Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 22nd September, 1932.

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

QUESTION—KIMBERLEY CATTLE.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a statement in Wednesday morning's Press relating to Kimberley cattle movements? 2, Is the information that Kimberley cattle were sent through the Northern Territory to South Australia and then sold at Kalgoorlie correct? 3, If so, have the Department of Agriculture put forward any suggestion to relieve the position?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Possibly, as Kimberley cattle can be sent to Kalgoorlie for immediate slaughter either through Fremantle or via the Northern Territory and South Australia. 3, Answered by 2.

QUESTION—PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.

Mr. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Premier: In view of the promise to private members last night not having been fulfilled, is it his intention to bring private members' business forward to-day, or alternatively to sit to-morrow and make up for the lost time?

The PREMIER replied: It is not my intention to do either.

Mr. Sleeman: Then we shall know how to take that.

The Minister for Lands: Last night's happening was an accident.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS.

As to Speaker's Ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: With regard to the ruling given by me last night at the close of the speech by the Minister for Works, when introducing the Bulk Handling Bill, I would like to make it clear that my ruling did not mean that the Minister should lay upon the Table all the documents from which he prepared his speech but only those official documents or files from which he may have quoted and which were in his sole possession. This rule is based on the rule of evidence in courts of law, which prevents counsel from citing documents which have not been produced in evidence. To lay upon the Table all documents from which a speech is compiled would make the rule ridiculous.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Your statement sounded somewhat confusing to me. You said that the Minister was not required to lay on the Table the documents from which he quoted, and then you said he was required to table them. May I see your ruling, in order to be clear on it?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes. I presume the hon. member has risen on a personal explanation. There cannot be any discussion upon a statement made by the Speaker to clear up the idea that I desired and demanded every member to lay upon the Table of the House letters or extracts from letters or documents used by him in the course of debate.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am not making a personal explanation. I am requesting that you make yourself clear regarding this ruling. As a member of the House, I think I am entitled to ask that. When you make yourself clear, and I am satisfied, I shall be glad to accept your ruling. You say in your ruling—

> I would like to make it clear that my ruling did not mean that the Minister should lay upon the Table all the documents from which he prepared his speech, but only those official documents or files from which he may have quoted and which were in his sole possession.

I do not know where the distinction arises. You do not mean that the Minister should Table all the documents from which he pre-

pared his speech. I did not suggest that he should do so. But you say—

> Only those official documents from which he may have quoted and which were in his sole possession.

The Minister read to the House letters and statements from different documents. Those are the documents I want laid on the Table. If your ruling means that those documents must be tabled, I am content.

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the hon. member I would like to say that letters sent by private individuals to the Minister on subject that he desires to bring before the House are, in my judgment, private and confidential, and may not be the subject of a request by any member to be laid on the Table.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is the point. Who is to decide whether they are private and confidential documents? The Minister read the documents to the House as evidence and proof of his statements.

Mr. SPEAKER: He read extracts from them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. Who assured you that they were private and confidential? The Minister did not say he was going to give extracts from documents that were private and confidential. He quoted them as reasons for the Bill. He gave them as Minister for Works, not as a private individual. I should like to know just when you learnt that the documents were private. They cannot be private documents when they are cited by the Minister for Works in the House.

Mr. Sampson: On a point of order, is there a motion before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. Sampson: This discussion is most remarkable.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to give any member who disputes anything that comes from the Chair an opportunity to ask for clarity regarding it.

Hon. M. F. TROY: There is no need for a motion. You have assumed, for some reason, that the documents from which the Minister read were private and confidential, but I point out that that assumption cannot be correct because the Minister quoted the documents as public property and as reasons for the Bill. How could such documents be private and confidential? How you could have arrived at that very fine distinction, I do not know. The Minister used certain letters that had come to him from Shanghai and Japan. They dealt with bulk handling and the marketing of wheat and were used to buttress his arguments. He quoted those documents as a guarantee that certain things would happen.

