

Clause 1—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Received from Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th December, 1920.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Bills: Loan, £3,370,000 2s. | 2361 |
| Stamp Act Amendment, 2s., Com., etc. | 2362 |
| Land Act Amendment, Com., report | 2363 |
| Wheat Marketing, Com., recom. | 2369 |
| Appropriation, all stages | 2371 |
| Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, 2s., Com., report | 2371 |
| Grain Elevators (No. 1), 2s. | 2377 |
| Discharge of Orders | 2382 |

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

BILL—LOAN, £3,370,000.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [4.35]: Members are fully aware that this measure merely provides authority to raise the money to carry on the works which have already been passed by the House. As a result of the discussion on the Estimates for loan expenditure, it is necessary to secure authority to raise the money to provide for the works in the schedule. This Bill provides the necessary authority. The unexpended balance of money on loan works at 30th June last was £2,806,236. The proposed loan expenditure, including Loan Suspense Account, amounts to £3,641,932, and the Loan Bill provides for £3,859,600. Of the amount of the present loan, two millions is for soldier settlement and £180,000 for capital for the Agricultural Bank. The balance of £1,690,000 is required for the following works: Departmental £75,000, railways £440,000, tramways £100,000, electric power station £80,000, harbours and rivers £180,000, water supply £260,000, development of goldfields and mineral resources £50,000, development of agriculture £150,000, State

undertakings £251,000, public buildings and roads £93,600, and discounts and flotation expenses on the loan £10,400. The total loans authorised to June 30 last aggregated £50,709,173 in addition to deficiency bonds authorised this session amounting to £690,000. The total indebtedness at June 30 last was £46,822,003 and the sinking fund £6,848,825, leaving a net indebtedness of £39,973,178. I informed the House what the various advances to individuals and investments were. Most of them are returning interest and they total £38,663,510. Members will remember that last year we raised £1,500,000 in London. That was the first loan raised in London since 1914. It was issued at 98 per cent. and bore interest at 5½ per cent. That loan was three times over-subscribed.

Mr. Troy: That was before you set the pace.

The PREMIER: It was after you had set the pace. During the war, loans were raised through the Commonwealth Government. That was by arrangement and we have some money to pay on those loans. We have some £200,000 to meet at an early date for the redemption of bonds and debentures. A good deal has been used for the purpose of purchasing machinery. Recently we were offered and accepted £50,000 in Melbourne, which we took at 6 per cent. We have on hand a certain amount of money and I think it will be enough to carry us over for a good portion of next year. I do not anticipate it will be necessary to go on the market until about June next, and probably not even then. We have an overdraft with the London County and Westminster and Parr's Bank in London of £600,000. That was provided to meet contributions to sinking fund and we secured that advance at 4½ per cent. interest. Nowadays, I think, the interest is a little bit higher. For the five months just ended, we have expended loan moneys amounting to £951,997 and of that £713,045 was for soldier settlement. Other loan expenditure accounted for £238,952. I would like the House to realise how little we have spent during the past 12 months out of loan moneys, other than for soldier settlement. We have in cash in hand to date £495,548. We have wheat certificates on hand and money to come from the dividends on wheat delivered to the pool. That money, of course, will come to the Industries Assistance Board, namely, the first advance of 2s. 6d. per bushel on wheat delivered to the pool and the second 2s. 6d. at the end of April. These two advances should total about £838,568. We have moneys to come to us from the Commonwealth Government on account of expenditure we have undertaken for them in connection with the settlement of soldiers on the land, a sum amounting to £357,110 or a total of £1,691,226. I have already told the House that we are faced with the expenditure of about £200,000 for bonds maturing towards the end of the year. In connection with soldier settlement, there is no cost in connection with the raising of

the money because the Commonwealth Government advances the full amount. So far we have paid £5 6s. per cent. for the money. We may have to pay more in future. This accounts for the reduction in flotation expenses and charges. Owing to the fact that the Commonwealth Government made no charges last year the amount available was not exceeded and there is still a balance available. Last year we obtained authority for a very considerable sum in excess of the amount expended. Last year we spent on soldier settlement £1,933,340 and on other works, loan moneys totalling £729,986. Some of that money was used as capital for trading concerns and some was used to increase the capital of the Agricultural Bank. This loan expenditure was lower last year than it has been for many years past. It is true, that during the previous year the expenditure was not very great. On soldier settlement it was £283,319 and other expenditure amounted to £766,417, which is a little more than last year. Although the House has just granted authority to spend a very considerable amount on various works, I expect that the position will be much the same as it was last year. I do not expect it will be necessary to spend all this money, but if it is advisable to have an active immigration policy, we should have the money in order to put works in hand. We cannot have men out of work in Western Australia and the times nowadays are uncertain and very much out of joint. We must be prepared to meet any possible situation regarding unemployment following the advent of immigrants. It has not been possible to do any public works for some time past because there has been no labour available. There is none to-day and I do not know what the position will be later on. I hope there will be plenty of labour available apart from Government works. Except upon very urgently needed works, money will not be expended unless plenty of labour is available. The present is no time for extension of public works because money is very costly and also because labour is so scarce. This Loan Bill provides for a very large amount. However, when members take out of the total sum the money provided for soldier settlement purposes, it will be seen that it is not so very considerable. I wish the House to understand that although the works are authorised, the works will not be gone on with unless there is a change in the financial position and unless men are available to carry on the work. We cannot come into competition with private employers who are engaged in production and who require labour when it is available in order that these works may be carried out. But I think it advisable to have the authority in case it is required. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 10th December.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [5.46]: I have read the Bill, and I have read also the speech delivered by the Premier in moving the second reading. The Bill is essentially one for Committee. In principle, I approve of some of the amendments it makes to the existing Act, but I can only regret that we have not a consolidating measure before us. Still, some very necessary improvements are contained in the Bill, and therefore I do not propose to take up time discussing the measure on the second reading, but will leave the discussion for the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of schedule to Stamp Act Amendment Act, 1918:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier might tell us why, under the clause, he is relieving the banks from all responsibility in regard to the stamping of documents.

The PREMIER: It is the custom to-day. The clause merely provides that the ordinary clearing house work may be done without the passing of stamped receipts.

Hon. T. Walker: But what is the cause of the introduction of this?

The PREMIER: The Solicitor General thought it had better be made clear that there should be no claim. There never has been any claim.

Hon. T. WALKER: It seems the object of the measure is largely to facilitate the business of the banks. In another clause we relieve the banks from giving receipts and we put the responsibility for the necessary stamps on to a third party acting as agent.

The Premier: But it never has been done.

Hon. T. WALKER: I know, but the question having been raised I assume this is simply to make it clear that in the case of a bank acting merely as holder, and transferring in trust the money to another bank, it shall not be compelled to acknowledge by a stamped document the receipt of the money.

The Premier: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Receipts for bank deposits:

Hon. T. WALKER: This puts an unnecessary obligation on the person acting as agent for another in lodging deposits at the bank, the responsibility of seeing that a stamp is placed on the receipt. The banks are the more reliable people to carry the responsibility, especially since the bank loses

nothing. On the receipt for a deposit of a large sum, the stamp may be fairly considerable, and it is permitted by the clause that the cost of the stamp may be deducted from the amount deposited. Why not place the obligation on the bank?

Mr. Pilkington: The bank cannot know the facts, whether the person paying in is or is not an agent.

The PREMIER: How can the bank know?

Hon. T. WALKER: The obligation of seeing that the stamp is affixed should be with those accustomed to that work all day long. Under the clause errors are likely to occur.

The PREMIER: The man who knows all about the transaction is the one who should be held responsible for the affixing of a stamp to the receipt. Obviously, the bank cannot know in what capacity the money is paid to the credit of another person. It is only necessary that somebody should stamp the receipt. At present it would be quite possible for my friend to pay in a sum of money to the credit of the leader of the Opposition without in any way incurring responsibility for the stamping of the receipt. In such circumstances it is very easy for the bank to be deceived, because the bank cannot know the facts of the transaction. It is a convenience for both parties that a man should be able to pay in to a bank a sum to the credit of another person. The man paying in will certainly see that he does not render himself liable to a penalty; it will be very easy for him to deduct the value of the stamp on the receipt.

Hon. T. Walker: But he may not know. Take the general community, who are not familiar with the Stamp Act.

The PREMIER: It has been said that everybody, except lawyers, is supposed to know the law. The man paying in will certainly know it. To-day a great many people avoid paying for the stamps.

Hon. T. Walker: Has it not been usual to pay in without getting a receipt?

The PREMIER: No, the bank usually gives a receipt, but the bank cannot always discriminate as to whether a stamp should be affixed to the receipt. This is a wise provision, and it will bring in revenue.

Hon. T. Walker: Is there any precedent for it in any other Stamp Duties Act?

The PREMIER: At any rate, we can lead the way.

Hon. T. Walker: I am nervous about these innovations.

The PREMIER: It is a good provision both for the banks and the Treasury.

Hon. T. Walker: This is creating a new offence.

The PREMIER: Against the person who pays in the money. This is the man who should be responsible.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from 9th December; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier had moved to insert a new clause to stand as Clause 9 to provide for appeals against appraisements.

The PREMIER: I propose to withdraw that new clause and substitute another.

Mr. Troy: Withdraw it altogether and we will get through the Bill.

The PREMIER: I hope to do so in any case, but I will now withdraw the new clause I moved last Thursday.

New clause by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

The PREMIER: I move—

That a new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 9 as follows:—“(1) Any lessee within three months after notice has been given to him of an assessment under Sub-section 4 of Section 30 of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1917, of the rent to be payable under a pastoral lease or of the reassessment under that section of the rent payable under any pastoral lease may, by himself or his agent, apply in writing to the Minister for a review of the assessment by the board of appraisers. (2) The Minister shall thereupon direct the board to hear such application, and notice of the time and place of hearing shall be given to the applicant, and the board may examine the applicant and other persons on oath (which any member of the board may administer) and call for books and papers and may vary or maintain its assessment. (3) If an assessment is reviewed by the board under the provisions of this section, the prescribed period of six months for the declaration by the lessee of the acceptance or refusal of a new lease shall be extended until one month after the applicant has received notice of the reappraisalment. (4) If a lease is refused after an assessment has been reviewed as aforesaid, the costs incurred by the Department of Lands and Surveys on such application, to be fixed by the board, shall be payable by the applicant to the Minister.

