

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why did not you insist on nominating primary producers for the Albany Harbour Board? You would not give us your vote on that.

Hon. A. BURVILL: It was useless to insist upon something that the Minister and another place would not concede.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We are not concerned about another place.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Besides, I did not wish to endanger the Bill. I favour this concession to the workers provided similar consideration is given to the primary producers, but I have a decided objection to the primary producers being regarded as a female quadruped of the bovine species—

Hon. G. W. Miles: In other words, a milch cow.

Hon. A. BURVILL: And that the proper occupation for other people is to extract from it the lacteal fluid, and thus make a very lucrative occupation of it. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, and I hope the second reading will be carried, but in Committee certain amendments ought to be agreed to.

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

*House adjourned at 10 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 23rd November, 1926.*

	PAGE
Personal explanation: Mr Mann and the Arbitration Court	2324
Questions: Wheat production, Southern Cross	2326
Railway gauge unification	2325
South-West power scheme	2325
Annual Estimates: Report	2325
Assent to Bills	2325
Bills: Public Education Acts Amendment, 3B	2325
Legitimation Act Amendment, 3B	2325
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Report	2325
Royal Agricultural Society, 2A., Com. Report	2325
Dairy Cattle Compensation, 2A.	2329
Special Lease (Esperance Pine Plantation), Returned	2341
Public Works Act Amendment, 2A.	2341
Lake Brown-Bullfinch Railway, 2A.	2346
Expanding Northwards Railway, 2A., Com. Report	2347
Boyup Brook-Cranbrook Railway, 2A., Com. Report	2354

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

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*Mr. Mann and the Arbitration Court.*

MR. MANN (Perth) [4.32]: I desire to make a personal explanation. On Wednesday night last, when the Bill to amend the Education Act was before the Assembly, and while speaking in support of an amendment by the member for West Perth to permit legal practitioners to appear before the Teachers' Appeal Board, I referred to a statement made by the President of the Arbitration Court in the Tramways case, and said the court had reproved the secretary for the manner in which he had put the union's case. On the 29th September, when the case came before the court, Mr. Nash opened the proceedings. My statement was based on the following remarks of the President of the court:—

I think I am voicing the opinion of all the members of the court when I say that the phraseology of the claims requires very careful looking into, to see that what you have put down expresses what you want, and what you do want is clearly expressed. You will have time to examine these various clauses between now and Monday, and if there are amendments required, let us have them and give Mr. Thomas a copy.

Mr. Bloxsome followed on and said—

You have been working under an agreement drafted by somebody else, and you seem to have adopted customs not expressed in the agreement at all.

It may be suggested that I strained the meaning of the court's remarks in saying that Mr. Nash had been reproved. I was reported in the Press as having said that Mr. Nash was incapable of presenting the union's case. I did not make use of the word "incapable" that was attributed to me in the Press report, nor did I infer that he was incapable. I made no attack upon him whatever. My suggestion was that he was on an average with other lay advocates. My point was in regard to the principle that debars trained practitioners from appearing in the Arbitration Court. My contention was that if legal practitioners were permitted to appear and also to draft the claims to be presented to the court, it would be much better and would result in the saving of much time.

Mr. Panton: As a matter of fact, the claims were based on the words used by Mr. Canning.

The Minister for Works: Yes, and he was a lawyer.

### QUESTION—WHEAT PRODUCTION, SOUTHERN CROSS.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has the Department of Agriculture obtained any details of the best average production of wheat at Southern Cross? 2, If so, will the Minister give (a) the years these were obtained, (b) what were these acreages, (c) what was the area cropped?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No details are kept of the Southern Cross district separately, but the Government Statistician compiles returns of the Yilgarn district, which includes Southern Cross, and the statement hereunder will probably be interesting:—

Season.	Acres.	Bushels,	Average per acre (bushels).
1914-15	60	45	0.8
1915-16	111	1,089	9.8
1916-17	440	1,932	4.4
1917-18	532	5,410	10.2
1918-19	1,167	7,580	6.5
1919-20	740	4,665	6.3
1920-21	994	7,976	8.0
1921-22	1,160	9,130	7.9
1922-23	1,560	11,372	7.3
1923-24	1,849	11,493	6.2
1924-25	5,665	34,365	6.1
1925-26	20,690	86,907	4.2

### QUESTION—RAILWAY GAUGE UNIFICATION.

#### *Federal and State Obligations.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier: 1, Are the State Government in possession of any proposals by the Commonwealth Government regarding the conversion of the State railways to the standard gauge, subsequent to the report of the Royal Commission of 1921 and the paper of 1922? 2, In the event of the State Government adopting the proposals for a main trunk line between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, as set out in the paper of 1922, would it be incumbent upon the Commonwealth to construct a modern bridge over the Swan River free of direct cost to the State? 3, What is the estimated cost of Western Australia's contribution to this scheme? 4, What is the estimated cost of the work to be carried out in the State to give effect to the proposals? 5, What sum is proposed in the aforesaid estimate for the purpose of erecting the new bridge?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, It will be incumbent upon the Commonwealth to bear their proportion of cost of a modern bridge. 3, £1,078,103. 4, £5,030,000 (labour and material). 5, £253,000 for proportional cost of bridge for two lines 4ft. 8½in. gauge. This figure does not include cost of deviation or cost of resumption of land.

### QUESTION—SOUTH-WEST POWER SCHEME.

Mr. WILSON asked the Premier: Is it his intention to introduce a Bill this session to deal with the South-West electric power scheme at Collie?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1926-27.

Report of Committee of Ways and Means adopted.

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, City of Perth Act Amendment.
- 2, Guardianship of Infants.
- 3, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
- 4, Reserves.

### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Public Education Acts Amendment.
  - 2, Legitimation Act Amendment.
- Passed.

### BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

### BILL—ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 28th October.

MR. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [4.43]: I desire to briefly support the Bill. I am glad the Government have introduced the measure. It will be an excellent move to have all the agricultural societies in

the State affiliated with the Royal Agricultural Society and to have them placed on a better basis. Agricultural shows throughout the country areas play an important part. The days on which the shows are held are annual holidays in the particular districts concerned, and the shows themselves do a great deal to indicate the progress of agriculture in the several districts. They also demonstrate the splendid work done by the settlers on the land. As the settlers improve their holdings and introduce new ideas, together with better stock, the progress made is reflected in the agricultural shows that are held. There is no doubt that in Western Australia, as time goes on, we shall cultivate a great many more crops than we are doing to-day, and the agricultural societies throughout the country areas will play a still more important part in bringing about that very desirable condition of affairs, thus helping to make the State more self-contained. I am pleased that the Government have introduced this measure to give the Royal Agricultural Society legal control of the agricultural shows held in the State. That, I am sure, will be of benefit not only to the Royal Agricultural Society, but to the various important agricultural societies throughout the State, all of which are doing most excellent work in the directions I have indicated.

**MR. GRIFFITHS** (Avon) [4.45]: I wish briefly to support the Bill. I should not like it to go through its second reading without having something to say, because I have been particularly requested by the agricultural societies in my electorate, numbering six or seven, to support this measure. Those societies are fully in accord with the idea of bringing under proper control the various agricultural societies and of giving the Royal Agricultural Society a proper standing as regards the outside centres. For some time past there has been a desire in the country districts that a Bill of this description should be passed, and I am pleased indeed that it is now in a fair way to become the law of the land.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [4.46]: I join with other speakers in supporting the Bill. I am particularly interested in a number of small shows or exhibitions that are held from time to time. Provision has been included whereby it will be possible for an appeal to be made to the Minister in the event of the Royal Agricultural Society re-

fusing to register any society, club, or association. I feel confident that the controlling body will deal generously with the smaller organisations, the whole of which are carrying on most useful work. If we have control by a governing body, better results will be secured in return for the efforts put forth by those who constitute the agricultural societies of the State. Since the smaller organisations are to receive the protection that it is essential they should have, I support the second reading of the Bill.

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [4.48]: In supporting the Bill, let me express my pleasure that the Government have seen fit to introduce it, because it represents another form of preference to unionists, which is the policy of the present Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Now you have given the show away.

**MR. SLEEMAN**: This Bill amounts to nothing more or less than preference to unionists. It provides that no society shall hold a show unless it is registered with the Royal Agricultural Society. I have advocated registration for the workers; no man should be able to obtain a job unless he is a member of a union. The Bill provides that it shall be practically a crime for any society to hold a show without the sanction of the Royal Agricultural Society. If members opposite would carry that idea to its logical conclusion, we should not hear so much from them against the granting of preference to unionists. That is what we are adopting under this measure and the whole of the Opposition are supporting it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

**MR. SAMPSON**: What is intended by "pastoral products and livestock" mentioned in the definition of "agricultural show"?

The Minister for Agriculture: All products.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Bill refers to agricultural shows which include livestock, but not fruit shows.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is to be the principal object.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The definition reads—

“Agricultural show” means and includes any show having for its principal object the exhibition of agricultural or pastoral products and livestock including horses in action.

Where a society is registered, control will be exercised over all exhibits.

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Unless that is made clear, we shall fail in our intention. If a man transgresses, he will be subject to disqualification, notwithstanding that the exhibit may not be a bag of wheat, a fleece of wool, a horse or a cow. Any exhibit at the show will be included.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Agricultural products, whether fruit, vegetables or anything else of the kind, are products of the soil, and the term “pastoral” will embody whatever is not contained in the term “agricultural.”

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A fruit show could be held apart from this measure?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Fruit would be included in agriculture; we could not have fruit without agriculture. The definition includes everything.

Mr. Sampson: The popular meaning of agriculture is farming in the broader sense.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What is known as agriculture is production from the soil, and all commodities will be included.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Even flowers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Mr. Pantou: That is horticulture.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Horticulture is merely a term for certain cultivation, as also is viticulture.

Mr. Pantou: Will horticultural societies have to register under the Royal Agricultural Society?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot see why they should not.

Mr. Pantou: Then there will be a bit of opposition.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Horticulture is the cultivation of flowers, just as viticulture is the cultivation of grapes. I think the definition includes everything.

Mr. SAMPSON: The meaning of a term is often altered by common usage. In the popular sense agriculture applies to farm-

ing pursuits. A farm is usually regarded as a piece of land used for the production of cereal or fodder crops. I agree that “agricultural” means all forms of culture and would include fruit, flowers and all other products of the soil. Perhaps the Minister would agree to include the word “fruit” and so remove any possibility of misconception.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The inclusion of the word “fruit” is not necessary. The only shows referred to are those held at present by the various agricultural societies throughout the State. There are many other shows such as vegetable and fruit shows, as well as dog and poultry shows run by different organisations.

The Minister for Agriculture: Dog and poultry shows would not be included.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the Minister, when moving the second reading, led us to believe that other than agricultural shows would be included.

The Minister for Agriculture: I included fruit and vegetable shows.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But only where those products are exhibited at an ordinary agricultural show. We do not want to interfere with the horticultural shows.

Mr. Pantou: To do so would be ridiculous.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We do not want to interfere with the poultry shows.

Mr. Sampson: Poultry would come under the heading of live stock.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We should not overload the agricultural societies with a responsibility that it is not necessary for them to undertake; nor do we want to hinder those who are running other than agricultural shows. We ought to be certain what the definition includes. Some members are interested in other shows and I should like to know whether they wish fruit and flower shows to come under this Bill.

Mr. PANTON: I was surprised to hear the Minister say that this Bill will include all kinds of shows, including horticultural shows. I am a member of the Perth Horticultural Society, which meets every month, and I have not heard of any suggestion to affiliate with the Royal Agricultural Society. If the Royal Agricultural Society have a section for flowers, they seek the advice of the horticultural societies of Perth and Fremantle. There are numerous horticultural societies; the railway and tramway men have one, and there is one to be found in many suburbs as well as in almost every

town between Perth and Bunbury. If the Minister's contention is correct the Bill will mean that each of these small societies will be called upon to pay some unknown affiliation fee. Not one member of the Royal Agricultural Society committee that I know of is a member of a horticultural society. I may have to move an amendment to provide that horticultural societies, which have no money for affiliation fees, are not included in the Bill.

Mr. Griffiths: I do not think the Royal Agricultural Society would wish to control flower shows.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The clause might be allowed to pass. In the meantime I will inquire as to whether it does include horticultural societies. If I find that it does I will have the Bill recommitted.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: My personal opinion is that these other shows are not included in the Bill, but the Minister says he intends to include them.

The Minister for Agriculture: I said I thought the Bill included them.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We should not bring in these other shows. If the Minister will have the matter gone into, and will acquaint members with the result before we pass the third reading, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. BROWN: It would not be advisable to include in the Bill any large horticultural society. As a rule at country shows flowers and other exhibits are included in the general show. It would certainly be a mistake to bring large horticultural shows within the scope of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Registration of Agricultural Societies:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause is for the protection of exhibitors. When the Act is proclaimed everyone who exhibits at shows must do so in accordance with the catalogue. Too often that has not been done, but at present there is no body empowered to impose a penalty commensurate with the offence. If in future a person wins an award unfairly he can be disqualified.

Mr. Sleeman: The Bill gives the Minister power to override the governing bodies.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Only in a limited way, and as it affects registration. The Bill is for the benefit of those who do

well, and enables a penalty to be inflicted on those who do ill. Without this power the transgressor may go unpunished.

Mr. Hughes: Do you not think the person dealt with should have a right of appeal against the Committee?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The clause is well drafted. We are not giving preference to anyone, but are seeking to protect those who exhibit at shows.

Mr. SAMPSON: I see no reference in the clause to representation being granted to the affiliated or registered agricultural shows. The Minister might agree to the following proviso:—"Provided that every registered agricultural show shall be granted representation on the council of the Royal Agricultural Society."

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think that is provided for in Clause 6, which includes delegates from all agricultural societies.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Swan merely suggested the proviso; he did not move its insertion.

Mr. SAMPSON: Clause 6 contains a reference to delegates of registered agricultural societies, but not, so far as I can see, any provision for their appointment. Consequently, the admission of representatives of the various registered shows would not be obligatory on the Royal Agricultural Society.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The suggested proviso is unnecessary in view of the fact that nothing can be done as to rules or methods of government except with the consent of the affiliated societies.