Mr. Kenneally: That people there would take bulk wheat.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister quoted extracts and gave the names of the writers of the letters which were sent to him as Minister for Works. He quoted the letters to the House as evidence in support of his argument. Do I understand you to say that they are private and confidential documents? I want an answer to that question. Otherwise, what are the documents to which you refer? Since you have given the ruling, you probably know of private documents to which you have referred. I do not know of any.

The PREMIER: There is no trouble about the documents connected with the speech of the Minister last night, to which the hon. member has referred, but this matter ought to be cleared up. Under what Standing Order are we compelled to produce any document which we quote to the House? If it were a public file or paper, of course it must be laid on the Table. That course always has been adopted, and must be adopted. But if someone wrote to the member for Mt. Magnet, and he handed the letter on to me to read and I afterwards said to the House that I had a letter from some correspondent of the hon. member and I quoted from it, could I produce it?

Mr. Sleeman: Was not a letter read here one evening by a private member and did not the present Premier call for it to be laid on the Table?

The PREMIER: Yes. However, one might not be able to produce a letter that is not public property. Naturally, any public document could be produced, and if asked for would have to be produced. But the position is different as regards these letters dealing with bulk handling. The matter is one for future guidance as to what is expected of us, and under what authority such documents can be claimed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If a private member read to the House a statement from a private document, he would not be required to lay the private document on the Table; but the case of a Minister is different. As a Minister of the Crown he receives these letters, and he puts them before the House in support of his argument in favour of a certain Bill, just as he might quote official

files or figures. Certainly the House expects, and it is required of him to lay those documents on the Table, so that members may know that the statement made by the Minister is a complete statement. Otherwise the Minister might put anything over the House. The position of the Minister is different in this respect from that of a private member. How can Mr. Lindsay contend that it is as Mr. Lindsay he introduces a Bill in this House? He introduces the Bill as Minister for Works. We are told that the very documents on which he bases his case for the Bill are private property.

Hon. P. Collier: The letters may be from trading firms interested in the wheat business.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The provision in question is in "May" for the reason that members shall be protected in dealings with Ministers. When Ministers quote any document that document must be made available to the House. Why should the Minister object to laying on the Table letters from which he quoted in good faith? If the Minister does not lay them on the Table, people will suggest that there is a reason for his not doing so. For the Minister's own protection, the papers should be laid on the Table.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I understand that in this case the Minister for Works is perfectly willing that everything he has bearing on the subject should be produced.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Then why all this objection?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It appears to me that his being willing in this case ought not to form a new precedent. I have never heard the point argued before, but "May" seems to make the position perfectly clear—

> A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other State paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table . . . . .

Then a particular case is quoted, an ancient precedent, but one which still seems to hold good—

> On the 18th May, 1865, the Attorney General, on being asked by Mr. Ferrand if he would lay upon the Table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred, on a previous day, in answering a question relative to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, replied that he had made a statement to the House upon his own responsibility, and that, the documents he had referred to being private, he could not lay them upon the Table. Lord R. Cecil contended that the papers, having been cited, should be produced; but the Speaker declared that this rule applied to public documents only.

I do not think it would be a good thing that the Minister for Works should consent to lay these papers on the Table of the House, if it should form a future precedent. It might easily be that to require such papers to be produced would not be right.

Mr. Kenneally: Is not a letter written to a Minister and indicating a firm's willingness to take bulk wheat a public document?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No.

Mr. Kenneally: Do you say it is a private letter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not public property.

Mr. Kenneally: Is it a private letter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It may or may not be.

Mr. Kenneally: If it is a private letter, it should not be quoted. If it is not a private letter, it should be laid on the Table.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I would indeed be surprised if hon. members of experience were to say that a letter written to me, whether as Attorney General or as a private member, was public property.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I do not suggest that.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I did not think the hon. member would suggest it.

Hon. M. F. Troy: There is a distinction there.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have no objection unless this forms a new precedent.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It will not form a new precedent. All the Minister need do in the future is to say, "I give this on my own responsibility; it is written to me privately." But if a Minister quotes letters and uses their arguments in support of a Bill before the House, the letters are public property.