I anticipate opposition to this proposal.

Mr. Troy: Why do you anticipate that?

The PREMIER: Because the hon. member said that the new clause would be opposed. Pastoral lessees should have an opportunity of appealing. Every other selector under the land laws of the country has the right to appeal to the Minister. The only difference is that in this case the Minister may direct the board.

Hon. P. Collier: "Shall" do so.

The PREMIER: That is all right.

Hon. P. Collier: There is a great difference between the words.

The PREMIER: The Minister at all events has to direct the board to make further inquiries and the pastoral lessee will be allowed to produce the evidence. If the evidence is such as to indicate that the board have over-priced the land, the Minister may then alter the conditions. The Minister shall cause an inquiry to be made before the matter is determined. I cannot understand how anyone could object to this. The pastoralist has made his home on the lease and when the time is drawing near for the lease to expire, under the old Act he has the right to the renewal of his lease unless the Government are prepared to pay for his improvements. He must have an option of renewal upon such conditions as may be set out at the time. That is only a fair thing. If the pastoral lessee refuses to accept the renewal of the lease, anyone who selects it after must pay for the improvements. If that way the improvements are protected.

Mr. Troy: We have no desire to do otherwise.

The PREMIER: They should be protected, and the lessee should have a right to be heard. The member for Kanowna, who was once Attorney General, said the other night it was only British justice to give a person the right of appeal. It is one thing for a man who applies for a lease for the first time to be told what price shall be charged, and another thing for a man who has spent all his life in developing a lease and then asks to have his lease renewed. The member for Mt. Magnet said he could on the Murchison cut up land into 100,000 acre holdings. Since he made that remark a pastoral lessee on the Murchison who holds 700,000 acres has informed me that he had 16,000 sheep and 2,000 cattle on it, but that to-day he has only 8,000 sheep and 2,000 cattle.

Mr. Troy: Does he want to cut it up?

The PREMIER: If the 700,000 acres had been cut into seven blocks, six of the lessees would have been wiped out altogether. The only feed on the whole property is now on 100,000 acres, the part where rain had fallen. On the other 600,000 acres this pastoralist lost half his stock, and all he has left is on the other 100,000. This is a fact.

Mr. Troy: I have heard these facts before.

The PREMIER: This man has made a statement which is true.

Mr. Troy: There are facts he has not mentioned. If you suggested on the Murchison that a man could not live on 100,000 acres you would be hooted off.

The PREMIER: I have only given the experience of this pastoralist. However, the point now is, are we justified in refusing to the pastoral lessees the right to be heard? I say the Committee would not be justified in denying them that right. Some reappraisements have been made.

Hon. P. Collier: Where has the highest reappraisal been made?

The PREMIER: The highest reappraisalment of all is on the Murchison—55s. The lowest is 10s., and the average is 31s. 10d. Thus the highest rental is 5½ times the amount of the lowest rental. The pastoralist should have the right to appeal here, as he has in Queensland, where I understand a judge sits with two members of the land court. The trouble of appealing to a judge is that it entails great cost as well as considerable delay. Moreover, our pastoralists are paying a premium for the renewal of their leases for 20 years.

Hon. P. Collier: They have the option of not going on, of course.

The PREMIER: Naturally; but if they do go on they pay increased rents not for 20 years but for 30 years. I am sure it must be the desire of every member that these men should be fairly treated. The appraisers may make mistakes—such as basing their calculations upon wrong information as to the carrying capacity of the land, for instance. All the factors of the situation should be considered.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier loses sight of one aspect of the question. Every time he speaks on it he draws attention to the rights of the lessees, but he entirely omits any mention of the rights of the State. At the time of the passing of the 1917 Act it was definitely stated that the pastoralists were getting an extension of 20 years under certain conditions. I believe most of the pastoralists have accepted the extension under those conditions. In the absence of the 1917 Act the present lessees would have had no rights at all at the end of ten years.

The Minister for Works: But they would have to be paid for their improvements.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not at the end of 1928. I took the word of the member for Perth for that. At the end of 1928 the pastoral leases would have become the property of the State.

The Premier: But the lessees had the right of renewal.

Hon. P. Collier: No.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was no right of renewal at the end of 1928.

The Premier: The lessees must be given the renewal under certain conditions or the improvements must be paid for by the Crown.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Undoubtedly the three gentlemen appointed a board for reappraisalment purposes are men who thoroughly understand the pastoral areas of this State. The Surveyor General is the chairman of the board, Mr. Canning is a member; and Mr. Canning, I know, would make all necessary inquiries regarding the areas to be re-appraised. I understand that the third member of the board, whose name I do not know, has had 30 years' experience of pastoral pursuits in Western Australia. The extension of the term of the lease was granted subject to reappraisalment

of rentals by the board. Six months were allowed to the lessee to accept the rental so fixed. The board, I take it, would look after both sets of interests. At any rate, I do not think they would overlook the interests of the State. Why is it that at this stage, three years later, we have a proposal to alter the conditions on which the term of the leases has been extended for another 20 years?

Mr. Maley: The conditions have changed even during the last 12 months.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The conditions as regards the land have not changed much. There is not the slightest doubt as to the value of the land and its carrying capacity. It is merely the market that has changed. I suppose the meat market is better to-day than it was in 1917.

Mr. Maley: It has gone right down.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It has gone down since the war, as it was bound to do. The conditions as regards the land have not changed, and the Minister has not told us why the conditions of the extension should be changed. In the matter of these pastoral leases, the birthright of the people was given away for 20 years in 1917, and I still maintain that that action constituted the greatest scandal that has ever occurred in this Parliament. However, I have always upheld such rights as Parliament has granted, no matter how they apply.

The Premier: You surely will not refuse the right of appeal?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The conditions of renewal give no right of appeal.

Mr. Pilkington: But this new clause gives not so much the right of appealing as the right of being heard.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The new clause allows an appeal for re-hearing in the case of lessees who are discontented with the rentals imposed by the board. The Premier has told us that the highest amount he has is 55s.

Hon. P. Collier: That is on the Murchison.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government who introduced the Bill were afraid to go higher than £3 and when the Bill was introduced it contained a provision that the amount should not exceed £3. However, that was struck out during the passage of the Bill through this Chamber. The rent is not going so high as was anticipated when the Act was passed in 1917.

Hon. T. Walker: It has never reached that maximum.

The Premier: The board have not yet finished.

Hon. P. Collier: But you have done the richest and best of the land.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The pastoralists have entered into an agreement that these leases should be carried on under certain conditions and I cannot see why the conditions should be altered. The pastoralists who took the areas for an extended term of 20 years under certain conditions should abide by those conditions.

Mr. Teesdale: But you give a murderer the right of appeal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is an entirely different matter. This land was taken up for an extended period of 20 years on the value set down by the appraisers. Now the Government say—I do not know under what pressure—"We are not satisfied. We want the appraisers to review their appraisement if the lessee is not satisfied." No one could make me believe that the appraisers went onto a station, looked over it and said it was worth so much. I am satisfied that they made all possible inquiries and probably obtained information which the lessee would not have given them.

The Premier: Yes, a great deal; here it is.

Mr. Teesdale interjected.

Hon. P. Collier: They should not fix it on the price of wool for one season.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If they did we would have a higher maximum than 55s. We should therefore adhere to the conditions laid down.

Mr. ANGELO: There is no suggestion of going back on the contract by the pastoralists who have agreed to transfer their leases to the new Act. All that the pastoralists desire is to have some method of rectifying mistakes, because mistakes have occurred in these appraisements. The leader of the Opposition said the other night that the pastoralists had been aware of the appraisements for some time. Some of the pastoralists have not got their appraisements to-day.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course.

Mr. ANGELO: Now that they are finding out what they have to pay, they realise that mistakes have been made. The leader of the Opposition said we had no faith in the board. Such is not the case. If the State was hunted through, no better persons could be selected for the board of appraisers than the three who have been mentioned, but these men have not been able to go through the State and make the appraisements themselves. They have had to delegate their authority to deputies, and some of the deputies have not the experience required for such an important job. In our district we have a returned officer. I do not suppose a more reliable or straightforward man could be found in the State, but the only experience he had had was as overseer on one station in a part of the district. It is on his report and on the report of many similar deputies that the appraisers have fixed their prices. Let me point out a glaring case. There is a station within 13 miles of the port of Carnarvon which could carry a sheep to seven acres. The appraisement of that station I believe is 41s. Another station which has to carry wool for 200 miles and runs one sheep to 15 acres, is asked to pay 33s. 6d. It does not require much experience to realise that a mistake has been made there. The pastoralists are satisfied with the conditions, but they consider that in some cases a mistake has been made. The appraisements have not been as they should be, and I am satisfied

that the pastoralists would agree to the new clause now proposed. Then if they were not satisfied with the appraisalment, they could produce evidence to the board and try to prove their case. I would certainly recommend them to agree to such a provision. Many pastoralists did not expect to have their rents more than doubled. Yet we hear of one case where the rent has been increased $3\frac{1}{2}$ times, namely, from 10s. to 55s.

Mr. TROY: It should not have been 10s. anyhow.

Mr. ANGELO: Anyone can realise that. The station situated close to a port should pay more than a station with similar country that has to carry its produce a considerable distance, and a station which has first class land should pay more than a station of second class land. All the pastoralists acknowledge this, and they do not want to upset these conditions. All they ask is that any mistakes may be rectified and I do not think there will be many mistakes. If the pastoralists can go in person to the board to prove their case, they will be satisfied. I believe there is not a pastoralist in the State who does not think Mr. King, Mr. Canning and the other gentleman are a competent board. I would like to know whether a pastoralist, after appealing to the board and being turned down, will be qualified to go back to the 1928 lease, even after having submitted his case to the board.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes.

Mr. ANGELO: Then I do not think the pastoralists will ask for anything more than the new clause now proposed by the Premier. I would stress the point that a great deal of the appraising work is being done by men who know very little about the pastoral areas as a whole.

Mr. Davies: Why were they appointed?

Mr. ANGELO: Because there were not more competent men to appoint; it is impossible to get them. In the Roebourne district I know of a deputy who for many years was a commission agent.

Hon. P. Collier: Several commission agents are standing for Parliament. Surely a commission agent is not without some capacity?

Mr. ANGELO: But this commission agent is being asked to judge the carrying capacity of land. That is the work of an expert.

Hon. P. Collier: A commission agent who comes here has to know something about all kinds of laws.

