first I saw that country, 35 years ago, I said it was going to be the great dairying country of Western Australia.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Then it won't cost so much to clear that land?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The plough can be put into that land straight away. It will require some draining.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: But they are settling the forest land first.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: If we were to carry the railway straight through without settling the people along it, we would accentuate the present difficulty of having miles of railway passing through unoccupied country.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: But will not the settlement interfere with the karri forest?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: In that country is a good deal of red gum and mixed karri land. The land where the settlers have been placed is eminently suited for fruit growing. Down there can be grown berries which will not grow in any other part of the State.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What sort of berries?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: All sorts, raspberries and currants of all kinds. To see that it will grow fruit-trees, one has but to go to the Warren homestead, five miles below Pemberton. There will be seen some of the finest fruit-trees in the world. I will instance two pear trees. I wrote to the "Fruit World" many years ago, pointing out what remarkable trees they were, and giving their dimensions. The "Fruit World" would not publish what I wrote, apparently thinking I had been dreaming. The editor communicated with the Agricultural Department, and the chief inspector went down with me. All the way down he was laughing at me and saying that when the tape was put on to those trees my dimensions would be found to shrink.

The Minister for Education: Those were not the trees you once grubbed up?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They were not. We measured those two trees. In height they reached 56 feet, in girth round the limbs 2½ chains, and in girth of the bole 6ft. 6in. at 5 feet from the ground. They have produced 5 tons of pears. So hon. members will see that that country will grow fruit, unlike some other country where I had to take drastic action.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Of what class was the fruit?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: It is a granulated pear which brings a good price in the market. The name is unknown. The seeds were planted many years ago when Mr. Brockman first built the house. It is five miles in a bee line from the coast. There is there any area you like of that class of country. The Northern Spy apple flourishes better there than anywhere else in the State, bearing

tremendous crops and being of excellent flavour. There can be seen growing down there greengages, damsons of all kinds, indeed all the English fruits. That is why I say it is necessary, in addition to putting people on the cleared land along the Merrup, to use that country which will grow fruit. Apart from growing fruit, that land when ploughed and sweetened will carry, as it is carrying to-day in small paddocks, five sheep to the acre all the year round. That is something which cannot be said of many parts of Western Australia. It is because of the summer rains. Many of our lands can carry large numbers of stock for a certain time each year, but down there the summer rains freshen up the feed, and consequently one can carry more stock to the acre there than in any other part of the State.

Hon. J. Mills: Do not sheep get coasty there?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Not unless they are taken down on to the coast. This is not coast country. It is seven miles to the coast country. Sheep can be run for perhaps three weeks or three months there, but after that must be removed. Cattle are taken to the coast every year from Bridgetown and Balingup and given a change, but if they are left too long they become coasty. An animal seems to have its coat brushed up the wrong way and sometimes the heart is affected. If it is driven too quickly it will drop dead. If a beast becomes sluggish it is usually left alone, but when the rains come it generally recovers. There are many corners at the mouth of the Gardner River, for instance, and other places where stock can be left for an indefinite period without going coasty. No one seems to know why this is.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Does that mean that only half the area between the proposed railway and the coast can be settled?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: No. On this coast line there are some beautiful swamps. When I was younger I took up one of these swamps and worked it for 12 months. I put on men and cleared five acres, and grew everything that could be imagined.

Hon. J. Duffell: What did you do with it?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I gave it up because the produce had to be carted 65 miles to a railway, and it did not pay. It must not be imagined that the blocks shown on the plan as surveyed are in process of settlement. They are all Crown lands at present, and not one has been taken up.

The Minister for Education: Were they surveyed for group settlement?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They were surveyed for ordinary settlement, but could be utilised for group settlement. The group settlement system is an ideal one for dealing with the heavier country.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What is the size of the blocks there?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: From 100 to 120 acres. It would be wrong to prevent other than group settlers from taking up these blocks. Let the Government lay out

their group blocks, seeing that no individual interferes with the system, and then permit other settlers to take up land if they want it. If a man does not want to join a group but is prepared, when the railway is in process of construction, to take up 100 acres, he should be allowed to do so. Mr. Baxter said that it would take about 16 years before the land could be sufficiently sweetened to be any good for dairying. I wish to combat that statement. With the aid of lime it can be sweetened rapidly. Swamps when drained are regarded as particularly sour country, but quicklime will immediately render the soil sweet and enable grass to grow. This has been proved by settlers on the Warren River. Mr. Baxter was also pessimistic as to the line being a paying proposition. If there was no settlement along the line it would pay so long as the timber was worked.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Can the timber be sold at a profit?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes: There is a little reaction because of the recent inflated prices, but timber cutters are apparently able to make a profit on the present price of sleepers to the Government. Mr. Baxter also said that if the land did produce fruit, nothing could be done with the produce. If we could get the freights down to pre-war figures we could send away a million cases of fruit from the district at a profit, without interfering with the local market.