Mr. Panton: Where are the delegates under Clause 6 obtained from?

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** For the purposes of the measure, the State is divided into six districts, which will send delegates.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Bill has been carefully drafted by the Parliamentary Draftsman in consultation with the Minister and the agricultural societies. It is one of the few measures of the session that seem fairly clear. There may be a delegate from every registered agricultural society to sit on even terms with the council of the Royal Agricultural Society for the purpose of framing by-laws. It would be a pity to introduce unnecessary words into legislation of this kind. The desire of the

member for Swan has been anticipated by the Minister.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not know that we are justified in giving so much power to the Royal Agricultural Society. However, the Minister has the final say after the Royal Agricultural Society. In my opinion there is not so much justification for the Bill as the Minister suggested when moving the second reading. Apparently the argument is that a man who does wrong at a small show cannot now be dealt with by the Royal Agricultural Society if he happens to be a member of that society, and that if the small societies are amalgamated with the Royal Agricultural Society the wrong action of such a man at a small show would be a wrong action affecting the Royal Agricultural Society. It is possible now for the Royal Agricultural Society to say to such a man, "As you have done something wrong outside, you shall not have an opportunity of doing wrong here."

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: The Bill is the outcome of a general desire throughout the State that the Royal Agricultural Society should control the position. Clause 6 provides for an annual conference of delegates from all over the State to make by-laws. The Bill is necessary, and is in conformity with the wishes of the small agricultural societies. I commend the Minister for having brought the measure down.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## **BILL—DAIRY CATTLE COMPENSATION.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.30]: I support the second reading. The lot of the dairy farmer calls for much sympathy and help. It entails laborious and never-ending toil. The dairy farmer, more perhaps than any other worker in a primary industry, has to look ahead. Many weeks before actually needing it, he must prepare pasture.

The Minister for Lands: I wish he could do it in a few weeks.

Mr. SAMPSON: It means a number of weeks, at all events. When all in that way has been done, the dairy farmer frequently finds himself the victim of unscrupulous middlemen. Evidence shows that in this State there have been many instances of dairy farmers being treated most unfairly. The pure satisfaction that come to most members of the community. He has no opportunity to enjoy social recreation and he has little, if any, time for reading. Indeed, so long are the hours he has to work that it is questionable whether his physique would stand up to reading or recreation. He goes to bed very early indeed in the evening, because he has to rise long before the dawn. Every day, week after week and month after month, his place is on the farm.

The Minister for Lands: You are showing good reasons why a man should keep out of dairying.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the truth were told about dairying, not many would enter upon that avocation. But the Bill is designed to improve the lot of the dairyman, and so I will support it. It has been said that very few dairymen encourage their sons to take up the avocation. I doubt whether the Minister for Lands, if starting out again, notwithstanding his knowledge of pastures and his interest in dairying, would venture to take up this work for a livelihood. In the "West Australian" of 29th October we had this evidence by Mr. John Rankin, a dairy farmer of Victoria—

I say that no man can get a return on the capital invested. I have not paid any income tax in respect of my dairying operations for five years. I have made a loss. I paid income tax as the result of my receiving various fees in connection with the bodies with which I am connected. Only one of my four sons has stayed on the land. The others, acting largely on my advice, have taken up other occupations. I told them to obtain a position at work that was more profitable than dairy farming. I was compelled to retain one son on the farm, as I was away so much attending to other public duties.

He put forward an apology for having retained even one son at this work. The Bill does not go far enough. It makes provision for compensation to owners of dairy cattle afflicted with tuberculosis and actinomycosis. Those two diseases are communicable to human beings. It is acknowledged by scientists and those qualified to speak medically that tuberculosis can be communicated in milk. As a matter of fact, milk is one

of the most readily susceptible of all foods, providing a ready host for germs. Consequently it is of the utmost importance that tubercular dairy cattle should not be allowed to provide milk for human consumption. Nevertheless it is suspected that tubercular cattle have been slaughtered for food. That, of course, is a startling statement to make. Having turned up an authority on the subject, I say the slaughtering of tubercular cattle for food is equally dangerous with the passing into consumption of milk from tubercular cows. Tuberculous deposits may remain occult for years and then suddenly flare up. That is the evidence of a well-known scientist. Another contagious disease to which cattle are subject is pleuro-pneumonia. Fortunately, cattle in Western Australia are not very prone to this disease. Still, cattle brought from the Eastern States have been proved to be affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and as a result dairymen in this State have suffered. Legislation that would protect the dairymen from losses in respect of these several diseases should receive very serious consideration. One or more meetings have been held by dairymen recently. Whilst those meetings may not have been fully representative of the industry, the matters discussed were of paramount interest. Those meetings, and a deputation with which I was associated that waited on the Minister some months ago have been, I believe, largely responsible for the bringing down of this measure, for which I thank the Minister for Agriculture. Legislation providing compensation to dairymen for the loss of cattle suffering from contagious diseases is necessary in the interests of the public health. The Bill recognises the responsibility of the public to bear some portion of the expense resulting from these dread diseases. It must be remembered that the better and more prolific the milker, the more liable is she to tuberculosis. The dairy cow has been developed to so high a stage of productivity that the other organs of the animal have become weakened, so leaving her prone to contract tuberculosis. Nature never intended that a cow should be so highly developed as a milker. I understand that one gallon of milk per day is ample sustenance for a calf; yet under modern dairying conditions cows will produce five gallons and six gallons and even more, per day. The drying-off of a tubercular cow gives her an opportunity to recover. Many instances of recovery have been reported as the result of this simple

treatment. We know that even in the human family many recoveries from tuberculosis have been achieved. I repeat that the responsibility of bearing the loss resulting from the destruction of cows afflicted with tuberculosis should be borne by the community. The provision of a pure milk supply is of first-class importance. At present, if a cow is suspected of being tubercular, an inspector orders her destruction. If the carcase be found to be only partly affected, the affected portions are thrown aside, but the remainder passes into consumption. Not every dairyman can afford to lose even one cow, and when several in the herd show signs of tuberculosis, I am informed it sometimes happens that the cows are slaughtered in the bush and the meat passed into consumption. That, of course, is because at present no compensation is provided, and in the event of, say, animals becoming affected, the dairyman has to bear the loss. It is a loss that should be borne by the community; or to an extent compensation should be paid out of an insurance fund and from funds partly, if not wholly, provided from Consolidated Revenue. In Victoria there is what is termed a Cattle Compensation Act, which was passed in 1924. The object of that Act is the eradication of disease in cattle. That I believe to be an impossibility. In Victoria the annual average number of cattle suffering from tuberculosis is 300, from actinomycosis 350, and from pleuro pneumonia 700, while of pleuro pneumonia contacts approximately 1,000 head are discovered at the abattoirs to be suffering from tuberculosis. In Victoria there is a charge of one penny in the pound on the declared or selling value of the cattle. By this means a compensation fund is provided. This applies to all cattle throughout the State. The tax is exclusively levied on cattle sold, but that to me seems to be a very inequitable way of doing things.

The Minister for Agriculture: We could not do that in this State because of its scattered nature.

Mr. SAMPSON: I notice the Minister limits the operation of the Bill not only to dairy cattle, but to such areas as are proclaimed. In Victoria the Act applies to all cattle, including bulls, cows, oxen, steers and heifers, or calves, and the term "disease" means any addition to tuberculosis, actinomycosis, pleuro pneumonia contagiosa. The cattle must be registered; that is a *sine qua non* in connection with the Victorian Act. I sent a telegram to Victoria to ascertain what

amount of money had been found with which to provide compensation and for other particulars, and the reply I received was as follows:—

Compensation payable for cattle destroyed is seven-eighths assessed value if diseased fully; not diseased, maximum twenty-five pounds. Amount paid since proclamation from compensation fund contributed wholly by cattle owners twenty-three thousand five hundred pounds; amount contributed from Government funds to pay forty per cent. of compensation respecting tuberculosis and actinomycosis eight thousand eight hundred pounds. Reserve in compensation fund £17,500.

The Victorian Minister for Agriculture was good enough to let me have that information. It shows that notwithstanding the comparatively low tax, the fund is ample for the purpose, and the reserve is very large.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not a penny compensation is paid for pleuro.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am hoping the Minister will agree to add pleuro pneumonia to the diseases mentioned in the Bill. It is a most contagious disease and when it spreads, plays havoc amongst the stock. Dairy cattle suffering from pleuro pneumonia have been received in this State, and in order that complete protection may be given to the dairymen, the Minister should agree to include the disease in the Bill. In Victoria the maximum compensation is £25, in which case the sum of 2s. 1d. per head would be payable on the sale of the cattle. Not every animal is worth £25 or anything like that amount. On the other hand, there are dairy cows that are worth up to £30. In the Bill it is obvious that the compensation provided for is not altogether an insurance; it goes some distance towards that object, but it is not 100 per cent. effective. The value of a cow is limited to £15 less 10 per cent., so that the full amount of insurance which could be secured for the most valuable dairy bull or cow would be £13 10s.

The Minister for Agriculture: In Victoria the amount is £25 less ten per cent.

Mr. SAMPSON: It seems to me that the Bill is not wholly for the protection or for the insurance of dairymen. I realise that the public suffer when the position is as it is at present, or are liable to suffer when cows are apparently suffering from tuberculosis and have not been condemned and, to use a colloquialism, may be killed to save their lives. The amount of £13 10s. would provide as big a return as any animal could possibly fetch if sold for butcher's meat. I suggest that the Minister agree to increase

the amount to £25 according to the value of the animal, which value would of course be declared when registration was effected. Even if the value appeared to be high, it would be possible to make an examination of the animal and fix the amount at what was considered equitable. The prevention of the unloading of diseased meat on the public is of the first importance, and for that purpose alone, the Bill has much virtue. But there is the other matter, and that is the insurance which the Bill sets out to provide for dairymen. The Bill stops short of giving that full insurance to which the dairyman is entitled. It will be said, possibly, that the killing of cattle in the bush is illegal, but startling rumours are heard occasionally of this being done and the meat being disposed of illegally. The Bill is limited to dairy cattle, and that being so, the compensation to be provided should be sufficient for those dairymen who lose the whole or a part of their herds. The measure should go further, and in addition to tuberculosis and actinomycosis, there should be consideration in respect of pleuro pneumonia and possibly rinderpest. I do not propose to press the rinderpest aspect because it is extremely unlikely that that disease will again make its appearance in Western Australia. I do not know what amount the Minister proposes to levy for the registration of cattle. It is, I take it, a definite amount for the first year, and afterwards it is to be varied as circumstances warrant. I hope that the Bill will pass both Houses; it is in the interests not only of dairymen but the public, that it should do so. It is important that we should have a pure milk supply, and it is due to owners of herds that they should have the advantage of compensation. Further, since the public require a pure milk supply, they should bear a portion of the expense of maintaining healthy herds. I regret that the Bill does not go further, and I am hopeful that in Committee the Minister will agree to add pleuro pneumonia, and to increase the amount of compensation from £15 less 10 per cent. to £25 less 10 per cent. I support the second reading.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [0.0]: I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. I congratulate the Minister on having introduced a measure that will extend some measure of justice to those interested in the dairying industry. When moving the second reading of the Bill the Minister said it was proposed to restrict the



operations of the Bill to the metropolitan area for the time being, and he also pointed out that on 6,000 dairy cattle estimated to be in that area, the payment of 2s. per head would amount to £600, which the Government proposed to subsidise up to £300. With the advantage of such a fund, the position of the dairyman will be improved. It furnishes a recognition of the principle that if, in the interests of the community as a whole, dairy cattle have to be slaughtered, the dairymen concerned are entitled to some compensation. I regret that the provisions of the Bill are not more liberal. The dairyman who may be unfortunate enough to encounter trouble with his herd may be a most careful man. He may look after his cattle splendidly; he may house them well; he may give them every care and attention possible. If his cattle contract diseases dealt with in the Bill and they have to be slaughtered in the interests of the community as a whole, then the community should not penalise the individual. I suggest to the Minister that he consider the advisability of amending the Bill so that an unfortunate dairyman placed in the position I have described, shall receive compensation to the extent of the full value of the cattle destroyed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You must state what the value of the cattle may be.

Mr. THOMSON: I know that. A subclause of Clause 5, which deals with compensation to owners, reads as follows:—

The value of any cattle so destroyed shall be determined by agreement between the owner and the inspector under whose authority such cattle were destroyed; and in default of such agreement the value shall be determined by some competent and impartial person nominated by the Minister, and the determination of such person shall be final and conclusive.

That subclause is fair enough but I do not think it is quite just to set out in the proviso to that subclause that "in no case shall the value as so determined of one head of any cattle exceed £15." Nor do I think it fair that the owner of the cattle should be penalised to the extent of 10 per cent. of the value of the cattle destroyed. A dairyman may have some very fine cows. As the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) has pointed out, very often the best cattle are those that show traces of disease. When the inspector examines the herd, the infected cattle are slaughtered and yet the dairyman can receive 90 per cent. only of the value agreed upon respecting the cows that have been killed.

The Minister for Lands: They get nothing now.

Mr. THOMSON: I know that. I have already said that the Bill represents a measure of justice to the dairymen and have congratulated the Government upon introducing it. I am pointing out that we should be just to the fullest extent possible, and the man who is making his living from dairying should be compensated to the full extent of the value of the cows slaughtered in the interests of the community. To limit the compensation to £15 per cow is to fix too low a figure, especially as that amount is subject to a 10 per cent. reduction. Cattle supplied to the group settlers have cost more than £15 per head.