Mr. ANGELO: But he is not asked to judge the carrying capacity of a lease. The conditions throughout a district vary so considerably that it is impossible for one man to know them all, let alone to be competent to judge various districts. I am afraid that these high rentals have been based on the profits resulting from stations during the abnormal times we have gone through. I believe they have been based on a sheep being worth 8s. a year to the squatter. The squatter may have realised this amount during the last four or five years, but I do not think it will last long. During the past

few months, the wool market has gone down considerably, and in some of the North-West districts sheep cannot be given away.

Mr. TROY: That is nonsense.

Mr. ANGELO: I heard of sheep being offered at 2s. 6d. a head.

Mr. TROY: The rental is not based on that.

Mr. ANGELO: I hope it is not, but I am afraid it is. If so, the values of stations will not be anything like in the near future what they have been in the past. Already we hear of stations being offered for sale and the bidding for them is very much smaller than it was a year or two ago. I trust the Committee will accept the new clause.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: I feel that the Committee might be misled by the statements of the member for North-East Fremantle regarding the liabilities of lessees. As a rule, the hon. member goes very carefully into all matters he takes in hand and members naturally accept his statements as being accurate. He informed the Committee that he had been told there was no compensation for lessees upon the termination of their leases. The Land Act distinctly sets forth that lessees on the termination of their leases shall be compensated for all improvements that exist on the lease. If the hon. member looks at Section 146 of the Land Act, 1898, he will find that the Minister has to pay for improvements in certain cases. The section reads:—

On the expiration by effluxion of time of any pastoral lease not open to renewal on the same or any other conditions to the same lessee, or upon any pastoral lessee being deprived by the Minister acting under this Act, of the use of any land held under a pastoral lease, and comprised within an agricultural area or reserve, the pastoral lessee shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, receive from the Minister the fair value of all lawful improvements then on the land of which the lessee has been deprived, or which being outside such land and comprised in such pastoral lease have become lessened in value by reason of such deprivation. If a pastoral lease be renewed to a succeeding lessee, the previous lessee shall be entitled to receive from the succeeding lessee the fair value of all such improvements existing on the land.

Mr. TROY: I do not object to any person making an appeal, provided the conditions are not what they were in the Land Act, 1917. That Act provided a condition by which the then existing lessees secured all their leases on the payment of increased rent.

Hon. P. Collier: Increased rent and the limitation of the areas.

Mr. TROY: The Premier stated that he expected largely increased revenue from these rents, and if the right of appeal is given, and the appeals are allowed, the general community must make up for the loss of revenue which will result.

The Honorary Minister: If the lessee can prove that a mistake has been made, should not that be recognised?

Mr. TROY: The advantage given to the pastoralists in this country is over and above that given to any other section of the community. That must be because of the influence they have, due to the wealth they possess. In Queensland, in 1902, the Philp Government were returned with a big majority and they extended the pastoral leases for 43 years. One of the conditions was that the leases were to be appraised every five years. Three years later, after the pastoralists had secured the extensions, the same Government brought in a measure providing that the rents were not to be raised more than 50 per cent. during the term of the lease. It is a remarkable thing that what has happened in Queensland is about to happen in Western Australia, and that is why I am averse to making provision for appeals. It might not work out in the interests of the State. The appraisers in this case are men who have a knowledge of the pastoral lands, and they certainly took the greatest pains when examining the country. The Premier gave a valuation of a station, which valuation was very high. I know the station. It enjoys a good winter rainfall and it gets a summer rainfall as well. It is within 100 miles of Geraldton and the railway goes through the property. I feel that there is an intention in the new clause to repudiate the provisions of the Land Act, 1917, or the conditions under which the holders of the pastoral areas agreed to the increased rentals, namely that they got an extended term. If the lessees, not being satisfied, on the expiration of the leases in 1928, decided not to renew them, many people would be found only too anxious to take them up. The majority of people were unaware of what was happening when the 1917 Act was passed. If they had been aware of the position there would have been a great protest. The board which the Premier speaks of is not the appraisal board.

The Attorney General: It is the same board.

Mr. TROY: It is not provided for in the amendment. I object to a judge.

The CHAIRMAN: It says in the amendment, "By the board of appraisers."

Mr. TROY: Another board may be appointed.

The Honorary Minister: No, that is not so. There cannot be another board.

Mr. TROY: While generally not opposed to giving the right of appeal, I do not feel too disposed to concede these men that right because they should abide by the contract that they entered into in recognition of which they were granted an extension of their leases.

Mr. NAIRN: Before the member for Mt. Magnet resumed his seat, he stated that, on the expiry of these leases in 1928, hundreds of people would be only too anxious to avail themselves of the opportunity of taking them

up. I can only hope that that is true. There are indications that to some extent we should consider whether the outlook is as good now as it was in the past. We have only to go back a few years to realise what drawbacks confront those engaged in the pastoral industry. At the present time there is a feeling abroad that the pastoral undertaking is the most attractive in the Commonwealth. In common fairness to those who are engaged in that industry, some provision for review of the valuation set upon their lands by the board of appraisers should be provided. I have not heard any argument worthy of consideration in favour of taking away from the pastoralists the right to have the board's decision reviewed. The value to be placed upon the holdings by the board of appraisers is being assessed under the greatest difficulties. We appreciate the enormous area over which the Board have to work and that should make us realise that it is humanly impossible not to make a mistake sometimes. In those circumstances, we should not hesitate for one moment to give the pastoralists the right to have their appraisements reviewed and, if necessary, re-assessed. So far as the industry itself is concerned, all the indications to-day are that the position is rather serious.

Mr. Troy: That is not so.

Mr. NAIRN: I am not saying that the industry is doomed but during the last five or six years, the impression has been that the pastoral industry is a veritable gold mine. Our experience has shown that there have been a great many failures.

Mr. Chesson: In every walk of life there are failures.

Mr. NAIRN: That is true, but in no undertaking is there the same risk as that attached to that of the pastoralist. I hope that the amendment will be carried.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The amendment put forward by the Premier this afternoon is vastly different from that which he submitted last week. I offered my strongest opposition to the amendment as then submitted and I am very pleased that the Premier has seen fit to withdraw it and put forward something more acceptable. I have no antipathy whatever to the men engaged in developing our great pastoral areas, particularly in the North-West. I am just as anxious to extend justice and fair play to them, even though they be wealthy, as I am, according to my views, to the humblest of the land. I do not propose to oppose the amendment. I see no objection to any person affected by an appraisement having the right to present evidence or facts for review to the same board which assessed the value of their property in the first place. I would oppose any proposal to place that review in the hands of any other tribunal because I do not know of any other which would be so well qualified to deal with the appeal. I do not believe in appealing from a board qualified to deal with it to some less qualified body.

Mr. Johnston: Who would decide on legal points?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, that would probably be the result, under the proposal as originally put forward. I do not desire to traverse all the ground that has been covered by other members but it is fair that when the Act was passed in 1917, those pastoralists who were affected by it, accepted the provisions laid down in the measure on that occasion. They were quite satisfied to accept the appraisalment by the board laid down under that Act. There was no suggestion by anyone at that time that there should be the right of appeal. I do not like the reference to "appeals," for it is really a matter of "review." At that time, Mr. Butcher, who may be regarded as representative of the pastoralists, was a member of the House and he expressed his approval with that part of the Bill in which the leases were dealt with. He accepted the proposal for a double rent and also admitted the great likelihood of the rent of some of the leases being fixed at more than double rent as laid down in the Bill. The Honorary Minister for Lands saw a strong possibility of that fact and expressed the view that some of the rents would greatly exceed the provisions laid down in the Act. He was correct, as time has shown, because during the past few days we have heard of a case where the rent was raised to 55s. per thousand. It has been contended that that was too high. That is only one case. We know that up to date the average appraisements in the Gascoyne district work out at 25s. and when the Bill was introduced, the maximum rent was fixed at £3 in the Bill. The House was opposed to any such limitation being inserted in this Bill, so much so that the then Minister for Lands, the present member for Moore, moved to strike out the proposal. If the House struck out the maximum of £3, they must have had an idea that the rentals might have been fixed higher even than that amount. Some of the best pastoral land in the country has been already appraised. I speak, subject to correction, but I believe that as the work proceeds further north the average rental will be lower. On the Gascoyne and the Murchison the rents ran up to 55s. per thousand acres. The present Honorary Minister for Lands spoke in connection with the Bill and used the following words—

From information obtained from those who have been there I understand that the whole of the Kimberleys are good for cattle, whilst East Kimberley stands alone. The herbage is sweet and is suitable for sheep, and if water is obtained that particular territory can carry one sheep to two acres. . . .

I do not know whether that is an optimistic estimate or not.

When we think of the enormous territory we have there, and when we have information like this from people who have spent years there, all I can say is that it is a disgrace that we can only boast of a total of five million sheep. Even if the country only carries one sheep to five acres, there is not a squatter who will object to pay-

ing £3 a thousand, for such lands, which under the Bill is the maximum. . . . I hope the member for Kimberley is listening. The Honorary Minister when speaking in the House said that no pastoralist would object to paying £3 per thousand acres as rent.

The Honorary Minister: I have not changed my views yet.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The present Honorary Minister continued—

I think, however, that that as a maximum is not enough. I would increase that figure so as to allow the classifiers to have a greater scope to differentiate between our best pastoral country and our worst.

Hon. T. Walker: That was a good speech.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is one of the shrewdest utterances I have heard coming from the hon. member. There seems to be a desire in some quarters to convey the impression that 43s., which was the maximum amount of rent reached in the appraisements last week, is an excessive amount. Something of this nature was anticipated when the Bill in 1917 was before the House. I quote the Honorary Minister's remarks to show that it is quite understood and anticipated by many members that the rents in some cases would go beyond £3 per thousand acres and considerably beyond it in the view of the Honorary Minister for Lands. This will show that there is no justification for any great outcry on the part of those affected by this measure. I think we should amend that part of the amendment which says that the Minister shall direct appeals to be heard with a view to giving discretionary power to the Minister. I do not desire to take away the right of these men to have their cases reviewed but it is quite possible that appeals will be lodged which on the face of them are not warranted.

Mr. Angelo: The appellant will have to pay the costs.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That does not matter.