Hon. J. Duffell: The freight would cost a lot.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I think not. I hope the Government will see the advisability of opening up the Bunbury port, and a harbour at Nornalup. We also have Albany as a port. Our eggs are not all in one basket. Coastal boats will call in at any time for a 10 ton cargo at a place just south-east of Point D'Entrecasteaux, and will also bring in 10 tons of stuff. At Nornalup a jetty could be built outside the inlet. It is protected there from all winds except from the south-east. A timber company some time ago proposed to start operations there, but owing to the huge expense of crossing the Shannon and other rivers in order to get the timber away the company considered the outlay too big and abandoned the project. I am sure the Government will see the advisability of making use of these ports within the near future. When we have a market for our fruit, as we had before the war, why should we be pessimistic? If freights are reasonable and the settlers are afforded facilities such as we are promised at Fremantle, or are given at Bunbury, they can handle their fruit at a profit. Western Australia to-day produces a million cases of fruit annually, and within a short time of settlement in this particular district it will be possible to export from there alone a million cases. It is better to sell overseas and bring foreign capital into the State than it is to sell to our own people. To adopt the latter

course is like taking in each other's washing.

Hon. J. Mills: What about pig raising?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Pig raising will follow in the train of dairying. Members have said more pigs can be raised in the eastern districts in a year than can be raised in a lifetime in the South-West. Not many records have yet been broken in that direction. People say it is better to sell their wheat at present prices than to ship it away in the form of bacon. If the price of butter drops so that it is no longer profitable to make it, the milk can be turned into hogs. If people overtake the local market, there is in England a market that will take all the pork that can be raised within this 130 miles of coast.

Hon. J. Duffell: There is no chance of competing with the American pork.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Americans say they use every part of the pig but the grunt, and they are talking of using that with which to call the people to dinner. If the Americans can do this so can we. If a small population like ours can raise £19,000,000 worth of produce in a year we cannot be very slow. With the aid of scientific methods we should be able to get the same results as any other country, and we have the land on which to do it. The Leader of the House has spoken of the beauty spots of this district. I know the country better than any man in Western Australia. Mr. Holmes smiles. I was there first of all in my jackerooing days in 1886. My father-in-law broke me in.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I was smiling at the thought of you being a judge of beauty.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I also spent 17 years as a forest ranger. Not only have I traversed the country from the Warren to Denmark, from east to west and west to east, but I have passed through every 20 miles of the country from north to south. The surveyors know a good deal about this country to-day, but I have found that they are not the best judges of land. They get fixed ideas, and have made bad mistakes in the past. As one who has made his living off the land, I can vouch for this country. Never was a better opportunity given for a man who wants to live under cool climatic conditions and with an assured rainfall than is offered here. It has always been a fetish of mine to build the railways in advance of selection. The money lost in transport, if there is no railway, is money wasted. It could be used in the development of the land if the railways existed. We have suffered in the past from that state of affairs. Let us profit by our experience and build the railway first, establishing the settlers as the railway proceeds.

Hon. J. Duffell: You would want plenty of money to do that.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: There are many beauty spots in this district. Any one who has seen the Nornalup Inlet is only too anxious to return there. The coast

from Point D'Entrecasteaux to the Warren is exceedingly beautiful. Further inland the drives through the forest are a joy indeed. The coast land is good change land, and there are also excellent swamp lands. Off the coast land we get black soil plains that are almost cleared, and behind that country to the north we get on to the fringe of the forest. Further inland we reach the more dense forest country. That continues up to the Shannon River, but from there the country changes slightly as far as the Frankland River. The Frankland River is known as the Gordon River higher up, just as the Warren becomes the Tone and then the Arthur. When we proceed up the Frankland River, it is noticed that the country changes, and from 1,000 to several thousand acres are required to make a successful living there, because it is purely sheep country. So far, it has not been found suitable for other purposes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If a railway were taken through there, would it not be found suitable for other purposes?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: It may be. Land which we thought was useless in the past has been found to grow good grasses, and so it may be that this particular country will improve under scientific treatment. The great beauty of the country in these areas is that it will grow English grasses. I have seen every sort of English grass sown down there, and all have flourished. The trouble which will confront the Government will be the prevention of a rush for land. Everyone I know who has been down to those parts has come away with a desire to get 100 acres so as to build a house and spend a month or two down there in summer. There is plenty of fishing, shooting, and so forth. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that I have seen ducks rise from some of the lagoons in such myriads as to darken the heavens!

Hon. J. Nicholson: You do not want 100 acres for that.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: But people would like to get such a holding.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Then we require the Closer Settlement Bill.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Minister for Lands can be relied upon to see that these people get 10 acres rather than 100 acres, so that their requirements will be met. I grew mangels down there and the grey ducks used to come across in countless thousands and pull them up. The result was that someone had to sit up all night and shoot at the ducks so as to drive them away. The dingoes down there are a great pest.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Are you in favour of the Bill?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Despite the efforts of the Vermin Board, the settlers will experience trouble from the dingoes if they do not fence off their properties, because the dingoes, which are crossed with tame dogs,

are the largest and fiercest that I have encountered. Although I could protect myself against the dingoes, I could not successfully cope with the ducks. In those days they were there in their millions.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: They practised closer settlement!