The Attorney General: Suppose the Minister gets information from the Public Library that is not available anywhere else, what will he do then?

Mr. Panton: See a trustee of the Public Library.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If the Minister utilised a document or book from the Public Library, he should lay the document or book on the Table of the House. In this case,

however, the information was sent to him as proof that bulk wheat would be accepted by certain countries. So the letter becomes a public document and therefore we require it to be laid on the Table.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have here all the documents required by the hon. member. I quoted certain letters from an insurance company. Here they are, including a copy of a letter which was not directed to me, and which I did not say was directed to me. It was sent to me by Mr. Donnelly, manager of the Graingrowers' Co-operative Company, Sydney, he having received it, and another letter which I quoted, from Japan and China. Other matter I quoted was from a letter I received from the General Manager of the South African Railways. Here is the letter. I mentioned also Mr. Stevens, a Commonwealth officer who made certain inquiries. Here is the matter received from him. Further, I mentioned the report of an advisory committee on bulk handling which sat and reported in 1913. Here is the report. I mentioned certain information obtained by myself; here it is. Lastly, I mentioned a report of the United States Department of Agriculture, and here it is. I move—

That these papers be laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Are the letters there which were received from Shanghai and elsewhere by Mr. Donnelly?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust that the atmosphere is clearer now. As long as I have been a member of this Chamber I have always been under the impression, quite apart from "May" or any other parliamentary authority, that when a member produced in the Chamber a letter or document, that letter or document could be impounded for the purpose of being laid on the Table of the House. That was one of the considerations which guided me last night in ruling that the Minister for Works, having read certain letters and given the names of the writers, should lay the letters on the Table of the House. On referring later to "May," however, I gathered from the rulings cited by that learned writer that only official documents were subject to this rule, and that if a member reads in the House a letter which he declares to be confidential, it cannot be laid on the Table. The member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) recently read in this Chamber a letter, and before getting very far he told the House from whom he got his information. I ruled then, in response to Mr. Sleeman, that the letter was not a document which should be laid on the Table of the House, because it was desired that the name of the writer of the letter should be kept confidential. I ask hon. members to believe that as Speaker I have only one aim and object, to hold the scales evenly balanced, and to try to the best of my ability to give fair play to all members of the Chamber.

Question put and passed.

BILL—BULK HANDLING.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read, recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

1, Local Courts Act Amendment.

2, Justices Act Amendment.

3, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.

4, Debtors Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Attorney General.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by Minister for Works, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 2 and 3.

In Committee.

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

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 39:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the Bill was previously before the Committee, I agreed to amend it to exclude butter factories. I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (a) and lines 3 and 7 of paragraph (b), after "milk products," the words "(other than butter)" be inserted.

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

Clause 3—Amendment of Third Schedule:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is a consequential amendment in Clause 3. I move an amendment—

That in line 2, after "milk products," the words "other than butter" be inserted.