The Premier: It will not do any harm.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In any case the appellant only has to pay the costs of the appeal when he refuses to take up the lease under the re-appraised figure but prefers to go on with his old lease. I think we should give permissive power to the Minister because no Minister would refuse the right of review in cases brought before him, but there may be cases in which the board consider it would be waste of time and money to review them. It is not a very important point but discretionary power should be left with the Minister.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Before tea I suggested to the Premier that we might insert "may" instead of "shall" in Subclause 2 of the amendment. It is not of great importance, but it may be that all the persons concerned will ask for a review of the assessment. They would have nothing to lose

by it, and possibly something to gain. I see nothing in the amendment which would prevent the board from even increasing the amount at first set down. Still, they would not be likely to do that. The Minister ought to have the discretion of refusing a review if the circumstances justified it. I do not suppose any Minister would refuse the right of the pastoral lessee to state his case to the board. Only in the event of their not taking up the lease would the appellants have to bear the cost of the proceedings if the assessment were upheld. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 2 "shall" be struck out and "may" inserted in lieu.

THE PREMIER: I do not think the amendment ought to be made. If a re-hearing is asked for, it should be granted. It is only natural that the lessee should wish to have his case reviewed if he thought the rent was too high. The board of appraisers are the only persons who can determine that question. In all the circumstances I think the pastoral lessee should have a re-hearing if he so desires.

Mr. ANGELO: Apparently the chief concern of the leader of the Opposition is that the board might be inundated by trivial complaints. I want to see "shall" retained in preference to "may." The difficulty might be overcome by providing that all applications for review shall be accompanied by a deposit, to be forfeited if the case should prove to be trivial.

Mr. TEESDALE: I cannot support the amendment. I know to-day a Minister whom I trust to entrust with the responsibility. Some Ministers, bitterly opposed to pastoral lessees, would allow their personal feelings to sway them in such cases. It would be a mistake to leave to a Minister positively antagonistic to pastoral lessees the right of saying whether or not the rental should be reviewed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Are you anticipating a change of Ministers?

Mr. TEESDALE: The leader of the Opposition has been very fair in his treatment of the Bill to-night and it would be graceful on his part to concede this small point.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I will not press it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause 5:—"In all cases where the board of appraisers make a re-assessment of any pastoral lease a report thereof shall be presented to Parliament, together with the reasons therefor and the evidence upon which the reasons are based."

Mr. Teesdale: I have no objection to that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I take it that the board, before arriving at their decision in the first instance, would go very fully into

the matter and exercise their best judgment. But when an application is made to have the assessment reviewed and, as a result, the lease is re-assessed, then Parliament ought to know the reasons for it.

The Premier: If this means that the file should be laid on the Table, no one could have any objection to it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The file will suffice.

The PREMIER: But if it means that a report has to be specially prepared, it will entail a good deal of work. I have no objection to the giving of the information to the House, but I think the amendment should be amended by the striking out of the words "presented to Parliament" and the insertion in lieu thereof "laid before both Houses of Parliament."

Hon. P. COLLIER: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will amend the amendment accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: That is understood.

Amendment as amended put and passed; new clause as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING.

In Committee.

Resumed from 2nd December; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Schedule (agreement):

Hon. P. COLLIER: Clause 12 (b) of the agreement provides for the payment of remuneration to the agents of 1½d. for handling the wheat. Why has there been an increase of one-eighth of a penny? Is it because of the increased handling charges consequent upon the increased price of everything? One-eighth of a penny applied to a 10 or 12 million bushel harvest amounts to a large sum.

The PREMIER: It is due to the increased cost of everything during the last 12 months. It is only a reasonable increase to give.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Have you worked it out?

The PREMIER: On an eight million bushel harvest it means something over £4,000. The difficulties of handling the wheat are also much greater.

Mr. WILCOCK: Subclause 2 of Clause 12 of the agreement is ambiguous. It deals with the question of wages. Who is to be responsible for the wages to be paid for the handling of the wheat? The Minister will say he has nothing to do with the matter, and the agents will say they cannot raise the wages without the permission of the Minister. The payments at country sidings should be somewhere near the wages paid on the coast. If they are fixed with due regard to the wages elsewhere there is not likely to be any trouble this year in the handling of the wheat.

The Premier: There will be a schedule of wages.

Mr. WILLCOCK: If there is any argument as to the amount of wages to be paid for certain work, I want to know who will settle it. The Westralian Farmers' Ltd. and the wheat growers will certainly not be likely to give anything away.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They do not care a hang about anything except increasing dividends.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Either the Minister is responsible to the country or the company are responsible. As the paragraph is worded, the responsibility rests upon no one.

Hon. P. Collier: It places the responsibility upon the Minister.

Mr. WILLCOCK: If there is any dispute about the handling of wheat towards Christmas time, when the Arbitration Court goes into vacation for three or four months, the wheat may be hung up. That would be a disastrous position.

The Attorney General: The Arbitration Court does not go into vacation for even two months.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I protest against the ambiguous wording of this clause.

The PREMIER: I am obliged to the hon. member for the warning he has given. However, I think he is mistaken. The Minister merely approves any proposed increase in wages or decrease in hours.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Clause 19 of the agreement, referring to the limitation of liability, reduces the agent's liability by one-half, from one farthing to one-eighth of a penny. Why this reduction?

The PREMIER: The position this season is entirely different from the position last season, inasmuch as the wheat will not have to be stacked and held for any length of time, but will be shipped practically as before the war. The agents' responsibility, therefore, will be very much less. A great deal of wheat has been already sold for shipment.

Hon. P. Collier: The responsibility was ridiculously low before.

The PREMIER: But we have to pay the agents for taking the responsibility. Of course they have to bear the responsibility of properly delivering the wheat.

Mr. TROY: If the agents' liability is so much less owing to the wheat being shipped promptly, they will not incur expense in that connection. The Premier has given no argument why the agents' liability should be further limited as here proposed. The responsibility should be retained now as it was in the previous agreement.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Like the member for Mt. Magnet, I think the Premier is astray on this point. Previously the agents had to acquire the wheat at the siding and take it into depot, where the agents' liability ceased.

The Premier: As far as the depot wheat was concerned.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No; the liability ceased. If anything, the liability is greater this season because the agents will have to take the wheat to the port and care for it until it has been shipped. Otherwise, the position must be that the Government are going to take this part of the responsibility, which is the greater part. It is true that we have handled our wheat more cheaply than the Eastern States, but that has been due to the Western Australian Government taking the risk of the wheat in stacks, which risk in the Eastern States was borne by the agents.

Mr. TROY: If there is no receiving agent at the siding and the grower has to leave his wheat there pending the pleasure of the Westralian Farmers Ltd., will the grower bear the responsibility?

The Premier: Yes, if there is no agent at the siding.

Mr. TROY: Wheat is often damaged very seriously at small sidings, and the grower ought not to be asked to bear that responsibility. I have seen 2,000 bags of wheat at a siding and no agent in attendance, the wheat being in danger of damage by parrots and other birds, by horses, and by fire. Sparks from a railway engine might set fire to wheat under such conditions. The agents should bear that responsibility.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedule "A":

Mr. THOMSON: The farmer is to be paid 2s. 6d. by way of interim advance, and the balance of the 5s. is to be paid to him at some later time. Is it the intention that the certificates shall be negotiable?

The Premier: They are negotiable now.

Mr. THOMSON: And the certificates under this Bill will be negotiable?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. THOMSON: Will the farmer be able to pay his certificate over to anyone who is willing to accept it?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I saw in the newspapers recently that the Australian Wheat Board were preventing certificates from being negotiated.

The PREMIER: I understand that a separate undertaking will be given to pay the second 2s. 6d. per bushel, apart from the ordinary certificate which is the farmer's receipt and on which the dividends are recorded from time to time. This other additional certificate will, I understand, be issued in April. The second certificate will be necessary if the second dividend is to be easily convertible into cash.

Mr. Thomson: The farmer will be quite in order in handing that certificate to a storekeeper or a banker?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules "B," "C"—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

As to recommitment.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member desires to restrict the discussion to Clause 2, he had better allow the report to be adopted first of all.

Hon. P. Collier: I do not desire to restrict it.

Mr. SPEAKER: On the motion for the adoption of the report it is competent to move for the recommitment of the Bill, but the whole Bill will then have to be considered de novo. On the motion for the third reading the Bill may be recommitted with limitations.

Hon. P. Collier: Very well, I withdraw my proposal.

Question put and passed; the report adopted.

Recommitment.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

Clause 2—Extension of Acts to wheat harvested in 1920-21:

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move—

That the following proviso be added: "Provided also that wheat acquired under the agency agreement authorised by this Act, or under any agency agreement ratified by the Wheat Marketing Act, 1916, or any Act extending the operation thereof, and made available for local consumption shall be sold at a price or prices, wholesale or retail as the case may be, not to exceed the price or prices, if any, lawfully fixed under the Prices Regulation Act, 1919, and applicable to the sale, but if no such price is fixed or a sale takes place elsewhere than in an area proclaimed under that Act, the price to be charged for such wheat on the sale thereof shall not exceed 7s. 8d. per bushel: Penalty £100.

The Attorney General: Is that on the Notice Paper?

Hon. P. Collier: No.

Mr. THOMSON: It is not in order if it is not on the Notice Paper. I was ruled out the other night on a similar point. Until we have seen the proposed amendment in print, it is hardly fair to ask us to consider it. I move—

That progress be reported.

Hon. P. Collier: Why?

Mr. THOMSON: We cannot be expected to discuss it straight away.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

All Stages.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

In accordance with resolutions adopted in Committees of Supply and Ways and Means, leave obtained to introduce the Appropriation Bill which was read a first time.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Northam) [S.27]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed: Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 and Schedules A to E inclusive—agreed to.

Schedule F:

Mr. TROY: I notice that under the heading "Premier's Department" a six month's increase at £50 per annum is shown for the secretary. How does this come about?

The PREMIER: This is due to the fact that the increase passed by Parliament was granted.

Mr. Troy: What does the secretary get now?

The PREMIER: He gets £600. He was drawing £550 and £150 as commissioner under the Postponement of Debts Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Will the Premier explain the meaning of the item under Contingencies, "Freight on A. C. Kessell's furniture from London, £449 3s. 5d."

The PREMIER: This is a very old friend.

Hon. P. Collier: I think we have heard of it before.

The PREMIER: We are recovering the money out of his pension.

Schedules A to I—agreed to.

Title, Preamble—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 17th November.