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: It was not until a company went south to bore for petroleum that they managed to drive the ducks away. Thirty men were employed there and they used to blaze at the ducks all day, the result being that the ducks flew away to the unoccupied lands. I trust that hon. members will take advantage of the opportunity to visit these areas during the summer months and if they are "sports," they will enjoy their sojourn there.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will you require the railway to bring the ducks home?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Probably. As to the country in the immediate neighbourhood of Nornalup, it is not only beautiful, but the land is very fertile. A contour survey has been made in those parts, the roads and the blocks being subsequently surveyed. That is the system that I have always advocated. The land from Nornalup to Denmark, which Mr. Burvill knows very well, is also splendid country. The swamp lands in that area will be worth a great deal to the State. If there is such a thing as unimproved value it can be found down there.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is the improved value there?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: If we could be certain that the railway would be put through within 12 months the swamps would be worth from £20 to £40 to-day.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is the improved value?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Hon. members may consider that the line has been taken too close to the coast and should be pushed back further inland. I do not agree with that contention. The area running back for 12½ miles from the line will bring settlers within 10 miles of the Hay River, south of Lake Muir, which is 12½ miles from the 12½-mile radial line. At that point, the country changes and thereafter much larger areas are required in order that the settler may make a living. The Government were wise in surveying the line so that it would hug the coast, because it is throughout the areas within 15 miles of the coast line that thousands of people will be settled on small areas. If the line were pushed further north, the areas necessary for each holding would have to be considerably larger. I take it that this will not be the only line to be built. Later on, I hope to see a line proceed north of Jarnadup and south of Lake Muir, linking up with the line that the Government now propose to construct. That extension will open up an enormous area of new country. The House should give the Government the power sought in the Bill. We should not confine the Government to 30 miles and force them to introduce legislation to authorise further construction later

on. We should empower the Government to construct the whole line if necessary.

Hon. G. W. Miles: By contract?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I hope so. Whether it be constructed in sections of 10 miles or 20 miles, it would be found far more satisfactory to the taxpayers if the line were built by contract.

The Minister for Education: Tenders will be called for.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I congratulate the Leader of the House on his speech in introducing the measure. The land to be served is worth the expenditure of not £800,000 on a railway, but many millions, because we will get it back a hundredfold. The country there does not suffer from the bugbear of dry seasons. The country is not unknown, but has been proved by the early settlers to be of great value for fruit-growing, dairying and sheep raising. The country has been proved and this is no wild venture or speculation by the Government. It is a sane and solid policy and I trust the House will approve of the full request put forward by the Government regarding this line.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [8.25]: After listening to Mr. Willmott, I realise that he has traversed the whole of the points I intended to deal with. I do not think there is any railway that could be suggested in the Commonwealth that will compare with the one under discussion or open up country more suitable for closer settlement. There is no other railway that will open up a greater variety of country, assuring an almost immediate and certainly a constant return, without the danger of droughts. We have a constant rainfall of from 30 to 60 inches per year.

Hon. J. A. Greig: I understand it rains all the summer and then winter sets in.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Besides opening up magnificent stretches of first-class country, the line will also tap a lot of second-class country which can be cheaply cleared and will make first-class grazing country, particularly for summer grazing. This is of great advantage and is a necessity in Western Australia at the present time, particularly in connection with the wheat areas.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why so?

Hon. A. BURVILL: Because if there is a water shortage or a lack of feed in other parts, sheep can be put in these southern areas.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Sheep are not worth £5 5s. a head that they can be sent down there.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I can tell Mr. Baxter of what is going on now and he can verify what I say for himself. For some years past a certain sheep farmer at Katanning has been sending down truckloads of sheep to the coastal sandhills and the flats at the base of those hills.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Katanning is not in the wheat area!

Hon. A. BURVILL: Yes, it is. This particular farmer has found that it pays him to send the sheep down to the country and

that they fatten there. His efforts have been so successful that others have commenced to follow his example.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you suggest there is any shortage of feed about Katanning?

Hon. A. BURVILL: This particular farmer has found during several years past that it paid him to send the sheep down to these areas, and others are doing the same.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If the country is as good as you suggest the stock owner would not rail his stock but he would feed them through the country.