The Minister for Lands: Some of them have cost more.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, and as I have already pointed out, it is unfortunate that the most costly animals are often those attacked by disease. I hope the Minister will consider a proposal to pay 100 per cent. compensation. Even that would not recoup the dairyman, because he might not be able to replace the slaughtered cows with animals that were equally prolific as pail-fillers. On the general principles underlying the Bill, I congratulate the Government on extending at least a small measure of justice to the dairymen. We recognise that the dairymen themselves are to provide the larger proportion of the fund. I would like to go further than the Bill does, and provide that where animals were slaughtered in the interests of the community, the people generally should bear the whole cost and there should be no charge upon the owner of the dairy herd. When placing the Bill before the House, the Minister said that it provided something in the nature of an insurance scheme, and I dare say that the dairymen appreciate the action of the Government in introducing the measure from that point of view. At the same time I do not think the dairymen should be losers to the extent of even 10 per cent. A dairyman may lose half his herd. In that event 10 per cent. off the maximum compensation allowed per animal would represent a big loss to that man, particularly in view of the additional fact that the dairyman may run the risk of losing his milk round as well. To retain his round, it will be necessary for such a dairyman to purchase milk for his customers until such time as he can replace the slaughtered cows. In that event the dairyman will be confronted with a considerable loss before he is able to

recover his position. I hope the Minister will agree to amend the Bill along the lines I suggest. The Government will be protected in view of the provision that the value of the cattle destroyed has to be determined by agreement or by an impartial arbitrator. No doubt advantages will be taken of the compensation fund.

**MR. MILLINGTON (Leederville) [6.10]:** The Bill is the outcome of representations of stock owners themselves. The necessity for making provision for compensation was brought home to them by the activities of the Agricultural Department last year when a somewhat rigorous inspection was made of the dairy herds in the metropolitan area. As a result, a number of valuable dairy cows were destroyed. I was asked to attend a meeting of stock owners in my electorate. They were naturally incensed and panic stricken owing to the action taken by the stock inspectors.

**Mr. Thomson:** It was a serious loss to the stock owners.

**Mr. MILLINGTON:** Of course. Those people depended upon their herds for a living. It was not only the value of their living that was affected; their assets, on which they depended, were depleted. It is hard to value stock of that description, from which people secure their livelihood. In one instance the stock owner had a small herd, including two valuable cows. Those particular cows had to be destroyed. Whereas the lady in question was able to make a living out of her original herd, it was impossible to make a living with the loss of the two valuable cows I have mentioned. Naturally, the dairymen became anxious, and they approached the Minister with a deputation urging that the Government should compensate owners for stock that were destroyed. When we put the request before the Minister, he stated that there was no fund available from which the stock owners could be compensated. After we had discussed the matter for some time, the Minister promised to consider the establishment of a contributory insurance scheme. The Bill before the House is the result of that discussion. It has to be recognised that this scheme is an experiment. I could propose a more generous measure of assistance than is outlined in the Bill. From my association with the stock owners, however, I am not sure that they would be in favour of more generous provisions. They were

opposed to the principle of contributory insurance. When the proposal was advanced by the Minister at the outset, I did not know how the stock owners would accept it. They took the view that they should receive more compensation.

**Mr. Sampson:** There is a lot in that too.

**Mr. MILLINGTON:** I realise that the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) and others can suggest a lot of trimmings to the Bill. The fact remains that the Government with which they were associated gave no consideration to this question at all. Now the Bill is before us they can show quite easily how it can be improved, provided funds are available.

**Mr. Sampson:** We were not asked for a Bill.

**The Minister for Lands:** Yes, you were.

**Mr. MILLINGTON:** I do not know what authority the member for Swan has for suggesting the inclusion of pleuro pneumonia; the stock owners do not consider it should be included within the scope of the Bill. Those people have to pay for the insurance, and they desire to safeguard themselves from diseases most likely to affect their herds.

**Mr. Sampson:** Pleuro pneumonia has made its appearance among the dairy cattle.

**Mr. MILLINGTON:** The stock owners say they desire to be insured against the worst types of diseases from which they are liable to suffer, such as tuberculosis and lumpy jaw. Dairy cattle have had to be destroyed because they were suffering from those particular diseases. The dairymen have now overcome their objection to contributory insurance, and have accepted the Bill as it has been presented to the House. It may be said that the obligation to insure is on the owner, but in this instance there are circumstances that justify a certain amount of the insurance being paid by the State. That justification arises from the fact that stock have been destroyed not only to prevent the spread of diseases among the herds, but in the interests of the health of the community. We managed to satisfy the Minister, who was most sympathetic, that if the public were to be protected from possibilities arising from the diseases in question, the people could be justifiably called upon to pay a proportion of the insurance money. I am pleased with the reception accorded the measure in this Chamber.

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

Mr. MILLINGTON: When we are introducing a principle that previously has not been recognised in this State, the dairymen are justified in asking that additional caution be exercised. There are dairymen who regard the measure in the nature of an experiment and hope that in the future its operation may be extended, but for the present this is as far as they care to go. I attended meetings of the dairymen and that is their desire. If we go further the registration rate must be increased, and the dairymen are not prepared to launch out further in that direction. Consequently, the Government have met the wishes of the dairymen in respect to the diseases to be included. I believe this measure will have the effect of improving the dairy herds from a health point of view. In the past there has been a disposition on the part of dairymen to resent inspection by the departmental officials. One can quite understand that. It has been suggested that the tuberculin test is not as effective as could be desired. Some owners insist that cows that have been condemned and afterwards slaughtered have been found to be not suffering from tuberculosis. Cows suffering from lumpy jaw have been destroyed and some dairymen contend that only the head of the beast was deleterious to health, and that the carcase could have been used for human consumption. Dairy cattle at the time were worth £20 a head and after the expenses had been paid, some owners found themselves with a debit, because they received nothing for the carcase. When members suggest that a rate of compensation higher than £15 should be fixed, I reply that the dairymen have discussed the question and are satisfied with that amount. One of them even remarked that £15 was a pretty good price for a tubercular cow.

Mr. Sampson: This Bill introduces the principle of providing compensation.

Mr. MILLINGTON: But when we provide for insurance the dairymen have to pay for it, and it is not proposed to insure the beasts to their full value. Therefore the maximum has been fixed at £15, which I believe is satisfactory to the owners. If a higher rate is fixed, a higher registration fee will be necessary, and the dairymen are not prepared to pay it. I believe the Bill will have the effect of greatly improving the health standard of the dairy herds, because there will no longer be any disposition to prevent inspection by the officials. The

dairymen even went to the extent of suggesting that the department were unduly active at the time in question. Some of them suggested in my presence that it was not so during the regime of the previous Government. When this fact was mentioned to the Minister for Agriculture he replied, "Well, if previous Governments did not insist on a thorough inspection, it is a serious reflection upon them."

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They made fuss enough about it at the time.

Mr. MILLINGTON: They made fuss enough about it to me. I could not suggest that the departmental officials should slow down in the matter of inspection, and since it was proposed that inspection be compulsory and infected cattle be destroyed, the only way out of the difficulty was to provide a scheme of insurance. The one method by which insurance could be introduced was to make registration compulsory in a given district; otherwise the owners least able to bear loss would probably be the ones which would fail to insure. The dairymen are satisfied that it would be well to start with a given district. The request for the measure came from a dairyman in the metropolitan area. The Bill will necessitate no additional expense in the matter of inspection. The present staff will be able to inspect the stock, and the department will be able to administer the Act. Naturally we do not wish to build up a big and expensive department that will eat into the funds supplied by way of registration fees towards an insurance scheme. I believe that the dairymen are satisfied that this measure should be passed in its present form. As mentioned by the Leader of the Country Party, there is certainly a request that its scope should be extended to other districts, and there is nothing in the measure to prevent that being done.

Mr. Sampson: No particular district is specified.

Mr. MILLINGTON: It would be well to organise one district thoroughly for a start. The Bill provides for rigid inspection when a sale of stock takes place. If one district is made subject to the measure and is cleaned up, the measure can then be extended to other districts. If an attempt were made to apply it wholesale to all the districts that supply milk to the metropolitan area, there would be no chance of securing adequate inspection within a reasonable time. It is only

right to confine the scope of the Bill to a specific area, and when that district has been cleaned up the measure can be extended to other districts that desire its provisions to apply to them. The suggestion that in the Eastern States similar legislation was applied generally is correct. For all that we are asking that it be applied here in an entirely different manner. The stock owners have not asked that it be applied wholesale, and therefore it will be applied to districts whence urgent requests for it have been received. I do not wish to speak on the state of the industry; that has not much to do with the question. Let us establish the principle that whereas ordinarily the obligation would rest on the owner to insure his stock, special circumstances justifying a subsidy by the Government have been shown. I presume there will be some opposition to the Bill, but all things considered the fact that it is designed to protect the public justifies its introduction and the assistance that it is proposed the State should afford to this insurance scheme. Although I should like to see insurance provided on a bigger and perhaps more generous scale, in view of all the circumstances and the fact that it is a contributory scheme, we may well be satisfied with this measure for the time being, knowing that the people particularly concerned are satisfied that we should not go further at present. There will be nothing to prevent the Government from extending the operation of the measure, or enlarging it with respect to the maximum amount. For the present, however, those concerned are satisfied that the Bill should be passed as printed. I congratulate the Government on the sympathy they have shown to the stock owners who requested this legislation, and I think it can be said that the stock owners of the metropolitan area are prepared to support it, believing it is the most satisfactory measure that could be introduced at this juncture and the utmost that they can finance. The fact that many outside districts have requested that the measure should be extended shows that the principle is sound and will be beneficial to the industry. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mt. Margaret) [7.41]: I do not intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. Having heard the remarks of the member for Leederville (Mr.

Millington), as well as the speech of the Minister for Agriculture in moving the second reading, it seems to me that the dairymen in the metropolitan area at least have discussed the matter with the department and are satisfied with the measure. The member for Leederville, who represents a district containing a large section of the dairy herds that supply the metropolitan area, has told us in unmistakable language that he has attended meetings and deputations of the dairymen at which the merits and demerits of the Bill have been discussed. We have it from him that the dairymen are perfectly satisfied with the measure and that it should be passed as a sort of experiment. As to the contributions to the fund, three-fifths by the dairymen and two-fifths by the Government, the member for Leederville says the dairymen are perfectly agreeable.

**Mr. Thomson:** It is the principle at stake. It might affect the whole of the State.

**Hon. G. TAYLOR:** The Leader of the Country Party remarks that there is a principle at stake that might affect the whole of the cattle owners and cattle raisers in the State. From the remarks of the Minister and from my reading of the Bill, I conclude that the measure is designed as a protection to the dairy herds so that the public may be safeguarded against getting milk from tubercular cows.

**The Minister for Agriculture:** The Stock Diseases Act gives power to protect the public.

**Hon. G. TAYLOR:** But not to confiscate diseased cattle.

**The Minister for Agriculture:** The Stock Diseases Act gives power to ensure a pure milk supply.

**Hon. G. TAYLOR:** But no consideration is given to the owner of a diseased beast. This measure will provide for remuneration in respect of a beast that is slaughtered on account of suffering from tuberculosis.

**The Minister for Agriculture:** That is an entirely new principle.

**Hon. G. TAYLOR:** Certainly it is in this State, though it is not new in other parts of the Commonwealth. The question is whether, in view of the protection that will be ensured to the metropolitan milk supply, the contribution by the owners of the beasts is not rather high. That, however, is a matter for consideration in Committee. The Bill says they have to contribute three-fifths, and the Government two-fifths. We know there will be some difficulty if the Bill is

extended beyond the dairy herds. We are discussing this matter purely from the point of view of remuneration to those who are the first people to be affected, namely, the dairymen in the metropolitan area, and in all probability some other parts where it is well known to the department that infected cows exist. If a farmer has a cow on his farm for his own requirements, it is unlikely the Government will send an inspector miles into the bush to look at the animal. That surely will not come about for some time. The fears of the leader of the Country Party need not, therefore, be considered very much at present.

Mr. Thomson: There are numerous dairy herds in the country.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am prepared to accept an extension of the powers contained in the Act to dairy herds, wherever they may be.

The Minister for Agriculture: All dairy herds are affected now under the Stock Diseases Act, but we have no power to compensate.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is right there should be power to compensate. The member for Katanning is afraid that the remuneration will come from the stock owners to a greater extent than it will from the Government. I believe, however, it is not the intention of the Minister to put the Bill into force all over the State.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It will be put into force in some districts that will embrace the metropolitan area?

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The people in the country need not worry, for I do not think the Act will be applied to them.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You cannot help applying it all over the place.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Minister will have power to say where it shall be applied. It will take at least two years to clean up the metropolitan area. If the departmental officers do the work in that time, they will do well.

The Minister for Agriculture: Inspections have already been made in the country under the Stock Diseases Act.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But the Bill will not be put into operation to too great an extent to begin with.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Leader of the Country Party need not have any fears upon that score.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [7.43]: The inspection of dairy herds has been going on for years. As long ago as 1909 or 1910 Mr. Titus Lander was very much in evidence. We all remember his expression "put the boot in."

The Minister for Agriculture: For some years the matter was neglected, but that was not due to the Minister's fault.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There were always inspections under the Stock Diseases Act.

The Minister for Agriculture: But they were not carried out for some years.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think they were. There was enough fuss about them. The Bill is to compensate owners for cattle destroyed. We are asked to provide compensation, the fund for which will be contributed to by the owners as a sort of insurance. In the early stages, the cleaning up of infected cattle will mean considerable outlay, but after a while the outgoings will become less. There may be an accumulation of diseased cattle which has escaped the notice of the inspectors. It is not always easy to detect the presence of disease. The dairying industry cannot be overvalued. It is usual for some members to talk about the awful work involved in this industry or that industry. All work that can be avoided may be counted as awful work by those who do not wish to engage in it. We cannot escape work. We probably shall not escape it in this Chamber until a late hour to-night. The dairying industry is a most valuable one to Australia.

Hon. G. Taylor: And a necessary one.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In Victoria there are a million and a half cattle, a large proportion of which are dairy cattle. They slaughter there nearly half a million head of cattle a year. In this State we have nearly a million cattle, of which 61,000 are dairy cattle, and we slaughter less than 90,000 a year. Our cattle are on stations, and are not kept in small numbers by dairy farmers or small holders. In Victoria 33 per cent. of the total number of cattle held are slaughtered each year. This shows the value of the dairying industry. In our case probably only 7½ per cent. of our total holding of cattle are slaughtered.