Mr. DUFF (Claremont) [S.36]: This Bill was introduced by the member for North Perth (Mr. Smith) and, as was pointed out by him, it is a re-enactment of the provisions of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1912, with certain alterations and additions. These alterations and additions were prepared very carefully by the

society, with the assistance of a magistrate or two, and others who were competent to advise. Hon. members after perusing the Bill will make up their minds to give it their support.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Let us get into Committee on it.

Hon. P. Collier: What are the principal features of the Bill?

Mr. DUFF: I will deal with those.

Hon. P. Collier: But do not forget that the member who introduced it spoke very briefly.

Mr. DUFF: I do not intend to take up very much time. The Bill deals exhaustively with the management and treatment and the prevention of cruelty to animals. The first measure of this kind was introduced in England nearly 100 years ago, and since then societies such as our own have sprung up practically throughout the western world. I do not know that there is any occasion to refer to the record of the society in this State. It will speak for itself. The latest monthly report exhibits a splendid and noble effort on behalf of the lower animals. I need not repeat that the society deals with persons who disregard and are utterly ignorant of the fact that animals have rights, and that man is under a moral and a sacred obligation in respect to his conduct towards them. I have heard it said that the society are rather inclined to be aggressive. That is not true. The society is only aggressive, and justly so, towards the inhuman monster who will wilfully illtreat a dumb animal. We have heard a good deal of comment as regards the discretion and care that is exercised in the appointment of honorary inspectors throughout the different districts in our State. I might mention the fact that before an honorary inspector is appointed in any district inquiries are made, and as much discretion is used in the appointment of that inspector as is used by the Premier in appointing justices of the peace. I might also mention that from the instruction classes which have been started at the State schools and in many country districts, great benefit has been derived. Children are taking more care and interest in the prevention of cruelty to animals than they exhibited before. The society is also providing approved lecturers. The field work done by inspectors has been of great value to farmers and others. An inspector visits different farms and he gives veterinary advice and treatment as well, particularly in cases of emergency. He, however, does not interfere with any veterinary surgeon who may be handy. Farmers, however, have declared that the visits of the society's officers have been of inestimable value to them. The society's officer also makes inspections of water troughs, wells, and other places where water is conserved. The object is to find out whether there is any disease in these troughs or wells. In this way the spread of disease amongst stock has been prevented.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I notice you are willing to consent to inoculation for diseases.

Mr. DUFF: If the veterinary surgeons order it I suppose it is all right.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That does not make it any the less cruel.

Mr. DUFF: I wish to give an idea of the gigantic work that is carried on by the society, and quote a few figures to show what has been done.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Tell us something about the Bill.

Mr. DUFF: The society since 1913 has investigated no fewer than 10,759 cases. Veterinary advice has been given in 3,190 cases, the prosecutions have numbered 319, and the convictions have totalled 310. The number of animals humanely destroyed has been 2,924. These figures show that a great amount of good work has been done by the society. The member for North-East Fremantle asked who the members of the committee of the society were.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not ask that.

Mr. DUFF: The members of the committee comprise ladies and gentlemen who devote much time to the carrying out of the aims and objects of the society. There are some clauses in the Bill which may be regarded as being drastic, but on analysis I think they will be found not to be so. I will leave further comment until we reach the Committee stage, and will conclude by quoting the motto of the society, "The depth of depravity indicated by an offence should be the measure of its punishment."

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [8.45]: I do not intend to delay the House at length in discussing the Bill on the second reading. The measure amends the Bill passed in 1912 and provides also certain additions and alterations. Under Clause 4 there are five new offences added, while six of the old offences are retained. The offences now include ill treating any animal; failing to supply any domestic or captive animal with proper and sufficient food or water or sufficient protection against inclement weather; keeping or using or acting in the management of any place where fighting or beating of animals is permitted or allowed; inciting any animal to fight or bait any other animal or encouraging or assisting thereat; conveying, carrying or packing or causing to be conveyed, carried or packed, any animal in such a manner as to subject the animal to unnecessary pain or suffering; needlessly slaughtering or mutilating any animal or subjecting any such animal to unnecessary pain or suffering; riding, driving, using, conveying or carrying any animal which is unfit for such use or treatment; neglecting, as the owner or person in charge, to reasonably exercise or cause to be exercised any dog, habitually chained up—this is one of the new provisions—carrying, packing, or causing to be conveyed, carried or packed, any poultry which is of different species; administering poison to any animal—that includes doping of any

race-horse — selling, offering, exposing for sale or giving away or procuring any person to do same, any grain or seed which has been rendered poisonous, except for bona fide use in agriculture; laying any poison or fluid or eatable matter, not being sown wheat or grain which has been rendered poisonous, or shooting pigeons released from traps. This embodies the whole of the offences under Clause 4. The chief new provisions are contained in other parts of the Bill, including Clause 13, which provides that a constable under certain conditions may destroy injured animals. Clauses 20 to 25 are new provisions. Clause 20 requires employers and owners to produce the drivers of animals and animals if so required. Under Clause 21 power is given to the court to deprive persons convicted of cruelty of the ownership of an animal. Clause 22 deals with the sale and purchase of decrepit animals, and Clause 23 regulates the slaughtering of those animals. I mention these few clauses because certain members say that they do not know what the Bill contains. No good purpose can be served by dilating on these points as most of the provisions are taken from the latest British Act which was framed in 1917. That is the latest legislation on the subject, with the exception of our own Act of 1912, which this Bill amends. I tried to make myself conversant with the conditions of the Bill in the short time at my disposal since I was asked to accept the responsibility for it in this Chamber. I look to members who, as Australians, are lovers of animals, to pass the Bill in the firm lovers of animals would like to see it. There is only one other matter I should like to add. The society has done most noble and humane work in this State. One of the former members of this House (Mr. Titus Lander), was perhaps the most prominent in bringing the society into being. I am only sorry the Government have not seen fit to bring in legislation which would enable Mr. Lander to carry on his work in the country districts. The animals of the city lost a good friend in Mr. Lander when he went into the country.

Mr. Troy: East Perth lost a good friend.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: In East Perth I have seen a general scattering take place among men with horses and carts when they heard that "Titus" was coming along. Evidently there were sore shoulders about and they were afraid of what would happen when "Titus" saw them. I should have liked to see the sphere of usefulness of Mr. Lander extended to the country districts. We have endeavoured to get the Government to amend the Veterinary Act, so that he could use his veterinary knowledge in the country districts in the interests of the animals there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better wait till that amending Bill comes along before he discusses Mr. Titus Lander.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) 8.50]: I must say the House has been given a lot of information by those who have spoken to the Bill. There is something that we have yet to hear about it. We have been told what the society is and what the members of that body have done, and also what Mr. Titus Lander has done, but we have not been told why there is a necessity for the Bill. This is a measure to prevent cruelty to animals and yet we find that the society which we are told has considered the Bill in all its aspects, and prepared it for presentation to the House, provides among other things for the cutting up of animals. Vivisection is still provided for in the Bill and animals can be inoculated for various diseases, no matter what their suffering may be. So far as this exemption is concerned, one would have thought that the society would have been the first to endeavour to do away with vivisection. The Bill provides that that shall continue. Then there is the matter of laying poison. It is a penalty for anyone to lay poison in order to catch cats in their back yards, but the laying of poison in agricultural districts is permitted. If it is cruel to give poison to an animal in one's back yard, surely it is cruel to give poison to animals on the farms. There is no difference, yet the society adhere to the exemption for poison laid for bona fide agricultural purposes. Am I to understand from that that there is no cruelty in poisoning an animal on the farm, although it is cruel to do so in the back yard?

Mr. Troy: What about catching a dingo in a trap and tearing his foot off.

Hon. P. Collier: He would come in the definition of captive animal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have not had much information about the Bill and in this instance there seems to be some inconsistency.

The Minister for Mines: What are hon. members to do if their neighbours persist in keeping cats?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know. Personally, I am fond of cats.

The Minister for Mines: So am I, but there is a limit.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Minister for Mines set poison in his garden and a cat took the bait, he would be liable to prosecution, but if the member for Mt. Magnet set poison in his garden in the country—and after all a farm is only a large garden—he would be exempt. There is some inconsistency in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair: Mr. Griffiths in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: Would the member in charge of the Bill explain to the Committee why the expression "domestic animal" means any horse, ass, mule, bull, sheep, and pig. Why bull?

Hon. P. Collier: That is the domestic bull.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: The cow is probably domestic but I have never before heard that a cow was a bull. Does the word "bull" include a cow?

Mr. Griffiths: I am somewhat at a loss to understand why "bull" has been placed there.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I notice that a fowl is included as an animal.

Hon. P. Collier: It will be an animal for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Griffiths: It is there for the purposes of interpretation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Paragraph (f) provides that the term "ill treat" shall include wound, mutilate, overdrive, over-ride, over-work, abuse, worry, torment, torture, and also knowingly overload and knowingly overcrowd and unreasonably, wantonly or maliciously beat.

The Minister for Mines: Does it include abusive language?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I want some information regarding this matter. This is a paragraph which will seriously affect people who are driving in the rural districts. Particularly will this be so during harvesting time, when they are driving along the dusty roads in the wheat areas, especially those who are situated 20 or 15 miles from a railway. Those farmers may at any time be pounced upon by an over zealous officer and charged with overworking their horses.

Mr. Duff: It is in the old Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does the expression "abuse" mean verbally abuse or otherwise? Mr. Pilkington: It will not seriously affect Parliamentary debates.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope not. Then we get an interdiction on the worrying of an animal. It seems to me we require an interpretation of each of these words.

The Minister for Mines: Fancy tormenting a kitten with a silken tassel!

Hon. P. COLLIER: Under this definition of over-working a horse, I am afraid most of our farmers at this busy season are liable to a penalty, for probably they are not only over-working their animals but even, perhaps, abusing them.

The Minister for Works: Would it be abusing a horse to call him a bullocky cow?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I cannot say. Perhaps the hon. member in charge of the Bill can tell us the difference between the clause and the corresponding section of the existing Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are all desirous of seeing animals decently treated, but this provision is a bit extreme. Who is to be the judge of over-driving and over-working? The limit of one horse's strength is perhaps six miles, while another's

strength may be equal to 60 miles. As to this silly provision about not abusing, if a man said "Damn!" to a horse or a bullock he would be abusing it.

Hon. P. Collier: Under this you might be prosecuted any day.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would be prosecuted every day. Let us have common sense in our legislation.