Hon. A. BURVILL: That may be so, but the country I refer to is suitable for feeding not only sheep but cattle and horses, particularly during periods of drought elsewhere. This country is going to help those who are on wheat land to the extent of enabling them to get their sheep and stock away at a time when that stock may be in want of feed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How frequently is it necessary around Katanning, for instance, to shift stock.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Some people get into the habit of over-stocking, and in such a case there will always be a place to which they can transfer their stock to advantage. Mr. Baxter has told us that no new country was capable of producing butter of a good keeping quality. I have been dairying down there and others have been doing likewise, and we can testify that the feed grown in those parts, whether it be maize, lucerne or anything else, is just as good in the first year as it is when grown 16 years afterwards.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I suppose that is why they never send good keeping butter to the factory.

Hon. A. BURVILL: It is why they have taken first prize at the Royal Show.

THE PRESIDENT: I ask Mr. Baxter not to interrupt so frequently.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If Mr. Baxter had a little local experience he would not be advancing such statements that it takes from 14 to 16 years to sweeten the virgin soil. Such an assertion is almost too ridiculous to answer. I do not think there is better butter-producing country in the Commonwealth. A good deal has been said about the markets. I cannot for the life of me see why, if we can grow grasses there, as we do, we should not have as good a chance in the overseas market—after overtaking our own—as Victoria and New South Wales. As a matter of fact, we are a week nearer to the European markets and that should be an advantage to us. Regarding the quality of the soil, there is no doubt about it. Mr. McLarty, of the Agricultural Bank, was down there recently and we learned that two group settlements have started out from Denmark. Hon. members have heard a good deal about the group settlement down Busselton way. This was Mr. McLarty's first visit to Denmark and I shall quote for the information of members the opinions he expressed at a meeting which he addressed. He said—

The criticisms current in Perth relative to Denmark represented the place as a sort

of "mugs' alley," but from his own observation he was convinced such criticism was unwarranted. He had never in his life seen such crops anywhere as those brought under his notice in the district. He had seen broad beans over 9 feet high and crops of lucerne and clover such as were not to be found elsewhere. For group settlement the district appeared to him much more favourable than Manjimup and several other locations. Altogether he was very favourably impressed and settlement would be pushed forward as rapidly as possible. The first instalment would arrive on Monday, and in six months' time about 150 souls would be added to the population. The department would look round for other suitable places in the district for group settlement, and personally he was prepared to do all in his power to advance the welfare of the existing settlers as well as the new groups.

These crops are already there waiting for the railway; they are ten miles out. I endorse what Mr. Willmott has said about the country and also that the railway should precede settlement. The whole length of line should be built straight away. Unfortunately, however, only sections of it will be put through, and of course unless we intend to embarrass the Government, the line will have to be built in this way. The groups would be more expensive on account of the cost of transport. If the railway were being built as it should be built, I am convinced that 20 per cent. would be taken off the cost of settling these people in that part of the State. One argument used against the construction of the railway was that the land would develop slowly, that it would take many years to bring it to a state of productivity and that therefore the Government should proceed with railway construction in the wheat areas. If the land is to be developed slowly in some of the areas, that is an argument why the railway should be put through as quickly as possible. I would like to see something in relation to the assistance that is given to development by the sawmilling industry. I support what Mr. Willmott has said, that if we build the railway right through and get two or three timber mills established, there will not be any fear in regard to the success of settlement or about the line paying. The freight that would accrue from the milling operations would be of immense value. To prove this I may be permitted to quote some figures to show what happened at Denmark when the timber industry there was thriving. Along the route of the proposed railway it is estimated that there are between 300,000 and 400,000 acres of forest, some of it dense, which, no doubt, will be permanently reserved when it has been cut out, while there will be a good deal which when cut out will be settled. The Denmark concession consisted of 22,000 acres and it ran for eight years. The number of men employed during that period averaged 450. The wages bill on the old scale amounted to £50,000 per

annum, and the forage bill came to £8,000. Stocks and sundries required for the mills accounted for £12,000, making a total of £70,000 per annum. Taking the present rate of wages at £4 per week, and working 50 weeks in the year, the wages to-day would represent £90,000 annually. This is not romance; it can be proved by anyone who cares to refer to Millars' records. Added to that £90,000, we have to take into account forage, stores and sundries which would bring the figures to £113,000. There were three mills going at Denmark. They cut on the average 2,400 loads a month, approximately 4,000 tons. Thus the railway had in freight 48,000 tons per annum. In addition there was freight on stores, fodder, sundries, and not including passenger traffic arising from the 450 men employed there, and their wives and families. I wish hon. members to note that that concession was one of only 22,000 acres and that there was plenty of room for many mills of the size of those which existed then. If all the mills that could be established along the route of the proposed railway were in full swing, I venture to say that one set of rails would never manage the traffic. The timber business is a bit dull at present. Perhaps it is as well that that is so, and that it should remain so for a number of years, because there is forest enough in that part of the State to keep timber mills going for over 20 years. Hon. members can realise the amount of wages that can be paid from a small area such as the timber concession that I have quoted and what a tremendous lift that would be to the country. There is another point I would like to stress and it is that if the line be built at once and the sawmills put into operation, not only will those mills provide work for a large number of men, but they may also find employment for the settlers themselves or the settlers' sons in the slack time, and those men would be able to secure timber with which to build their cottages far more cheaply than they otherwise could do. I had a fair amount of experience in Gippsland before coming to Western Australia, and this leads me to stress the point that the line should be built before settlement takes place. The land could be more easily cleared if the timber mills were just ahead. To take out the good timber, tramways would be run in various directions from the railway, and these formations would provide roads for the groups which came later. There would also be plenty of timber to build homes for the group settlers, and the cost of transport would be much cheaper. I would like to give an indication of the volume of traffic which should be available apart from timber. I consulted the railway authorities with a view to making a comparison between the Denmark line and the line in the wheat belt nearest to it in length. The Denmark line is 28½ miles long, and the nearest line to it in the wheat belt is the Katanning-Nyabing line, about 30 miles long.