The Minister for Agriculture: We slaughter more sheep here.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In Victoria  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million sheep are slaughtered annually, and the population is five times greater than ours. We have not more cattle to slaughter. If we had, they would be exported. The works at Wyndham are not over-supplied. We cannot get all the cattle we could kill. Dairying is a very valuable industry to the State. Although it is unfortunate that the industry ties down those that are engaged in it, because a cow must be milked once in 12 hours, it is of great importance to the whole State. It brings in that weekly cheque which a man must have when he possesses small means. It is the weekly cheque that makes the industry workable. Let us face the position. We do not want to force people to engage in it unless they desire to do so, but let us encourage them to do so. Since 1919, 20,000 cows have been added to our dairy herds, so that we have 50 per cent. more cows in five years than we had. That is not a bad record for Western Australia. Unfortunately we have not added 50 per cent. to our population in the same time. We need not face the industry squirming and squealing about the awfulness of it, but as one that is regarded as valuable the world over. In the United States the dairy herds last year brought in more money than all the wheat and all the potatoes grown there. Dairying is practised everywhere, as a rule in small herds. If the herds are kept fairly small, there will be a large number of people engaged in the business. In Victoria the average per farm is about 11 cows. One person can milk that number, but generally there is more than one person on a farm, which makes life easier for all. In Victoria nearly three-quarters of a million cows are milked, and yet they can slaughter 33 per cent. of the total cattle held. The value of the industry lies in the butter and cheese produced from it. The report of the dairying industry in Australia is most interesting. It is a great misfortune that in this State we should be milking only 61,000 cows out of a total of 2,300,000 milked in Australia. Of Australia's wheat area we have nearly a quarter in our State, but we have only  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the dairy cattle in Australia, equal to about one-fortieth of the whole. That disparity must be removed. There is great wealth in the in-

dustry for many people. There is no reason why we should not aim at milking as many cows as are milked in Victoria. Victoria is only a fraction of the size of this corner of Western Australia. We have, therefore, something to look forward to in the industry here. Let us look at the industry as if we wanted it fostered. Do not let us begin by sympathising profoundly with everyone who is engaged in it, but let us give our dairy people decent cows, decent land, in a decent way, and ask them to respond. This Bill may be regarded as an insurance. The owners are asked to contribute rather too much, namely three-fifths of the total amount of compensation to be paid. There ought to be some provision whereby the Minister is able to pay compensation out of some fund established for the purpose, this to be repaid over a few years. Obviously, since no compensation has been paid up to now, the greatest crop of claims will come in the first year. The Bill will be confined to districts declared by the Minister. He should tell us what he means by that. The Bill ought to be applied to districts that ask for it, and to the people that ask for protection. Every cow in the declared districts must be registered. That would be a nuisance to the owners. If a man is not selling milk, why should he do this? Suppose Northam were a declared district, and the surrounding farms were taken in? Then every man with a cow there would have to go to the trouble of registering, and would have to pay a fee. The bother of making out returns and sending them is in itself more than people would care to undertake, particularly as they will not be so keen on compensation if they are not milk sellers. The member for Leederville (Mr. Millington) says that the Bill has been asked for by the people of the metropolitan area, and is intended to apply to them. No one has said to me that he or she wants or does not want the Bill. However, the Minister would not bring down a measure of this sort, requiring the owners to contribute three-fifths of the compensation by way of a special tax on their cows, unless those owners had asked for it. Still, the measure covers the whole of the State if the Minister by proclamation so determines. This is not in any sense a Government Bill: the Minister would not bring it down unless requested to do so. The amount of contribution is large, and to make a compulsory levy of that nature by Act of Parliament would hardly be justified. No one would urge it for a moment. Then the

question comes, are we to have district funds or are we to have a State fund? Suppose the Minister applied the measure to Leederville. Would the fund collected there be reserved for the cattle owners of that district?

Mr. Millington: The measure will extend to every district proclaimed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Will there be one fund, then?

Mr. Millington: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member was not too sure of that a little while ago. Suppose Osborne Park contributes for a couple of years and then other districts come in. The people of Osborne Park will have been contributing so much longer than the people of those other districts.

Mr. Millington: And they will have had the benefit of the fund.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The money in the fund will not be sufficient during the early stages. An advance will have to be made, and the fund recouped over a number of years. That is quite obvious. Otherwise there are not the number of diseased cows estimated by the advocates of the Bill. Two-fifths compensation will be the real compensation to the cattle owners, since they are to contribute the rest themselves. Under the measure there will be inspections and all sorts of proceedings against which the cattle owners will before long protest. We want to have the dairying industry, and we want to have the cows sound. It is hardly possible to find in the whole world a herd altogether free from tuberculosis. With all due respect to those best able to speak—the professional men—I doubt if any of us would be alive to-day if bovine tuberculosis could be so easily transmitted to the human being as is suggested. Most of us, before the disease was thought to be so deadly, must have had milk from affected cows. Years ago there was no inspection of cows anywhere in Australia. Take the case of Scotsmen, who live on milk to a large extent, and are some of the finest men in the world. The same may be said about Irishmen, who lived on milk before this disease was thought of, and who must have had infected milk. However, we ought to exercise the utmost care. If the cattle owners want the Bill, I am perfectly ready to support it; but it should be applied only to districts which have asked for it. The cattle now are subject to inspection by the

Stock Branch, and are destroyed without compensation.

Mr. Millington: Other districts have thought it good enough to ask to be included.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Which districts have asked to be included?

Mr. Millington: Districts outside the metropolitan area.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is easy to speak generally and say, "They all want it."

Mr. Millington: I can tell you the exact districts in two minutes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the Speaker will give the hon. member two minutes. He had better think the matter out.

Mr. Millington: The cattle owners from Perth to Bunbury want to be included.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No.

Mr. Millington: They say they do.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is like the "They Say" column in the Press, which does not mean anything. I want the Minister to bring in only those cattle owners who have expressed their willingness to contribute the two-fifths to the fund and who want this work done. To-day, as I have said, cattle are inspected, and sometimes destroyed without compensation. Many people in the country will much prefer that system to the proposals of the Bill. We are asking a great deal in requiring the cattle owner to contribute three-fifths of the amount of compensation.

The Minister for Agriculture: They contribute all of it now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but only on the cows they lose. Probably they will contribute quite as much by way of the three-fifths, when administration and other expenses have been taken out of the fund. The point is that the Bill represents an insurance against loss of several cows at the same time. We might, however, do better for the owners than ask them to pay three-fifths. Perhaps the Minister will agree to two-fifths contribution by the dairymen and three-fifths contribution by the Government, thus reversing the proportions. Perth is getting a wonderfully good supply of milk. One hears nothing but praise for the quality of milk sold in the metropolitan area during the last few years. Certainly it is good milk, and I believe it is obtained from most wholesome cows. When I was interrupted I was about to say something regarding compensation. The claim under the Bill would be, I take it, the value of the cow if she were not

diseased, not the value of a diseased cow. I hope that is quite clear. At all events, that ought to be the basis of compensation. We shall develop the dairying industry pretty rapidly in this country. Just as Victoria milks one-half of the total number of her cattle, so I hope Western Australia will before long have many more cows yielding profit and revenue. Some features of the measure can be further discussed in Committee. We shall certainly want to know whether the Bill is to apply to all cattle within districts proclaimed, irrespective of whether they are used for the supply of milk to the public or whether they are merely cattle running on farms. There is less risk of trouble on farms, I should say, than anywhere. All the returns required will be a source of trouble, and in some cases of expense. I repeat that the cattle owners in contributing three-fifths, will be contributing pretty nearly as much as they lose to-day. However, they want the Bill, and so far as I am concerned it will be passed into law. The Minister told us he would not have brought the measure down but for the request of the people most interested. We do not grudge the Government contribution of two-fifths; indeed, we think it might be made a little more liberal. The State contribution would be in the nature of a guarantee of the supply of even better milk than we are now getting. I hope the House recognises that in the dairying industry we have one of the greatest industries available to us. There are 2,300,000 cows in Australia. New Zealand, the last time I looked up the figures, was exporting dairy produce and so on to an annual value of 37½ millions sterling, as against Australia's figure of 7½ millions. The industry can be made as valuable to us as it has proved to New Zealand, and therefore it behoves us to see that such of our lands as are suitable for dairying shall be turned to that account. When on the group settlements the other day in company with some of the British delegates, I met an enthusiastic Irishman. He was in a clover field of six acres on which there had been 27 cows for nine weeks, and the only mark to be seen was where the cows had been turned in at the gate—they had worn a bare patch there. The Irishman said, "If I had clover like this in Ireland in November, I would be doing something in the Christmas beef market. They would not believe me if I told them at Home about the clover there is here." The thing is to get to work on the development of the dairying industry here very soon. Dairying is a calling

which represents a tie, and therefore deserves to be rewarded. It is one of the greatest of industries, and so far as we can we should protect and encourage it.

**MR. BROWN** (Pingelly) [8.14]: I regard this as a most desirable measure in the interests of the community. The health of the community, generally speaking, depends in great measure on the quality of milk consumed in large towns. Years ago, when an infant had to be put on cow's milk, the nurse liked to have the milk of one cow for the child. She preferred to keep the child on absolutely the same milk all the time. Now, however, nurses are beginning to realise that there is danger in one-cow milk, and that it is much better to feed an infant from a mixture of milk of a number of cows. There is the danger that a single cow might be affected. Under the Bill, I am afraid, there will be a little friction in respect of compensation. At first glance £15, less 10 per cent., seems reasonable, but of course there are cows for which the owners would not take £25 or even £30. When a cow has to be destroyed, who is to determine its value? Is the inspector to be the sole arbitrator? The owner would put a certain value on the cow, but the inspector may say, "It is not worth so much." Is the inspector's word to be final?

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell**: No, they will call in an arbitrator.

**Mr. BROWN**: He will have to be a good judge of a cow, and even then there will be possibility of friction. Again, is this to be confined to tuberculosis? I do not think tuberculosis is contagious; rather do I think it is hereditary. If a rigid inspection were made, it might be possible to stamp out the disease altogether. The Bill provides that no compensation shall be paid if the animal destroyed is visibly affected with tuberculosis and if the owner has failed to give notice thereof. How is the owner to know the beast is affected? Only an expert inspection, with perhaps a test, will determine that. The owner might notice that the cow is falling away, but might put it down to indifferent feeding. Then the inspector comes along and declares the cow is suffering from tuberculosis and must be destroyed. In such a case the owner would not get compensation. It will require a large number of inspectors to carry out the Act, which I am afraid will be more costly than



the Government expect. Again, is the Bill to apply to the metropolitan area alone? We have in our agricultural districts large towns, with herds of 20 and 30 cows each. It will not be fair if the Bill is restricted to the metropolitan area; it should be made to apply to the agricultural districts also.

The Minister for Agriculture: You see a danger in the Bill, yet you want it to be applied to country districts!

Mr. BROWN: I think it ought to apply all round. Cattle are subject to diseases in epidemic form, and if piuro were to break out, what would be the result? Probably there would not be sufficient money in the fund to pay all the claims made in respect of cattle destroyed. However, I take it the Bill is to apply only to dairy herds. It is a serious matter, for nobody knows when a serious epidemic may break out. Recently we had experience of a rinderpest epidemic, never before known in Western Australia. I have often wondered why we could not apply to cattle the inspection made of stud stallions. No man is allowed to travel a stallion unless it has passed a veterinary inspection. It might be possible to have our cattle inspected in the same way, and so ensure clean and healthy stock. It is important, because Western Australia is going to rely largely on the dairying industry, more particularly down in the group settlements. If none but healthy cows are produced there, it will mean a lot, both to the industry and to the group settlement scheme, whereas if the cows are not healthy it will result in misery and hardship to the group settlers. When the clover is fairly established on the groups, we shall be looking to the South-West to supply all our butter for local consumption and, perhaps, to export quite a lot to the Old Country. Therefore we require a rigid inspection of our dairy cattle. Dairymen should not be allowed to breed from unhealthy stock. Only by preventing that can we have a healthy lot of cattle in Western Australia. One little point about which I am perturbed: when the expenses of an industry are increased, generally they are passed on. Probably the dairymen will be able to pass on the expenses arising out of the Bill, and as a result the price of milk will be increased. Still if it means a pure milk supply, there should not be much grumbling. I will support the second reading.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE** (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet—in reply) [8.23]: I cannot complain of the way the Bill has been received, because apart from some suggestions that it may be dangerous, and others that it is not as perfect as it might be, the Bill apparently has commended itself to the whole of the House. One member of the country party has suggested there is a danger of the Bill being applied to the whole State. He fears that if this be done herds may be destroyed by direction of the Chief Inspector of Stock. But that is the position! The Chief Inspector and his officers have power to enter any place and, if they find cattle suffering from diseases, take whatever action lies within their power.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He has had that power for years past.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** That is so. The Bill does not either extend or curtail that power; it merely provides what has been lacking in the past, namely, an insurance fund from which compensation shall be payable to the owner of stock officially destroyed. It is entirely new legislation in Western Australia. It may not go so far as some members desire, but it is the initiation of a principle and it can be extended if, as the result of experience, Parliament thinks it ought to be extended. Members are not acting wisely in suggesting that the measure should include other stock diseases, such as pleuro-pneumonia, for the inclusion of that disease would mean a higher penalty to be paid by the owners of dairy cattle in registration fees, and might mean the breakdown of the fund if an epidemic of pleuro-pneumonia were to occur. We want to see a fund established from which compensation will be paid, so I suggest there ought to be no bidding by members, who have no personal responsibility in respect of the Bill, to include other diseases. Members, in their zeal to afford greater advantages, may lose the legislation altogether, which would not be in the interests of those whom they wish to serve. It has been the privilege of members of the Opposition to say it might be better to give greater advantages. But it is rather late in the day to ask for these things.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have brought down the Bill only at the request of the dairymen.