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

Bill reported with further amendments.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 13th September.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Kalgoorlie) [5.6]: The Bill is similar to others that have been introduced during the past eight or nine years. In 1925, the then Minister for Works (Hon. A. McCallum) introduced a similar Bill, and again in 1926 and 1929. In those circumstances, it will be realised that the Bill has been on the stocks for a considerable time. I regret the present Bill does not provide for an alteration in the franchise. It will be remembered that an attempt was made when the Labour Government were in office, to provide for the principle of one ratepayer one vote. Bills embodying the principle were passed by this House but, as the result of opposition in the Legislative Council, they did not become law. The present Minister for Works is apparently prepared to allow plural voting to remain in the parent Act. Notwithstanding that constitutions, not only of local governing bodies but also of States, have undergone changes throughout the world, and that in New South Wales a Bill has been introduced to alter the Constitution to provide for an elective Legislative Council in place of the present nominee Chamber, the Minister seems satisfied to continue under the old order and allow a number of votes to be cast by individuals, in preference to adopting the principle of one ratepayer, one vote. Then again, the Minister does not propose to effect any alteration in the title of road boards or road districts, notwithstanding the fact that conferences of road board representatives have reaffirmed resolutions passed on at least two separate occasions in favour of an alteration of those designations to district councils. In August last a conference again voted in favour of that alteration. The change of title is desired because the functions of road boards have been extended from time to time with consequent added responsibilities. When the parent Act was passed, their responsibilities were quite limited. The Minister appears to be satisfied with the existing arrangement, and probably relies on the decisions of conference relating to other provisions in the Bill and has ignored their desires regarding an alteration in their title. Some fresh provisions are included in the Bill, although the Minister did not mention them during the course of his second reading speech. For instance, he proposes to extend the definition of "owner" by including tenants of lessees and of lessors not responsible for rates imposed under the Act. The Minister did not explain the meaning of the proposed alteration, and I hope he will take advantage of his right to reply to tell us what is proposed under that heading. I also find it is intended to abolish the right of ratepayers to elect an auditor annually. Probably that provision has been inserted in the Bill as a result of requests placed before the Minister, but he did not take the House into his confidence in that regard. The Minister also proposes that a road board may appoint an auditor as an officer of the board. I suppose that provision is inserted on account of outback road districts. The Minister may think it altogether too expensive to send auditors into those far distant areas, but he did not clear up that point. The Bill also provides that in road districts where the revenue recoverable by way of rates is less than £500, the road board may be abolished and that district amalgamated with that of another road board. The Act provided for a minimum of £300, and the Bill of 1929 sought to increase the minimum to £600. It must be remembered that at least 25 per cent. of the revenue collected by road boards is spent in administration costs, and therefore the amendment in that direction is desirable. It stands to reason that in districts where the revenue does not exceed £500 the people are anxious to have the money spent on useful work, hence the desirability for the alteration. Other portions of the Bill are almost identical with amendments embodied in Bills introduced formerly, and I intend to support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—York—in reply) [5.15]: I think there are only two points which the hon. member has brought up. One is in respect of the alteration of definition of "owner." The reason for that is that the University endowment land and certain Education Department endowment lands have been leased to tenants, and the local authorities have no legal power to rate those properties. On the Notice Paper I have an amendment to be inserted in the Bill in order to make the point clearer. The hon. member had a doubt about certain things, but he will find that doubt removed in Section 212 of the Act. At present religious bodies have no rates to pay, but if they let portion of their property for the erection of houses or for business purposes, the point is dealt with under Section 212 of the Act. As for the education endowment land, there is no power to rate that land if it be leased to other persons.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Would it apply also to the Commissioner of Railways and to the denominational bodies?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it is provided that religious bodies are rate-free. But if they let portion of their property for homes or business purposes, that portion becomes rateable. The point dealing with auditors has been requested for a number of years. The department has but three auditors, and they cannot go all over the State in one year. In many country areas an auditor is appointed. Not always is he in a position to do the work properly. But now, with the approval of the road boards, the department will increase the number of their auditors to six, and the local authorities will bear half the cost. So it is hoped to be able to keep a continuous audit on all the local authorities in the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment to Section 5:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Minister does not say whether this will include the tenants of the Commissioner of Railways, who has a number of cottages let to railway men throughout the State.

The Minister for Lands: It is not intended that they shall be included.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Will the railway men, the tenants of the Commissioner, have to pay rates? Is that the intention of the Minister?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can assure the Committee the point has not been considered. If the Act has been interpreted that way, it has not been brought to my notice. To begin with, the Commissioner of Railways has no lease of the land. All that this is intended to do is to bring in properties that cannot be rated under the Act, such as the University endowment lands and the Education Department's endowment lands. This is merely to provide that tenants on those lands shall be rated. However, I shall have the point raised by the hon. member inquired into, and if I find it is as he suggests I will recommit the Bill.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: This clause would not make the Commissioner of Railways responsible for rates. What it does is to provide that the tenant of an owner or lessor who is not responsible for the payment of rates shall become responsible. It is the tenant who shall become responsible.

Hon. A. McCallum: That, if it be right, makes it all the worse.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Undoubtedly the tenant of an owner or lessor who is not responsible for rates shall become responsible. That is the purpose of the clause.