Along the Nyabing line 393,000 acres of land has been alienated. Along the Denmark line about 100,000 acres has been alienated. The Denmark country, on account of the drainage of the low land not being completed and owing to the difficulty of clearing, has only about one-fifth cultivated. Along the Nyabing line about one-half is cultivated. The freight on the Nyabing line from all sources, however, is exactly the same as that on the Denmark line, although the former is 11 miles longer. The passenger traffic on the Denmark line is 650 per annum, compared with 400 per annum on the Nyabing line. Members can therefore appreciate the results which might reasonably be expected by building a line in this class of country where there will be closer settlement. There will be no danger of the railway not paying alone, from a timber point of view and with group settlement there will be no risk of the line not paying from the producer's point of view alone. It is imperative that this railway be built, because it is part of the Premier's immigration scheme to settle groups there, and the Government may be seriously embarrassed if this railway is not authorised. I am sorry the Government have not the money to build the whole length of the line immediately, because if this were done, the line would prove payable, and would lead to the rapid development of the district.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, debate adjourned.

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

## BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 5:

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "amended" in line 1, be struck out, and the following inserted:—"by striking out all the words after 'dog,' in line one of the section down to and inclusive of the word 'days,' in line two."

No time is allowed in which to register a motor car or any other vehicle, and why should 21 days be allowed to register a dog? If the amendment is accepted, any person who keeps a dog without registering it will be liable.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I cannot agree to the amendment. Twenty-one days is a reasonable period to allow for registration

The English Act and all the Acts of the Eastern States allow a period of 21 days.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot agree to 21 days. I prefer the amendment. I cannot see why a person should be allowed to keep an unregistered dog at all. Why should he not register a dog straight away? The 21 days allowed has made it practically impossible to convict anyone of keeping an unregistered dog, because it has been necessary to prove that the person had had the dog for 21 days. It is not a matter of 21 days from the 1st July.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The Leader of the House has made out no case for the deletion of the 21 days period. Any difficulty experienced has arisen through lack of vigilance on the part of the local authority officials. In other States a period of 21 days is allowed from the first of the year.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is an entirely different thing. It is not proposed to interfere with the provision under which 21 days is allowed after the commencement of the year. Clause 10 deals with that matter. The present clause refers to a man keeping an unregistered dog at any period of the year. It is practically impossible to prove that the man has had the dog for 21 days. The clause is important from the point of view of country road boards, because of the enormous destruction done among sheep by unregistered dogs. It is those road boards that raise the point as to the extreme difficulty of obtaining a conviction.

Hon. E. ROSE: There is no 21 days' grace allowed in respect of other registrations, and why should it apply in the case of dogs? More trouble than enough has been caused by unregistered mongrels among sheep in the country districts. I should like to see the license fee double what it is. Time after time have road board conferences complained that the law as to registration is not sufficiently stringent.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I would support seven days' notice in preference to 21. However, having regard to what has been stated here to-night, I shall support the amendment. It appears that registration fees are not collected owing to the dilatoriness of officials. The registration fee is only a small amount, and rather than risk losing the case in court the authorities will not prosecute. All sorts of juggling is done with unregistered dogs, so that it becomes almost impossible to collect the license fee.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In Melbourne the 21 days period is allowed.

The Minister for Education: Is it allowed twice over?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: No. The period is allowed because circumstances may prevent a man from going straight away after purchasing a dog to register it. The object is to prevent what I may term victimisation, for a man should not be fined because after purchasing a dog he does not rush away first thing to register it. Of course I have

no sympathy with the owners of dogs that destroy sheep. Let mongrels be destroyed straight away. I would be prepared to accept 14 days instead of 21.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: According to Mr. Duffell, if a dog is sold the registration does not hold good.

Hon. J. Duffell: The transfer has to be registered.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is provided that where the ownership of a dog is transferred, the registration shall hold good, and that the transfer shall be registered without fee. In this clause we are dealing with unregistered dogs. A man buying a dog which is registered could not be prosecuted for having an unregistered dog.