**The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** I have brought it down with the consent of

the Government. The Bill would never have been introduced without the consent of the Government. The request of the dairymen could only be a request, and need not have been acceded to; but it was considered by the Government, and, in consequence, the Bill has been introduced. The Government could have said, "Let it stand over a little longer." They did not do that, but on my recommendation they decided to bring down the Bill. I hope no attempt will be made to introduce other diseases into the measure. If it be found from experience that the fund is capable of paying compensation for other diseases, Parliament can extend the measure to embrace those other diseases; but let us not do anything that will make it impossible to pay the compensation contemplated in the Bill. I should be prepared to raise the maximum from £15 to £20 if I thought the fund would be sufficient to meet the claims made upon it. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that it may be necessary to provide that a special fund shall be created from which compensation shall be drawn until such time as the accumulated fees are sufficient to provide a fund. Time alone will tell whether the fund is capable of paying a maximum of £15, or of £20. Such a fund is already in operation in Victoria. There the Act applies to the whole State, and includes pleuro-pneumonia. But Victoria is a very compact State and it is quite easy there to levy on the sales of cattle. In Western Australia it is a very different matter, for the State is so extensive and sales of cattle are held in so many places that it would be difficult to keep track of the operations.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I told the Minister that only 2½ per cent. of the cattle handled are dairy cattle.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is not possible in Western Australia because the country is too extensive and we have not the necessary machinery. Moreover, the expense would be considerable. If the Bill is passed I propose to extend its operations little by little. Other people have expressed a desire to have the benefits of this Bill conferred upon them. A few weeks ago I was asked at Harvey why I proposed to limit its operations to the metropolitan area. I pointed out that as the department examined and cleaned up stock, the operations of the Act would be extended by proclamation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Were you asked by the people of Harvey?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: By the dairymen there. At Yarloop also I was asked some questions about the measure. I was surprised to find that the people there knew anything at all about it, because up to that time only the second reading had been moved and there had been very little publicity given to it in the Press. The departmental officers are carrying out inspections of stock and are making investigations. I am satisfied that the measure will have to be extended by proclamation to other parts of the State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have the power to destroy cows now if they are suffering from tuberculosis.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, but the owner gets no compensation. Under the Bill he will receive compensation. I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee to-night. I thank members for their remarks and hope the Bill will receive the assent of Parliament.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### **BILL—SPECIAL LEASE (ESPERANCE PINE PLANTATION).**

Returned from the Council without amendment.

#### **BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [8.34] in moving the second reading said: The Bill amends a very vital section in the Public Works Act and in itself it is a very important measure. At the present time our laws provides that when any land is resumed for public purposes, the price to be paid is to be the value at the time the land was taken.

Mr. Davy: Not quite that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The value at that date. The interpretation of "value" has been given by the courts as meaning the price a willing buyer is likely to offer a willing seller. The Commonwealth law provides that the price to be paid is to be the value of the property as at the pre-

vious January, and the object of the Bill is to bring the State law into line with that of the Commonwealth. It should be borne in mind that this will operate not only in respect of land acquired for State purposes but also to land acquired by the Government for local authorities. The Bill therefore has a far-reaching effect. The object first of all is to simplify the assessment of the value and to protect the State against doubtful transactions being entered into by property owners if Public Works Department proposals are known through leakage of information. The Bill is long overdue; we know that the department have been pressing for a measure of this description for some years. I understand that the reason for not submitting the Bill earlier was that there was not much activity in the way of public works, principally on account of the war. Now, however, the department are becoming active again and it is most desirable that we should have such legislation on the statute-book. The principal work to which this legislation will be made to apply in the not distant future will be the new road and railway bridge at Fremantle. The Engineer-in-Chief informs me he is afraid to put his proposals on paper because of possible leakages, and that all land agents have their ears to the ground and are seeking information.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is a reflection on your officers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Nothing of the kind. We know that when there have been big public works proposed there have also been leakages of information not only to the effect that the Public Works Department has been dealing with a certain matter, but even to the extent that Cabinet has been dealing with it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The hon. member speaks from experience.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know what I am talking about. The Bill will protect not only officers of the department but Ministers as well. It is most desirable that when public deals are to be made and the Government propose to step in to acquire a big stretch of land involving the expenditure of a considerable sum of money, the freest and most open discussion possible should take place. The proposal contained in the Bill will make for sounder judgment and will allow the public to express themselves and those who have to exercise the functions of government to come to a decision. In that way they will be better ad-

vised as to the requirements of a locality, and the position will be better all round. Under the existing law the price to be paid is the value at the time of the acquisition. One dare not go out and discuss a proposal, or any public scheme. Everything must be kept strictly confidential, otherwise all sorts of dodges may be put up that will mean the fleecing of the public, and the Government are called upon to pay an exorbitant price. We know that in the past there have been quite a number of bogus sales, that secret deals have been made, and we know also that all kinds of options have been obtained, and all sorts of conditions have prevailed in regard to land the Government desired to acquire. Proposals to erect big buildings have not been disclosed until the State has stepped in to acquire a property, and then suddenly these things are produced, and the State is expected to pay compensation for such supposed obligations. The Bill is designed to overcome that kind of thing, and it will declare that the price to be paid shall be the value that existed at the previous January, and only the improvements effected on the land since that time will be paid for. This will safeguard the interests of property owners who in good faith have carried out improvements. In connection with railway resummptions, there is no provision for a property owner to be compensated for any improvements he may effect after an Act authorising the construction of a railway has been passed. Under the Bill any improvements made after the previous January are to be paid for at the cost price, and it can be taken for granted that when an owner does submit the value of the improvements that value will be genuine. The Bill will prevent speculation and payment will be made for genuine improvements. In view of the comprehensive public works policy that will be carried out within the next few years, it is most desirable that a Bill of this description should be passed. In the city the measure will operate in respect of the acquisition of land for local authorities, land that may be required for the widening of streets. I understand that the City Council are contemplating resummptions in this respect.

Mr. Davy: To widen streets?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Davy: This will not help them to widen streets.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Decidedly.

Mr. Davy: They adopt the alignment plan; they prescribe a new building line.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Not necessarily. They may desire to resume land. We carry out a lot of resumptions for the City Council.

**Mr. Davy:** Of course you do; the City Council never stop resumming land.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** All the land we resume for them will be affected by this measure. Outside of the city there are works such as extensions of harbours. Operations in this respect are being carried out at Fremantle and Geraldton, and we are contemplating extensions at other centres. There are also railway deviations, and new railway sidings, and, as I have already stated, a big work in respect of which operations may be taken in hand in the near future will be the railway and road bridge over the Swan River at Fremantle. There are also extensive drainage works in the South-West as well as water conservation throughout the wheat belt. I have already stated that the Bill will bring our legislation into line with that of the Commonwealth, which has been in operation since 1906.

**Hon. G. Taylor:** Has it worked well?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** They do not resume very much, though they have resumed a fair amount of property in connection with naval bases. Land was resumed in connection with the Henderson Naval Base and for naval works in New South Wales and Victoria.

**Mr. Davy:** You do not suggest that this will make our laws governing resumptions the same as those of the Commonwealth?

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Yes, except that we will pay for genuine improvements made as from the 1st January.

**Mr. Davy:** They pay on a different basis from that adopted here.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** That is arguable.

**Mr. Davy:** It is recognised that our Act, dealing with the resumption of land, is the hardest to operate.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Yes, taken literally. But most of the cases dealt with by the Arbitration Court have been based on the decision of the Federal Court.

**Mr. Davy:** I do not know that.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** We know it. We know the interpretation that has been adopted, and we know that the decision is generally given on the basis of that adopted under the Commonwealth Act.

**Mr. Davy:** The Commonwealth reports are absolutely of no value in connection with cases under the Western Australian Act.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** There is no doubt about the operation of both Acts, although they may be worded slightly differently.

**Mr. Davy:** There is a considerable doubt about that.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Not on the definition laid down regarding the willing buyer and the willing seller!

**Mr. Davy:** Willing, but not anxious.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Yes, that is the basis on which the decisions have been fixed.

**Hon. G. Taylor:** Arbitration courts generally lean to the seller rather than to the buyer, particularly when the buyer is the Government.

**The MINISTER FOR WORKS:** When the Government are involved, the sympathy is all on the other side. The Bill will provide for a period before the gazettal of the resumption, during which the potential value can be examined, and proved reasonable or too remote. The point regarding potential values is always argued when land in the city is being dealt with. It is constantly claimed that land has a potential value. It is argued that if certain things happened, there were potentialities for greatly increased values respecting the property concerned. Under the Bill, if the property is to be resumed in November, the period from the preceding January to that November will be made use of to test out the claim regarding the potential value. The value at the preceding January may be taken as so much and the period to November will be taken in order to ascertain what reliability can attach to the claim respecting the augmented potential value. Thus it will be possible to determine whether the claim is excessive or too remote. The whole value will be figured out. Under such a provision, negotiations for a settlement will be more simple than they are at present. If nothing is known regarding the possibility of land being resumed, we will be more likely to have genuine sales of land adjacent to the holdings to be resumed. Thus we will be able to find out information regarding prices. Under such conditions there are not likely to be fictitious deals or sales or options, and we shall get from the values disclosed by the sale of land adjacent to the areas to be

resumed, a better idea of the value of the land to be resumed. This will simplify the whole process of settlement, and to a great extent will avoid complications.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should be prepared to pay a fair price cheerfully.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Very few people want to go to court with these claims.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not my experience.

Mr. Davy: Your experience is a short one. I do not remember more than two cases that have gone to court since you have been Minister for Works.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can remember at least twenty cases.

Mr. Davy: Not 20 cases that have gone to the courts within two years?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Davy: I say no.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There have been quite that number in connection with water supply matters in the hills alone.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You refer to gardens in the hills?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Davy: I do not think there have been any such number of cases taken to court, but it is no use continuing to say so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course not. My experience shows that when the Government are involved, property owners will not accept a settlement, but will force the Government to the last ditch.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That was not my experience.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They will force the position until they get the last shilling. Of course, no one would desire to do anything that was unfair. All we want is to pay a reasonable figure and to secure a just settlement. At the same time, we must see that the public are not called upon to accept a fictitious value, and that the public funds are safeguarded.

Mr. Davy: You are not prepared to trust the court to decide what is fair value?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have not said that at all. I am merely laying down a basis. We know what has happened. Where land has been resumed, leases or options have been produced that provided for the erection, for instance, of an extensive coffee palace.

Mr. Davy: How often?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But it has been done.

Mr. Davy: By a rogue, occasionally.

Hon. G. Taylor: And the Minister wants to catch the rogue.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And the State has had to pay out unduly.

Mr. Davy: Because of an occasional rogue, you want to penalise innocent men!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know what is going on at Fremantle now, and it was because of that that we have introduced the Bill. We know what is happening with regard to the land speculators who are trying to find out where the railway is likely to go across the river. We have had experience in this matter, and we know of all sorts of dummy sales and secret options that have been made, and the public have had to pay extra because of them. Naturally we cannot produce evidence; the documents are there, but still we know in our own minds that the business is not genuine. We are not able to secure any proof to the contrary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A great deal of land has already been secured in connection with the Fremantle railway bridge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, a good deal on the heights. The Bill will safeguard the interests of the property owners, because it provides for payment for improvements the owner may carry out between the date of the authorisation of the construction of the railway and the date fixed for the resumption of the land, and the actual resumption. Those improvements will be paid for on the basis of the actual cost, and nothing above that figure. No matter how rigid a secrecy may be attempted in the departments, it must be realised that a considerable time must elapse before the business can be completed. In a proposition such as the Fremantle bridge, considerable time must elapse from the time the Engineer-in-Chief prepares his proposal regarding the line, his proposal reaches the Minister and a Cabinet decision is arrived at, and, finally, until the land resumption officer is able to gazette the resumption of the property. During all that time it is possible for information to leak out. In that period any one of the actions I have referred to may be taken so that an advantage may be gained from the State and people may make money out of the proposition although not entitled to do so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And then you have to consult Parliament before you can construct the bridge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but not before we resume the land. Naturally before we could construct the bridge, the money would have to be voted by Parliament. I am merely talking about the resumption of the land itself. While that is going on, it is impossible for anyone to discuss the work openly. The Government are deprived of the advice of men who might be able to assist them. The people cannot discuss the proposition. Everything has to be begun secretly, and without the knowledge of people who are mainly concerned. This provision will not only protect the officials from any suspicion of being responsible for information leaking out; but it will also afford Ministers and Cabinet itself equal protection. There have been deals carried out in this country without officials knowing anything about it. In practically every State of Australia there have been scandals regarding resumptions of land. With such a provision as that contained in the Bill, it will be impossible to level accusations against either officials or Ministers here, because no matter what is done, the date is fixed regarding compensation for the previous January or, it may be, 11 months before the deal.

Mr. Davy. You take a man's land in December and pay what it is worth in January, although the value may be quite different in December.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is that point of potential value that will be considered when the price is fixed! A man will have 11 months in which to test that point out. Thus it cannot be said that a man will be robbed of increased value that may accrue during the interim.

Mr. Davy: But he will be.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, he will not.

Mr. Davy: I say he must be.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member knows full well what the position will be. He knows that the question of potential value will be taken into consideration when the price is being fixed.

Mr. Davy: Only insofar as it is reflected in the present value.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, the potential value will be fully tested. From six to eight months after the date when the price is fixed, the potential value will be

argued, and the period that will have elapsed will enable those testing it to determine what reliability can be attached to the owner's claim respecting the potential value of the resumed property.

The Minister for Lands: You need not be frightened; the owners will get full value!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course, it may cut both ways.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No one would contend that the State should take over land without paying a reasonable or even a liberal price for it. No one would desire to deprive the owner of the fair value of the land.

Mr. Davy: Under existing conditions the Government can take a block of land and ruin a man's business, although the man may not get a penny for it by way of compensation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What Government would do that without giving the owner a fair return?

Mr. Davy: It has been done.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not know of any instance where a man's business has been ruined.

Mr. Davy: I can give you some particulars.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have had to take over some orchards in water catchment areas, but I do not know of any instance where a man's business has been ruined. On the other hand, we do know many instances of men having made a lot of money because they happened to own land that the State required to resume.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have not heard of any such case.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Well, I have.