The Colonial Secretary: The wording is just the same in the existing Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not care. Because our predecessors were not sufficiently alive to deal with this matter, are we not to put it right? I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (f) "abuse, worry" be struck out.

The Minister for Mines: Much of this could be applied to members of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course it could, for this includes mules and, for that matter, asses also. By that I am not referring to the member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington).

The Minister for Mines: Why exempt the member for Perth?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I must exempt him, because he is superior to all consideration of asses. Even the lowly ass of Galilee would be beneath his notice.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I see no objection to these words. Without causing any inconvenience they have been in operation since 1912. Certain powers are required by the officers looking after our dumb animals, and I should like to see the Bill go through unamended. The words of the provision are practically identical with those in the section of the existing Act.

Mr. TROY: The word "worry" is superfluous. "Torment" embodies all that is necessary. Of course to abuse an animal is, not what the Minister for Works supposes it to be, but to ill-treat it. I do not object to any of the words in the provision, but the danger is that the administration of the measure may be in the hands of busybodies of no practical experience. Take the question of over-riding or over-driving: what would happen in a case of life and death?

Hon. Sir H. B. Lefroy: Due consideration would be given to the circumstances.

Mr. TROY: Suppose a horse jibbed, even with an empty cart, and the man in charge belted it with his hat or even with a whip—an inspector might prosecute. Yet if the man in charge were to let that horse beat him he would never get any good out of the animal again, because sometimes the withholding of a beating will ruin a horse.

Mr. NAIRN: I hope the words will not be struck out. They are essential. They have been in the existing legislation for many years. "Worry" is used in the sense of one animal worrying another to death. In a conviction under a measure of this nature, almost invariably the decision is on a question of fact. I have never heard of an abuse of the powers given under the existing Act.

If any attempt were made by busybodies to harass a man it would not be supported by the society. One cannot imagine a penalty being inflicted on a man for over-driving when hastening for a doctor. On the other hand, horses from livery stables are frequently taken out and cruelly over-driven. It is a wicked and scandalous proceeding.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As the striking out of these words would probably be unwise, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. MALEY: Under the Municipalities Act the impounding of animals is fully provided for, and the obligation is cast upon the local authority to frame regulations dealing with the question. If stock is impounded by the local authority that stock has to be attended to. In my opinion the paragraph dealing with the definition of a pound is superfluous. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (g) be struck out.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Even if it is a duplication I cannot see that any harm can be done by its inclusion here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is a useful paragraph. It cannot be supposed that all pound-keepers in the State will look after the animals in their charge. There have been numerous complaints because of the fees which have been charged for the impounding of animals.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Offences of cruelty:

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: Paragraph (b) deals with supplying food and water to animals held in captivity and to protecting them from inclement weather. Under this paragraph a pastoralist who holds sheep in a yard for 24 hours would be liable to prosecution. It is impossible to shelter sheep under such conditions, and the society should not enforce the law in such a case.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I can see no objection to providing animals with sufficient food and water as well as shelter. People sometimes go away and leave animals tied up without either food or water. The paragraph is intended to cover cases of that description.

Mr. TROY: I move an amendment—

That the words "or sufficient protection against inclement weather" be struck out. It is impossible to provide such protection in the case of sheep which have been yarded over night.

Mr. DUFF: The intention of the society is to guard against wilful acts of cruelty on the part of people who leave animals exposed.

Mr. HARDWICK: The paragraph is intended to operate against persons who do such things as tie up their horses outside at night without any covering.

Mr. PICKERING: It would be impossible to provide shelter for sheep that have been placed in sale yards, for instance. The paragraph is too wide in its scope.

Mr. DURACK: Domestic animals are defined as being sheep, pigs, goats, etc., and an inspector of the society might well take action unless this paragraph is struck out, against pastoralists and other breeders of animals.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: The paragraph also applies to dogs, cats, fowls. I agree that if a dog is tied up it should be sheltered, but unfortunately the paragraph applies also to sheep and cattle. It is overloaded. If those administering the measure act judiciously all will be well, but if its administration falls into the hands of officious people there will be trouble.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I hope the words will remain. They are in the parent Act, and no member has given instances of their operating harshly. We must assume that this measure, like other measures, will be administered with discretion.

Mr. MALEY: The trouble is that there are too many honorary inspectors.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If we are to assume that officious busy-bodies will be acting as inspectors under this measure, we ought not to pass the Bill at all. We must assume that magistrates will give consideration to all the circumstances of every case. Protection should be provided against careless people who own animals.

Mr. NAIRN: As one who has taken a considerable interest in the society, and as an active member thereof, I can inform the Committee that the society depend entirely on voluntary contributions, and that if they took absurd action they would themselves be putting it out of their power to continue their work.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. PICKERING: What is the force of the words "needlessly slaughter" in paragraph (h) of Subclause 1?

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have details of needless slaughter and needless doing to death of animals in revolting circumstances. The burning of a dog to death and the flogging of three horses to death are instances in point.

Mr. PILKINGTON: Paragraph (i) of Subclause 1 says that it shall be an offence to —

convey, carry, or pack, or cause to be conveyed, carried, or packed, any poultry which is of different species.

I know nothing about the necessity for such a provision as this, but, in order to make the paragraph grammatical, I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1, paragraph (i), after the word "poultry" there be inserted "together with other poultry."

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Paragraph (k) makes it an offence to—

sell, offer, expose for sale or give away, or procure any person to do the same, or knowingly to be a party to the sale, or to sell, expose for sale, or give away, any grain or seed which has been rendered poisonous except for bona fide use in agriculture.

The proviso appears to put the matter all right, but does not extend to the sale of poisoned grain or seed. I suggest that after the word "was" in line 3 of the proviso "sold or" should be inserted. The destruction of domestic vermin is as justifiable as the destruction of agricultural vermin.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it is right for farmers to use poisoned grain to destroy vermin, it is right for everybody else to use poisoned grain for the same purpose.

Mr. TROY: Paragraph (l) makes it an offence to—

knowingly put or place upon any land or building, or cause or procure any person to put or place, or be a party to the same, any poison or any fluid or edible matter not being sown seed, or grain which has been rendered poisonous.

That paragraph will work very badly, especially in the case of poisoning water for rabbits and wild dogs.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Clause 6 gives the necessary exemption. I move an amendment—

That in the proviso to Subclause 1, after the word "was," line 3, there be inserted "sold or."

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

Clauses 5 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Limitation of time within information or complaint laid or made:

Mr. BROWN: Ninety days is too long. Sixty days should be sufficient.

Mr. TROY: Why sixty days?

Mr. BROWN: There should be some limit of less than ninety days.

Mr. TROY: Make it thirty days.

Mr. Griffiths: This is intended to meet the needs of outback places.

Mr. TROY: I move an amendment—

That "ninety" be struck out and "thirty" inserted in lieu.

I know of no place in this country where an information could not be laid within 30 days. I would like to know of any place in the Murchison which would require ninety days in which to lay an information.

The Colonial Secretary: You supported ninety days in 1912.

Mr. TROY: That is not my opinion now.

Mr. DUFF: About 18 years ago, Resident Magistrate Clifton of East Murchison—

The Minister for Mines: Give us something up to date.

Mr. Pickering: Has not there been any advance in the Murchison for 18 years?

Mr. DUFF: Resident Magistrate Clifton was stationed 500 miles beyond the rail head. A man had got his team into a bog and he hammered two of the horses to death and had to drag them out with the other horses. This happened 40 miles out and was not heard of until long after it had occurred. This shows the need for the period mentioned in the clause.

Mr. PICKERING: The 1912 Act provides thirty days and surely that should be sufficient now.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Some of these offences are committed by men doing overland trips and they are away for months. That is why an extension is asked for.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If we are going to amend the law we should show that the existing law has proved detrimental. The only instance mentioned was one 18 years old. Unless it can be shown that 30 days is not sufficient we should not amend the existing provision. I support the amendment.

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

Clauses 12 to 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Injuring trespassing animals:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause would apply to the shooting of kangaroos. Very often a kangaroo is injured and travels for some distance.

The Minister for Mines: A marsupial is not an animal under this measure.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I should like an explanation from the member in charge of the Bill.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: If the Minister looks at the interpretation he will find that the expression "animal" means any domestic animal. It cannot apply to a marsupial.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would like the hon. member to explain the meaning of the last portion of the clause. I agree with the Minister that the whole of the clause should be struck out.

Mr. Pickering: It is the same with goats; they are most destructive animals.

The Minister for Works: I have 200 of them at my place.

The Minister for Mines: They must have escaped from Denmark.

Mr. TROY: It frequently occurs that dogs get among sheep. A man might shoot a dog in such circumstances and never know to whom the dog belonged. It might not be possible to trace the owner, and one might have to go 20 or 30 miles to find a justice of the peace. Moreover, the penalty is too heavy.

Hon. Sir H. B. LEFROY: The clause will do an injustice. A kangaroo dog may get amongst sheep and worry them, and if the owner of the sheep should shoot at the dog and wound it, and the dog should go on to somebody else's property, the man who shot it would have to report the fact. We should

consider individuals as well as animals. The kangaroo dog that gets amongst sheep does not deserve any consideration.

The Minister for Mines: If a dog has been shot and escapes to an adjoining paddock, the object of the clause is to prevent it suffering a lingering death.

Mr. DUFF: Dogs are not the only animals which stray on to people's properties. Pigs have been known to stray also and trouble has been caused through shooting them. The clause should be permitted to remain.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When people go kangarooing they take dogs with them and it is then that the dogs find their way amongst the sheep. You shoot at them and if your luck is in you may kill the dog; if it is not, you only hurt it. Then if it is only hurt, it gets away, and if you do not know who the owner is you do not say anything about it.

Amendment put and passed; the clause struck out.

Clause 27—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—GRAIN ELEVATORS (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [10.15]: This is a short but nevertheless somewhat important Bill. It proposes to allow those who put their wheat into this season's pool to divert 6d. per bushel of the surplus proceeds towards the purchase of shares in the West Australian Grain Growers' Co-operative Elevators Ltd. I am not quite clear in my reading of the Bill as to whether all the creditors of the farmers concerned are entirely protected.

The Premier: I think the Industries Assistance Board is protected.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The language seems to be ambiguous.