Hon. J. Duffell: Suppose the man bought the dog in Melbourne and brought it over here.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Then he should register it directly he gets it here.

Hon. A. BURVILL: For Mr. Duffell's edification I have to state that country road boards have been up against this business of unregistered dogs for years, and that they have always urged the enactment of such a provision as this. In present circumstances the period of three weeks practically prevents the obtaining of a conviction. Section 20 of the principal Act provides that notice shall be given to the owner. The country people want the registration law strictly enforced, owing to the way they have suffered from mongrels, which are far worse than dingoes, worrying sheep and poultry; they have even been known to attack calves.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause:—“and is further amended by adding the following:—‘This section shall not apply to the Royal Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals of Western Australia, as regards dogs in their custody from time to time, and held temporarily by them for the purpose of finding the dogs suitable homes.’”

The society have requested me to secure the insertion of this provision in the Bill because in the course of their work they receive large numbers of dogs into their possession temporarily. Those dogs have to be kept by the society until suitable homes can be found for them. Unless the amendment be made, the society will be compelled to pay license fees for these dogs, which means that the society will have to relinquish that branch of their work.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am opposed to the amendment. The S.P.C.A. hold these dogs for profit, or at least for trade.

Hon. J. Duffell: No, they never sell them.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I cannot conceive of their giving the dogs away. If they

want the license fee remitted, let them give up the work altogether.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: This is not a trading concern. It is the S.P.C.A.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: They pick up dogs in the street, or have them given by owners who have grown tired of the animals, and they want to hold them until they can find other homes. It seems to me likely that the society sells the dogs. It would be only natural if they should try to recover the expense of keeping the animals. I have a strong aversion to dogs wandering about the street. Such dogs should be destroyed. The City Council have a lethal chamber for them.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The council are not very active, are they?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The society should destroy those dogs. The world would not be very much the worse for it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that it would matter much if the society did sell the dogs, for it would give the society some money with which to carry on their excellent work. I have sufficient confidence in the society to support the amendment, for I am quite sure they will not abuse it.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I am opposed to the amendment. We have too many dogs already. The better plan would be to destroy those dogs which the society take into their care.

Hon. J. Duffell called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If the society take care of those dogs they should make a business undertaking of it, registering the dogs and then selling them. In either case the money spent in this work would be better spent on the Children's Hospital.

Hon. H. STEWART: If the dogs are valuable the society should be able to dispose of them at a profit, while if they are not valuable they should be destroyed. If the amendment be not carried, the society will register such dogs as are worth registering and will then sell them at a profit.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I appeal to country members who are opposing the S.P.C.A. and their efforts at humane work amongst dogs. I have supported those country members in their endeavour to get rid of dogs which do harm to sheep. Here, however, we are dealing with a different proposition. The society do a humane work amongst dogs, many of them quite good dogs without being very valuable from the point of view of the breeder. A number of people in Perth, dog lovers, cannot afford expensive dogs. Those are the people to whom the society without fee or reward distribute dogs. Probably a dog is with the society only a few days, or at most a week. I cannot see that the society should be compelled to go to the expense of registering such a dog. As soon as they give a dog to a new owner, the animal of course has to be registered.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is very evident that several hon. members do not realise the value of the work being done by the S.P.C.A. The society humanely destroy mongrel dogs, but many dogs coming into the possession of the society are too valuable to destroy and so are taken care of until an owner can be found for them. Only to-day I have had two applications for dogs. The society do not charge for these dogs, any more than they charge for services rendered to farmers all over the State. Surely we can grant this small concession, which will be of so much assistance to the society.

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

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 10:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move an amendment—

That after "amended" in line 1, the following be inserted:—"by striking out the word 'January,' in the fifth line of the section, and inserting the words 'July and is further amended' in lieu." This is only consequential.

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

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 11:

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That after "of" in line 5 "great" be inserted; and that in the same line "sheep" be struck out and "small cattle" inserted in lieu.

This would make the Bill accord with the Cattle Trespass Act of 1882.

The Minister for Education: I think the amendment is an improvement.

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

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of Section 15.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That after the words "local authority" at the end of the clause there be added—"such list shall be made up on or before the 31st of July in every year, and a revised list made up every three months thereafter and delivered in like manner to such officer"; and that the following subclause be added—" (3) The police shall, when it comes to their knowledge, notify the local authority of the name of any person keeping or owning an unregistered dog." If the police are to be expected to help in this matter the list of names should be delivered within a reasonable time as set out in the amendment.

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

Clause 9—Insertion of section after section 17.



Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is a fallacy to place a collar and disc upon Pomeranians and Pekinese dogs. These animals are never allowed to stray.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Have you ever seen one run over?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: People sometimes get run over. The owners of these dogs usually take great care of them in order to prevent such a thing. I move an amendment—

That in subclause (1) the following words be added—“provided that this section shall not apply to Pekinese or Pomeranian dogs.”