The Minister for Railways: And I have heard of such instances, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill is an important and urgent one. We have big proposals on foot, and we want to get on with the work. This will enable steps to be taken with much more security. The Bill will provide for a fair deal for the owners of property, and at the same time provide for the security of the State. At the same time the Bill will permit a more free and open discussion of the proposals of the Government. That is not possible under the existing Act. We want to make sure that when land is resumed the State will get fair value for its expenditure, at the same time making sure that no individual will be deprived of a fair return for his property. It merely en-

acts in the State what has already operated in the Commonwealth since 1906. I do not know of any complaint that has been lodged against the Commonwealth law, which has worked smoothly, and our officers are anxious that similar legislation shall be operative here. There are works which it was impossible to carry out during the period of the war and with which we must push on now, and it is essential that this measure be placed on the statute-book. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Davy, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—LAKE BROWN-BULLFINCH RAILWAY.**

### *Second Reading.*

#### **THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon.**

A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [9.2] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to authorise the construction of a railway from the Beneubbin extension at Lake Brown to Bullfinch. It will be remembered that the first proposal was that this railway should run into Merredin. What prompted the Advisory Board to make that suggestion in the first instance was that the value of the land out as far as Bullfinch had not then been properly tested. They had no records of the actual rainfall, and were not too sure of the suitability of the area for wheat growing. Since then the Lands Department have thrown the area open for selection, and there is considerable settlement out to Bullfinch. Wheat is being grown successfully right through the area, and the Advisory Board recommended that the route be altered so that the line may run into Bullfinch. The board state that they were greatly impressed with the quality of the soil in the area to be served by the railway. The classification shows that about half of the land consists of first-class forest country, and approximately two-thirds is cultivable land, the remaining one-third being grazing country. The board point out that there has been considerable development, especially in the Goomarin and Campion districts, and on the newer area at Geelakin. The settlers in those districts are a very fine type, and have cleared and fallowed large areas for cropping. Areas east of the rabbit-proof fence have also been taken up. In the early stages the rainfall was considered to be inadequate, but crops are now being grown successfully, even as far east as Southern Cross, and the results

at the Merredin experimental farm have shown beyond doubt the quality of the land and its suitability for wheat growing. While it may be held that the suitability of the area for wheat growing has not been definitely proved, the proof is sufficient to satisfy the board that it is advisable to carry the projected line to Bullfinch. The length of the line will be about 48 miles, and the estimated cost is £3,000 per mile. The railway will serve an area of about 417,000 acres, of which approximately two-thirds is cultivable land. With the exception of about 9,000 acres, the Goomarin and Campion districts will be brought within a 12½ miles radius. The small area of 9,000 acres is held by nine settlers, and they will be within a 14-miles radius of railway facilities. The only way to bring them within closer reach of railway facilities would be by taking the railway into Merredin. If the railway were carried to Merredin, it would be only about eight miles shorter than the one proposed, and it would serve only about 106,200 acres as against 417,000 acres to be served by the extension to Bullfinch. That is the big difference between the two routes. After the Advisory Board submitted their first report recommending that the line should be extended to Bullfinch, a deputation waited on the Premier and urged that the original route be adhered to. The Premier promised to refer the matter back to the Advisory Board for further report. That was done, and it may be well to read the report that the Premier has received from the Advisory Board in order that there may be no doubt as to their attitude. The report bears the date 27th October, 1926, and reads—

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

Mr. Griffiths: They do not have to grow the wheat.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The report continues—

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

Mr. Griffiths: That report was made after the deputation went on the Premier.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. One of the reasons why the Railway Advisory Board was inaugurated was to remove these propositions from political influence. The idea was to refer the question of railway routes to a board of experts so that the whole of the facts would be examined dispassionately and the Government would be fortified by having the best advice.

Mr. Lindsay: It is agreed that the Advisory Board have made some mistakes.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The only people who have not made mistakes are the people who have done nothing. To do nothing is the only way to avoid making mistakes.

Mr. Lindsay: The fact of their having made mistakes shows that we need not always agree with them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The matter was referred back to them after the deputation had waited upon the Premier. The board gave the matter further consideration and were confirmed in their previous view that the line should be carried into Bullfinch. It must not be forgotten that their first proposal was to carry the line into Merredin.

Mr. Lindsay: Which was wrong.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Consequently the board really made three inquiries. In view of the new settlement and the extensive areas towards Bullfinch that have been taken up, the board have recommended the Bullfinch route. After the board have made three different investigations, the Parliament that would take upon its shoulders the responsibility of ignoring the board's recommendation would be assuming a very serious responsibility.

Hon. G. Taylor: Has the personnel of the board been the same throughout?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; Mr. Anketell is not now a member of the board and a railway construction engineer has taken his place. I think it will be agreed that the board have given the matter close attention. The figures show that if the line were taken into Merredin it would save eight miles of track, but would serve only 106,000 acres as against 417,000 acres by adopting the Bullfinch route.

Mr. Griffiths: But the board never considered the proposition to go into Merredin.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did; the files are full of all the suggestions.

They went up there, met the settlers and discussed the question with them. The board stated that their examination was very much assisted by the information they obtained from the settlers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about the proposed Carrabin junction?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They disagree with that proposal. They say the proper route for the line is to Bullfinch.

Mr. Lindsay: Did not they take into consideration the country north which may be served by a line coming into Bullfinch in future?

Mr. Corboy: Of course; the Surveyor General has his parties out there now surveying it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In the past, Parliament has adopted the recommendations of the board; I do not think there has been one instance where we have departed from the board's recommendations. We realise that the board is composed of independent men who are not likely to be swayed by any influences, but who act in the best interests of the State. Every suitable surveyor we can get hold of is in the field to-day on railway location work. We are trying to organise another party for railway location, but that is a particular class of work and not every surveyor can do it. Consequently it cannot be said that we are going slow or that any time is being lost.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: This is eleventh hour activity. Why did you not keep steadily at railway construction?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have been at it all the time so far as staff and plant would permit. I think the House will agree that the recommendations of the Advisory Board should be adopted. I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Griffiths, debate adjourned.

## BILL—EJANDING NORTHWARDS RAILWAY.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 12th October.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [9.13]: In the dying hours of this Parliament, we are hearing a lot about new railways.



The Minister for Lands: You should complain! You set the example years ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am not going to complain on the same score as the Minister complains, but I am going to say that we are hearing a deuce of a lot about railway building and railway service at the eleventh hour of the session.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Do you not think it justified.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. More than three years ago a railway was authorised in the hon. member's electorate. That line has not yet been built.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: It is going on.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes.

Mr. Chesson: It is a good thing to make a start, is it not?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would have been 2½ years ago.

Mr. Chesson: Better late than never.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: So that is the cry of the party in power—better late than never, but always late! That ought to be made known to the country.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: What about the money?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Money! The Government have had money to burn all the time. Let the hon. member look at the latest public accounts and he will see how much money they have had. All the time they have had far more than we ever had. There is one amount of £1,500,000. The hon. member had better not say anything to me about the money. I know how much money has been in hand, and how many people have been out of work. The elections were not so near then as they are now. The member for Albany laughs. It may be a laughing matter for him, but when his electors ask him why that line was not built and the land not settled long ago, it will be difficult for him to make them believe that the Government are serious now. Hardly a railway line has been built by the Government in 2½ years.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Are you going to oppose the Bill?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The joke is on the other side. The public are used to serious treatment at the hands of this side of the House.

The Minister for Works: They know they get the goods from us.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know that much would be expected from a

Government which built two small lines and started one at Norseman in 2½ years. The Ejanding Northwards line is designed to serve country that is not now served by railway. Apparently the Advisory Board recommended this route. It is a pity the line did not start from Ejanding years ago instead of from Wyalcatchem.

Mr. Lindsay: You are quite right there. It was another mistake.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If it had gone from Ejanding we should have been saved the construction of many miles of railway and the country would have been better served. Still, we have very good value in the Wyalcatchem line. There is a wonderful town at Wyalcatchem and very good development at Koorda. The land itself is very good. I am speaking of the matter from the point of view of railway construction. The whole of the country along the Dowerin-Merredin line is closely settled with farms, and there are also as many people in Dowerin as there are upon the land round about. That is a fact we do not take into consideration when dealing with these matters. I suppose the growth of the town there is greater than the increase in people upon the land round about. There must be three or four times as many people in the towns in those districts as there are on farms. It is always so. The farmers have to be served. In Northam there must be 5,000 people serving the agricultural industry. The trade created by primary producers is such as to make necessary these considerable townships. Some people believe that land settlement means merely the number of people placed on the land as the result of building a line, but they forget those who are employed otherwise. The building of these agricultural lines made Fremantle. The members are not very grateful to us for having done this. I remember going to North-East Fremantle before we started an active policy of agricultural railway construction. The whole place was empty, including the shops and the houses. There was very little trade being done there.

The Minister for Lands: The houses have never been empty.

The Minister for Railways: When the quarries stopped work the people had to find other occupations.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We soon filled up the houses again by means of agricultural development. We made work possible at Fremantle by building the spur

lines, and providing the labour that resulted in their construction.

The Minister for Railways: Soap factories, flour mills and other factories were afterwards opened.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: As a result of the building of agricultural railways and of back country development! When the Government produce a plan showing an area to be opened they indicate so many thousands of first class, second class and third class land, and show that the district can produce so much wheat, and carry so much stock. That is only the beginning of the tale. Last year our railways did not pay, but the year before they showed a profit of £190,000 and the year before last £140,000. This was the result of agricultural development. Spur lines have made possible the use of the whole railway system. The Great Southern line carried very little traffic, but with the spur lines it became a busy one.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I do not believe in spur lines.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A great deal of the produce grown along that line ought to go to Albany. There is quite enough grown near Albany to keep that port busy if all the produce went there. At the moment the hon. member does not believe in spur lines, but once he did.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Never.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The railway programme seems fairly formidable. This is not a long line, but it is one of many that we have to consider. Ministers have become very active in the dying hours of the session. When the Premier said no other Bills would be brought down this session, as a reason for not introducing some he was asked to bring down, I was glad to hear him say that the statement did not apply to railway Bills. It would be easy for this party to build railways if these railways were authorised by my friends, probably more easy than if we had to ask for the authorisation. There can be no opposition to the Bill before us, for the reason that it opens up wonderfully good country. It provides for the opening up of country to the eastward of a point on the other side of Cowcowing, and provides for the extension of a line to the east of and parallel with the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line. The country has been tested and proved to be excellent. We can look forward to the production of wheat

there. A great deal of the land is lighter than the best land. We can do a great deal with wheat at 5s. that we could not attempt to do with wheat at 3s. 4d. We can obtain a substantial profit from second class land with wheat at 5s. as against a possible loss with wheat at 3s. 4d. We could not ask people to farm land that will give a 10-bushel average at the best with wheat at 3s. 4d., but we could recommend them to do so if we are satisfied that wheat will remain at 5s. and over. Propositions which once would have been a loss become more certain with the world's market for wheat as it is to-day. I hope the Bill will pass, and that the railways already authorised will be speedily built. It is not enough to authorise the construction of a railway. It is not right to deceive people into believing that a line will be built within a reasonable time, when it may be delayed. The line from Denmark to Nornalup was authorised three years ago, as was the Yarramony-Yorkrakine line.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so urgent as this one.

The Minister for Works: The Dwarda line was authorised 14 years ago.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: By my friends who did not build it.

The Minister for Works: You were in office, but did not touch it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Years after it was authorised.

The Minister for Works: It had to wait until we came back.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Yarramony-Yorkrakine line was promised by my friends before 1911, and this probably enabled them to win a seat. Not a tap was done to it, however. Of course we could not build railways with money at 6½ per cent., and railway material costing over 100 per cent. more than it did. Things are better to-day, but material is still dearer than it used to be.

Mr. Lutey: Rails were cheaper when the Dowerin line was built.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. It was impossible to build railways with money and material as dear as it was. I do not oppose railway proposals because Ministers have failed in their responsibility towards lines already authorised. There is also the line from Pemberton towards Nornalup, which eventually will junction with the Albany-Nornalup line, and make a through line from Bunbury to Albany. I know a

great deal of this country. The railway will be fully justified, and will pay. I hope the people will not be kept waiting for years before this line is constructed, and that not only will it be authorised, but that it will be built as soon as the railways already authorised are put in hand.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [9.27]: I would not have spoken but for the remarks to the member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough). The Leader of the Opposition knows that no Government in this State brought down more railway Bills at the close of the session than did the Government of which he was a member.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Name them.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I cannot name them all. There were 12 or 13. One was the Wongan Hills line, one of the longest ever submitted to Parliament. That was not the worst of it. Though the country decided in favour of a change of Government, attempts were made to hinder the Labour Government from getting the money with which to build the railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not by anyone I was connected with.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I do not accuse the hon. member.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You had better not.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I am not doing so, but I know that some members connected with his party did this.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What a scandalous suggestion!

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I do not think the hon. member was guilty of this.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You know quite well I was not.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I do not think he was. The hon. member can make no complaint in regard to bringing down railway Bills at this juncture of the session. Several railway Acts have been passed by Parliament, and I ask hon. members whether we are not justified in trying to obtain money for the building of those lines at the lowest possible rate of interest? In January last we put up a proposition to build railways under the migration agreement. Every one of those railways had been authorised by Parliament. The schedule is now on the Table of the House. We have been trying to get cheap money. The money has not been available. Money to-day is al-

most as tight as ever it has been, and the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, it is not.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: I know differently, and the hon. member knows differently. We have to consider that this State cannot exceed between four and five millions of loan money annually. Further we have to consider that 50 per cent. of that expenditure has gone to agricultural development. Last year, moreover, we had to find close on £700,000 to carry out the metropolitan water supply works authorised by the hon. member before he left office. In addition we spent close on £900,000 on railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No. About £600,000.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: Close on £900,000. So it goes on. The money is not available for constructing all the works at one time. The Leader of the Opposition is anxious to know what the Albany electors will tell their member if the railway is not constructed and the land is not settled. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition why the land is not settled.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It cannot be settled until the railway is built.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: The hon. member himself started a group settlement three miles out from Nornalup, 26 miles from Denmark.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The railway would have been there now if we had not gone out of office.