The Premier: At any rate, the creditors must be protected.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It would be manifestly unfair to permit any of the proceeds from this season's harvest to be diverted towards the purchase of shares in this company, while the farmers concerned have undischarged liabilities to creditors which have been standing for years past.

The Premier: I think it is clear in the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We can discuss that matter in Committee but even so, it seems to me that there will be a possibility under the Bill of the persons concerned being allowed to invest this money in the shares of the company before they have discharged their liabilities to the Industries Assistance Board.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I see no reason why any of the surplus money should be devoted

to this company before the farmers concerned pay their debts to the Industries Assistance Board, any more than they should be allowed to take up shares before the debts to the private creditors have been paid. The Premier stated in moving the second reading of the Bill that with the "approval of the manager of the Industries Assistance Board, 6d. per bushel might be diverted to the purchase of these shares."

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Although these clients may still owe a considerable sum to the Industries Assistance Board?

The Premier: Some of them have credits.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And some of them may have debts. It may be the intention of the Government to pursue that policy and give the manager of the Industries Assistance Board power to forego his right to the payment of money owing to the board, but there is nothing in the Bill that will permit of that being done. The Premier made that statement during the second reading, but there is nothing in the Bill to bear it out, and I do not think there should be anything in the Bill allowing money to be diverted for this purpose until all liabilities are discharged either in the case of clients of the Industries Assistance Board or of outside people. They should discharge their obligations to private persons as well as to the Industries Assistance Board. If they have a credit they will be able to use their money for any purpose they wish. Until they meet their liabilities, however, whether to private creditors or to the board, I do not think they should be permitted to take up any shares.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is a difference between the board and the Act. They are two different matters.

Mr. Hickmott: Would not the creditors hold the shares of these people?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What a nice thing that would be.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What is the good of holding shares of clients who have owed money for years? If there is a surplus from this harvest, instead of providing for the payment of the debts, the hon. member says that the farmer should have the power to purchase these shares and the creditors will hold them, although they will be no good to the creditor for many years to come. I have no objection to the Bill provided that it is made perfectly clear that only when there is surplus money to the credit of the clients of the board, shall they be able to purchase shares in this company.

The Premier: I think that is absolutely the intention of the measure.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am concerned with what the Premier stated regarding the powers of the Industries Assistance Board to permit these shares to be purchased.

The Premier: I do not think I used those words, although there are a good many in credit.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have no right to be there.

Hon. J. COLLIER: I agree with that, but if they are in credit there is no objection to the purchasing of these shares.

Mr. Money: If the farmer owes money, he would not be a shareholder.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If he could use Government money he would get shares.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the hon. member means that if a farmer is a client of the board he would not desire to be a shareholder, I would suggest that such a farmer would like to remain in debt to the board and at the same time get these shares if he were permitted to do so. We must see that such a thing shall not occur. Until a man has a surplus he should not be allowed to do what he likes with the money. Apart from the aspects I have referred to, I see no objection to the Bill. All interests must be protected and the Government must certainly be protected as well. I am not prepared to give the Government power to say to any client of the board that although he owes a certain amount of money to the State, the State will forego its claim in order to allow the farmer to pay 6d. per bushel towards the purchase of the shares in this company.

Mr. Johnston: Even if the account is quite safe.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No matter how safe it is.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not care how safe the account is. I presume the hon. member means that if there is ample security I should not object. I am not prepared to agree with that contention at all. The farmers should be prepared to meet their liabilities before making use of their money for the purchase of shares.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [10.25]: In dealing with this question during the course of the Address-in-reply, I pointed out that, in my opinion, this request was one of the most impertinent that had ever been placed before a Government. When farmers went to the Government and asked permission to allot money to be paid out of the 1919-20 wheat pool in order to purchase shares in the direction suggested, whereas at the same time they owed hundreds of thousands of pounds to the Government and private creditors, it was beyond my comprehension that such a thing could be put to any Government in any part of the world. I thought it was a little bit "over the odds." I thought they had gone to extremes. This is a very difficult Act to deal with because we have already two or three Bills dealing with the same subject and it is difficult to know whether we are over-reaching ourselves in any one Bill. We should not do so in this Bill at any rate as it is the crux of the other Bill which was introduced by the Premier last Friday. Let us review the matter for a few moments. Two years ago Parliament refused to grant permission for the erection of grain elevators. The Commonwealth Government offered to lend the

State Government money to build the elevators. The measure went through this Chamber, but another place refused to grant the permission for the erection of elevators. They pointed out, and very justly too, that owing to the war and the increased cost of machinery and buildings, this proposition would be a losing one for the Government and naturally, protecting, as they say they do, the interests of the State, they refused to pass the measure.

Mr. Johnston: And to-day the same elevators will cost half as much again.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: What is the position? We find that the general manager of the Westralian Farmers Ltd., Mr. Basil Murray, went to Melbourne.

Mr. Hickmott: There would have been a saving on the bags had the elevators been erected.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so. Farmers received more for their bags than it cost them. That was the evidence which was given before the Royal Commission. Mr. Keys, the manager of the local wheat scheme, pointed out in his evidence before the Commission that the sale of bags with wheat sent to America had realised more than they cost in Western Australia. He also pointed out that they got half the value of the bags in England. As I say, Mr. Murray went to Melbourne and was very successful in convincing the Prime Minister that he had a company known as the Co-operative Company. Then several gentlemen went around this State and tried to convince the farmers that there was such a company. They wanted to form a company after having got the ear of the Prime Minister, and they succeeded in convincing some of the farmers that there was such a company. Eventually the Bill was introduced into this Chamber. But some questions were asked by Mr. Sanderson in another place a little while ago as follows:—

1, Have the Western Australian Wheat Marketing Committee received any objection from farmers to a levy out of the wheat dividends for the benefit of the West Australian Graingrowers' Co-operative Elevators, Limited? 2, If so, what objections are advanced against the levy?

The replies given were—

1, Yes. 2, Various. With regard to (2) the objections include (a) shares in the company have been cancelled; (b) original applications for shares are alleged to have been made in error; or (c) have been withdrawn owing to inability to pay; or (d) involve other persons without their authority.

Those are the reasons given. Those persons had been led astray by the eloquence of some hon. members in this Chamber and other gentlemen outside the Chamber.

The Premier: When was that answer given?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On the 4th November, 1920. Those people were appealing to the Government to save them from the position in which they had been placed by

the eloquence of those who had addressed them. Mr. Murray went to Melbourne and induced the Prime Minister to grant him a loan of £550,000. The company is supposed to have a capital of £1,500,000 in 1,500,000 shares of £1 each. They were required to have 300,000 shares allotted prior to starting the works, the shares to be paid up to 10s., and the company had to spend £100,000 on the works before the Prime Minister would advance any money whatever. It was necessary to introduce a Bill in the Commonwealth Parliament to carry out the provisions of the agreement. Here are a copy of the Bill and a copy of the agreement. The true position was not placed before the Federal Parliament. The Federal Ministers were led astray. To prove my contention, let me say that when the Bill was before the Senate Senator Pratten asked this question—

Can the Vice-President of the Executive Council explain why the Western Australian Government have not anything to do with this scheme?

Senator Russell said—

The explanation is that they had not sufficient votes in the State Parliament. The scheme, however, is subject to the Parliament of that State giving full powers to the co-operative company which has been formed.

Then Senator Pratten commented—

If the Western Australian Ministry have not sufficient votes to secure the endorsement of the scheme, how can they expect the second one to be endorsed?

And Senator Russell replied—

They have not sufficient money and not sufficient power, probably because a number of their supporters regarded the scheme as being of too socialistic a character.

The Premier: Who gave Senator Russell that information?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I conclude that the gentleman who approached the Federal Ministers led them to believe that the Premier of this State had not sufficient votes to enable him to carry out a scheme of which he approved. What is the position? The Parliament of Western Australia refused the works, and now the promoters get behind the Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr. Johnston: You mean the Upper House refused.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Well, the Upper House is part of the Parliament of Western Australia. It was the country members of that House who threw it out. They realised that this was likely to be a millstone round their necks. Now the promoters want to get behind Parliament. They do not want Parliament to discuss the question of whether it is likely to be a payable proposition. They said to the Prime Minister, "Lend us the money to do it, and we will get it from the Government of Western Australia in another way." And they come along with this Bill and ask the Government of Western Aus-

tralia to advance to Industries Assistance Board clients 2d. per bushel. If a quarter of the wheat went through the Industries Assistance Board last year there is the full amount of £100,000 required to commence the works, the £100,000 paid by the Government of Western Australia; and the position will be that with the £100,000 of the Western Australian Government's money, which is owing to them, and the £500,000 from the Commonwealth, those who have this matter in hand will come along to the State Government and say, "You have £100,000 invested here. It will be impossible for us to carry on the work and have the buildings erected without Parliamentary sanction." We are going to erect public undertakings which will mean before completion two million or two and a half million. I say it is time to have it brought before Parliament in a straight and proper manner. I ask is it possible to handle wheat, even in an elevator, when the farmer has to pay for bags to take it to the siding, and when one-third of the wheat will have to be shifted in bags? The farmers will have to buy bags to send the wheat to the seaboard, and will have to pay the heavy cost of machinery with 6 per cent. or more as interest added. In these circumstances will it be possible to make of it a payable proposition? I say it is impossible at the present time, and those who formed this company know it. I hope that Parliament will see to it that not a fraction of State money is going into this company unless the Bill is brought down in a proper manner and unless the State takes control of the construction of the works.

The Premier: I will give you that undertaking.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I regret I cannot deal with matters contained in the other Bill, and that ties me to some extent. The Premier says he intends to protect the creditor in this Bill. Since it has been introduced I have endeavoured to get some information concerning it. If the Bill is passed, as I am told it is drafted to-day, and the Government carry out the intentions of the Bill, not the intentions of the Premier as stated to this Chamber, it will not be worth the paper it is printed on.

The Premier: Why?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier cannot advance 2d. per bushel on wheat unless the persons holding the wheat handle the certificates, and they cannot hand the certificates to the Minister if they are on the Industries Assistance Board—

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because they have not got the certificates to handle. The certificates are there as security for money already owing. They represent prior engagements before the introduction of this Bill.

The Premier: That is in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is not what the Premier told the Chamber.

The Premier: Yes, it is.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier said the manager of the Industries Assistance Board, with his approval, may grant the necessary permission to these people without their paying the Government.