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: This is class legislation. I could argue that cattle and sheep dogs should not wear collars and discs because, in thicket country, they may be hung up and lose their lives. When the small dogs referred to by Mr. Duffell get into the country they lose caste, and take up with kangaroo dogs and others and generally have a good time with the sheep. I do not say they hurt the sheep, but they get behind them and bark and chase them all over the place, with the result that the sheep lose condition. All dogs should be treated alike and for that reason I must oppose the amendment.

Hon. E. ROSE: Unless these small dogs wear collars and discs it is impossible to say whether they are registered or not. If exceptions are made in their case people will want the same treatment in other cases. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If we except any dogs at all they should be the useful dogs. We should certainly not exempt those which are neither useful nor ornamental. Valuable kangaroo dogs are often killed because when a dog is attacking a kangaroo the first thing the kangaroo does is to get a claw into the collar of the dog, which generally means the end of its life. I have always looked upon these small dogs as a nuisance, and have ever urged the driver of my car to make short work of them if they are met with in the street.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I regret that anyone should adopt such an attitude concerning these dear little dogs. If mine is run over I shall not be content to remain silent. Pekinese and Pomeranian dogs stray a good deal, and although their owners may desire to keep them at home they are constantly running about the street and are frequently run over. Every dog should wear a collar and disc. My chief complaint is concerning the discs supplied by the City Council. The attachments provided for them are so insecure that the discs are continually being lost. I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Amendment of Section 29:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The present practice is to allow each aboriginal native to keep one dog unregistered. It is

difficult to tell whose dog it is if it is not registered. The proposal is to allow aborigines to register their dogs free, but if they are registered they must wear a collar and disc. These will have to be paid for. I do not wish to see this become a charge upon the Aborigines Department, and it is only right that the local authorities who desire that dogs shall be registered, shall provide the necessary collars and discs which would not cost more than 1s. For this reason I move an amendment—

That in line 4, after “charge,” the following words be inserted:—“collar and disc for which shall be supplied free of charge by the registering authority.”

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

Clause 12—Amendment of Section 31:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I hope the Committee will not agree to the clause, which changes the age at which dogs must be registered, from three to six months. It is easy to fix the age of a dog at three months, whereas it is very difficult when it is six months old. A dog at six months is almost matured.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I support the views expressed by Mr. Macfarlane. We should make the registration of dogs as simple as possible. It is easy to deal with the matter when the dogs are three months old, but it is a different proposition altogether when they are aged six months. The present Act is workable, whereas the clause will not be.

Hon. E. ROSE: I oppose the amendment because a dog six months old is almost as destructive as one 12 months old.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is useless discussing the alteration of the age under this clause because this is a consequential amendment following upon a clause we have already agreed to fixing the age at six months. The matter cannot be dealt with at this stage, but only on re-committal.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—Amendment of Section 35:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 all the words after “words” be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—“and such regulations may impose a penalty not exceeding £5 for any breach thereof.”

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

Clauses 14 and 15—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move—

That the following new clause be added to stand as Clause 11:—“Section 20 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word ‘registered’ in line 2 and inserting in lieu the words ‘usual or last known,’ and is further amended by

striking out 'registered' in line 5 and inserting in lieu the word 'such.'''

This deals with notices. Most people have no registered address.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am in accord with the new clause.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move—

That the following new clause be added:—"Section 22 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after 'destroyed' in line 5 the words 'without cruelty by some speedy means.'"

This is a request from the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and is taken from legislation in the Eastern States and also from the English Act. It will mean that if an animal is wounded, it will not be allowed to linger but must be quickly despatched.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. J. Duffell: I move—

That the following new clause be added:—"Section 25 of the Act is amended by striking out all words after 'animal' in line 3 down to and inclusive of the word 'time' in line 4."

This is another amendment requested by the S.P.C.A. It will bring Section 25 of the Dog Act into conformity with Section 4 of the Cruelty to Animals Act. The latter section makes it unlawful for a person to incite any animal to fight or bait another animal.

The Minister for Education: That is a different matter altogether.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: At the present time we find it impossible to secure a conviction against people who have encouraged dogs to fight, for they always advance the excuse that the animals were trespassing which means that under the Dog Act the excuse is a valid one. If the words are deleted, dog fighting will be prevented, as well as other forms of cruelty, without the offenders being able to shelter behind Section 25.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member should look at both sides. If the amendment is carried and a farmer finds stray stock on his property he will not be able to employ his dogs in clearing the field.

Hon. E. ROSE: I oppose the amendment. As the Minister has pointed out it would be impossible for a farmer to drive stray stock off his field with such a provision in existence. If the hon. member wishes to prevent dog fighting, let him adopt other means.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I cannot support the amendment. "Let dogs delight to bark and bite, it is their nature to." If dogs do have a scrap, it is not such a seri-

ous thing; they are better friends afterwards.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The owner or an occupier of an enclosed field in which stray dogs may find their way already has the power to employ means for driving off or destroying those dogs without incurring any liability.