The **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: There is a large area of land between Nornalup Inlet and the present Denmark groups, but the officials say that it wants testing before groups can be established on it. That is the reason why the land is not yet settled. I went there and the officials pointed out to me that the land must be tested beforehand. It would not be right to put people there until we have ascertained whether the area is suitable for growing fodder. Experiments have been made, but I do not yet know the results. However, that is the reason why the land is not settled. During the last three or four weeks I have been trying to get land for the purpose of starting further group settlements. As I have previously told the Leader of the Opposition, I hold a permission dated the 28th September for the establishment of 300 new farms. I have founded near Nornalup two

groups almost touching the river. The railway there is under construction.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Jolly little of it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the railway were not actually under construction, I would not for one moment think of putting people there. As regards the extension from Pemberton to Northcliffe, the officers tell me there is splendid land out beyond Northcliffe, much better land than some which is already settled. Indeed, Mr. McLarty tells me that the land outside Northcliffe, between Northcliffe and Denmark, is not excelled by any land he has seen in Australia; and he has seen a good deal. But we cannot get to that land. I am now pressing the Commission to find money for the construction of railways in the interests of future settlement. If they will not agree to supply the necessary funds, I cannot help it. The Government have been doing their utmost to get money at the lowest possible rate of interest. I am pleased the Bill has been introduced. My only regret is that the proposed line does not go further north, where there is a large area of land which, according to the Surveyor General, is highly suitable for settlement. However, we shall bring that area closer to railway communication by the length of this proposed line. We want railways going into areas which at present have no means of communication. Yesterday I had no fewer than 86 applicants for one block. For five other blocks there were between 120 and 130 applicants.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You know full well that you will never again have enough land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If I had railways, I would have land for the people, because as soon as the Agricultural Bank trustees know that the Government have decided on a line of railway, they will advance money on the lands to be served.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I am not opposing this railway; I am supporting it. I am not making any excuses.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member was scarcely fair in twitting us with not building railways but merely introducing Bills for their construction. The railways will be built next year if the present Government remain in office. Those railways will be built just the same as we built the lines passed in the 1911 session by a Government of which the present Opposition Leader was a member. The last Labour Government built every line introduced by the

Government that preceded them. The present Government have been in office only 2½ years, hardly long enough to feel their feet in regard to the farming industry of this country.

Hon. G. Taylor: I am afraid you never will feel your feet.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member need have no fear on that score. Throughout the country, wherever one goes, one hears that the Government will come back next year. Take the advertisement which Mr. Lovekin gave the Government today. Read in the "Daily News" how the Government are regarded in London; what is their repute in that city where the financiers are.

Mr. Teesdale: If he says that, it finishes you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Lovekin has just come back from London.

Mr. Teesdale: Full of information.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Lovekin's statement shows clearly what the position is, and influences others. With such a Government in power, supported by such a party, there is no fear of Western Australia not being able to get the money required for development. But we want to get the money as cheaply as we can. We will not pay 5 per cent. if we can get it for one per cent. We have too much regard for the financial welfare of the State to pursue any other course. We are endeavouring to obtain the money required for the railways introduced by the previous Government. If the money had been available, most of those railways would have been in hand now.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You would never have thought of cheap money if it had not been prepared for you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is nothing in the hon. member's agreement about railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, there is.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I say there is not. However, I do not want to discuss that aspect now. If the Opposition Leader twits me with it, I will discuss it, subject to the Speaker's permission. There is nothing in the report as to railway construction. I was surprised to hear the opening remarks of the Opposition Leader on this proposed railway.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are always surprised.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No. I thought this railway construction proposal

would have been supported by the Opposition Leader if by any member of the House.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do support it.

Mr. Teesdale: As regards twitting, I have heard worse than that from the Government side of the House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member can talk about his own twitting if he likes.

Hon. G. Taylor: Never mind! You have Lovekin behind you, so you are all right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I know the member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) does not like to have anything said in favour of the present Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Nonsense!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member would declare that a person did not carry any weight if he said anything that was to the credit of the present Government.

Mr. Teesdale: Lovekin mentioned something worse than the present Government.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If this country changes its Government next year, it will have something worse.

Hon. G. Taylor: You want to watch the old rogue elephant when he praises you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The country will have something worse then. However, that is not in the Bill. This railway will open up many thousands of acres of land which we want for settlers. It will be the means of settling a large number of people who are now asking for land. For that reason the Minister for Agriculture has already arranged to start an experimental farm in the district.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There are farms all over the place.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have been out there, and you have not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I know the district. I have been through a good part of it, and have been where the railway is to go, away east of Pithara. This is one of the lines most urgently required for future settlement. There are some railways which, I admit, will not make an additional acre of land available for settlement, though they may assist in the development of land already settled. However, the Pemberton and Denmark extensions and other lines of that description will open up new country, of which we are now in great need in order to still the clamour for that land which

people from oversea are so anxious to obtain.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [9.43]: I support the Bill, and agree with the Minister that this is one of the railways which are urgently required to open up the country. The Railway Advisory Board's report, which has been laid on the Table, states that the line will serve 946,000 acres. That is not the first report we have had on the district. The previous report dealt with the subject from another aspect altogether.

Hon. G. Taylor: Sometimes reports are very conflicting.

Mr. LINDSAY: I say that the previous report was wrong, and that this one is right. I agree with the Opposition Leader that if the Wyalcatchem railway had not been built, the proposed line would have served as 30 miles of railway in that country. I was rather surprised to hear the Minister for Lands mention another proposed line as being urgent. I am most anxious that the line now under discussion should be built, and part of that line is in my electorate; but I sincerely trust that its construction will not mean the repudiation of any railways previously authorised.

The Minister for Lands: I have applied for the money required for their construction, but I say that they are not so urgent as other lines are.

Mr. LINDSAY: Although I want to see this line built, I hope it will not be given precedence over railways authorised some years ago. The Minister referred to the development of the lands to be served by this line. I happen to know the country pretty well. The Minister also made a reference to experimental farms. An experimental farm has been established in this district by the Minister for Agriculture, and rightly so; but it is a long way from the end of the proposed line. It is probably 80 or 90 miles further north. I regard this line as the most important railway included in the mileage of railway construction suggested under the migration agreement. Application has been made for the building of 200 miles of railway under that agreement. I hope that when that mileage of line has been built, some of the country already settled in the eastern part of the district will likewise receive consideration. Probably I would not have spoken on the Bill had it not been for the statements of the Minister for Works. Many mistakes have been made

by the Railway Advisory Board. The members of that board are only human, and all human beings make mistakes. If that eastward extension of the Ejangding railway is not connected on to Bullfinch, a mistake will be made again. The whole of the land within the limit of our wheat belt is fit for settlement, and will be settled, in spite of our pessimists. So in deciding the route of a railway we must take into question, not tall trees, but the distance of one railway from another. I hope when such a question is to be decided, we shall take it from that point of view alone. I know this country very well. A great deal of it is light land, good light land that can produce excellent crops of wheat. It is to-day producing a better average yield than are the heavy forest lands, taken generally. It may be that we on the light lands farm a little better than do the others. I have travelled through the other States and seen their light lands, and I say the land northward from Ejangding is good wheat land, capable of producing good average crops. I agree that the railway should be built. Portion of it is in my electorate and I hope the line will not stop at 75 miles, but that the 200 miles will be built in the near future. At the same time, I agree that authorised lines should be built strictly in order of precedence. When the department throws open lands for selection, it is for the department to consider whether those lands should be served by a railway. I agree that this railway should be built, for it will open up a huge area and will add nearly £1,000,000 per annum to the wealth produced in the State.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle—in reply) [9.50]: I merely wish to allude to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Although we have had four railway Bills before Parliament, we have not yet lived up to the achievements of our friends opposite who, in the session of 1911, at the close of the then Parliament, brought down 12 railway Bills. Again, when last they were in office at the close of the Parliament they brought down five more. We have not yet lived up to that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What are you complaining about?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: I am not complaining. It was the hon. member who complained of our activities. I find that for years past it has been the practice to

bring in railway Bills during the last session of Parliament. We have not yet lived up to our friend's achievements in that direction.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Nor in any other direction.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: Except in the direction of doing the work instead of talking about it.

Mr. Davy: You certainly never fail to speak very highly of yourselves.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: We do the work. It is not merely that the Bills are passed and left; it is that the work is done; that is the difference. If those opposite had remained in office, the railways for which they secured authorisation would not have been built for many years. However, the country was fortunate for, with the change of Government we came into power and built the railways. If the hon. member has any complaint to make, the complaint will be found to be more against his own actions than against ours.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Purchase money to be determined under the Public Works Act of 1902:

Mr. DAVY: This comes as a surprise in view of the Bill to amend Section 63 of the Public Works Act, which the Minister has introduced to-night. The clause provides that compensation shall be determined under the Public Works Act, on the same principle as is provided in the existing Public Works Act. That principle is a very simple one, and the only complaint the Minister has been able to advance against it is that he does not agree with the decisions of the court on that principle. It is that the Government shall pay to the owner of resumed land the probable reasonable price that such land might have been expected to fetch at the date it was taken. In Clause 5 there is a proviso setting forth that no regard shall be had to any increased value occasioned by the railway. The Public Works Act says just that when it says "without regard to any increased value occasioned by the proposed public work." We are only com-

plicating matters by varying that. As far as possible, administrative Acts, such as the resumption of land, should be uniformly conducted. It should be sufficient if we say that land to be taken for the purposes of the Bill shall be taken under the Public Works Act. I move an amendment—

That the proviso be deleted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The proviso is usual in all Bills authorising railway construction. The Crown Law Department have found it advisable to have such a provision in the Bill.

Mr. Davy: If you once start a bad thing, it will go on for ever.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No one has shown it to be bad; on the contrary, it has proved to be a safeguard.

Mr. Davy: Is not everything you want in the Public Works Act?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If that had been found to be sufficient, the Crown Law Department would not have inserted this provision in the Bill. Unless good reason can be shown for its excision, the proviso should be allowed to remain.

Mr. Davy: Now you are talking like a Tory.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not want it to be said that this Committee has agreed to strike out a provision, and in consequence the State may be mulcted in heavy costs.

Mr. DAVY: I do not propose to press the amendment, because the Minister has stated that the proviso has been included in railway Bills for many years. I am surprised to find the Minister advancing as an argument that what has existed for many years must necessarily be right. I am inclined to agree with that proposition, but it does not accord with arguments he frequently puts up. He advances theories that what is, is probably wrong. What I suggest is that the proviso is so much surplusage; it means nothing and it carries the principal Act no further. I suggest that he should see whether it is necessary to have these 12 or 15 lines in the Bill. The shorter a Bill is and the fewer words used, the better.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 8, Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## BILL—BOYUP BROOK - CRANBROOK RAILWAY.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 12th October.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [10.5]: This railway opens up another class of country in the South-West, country that carries a considerable amount of timber. The Boyup Brook land is amongst the best in the State. By some strange chance it is land which does everything that all the land in this country is capable of doing. There we find the best wheat crops, the best apples, the best root crops and the best sheep-carrying country. Just at this spot we find land capable of doing all these things. It is comparatively light clearing, lighter than it is further west. I do not say this holds good for the whole 100 miles of the proposed line, but there is a considerable amount of wonderful sheep country along the line, and country that is good for many agricultural purposes. The land will gradually become more and more useful. One would imagine from the discussion to-night that the dairying industry is not as valuable to Australia as in reality it is. We do not understand what the carrying of cattle means to any country. This will be great stock country. For some time to come the timber will produce traffic that will make the line profitable. When the line out from Busselton to Margaret River, joining up with Augusta, was built, it was not expected that it would open up a vast amount of timber land, but as a fact it has carried timber from the day when it was opened, and will be carrying it for years. It will be much the same with this particular line. Not only shall we have the timber to carry, but it will be possible to settle a great many people upon the land there. It is not all wheat land, such as we find in the wheat belt.

The Minister for Works: There are splendid wheat crops there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At Boyup Brook that is so, but not over the whole length of the proposed line. I do not know of any better land than that at Boyup Brook. The rainfall is not as heavy as it is near the coast, or at Pemberton, but it is such as to justify the construction of a railway. I hope the Minister will keep in mind that these lines through this country ought not

to be 30 miles apart. The wheat belt country is comparatively level, and people can get from point to point with considerable ease. In the South-West the country is hilly and undulating, and is difficult to cart over. We have to see to it that the lines are not too far apart. A Royal Commission set down the minimum at 30 miles apart; that was an unfortunate thing. The practice was to determine that the lines should not be more than a given distance apart. The nature of the country makes a deviation imperative. The Dowerin-Merredin deviation was made away from the goldfields line, with the result that we had a deviation of more than 30 miles. A line cannot be made dead straight owing to the difference in the grades, and it was necessary to have a deviation.

The Minister for Works: There will not be the heavy carting to this line that there would be on the wheat belt.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We shall have a considerable amount of timber to carry, and that is heavy carting. The difference between carting in the South-West and the wheat belt is that for the most part wheat carting is done in the summer, whereas in the dairying industry in the South-West the carting goes on all the year round. In our country we can get about practically everywhere in the summer. If we had only summer roads to provide, the cost would be very little. The winter traffic not only cuts up the roads but makes it imperative to lay down a heavier track than would otherwise be necessary. Of course it is realised when one goes into the South-West and sees people struggling with their produce over winter roads, that it is an all-the-year-round traffic there. When the sleepers cut out, no doubt the roads will be maintained much more easily. The winter traffic has destroyed some of the best roads put down in the South-West.

The Minister for Works: The new system of carting sleepers by motor truck has played havoc with the roads.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Such traffic must knock the roads about. It is cheaper and better to have the lines nearer to each other than to have them far apart. The land is not level, and one cannot get by a direct route to a railway station. The distance of this line is a little more than 30 miles as marked on the map. However, there is the right to deviate to an extent of five miles. Members opposite resisted

that degree of deviation when they were sitting on these benches. The engineers ought to be permitted to get the best grades possible. I hope that when the route is being permanently fixed, regard will be had to the circumstance that the distance should not be more than 25 miles if it can possibly be avoided. Of course we are guided to some extent by the Advisory Board's report in the matter of terminal points and route. In this country, however, we must not expect to get railway surveys made at a low cost. It is much better to spend money on surveys than on regrading. Nothing is so disappointing as to have to shift a railway line once it is down. After the land has been settled, it is impossible to shift the line, particularly if townships spring up as they frequently do. Therefore the House should not object to a reasonable vote for railway surveys. Hon. members know that even an engineer must have difficulty in constructing the best track between two points 100 miles apart without giving the matter a good deal of time, which means expense. However, the Minister knows that in the experience of his officers it has not been found possible to locate railways in the South-West as easily as those in the wheat belt. As the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) has reminded us, in the wheat belt one can almost go direct from point to point, very little deviation indeed being required. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. There will be traffic from the time the line is built. Albany ought to be an extremely active and busy place with the lines that already exist there, if it were getting all the traffic it is entitled to; but somehow wheat has not been stored at Albany since the establishment of the wheat pool. Experts declared Albany to be the best place in Western Australia for the storage of wheat, and said that it was most likely to be free from such troubles as weevil.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: The weevils were not too bad there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Albany was supposed to be free from weevils because of the climate. I hope this line will not only be authorised but laid down without delay after other lines already authorised have been constructed. When it is possible to get cheap money for the settlement of our country, and when our own flesh and blood in the Old Land are looking for opportunity and work which, I am afraid, they are not likely to find there,



we should push ahead with development here; and therefore I support the second reading of this Bill with a great deal of pleasure.