The Premier: There are many who are in credit.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier said that there was nearly one million pounds outstanding at present. There may be some farmers in credit. The Government have no right, for the purpose of the formation of a company, to grant one sixpence under the Industries Assistance Act until the liabilities under that Act have been paid. We have nothing to do with those who are clear of the Act. There is no necessity for a Bill for these people. We have nothing to do with farmers who are outside the scope of the Act. We have to remember that for years this country has been going without the money necessary to pay for their land. For years the State has been going without the money necessary to pay the Agricultural Bank interest.

The Premier: No!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some of it has been paid, I admit, but the State's just dues in other matters, such as machinery, etc., which are owing to the Government for advances, have not been paid. We are paying a big staff for the purpose of looking after the interests of the State in this direction. We are doing wrong to build up a private company at this juncture whereby the funds of the State have to be used for this purpose.

The Premier: They cannot be used.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am of opinion that the only chance this company has in regard to their £100,000 is to get it out of the Government for the purpose of making a start, and when they have made a start there will be only Government money in the undertaking.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [10.44]: I congratulate the Government upon having brought this Bill forward.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have not taken legal advice on the matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It evidences a proper desire on the part of the Premier to assist in the establishment by co-operative companies of these grain elevators throughout the wheat districts of Western Australia. It is a great pity that the Bill which was introduced by the Honorary Minister (Mr. Baxter), some two years ago for the ratification of an agreement for the erection of silos throughout Western Australia with Federal money was rejected by the Upper House.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It saved this country scores of thousands of pounds.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I can hear the voice of the member for North-East Fremantle ringing in condemnation of the actions of the Upper House from time to time in jettisoning Bills which passed the people's Chamber.

I know of no worse action ever perpetrated by the Upper House than this failure to ratify that Bill.

The Premier: It would have been a waste of money at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot under this Bill pass strictures upon another place.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Had that Bill been approved by Parliament at that time it would not have been necessary for this company to come into existence for the erection of grain elevators in Western Australia. We would have had a large proportion of the work done at very much less expense than the company will now be able to do it for.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Just as they got it in Sydney. It cost thousands of pounds to put in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON: They have fine elevators in the wheat districts of New South Wales. I had the pleasure of seeing them, and it is that knowledge which makes me regret the failure of this Parliament to ratify the measure brought forward by the Government. Reference has been made to the work of Mr. Basil Murray in preparing the agreement with Mr. Hughes for the construction of these elevators. Mr. Murray has done no greater service for the producers of Western Australia than he performed in the making of that agreement. I doubt very much if there is anyone else in the State who could have secured so favourable an agreement from the Federal Government. The people of Western Australia have everything to gain by it.

Hon. P. Collier: Why?

Mr. JOHNSTON: And the State has nothing to lose.

Hon. P. Collier: If the Government have setled on the lines of equity and fair dealing that ought to have been conceded to anyone else beside Mr. Murray.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is so.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member says no one else would have got it but Mr. Murray.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Murray had to interest the Prime Minister in the undertaking.

Hon. P. Collier: In what way?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Murray had to show him the injury that the wheat grower of this State has sustained through the action of another place in rejecting a measure which was greatly to the interests of the Western Australian wheat grower.

Hon. P. Collier: The best way of interesting the Prime Minister would have been to show how to swing the Country party votes in his favour.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Mr. Murray would have no power to advance any argument of that kind.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss Mr. Murray on the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It would not have appeared to Mr. William Morris Hughes if that

argument had been advanced. The Federal Government have agreed to advance to the Western Australian Co-operative Grain Growers Elevators, Ltd., by way of loan, a subsidy of £2 for every £1 that the producers of Western Australia put into this movement. This is a matter which quite properly we might have expected the State Government to have undertaken, just as the State Government of New South Wales undertook not only the provision of silos two years ago but the provision of a complete system of handling grain in bulk by means of elevators.

Hon. P. Collier: It does not matter; you are getting it done by Government all the same.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is so, but under this measure the Federal Government are coming to the assistance of the producers of Western Australia, when through the actions of another place the State Government were prevented from carrying the work into effect.

Hon. P. Collier: The producers do not care so long as it is some Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The producers in this matter are self-contained. They are putting their own good money into it to the extent of £300,000.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not there yet.

Mr. JOHNSTON: And £100,000 of their own thrifty savings will be put into the construction of these elevators before the Federal Government advances are forthcoming. We can congratulate the wheat growers of Western Australia upon their sturdy spirit of self-reliance as evidenced by the fact that when the State measure failed to receive the approval of Parliament they got to work and decided to put their own money into it, and Mr. Hughes was good enough to say "Yes, I know it was not the fault of the men working in the backblocks of Western Australia that they were prevented from taking advantage of the provisions, which I offered to them—"

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Who was responsible for the Bill not passing?

Mr. JOHNSTON:—and for the benefit of the wheat growers of Western Australia I will loan the money to the Farmers' Co-operative Company on the basis of £2 for every £1 they put into the scheme."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Was it not the farmers' representatives who did not vote for the Bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am not here to hold a post-mortem examination on what happened at that time; I am here to express appreciation of the attitude of the Western Australian Government in bringing in this small measure to assist the self-reliant efforts of the co-operators in the wheat belt who are putting their own money into this affair without stint.

Mr. Brown: A profit-making investment, is it not?

Hon. P. Collier: Eight per cent.

Mr. JOHNSTON: In conjunction with Mr. W. D. Johnson and others, I have been

successful in my efforts in inducing farmers to take up shares.

Hon. P. Collier: You caught the unsophisticated farmer unawares.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The farmers knew what they were doing when they heard that the co-operative bulk handling scheme was being put forward with the imprimatur of the Western Farmers Ltd., and with the recommendation of such men as Mr. Basil Murray, Mr. W. D. Johnson and others. The farmers attended the meetings in large numbers, and in most of the localities that I visited they took up their full quota of shares practically to a man without any persuasion or pressure. Mr. Bath is also a director of the company. Wherever I went I found that the farmers needed little urging to take up shares. They came along determined to do their part to assist in the establishment of the bulk handling system in Western Australia by their own co-operative efforts. Every wheat grower in Western Australia should be in this movement to ensure its success, and for my own part I have doubts as to the scheme being fully successful unless all the wheat growers in every district are permitted to take up their full quota of shares where they desire to do so. Every settler who is working under the direction and with the assistance of the Industries Assistance Board should be allowed to come into this movement, provided, of course that his position is sound. It will be impossible to establish the elevators unless all the producers take their quota of shares.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Industries Assistance Board people cannot take up shares under this Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: They should be permitted to do so. Many of the farmers are working with the assistance of the chartered banks, and are being permitted, where their accounts justify it, to take up their fair quota of shares. Surely the farmer whose position is sound, whose property is mortgaged to the Agricultural Bank should not, in this respect, be placed at a disadvantage as compared with the settler whose property is mortgaged to a private bank.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Industries Assistance Act is not a banking Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is nevertheless a good Act and I hope the hon. member will assist to make it permanent. I understand that the Bill before us now has received the approval of the chartered banks who hold farmers' mortgages. I understand also that it meets with the approval of the wheat scheme, and also of the directors and members of the West Australian Grain Growers Elevators, Ltd. So that the main points this House would have to consider before passing the measure into law would be to see whether the interests of the farmers as well as the interests of the consumers are protected. So far as the interests of the farmers are concerned, we know that this, a farmers' own movement, that they will con-

trol the company, owning as they do all the shares in it. May I say that in this company no one except actual wheat growers are at present permitted to take shares. Those who are not wheat growers are not permitted at the present stage to become shareholders in the company. It will be seen, therefore, that this is in reality, as it is in name, a grain growers co-operative elevators company. In regard to the consumers, the company will be precluded, by its agreement with the Commonwealth Government, from dealing in grain. There is, therefore, no fear whatever of the elevators or silos being used to further the interests of any private party in any manner contrary to the public good, or of any monopoly in grain arising from the operations of this company. As showing the purely co-operative nature of the company, I point out that all profits above 8 per cent. made by the company will be divided amongst all the wheat growers who put their wheat into the elevators on the basis of grain that they have delivered. It will thus be seen that the company will be a good thing for the wheat growers, but those who are not shareholders in the company have their interests fully protected under an agreement made with Mr. Hughes, equally with the interests of those wheat growers who are shareholders. I support the second reading of the Bill and congratulate the Government on their action in having introduced it.

On motion by Mr. Chesson, debate adjourned.

MOTION—DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

On motion by the Premier the following Orders of the day were discharged from the Notice Paper:—

State Trading Concerns Act Amendment Bill, Second reading.

University of Western Australia Act Amendment Bill, Second reading.

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, Second reading.

Stallions Registration Bill, Committee progress.

Architects Bill, Second reading.

Rottneet Island Bill, Second reading.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th December, 1930.

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Question: Mining, Experimental Treatment Plant | 2382 |
| Standing Order, Suspension | 2382 |
| Assent to Bills | 2383 |
| Bills: Factories and Shops, report | 2385 |
| Meekatharra-Horseshoe Railway, Com. | 2385 |
| General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment, 1R. | 2391 |
| Land Act Amendment, 1R. | 2394 |
| Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Assembly's Amendments | 2394 |
| Railway Classification Board, Com. | 2394 |
| Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2R., Com. | 2397 |
| Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2R. | 2408 |

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

QUESTION—MINING, EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT PLANT.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Education: 1, What is the cause of the delay in erecting the experimental treatment plant at the School of Mines, Kalgoorlie? 2, Is it a fact that the building additions for the plant were completed last July? 3, Will the plant be ready for use when the school resumes after the New Year?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The matter has been expedited as much as possible. 2, The building was completed on the 17th August. 3, Every effort is being made in this direction and it is hoped and anticipated that it will be in readiness when the school re-opens.

STANDING ORDER SUSPENSION.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [3.3]: I move—

That Standing Order 62 be suspended for the remainder of the session.

This is the Standing Order which precludes the taking of fresh business after 10 o'clock. It has always been customary in the past to suspend this Standing Order on approaching the end of the session. It is not my desire that we should have late sittings, but when we come towards the close of the session it may be necessary to sit to a late hour. It never seems possible to reach finality without at least one late sitting.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [3.5]: It will be within the recollection of hon. members that about 10 days ago this same notice of motion appeared on the Notice Paper, and I took it upon myself to represent to the leader of the House that there were several members who found it disadvantageous to stay late at night, and I asked him to forego making use of the privilege under this Standing Order. He agreed