The Minister for Education: We are talking about stray cattle, not stray dogs.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The hon. member is trying to bring down small game with a gun which might be employed on elephants. I suggest he bring in a separate Bill to make dog fighting illegal.

New clause put and negatived.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I move—

That the following new clause be added to the Bill:—"A license may be granted to a breeder of dogs on payment of a fee set forth in the third schedule which license shall be deemed to entitle the holder to keep any number of dogs not exceeding six during the currency of the license."

This has been requested by the dog breeders in the metropolitan area, and it will bring our Act into line with those of the Eastern States.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: A breeder is getting a very big concession by the increasing of the age from three months to six months and should be satisfied. Generally the young dogs would be sold before they were six months old, and the breeder would pay no license fee at all for them. For the old dogs he should be prepared to pay a license fee.

Hon. E. ROSE: I oppose the new clause. This is a species of class legislation.

Hon. J. Duffell: Class stuff! What about the Closer Settlement Bill?

Hon. E. ROSE: If a man can afford to keep a lot of breeding dogs, he can afford to pay for them.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I have been requested to support this proposition.

The Minister for Education: To save breeders a few bob.

Hon. J. Duffell: No, the Government will benefit.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If breeders pay 30s. for six dogs the authorities will receive the equivalent of what is charged in the Eastern States.

Hon. A. Burvill: Would that be for dogs or bitches?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Either.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Schedule 3 provides that a man might keep a pack of 10 hounds for £2; yet Mr. Rose talks of class legislation. Breeders sell the young dogs as soon as they can. The Government will gain the advantage because they will receive 30s. down every year.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I oppose the new clause. Breeders of sheep and cattle dogs in the country have raised no objection to the fees now charged.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

|      |    |    |    |   |
|------|----|----|----|---|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 5 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 7 |

Majority against .. 2

#### AYES.

|                   |                       |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Hon. J. Duffell   | Hon. H. Stewart       |
| Hon. V. Hamersley | Hon. J. M. Macfarlane |
| Hon. A. Lovekin   | (Teller.)             |

#### NOES.

|                      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| Hon. H. P. Colebatch | Hon. A. J. H. Saw      |
| Hon. J. J. Holmes    | Hon. F. E. S. Willmott |
| Hon. J. Nicholson    | Hon. A. Burvill        |
| Hon. E. Rose         | (Teller.)              |

New clause thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

#### Recommittal

Bill recommitted to further consider Clauses 2, 14 and a new clause.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I urge that the old period of three months be allowed to stand. The principal objection to the extended period is that it is difficult to determine whether a dog is six months old or not. Contention arises between the inspectors and owners, and dogs may escape registration for six months or longer. At three months the difficulty is not so great. The Kennel Club is quite in accord with the three months provision. I hope the clause will be negatived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The clause as printed will bring our law into uniformity with that of the Eastern States. Everywhere else the provision is six months.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is no reason why we should depart from the existing practice.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is the Eastern States legislation of recent date?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is the existing legislation.

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

|      |    |    |    |   |
|------|----|----|----|---|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 4 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 9 |

Majority against .. 5

#### AYES.

|                      |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| Hon. H. P. Colebatch | Hon. A. Lovekin |
| Hon. J. Duffell      | Hon. H. Stewart |
|                      | (Teller.)       |

#### NOES.

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Hon. H. Boan      | Hon. E. Rose           |
| Hon. A. Burvill   | Hon. A. J. H. Saw      |
| Hon. V. Hamersley | Hon. F. E. S. Willmott |
| Hon. J. J. Holmes | Hon. J. M. Macfarlane  |
| Hon. J. Nicholson | (Teller.)              |

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 14—Amendment of Third Schedule:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendment I have to move in this clause is really consequential upon our having made all registrations start from the 30th June. I move—

That the following be added to the clause: "and the Schedule is further amended by inserting the words '31st day of December' in lieu of the words '30th day of June.'"

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

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 14: "The Second Schedule is amended by substituting the words '30th day of June' for the words '31st day of December' in forms (a) and (b)."

New clause put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is also a consequential amendment in Clause 12.

The CHAIRMAN: That is so.

Bill again reported, with further amendments.

*House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 13th December, 1922.*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Questions: Railway Advisory Board, Quindanning visit                                 | 2186 |
| Eastern States competition   | 2186 |
| Sitting Hours  | 2186 |
| Assent to Bills  | 2186 |
| Standing Orders Suspension, Taxation Bills   | 2186 |
| Bills: Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment, report, &c.                         | 2186 |
| Land Tax and Income Tax, Com., report, &c.   | 2186 |
| Licensing Act Amendment, Council's Amendments  | 2185 |
| Esperance Northwards Railway Extension, returned                                     | 2221 |
| Annual Estimates: Votes discussed, Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage | 2195 |

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.