**MR. A. WANSBROUGH** (Albany) [10.17]: I congratulate the Government on the bringing down of this Bill for the construction of a railway from Cranbrook to Boyup Brook. The line has been promised to the settlers in that area for the past 20 years, to my knowledge; and assuredly the settlers in question appreciate the Government's action. A reference to the map hanging on the wall of this Chamber shows that for a distance of 40 miles at each end of the proposed line the whole of the country to be served by the railway is alienated. True, for a distance of 20 miles in the middle the land is but sparsely alienated. However, I venture to say that within one month of the passage of this Bill every acre of those unalienated areas will have been applied for. Upon reference to statistics I learn that within an area of 15 miles of the proposed line the settlers have 2,198 horses, 3,059 cattle, 147,377 sheep, and about 500 pigs. Allowing a mild valuation of £8 per head for horses and cattle and £1 per head for sheep and pigs, I find that the value of stock now held in that country amounts to £189,933. Further, in the Tentarden area, which is outside a 15-mile radius of the proposed line, there are 50,000 sheep, the produce from which will also be carried over the proposed railway. The records of the Forests Department show that there are 250,000 acres of good marketable jarrah within the area to be served by this line, jarrah estimated to go from six to 12 loads per acre. Taking an average of eight loads per acre, the quantity available, at 7s. 6d. per load royalty, will give a revenue of £750,000, being £450,000 more than the estimated cost of construction from timber alone. It is also recorded that in the area in question there are 500 acres of orchard in full bearing. The Bill provides for a deviation of five miles on either side. That is a good proviso, but I do not altogether agree with the Leader of the Opposition that our railways ought to be built nearer to each other than is the practice to-day. We cannot afford to build railways at every 20 miles. The State is too large, and the population is too small. The present proposal seems to me a thoroughly wise one, and I give it my whole-hearted support.

**MR. BROWN** (Pingelly) [10.19]: I support the Bill, and rejoice to learn that we have so large a tract of country yet awaiting development. The proposed line, being 100 miles in length, must open up a considerable territory. This is, however, a different class of country from that which is known as the wheat belt. Two or three other railways which have been mentioned this evening serve a different class of country altogether. No doubt the country comprises good sheep land; there is a lot of timber available, and the land will probably be good for fruit and dairying. There is one other point I would like to bring under notice. In agreeing to the construction of the line proposed, which will cost a considerable sum of money, the Government should not forget at least one line that was sanctioned some time ago. I refer to the Brookton-Dale River line. That railway will pass through similar country that is equally good. We have been fighting for that line for over 20 years, but we have not got it yet. I hope the Government will take into consideration the question of constructing it. If an inspection were made, it would be found that the area to be traversed is typical of the land along the Boyup Brook line. I venture to predict that the construction of the Dale River line will bring into cultivation land adjacent to Perth. However, I hope the Government will give consideration to the project and build the line as soon as possible.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [10.22]: I have often questioned whether the building of additional railway lines can be justified because of the prevailing tendency to-day in the direction of motor transport. I regard the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway project as a distinct exception from that suggestion. Recently I accompanied the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) through the area to be served by the line. I must acknowledge that a wonderfully good area will be served by the line when it is constructed. In fact, I believe it could be described as a paradise for stock. The quality of the land I saw was suggestive of the best areas in Victoria, differing, of course, regarding the class of timber to be found there. The pastures were prolific, and, so far as I could see, the land was remarkably good. Boyup is already renowned as a centre for high-class and well-conditioned stock, while from an agricultural standpoint I do not know that there is land much superior in any other part of

the State. I hope the House will agree to the Bill and that the line will be constructed at the earliest possible moment. It will open up a considerable area of land suitable for potato and fruit production. Apart from the group areas, I believe that more schools have been established during the past year or two in the districts to be served by the line than in any other part of Western Australia. It has been stated that the quality of land is reflected in the character of the people. If that be so, then the quality of the land between Boyup Brook and Cranbrook is undoubtedly good. We found the settlers there remarkably hospitable. There is every justification for the construction of the line. It has been promised for a long time, and the people are anxious to see it constructed.

**MR. J. H. SMITH** (Nelson) [10.27]: It seems hardly necessary for me to speak in support of the construction of the line because the proposal stands on its merits, and there has been no opposition to it. In these circumstances we can expect the early construction of the line. I hope the Minister will not be too precipitate, and rush a crowd of men down to the district in the early part of January! I compliment the Minister for Works upon his desire to construct the railway. He has seen for himself what the country is capable of producing. After battling for six years in this House, at least one of my ideals is on the eve of fulfilment. I refer to the construction of this railway. I have advocated the line for over 20 years, ever since Lord Forrest supported it. I was chairman of the Railway League, and I regret that not much notice seemed to be taken of my efforts. The advisory board appointed by the previous Government reported favourably, and the present Government have agreed that the line should be constructed, in the interests of Western Australia.

The Premier: On national grounds.

**Mr. J. H. SMITH**: Yes, and for the development of the country. I listened with a great deal of interest the other day at a public function, to one of our great big men. He is one of the greatest Australians we have amongst us, and his utterance lifted us out of ourselves. We appreciated that we had a man amongst us. He was our own Premier who told us, in terms we will never forget, what was necessary for the welfare of the State, of Australia and of the Empire. It was a great speech.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Don't boom them. They boom themselves sufficiently.

**Mr. J. H. SMITH**: I appreciated that speech.

**Mr. Teesdale**: There is nothing in the Bill about it.

**Mr. J. H. SMITH**: If the hon. member is not big enough to appreciate the Premier's utterance, at least I do. The railway will serve to develop the whole of the South-West. When six years ago I put up a case for the same railway, the member for Guildford asked, "Who is going to say this country is worth developing?" I said "The settlers already established." The hon. member then said, "They are no judges, and in any case they will exaggerate and say something that is not true." So, to enable the Minister for Works to put up a case I have got the statistician to compile the figures proving that the railway should have been built 20 years ago. Respecting the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway, he says there are in the district 2,198 horses. They are principally draught horses.

**Mr. Teesdale**: Brumbies.

**Mr. J. H. SMITH**: No, not brumbies. They are all draught horses or utility horses. Then there are 3,659 cattle, 90 per cent. of them being dairy cattle; 147,377 sheep, nearly 1,000 pigs and 250,000 acres of the best jarrah forest, estimated to cut between six and 12 loads per acre with a general average of eight loads estimated to return 7s. 6d. per load in royalty. There the statistician is altogether wrong, for the Government will get from 30s. to £2 per load royalty.

**Mr. Teesdale**: More cheap money!

**Mr. J. H. SMITH**: What does the hon. member mean? Millars' combine and others have been robbing the State in the past. But this is all Crown land, where the Minister for Forests can put up areas for public auction. I guarantee the timber will carry the railway over for 10 or 20 years. More cheap money! I do resent that sneer. Does my friend realise the value of the timber, that it has brought 45s. per load royalty at Busselton. Why should we not be entitled to the maximum amount we can claim for royalty? Members do not seem to realise that our timber freights exceed our wonderful wheat freights by over £100,000 per annum, or that we pay 1s. 6d. per load wharfage on every load we send away, whereas wheat freights are sent away free.

Yet I get a cheap sneer from one on my own side about more cheap money.

The Minister for Works: Come over here.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: No, the Premier has given me rebuff after rebuff.

Mr. Teesdale: And you extend the other check.

Hon. J. H. SMITH: Yes, and get smacked on both sides. However, it is essential that this railway should be built. Then along the route of the railway there are 500 acres in orchard, where people have been endeavouring to grow fruit on a commercial basis 45 and 50 miles away from the nearest railway. The land to be served by this railway is going to produce some of the finest orchards in the world. Consider what it has been for those people growing fruit 40 and 50 miles from a railway and carting it in on a spring cart or a buggy, receiving perhaps 3s., 4s. or even less per case, unfortunately not being able to make a bargain on rails at Bridgetown or at some other station. I guarantee that once this railway is built there will be under orchard not 500 acres, but thousands of acres. Within 12 months of the Government starting the construction of the line, I am sure there will be 5,000 acres under orchard. I could go on all night talking of that country.

Mr. Teesdale: Don't!

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I am speaking of the South-West, not the North-West. I could tell members of the wonderful amounts of money that has been made by men on small holdings. In the year before last a man took from five acres of orchard 1,750 cases of fruit, which returned him a clear profit of £750. From the same area last year, which was a bad season, he cleared £500. Where, in any other part of Australia, would it be possible to get five acres of land that would give the same magnificent returns? Take land under irrigation for intense culture, or land used for dairying, and such returns will never be obtained. That is not an isolated case, and I would mention many more but that members seem quite convinced of the need for passing the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: And are anxious to pass it.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes, but the Minister for Lands should not forget that if I had not been advocating the construction of this railway for years, the Government probably would not have been asking us to authorise it. The Minister is anxious to get it passed.

Why? Simply because my arguments for years past have been so convincing.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Then why delay it?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: If the member for Albany has not seen fit to put up a case for his own district—

Hon. G. Taylor: No case is needed in support of this railway.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: If the member for Albany did not deem it necessary last year or the year before to put up a case for his own district—

Mr. Teesdale: You will have the Government changing their minds presently.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: There is a large area of land to be served that has not been alienated from the Crown. I object to the action of the Mitchell Government in having directed that the area between Boyup Brook and Cranbrook could be selected only under group settlement conditions. That policy has been continued by the present Government, and it is a crying shame. The old settlers in that district did not have too much land.

The Minister for Lands: There are no group settlements in that area.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: That is just the interjection I wanted. The Minister cannot deny that applications have been made for land and the invariable reply has been that the land is held for group settlement purposes.

The Minister for Lands: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Then the Minister ought to ascertain the facts without delay.

The Minister for Lands: Is there land in the district suitable for group settlement? I want land for that purpose.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister is merely attempting to bait me. He knows the views of his advisers and of Mr. Amery. I understand that a party will be leaving Perth on the 29th of this month to inspect the area and that in the party will be the Surveyor General and the District Surveyor.

The Minister for Lands: That is with regard to the railway, not to the land.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: They are going to inspect the land also. The Minister is not taking the Surveyor General and the District Surveyor down there for nothing. I am not blaming the present Minister for Lands. Before he took office this land was held up for group settlement, so that sons of old settlers have not been allowed to select a single acre. Yet nothing has been done towards building the railway. All that was done was to send down the Ad-

visory Board to report. I am pleased to know that when the Minister for Works visited the district he was greatly impressed. Speaking at Boyup Brook he said he was astonished to find such fertile country. He told the people that it was the policy of the Government not to make half-promises, but that when they put a railway on their programme, they intended to build it according to the Advisory Board's report. I know I am boosting the district somewhat, but I could not miss the opportunity to say a few words in favour of an undertaking that will make for the welfare of this State and of Australia generally.

**MR. E. B. JOHNSTON** (Williams-Narrogin) [10.49]: I desire to say a few words in support of the construction of a railway from Boyup Brook to Cranbrook, a proposal that has already received approval from all sides of the House. I hope that the Government's action in introducing this Bill, with which we all agree, indicates that they intend to begin an era of active railway construction throughout the State. The Government have acted wisely in introducing this measure as recommended by the Railway Advisory Board some months ago. So long as the Government adhere, as this Government always have, to the routes which that independent tribunal recognised as the best routes, they will be on safe and wise ground. It is pleasing for the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) and others, who have advocated this line for so many years, to see the consummation of their hopes. Quite 20 years ago a railway in this direction was forecasted. Before that, it was desired by the late Lord Forrest when Premier, but nothing has been done in a practical way to bring to fruition the wishes of the settlers there, until the Government brought down this measure.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: It was definitely promised.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes. This line will serve a number of old settlers in the district. It is pleasing to know that at last the iron horse is coming along. This railway will form another connecting link between the Great Southern and the Great Western districts. The land along the Great Southern may be said to comprise the best part of the State, and the more the Government can open up these lands east and west, the better it will be for the State. The member for Nelson has referred to the large amount

of timber in the district, as well as to the old settlers there. Undoubtedly there is room also for many thousands of other people to be settled along the route of the line, and in the district to be served by it. The land is exceedingly fertile and well watered. I know it well. It is eminently suited for close settlement. I believe there will be room there for homes for thousands of people. In giving my approval to this railway, I hope the Government will not be satisfied merely with the authorisation to construct it, but will build it as quickly as possible.

The Minister for Lands: We do build the railways we get authorised.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I know that. I am not finding any fault. I am approving the action of the Government in bringing down this Bill, and expressing the hope that the line will be built quickly.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

*House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Wednesday, 24th November, 1926.*

	PAGE
Bills: Albany Harbour Board, 2s. ... ..	2360
Roads Closure, 3s. ... ..	2360
State Insurance, Report ... ..	2360
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2s., Com. ...	2360
Legal Practitioners' Act Amendment, 1s. ...	2362
Loyal Agricultural Society, 1s. ... ..	2362
Ejanding-Northwards Railway, 1s. ... ..	2362
Boyup Brook-Cranbrook Railway, 1s. ... ..	2362
Shearers' Accommodation Act Amendment, Com.	2363
Timber Industry Regulation, 2s. ... ..	2376

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