Hon. A. McCallum: Then the railway men would have to pay?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Certainly the tenants will have to pay.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Members will see on the Notice Paper an amendment which I propose to insert in this clause. As I say, if the clause, plus the amendment, will make these railway cottages subject to rates I will recommit the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Railway Department has let properties for business purposes, and I understand there is no power to compel the occupiers of those premises to pay rates. Latterly in entering into agreements with such occupiers the Commissioner of Railways has made it a condition that they shall pay rates.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In Section 212 of the Road Districts Act occur

these words, "land the property of the Crown and used for public purposes or unoccupied." We have to decide whether the housing of the railway men in those cottages is a public purpose. If so, I think this would not apply to a tenant. It is not the intention of the Government that it should apply. Of course if the Commissioner's property is leased to a business concern, the occupiers ought to pay rates.

Mr. SAMPSON: The effect of this would be that the rent would necessarily be reduced. If the Commissioner did not reduce the rent, the tenants would walk out.

Mr. Kenneally: And have no other place to walk into.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have to consider it from the standpoint of the local authorities. Rates should be payable for those cottages. The local authorities should not be deprived of those rates.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I am prepared to accept the Minister's undertaking to have the matter gone into, so that railway cottages shall not be brought in under the clause. The Commissioner for Railways will certainly not reduce the rents, which are calculated as part of the men's wages. If the men have to pay rates and taxes, this will be another method of reducing their wages.

The Minister for Lands: He practically compels the men to occupy these premises.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yes, and there are no other places they can occupy.

Mr. SAMPSON: Are we to understand that this principle will not be proceeded with? I hope that is not the case. For many years this has been a burning question with local authorities. At Merredin, for instance, a number of cottages are owned by the Railway Department and occupied by railway workers, but no rates have been paid to the local road board. That is distinctly unfair and improper. The member for South Fremantle is needlessly and unjustifiably suspicious. The Commissioner for Railways would do only what was right and fair, but under the Act there are no means of enforcing the payment of rates. In the case of shops on railway property, I understand an arrangement has been made whereby the rates are paid to the local authorities.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There are two kinds of railway cottages, one occupied by railway employees practically as part of their job, and others which people occupy who may not be employed by the railways. Those cottages which are exempt come under the definition of land which is the metropolitan area come under the public purposes.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The cottages in the metropolitan area come under the Municipal Corporations Act.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The wording in the Municipal Corporations Act is practically the same as in the Road Districts Act. I do not think the alteration proposed will affect the situation. It is the exemption section which governs the situation. I will, however, discuss the matter with the Minister for Works and see that this clause does not bring about what the member for South Fremantle fears.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Minister for Works said it was not his intention to include properties controlled by the Commissioner for Railways.

The Minister for Works: I never thought of it.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: And the clause was not intended to provide for rating on such properties?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The effect of the clause will be to make the lessee or tenant of public endowment land the owner for the purpose of making such land rateable. I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) the words "or tenant of a lessor who is not responsible for rates imposed under this Act" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"or a lessee or tenant under a lease or tenancy agreement of land which in the hands of the lessor is non-rateable land within the meaning of this Act, by which in the hands of such lessee or tenant and by reason of such lease or tenancy is declared by this Act or any other Act to be rateable land for the purposes of this Act."

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

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 6:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Is this clause intended to provide that elections shall take place on Saturday rather than on week days?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. Most elections in the country are already held on Saturdays, and the annual election is by this clause fixed for Saturday.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Amendment of Section 62:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I shall be glad if the Minister will explain this clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This is to extend the period for receiving nominations from seven to fourteen days. This may mean putting the date of the election a little further forward. The clause also provides that, when a member of a board dies and a vacancy is created, such vacancy may be extended to a period of four months instead of three months.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 69:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph 5, before the word "nomination" in the last line, the words "closing of the" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I see no reason for accepting the amendment. The paragraph is quite clear as printed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 11—Penalties in case of nomination of incapacitated person:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: What is the reason for this clause? It throws a responsibility not only upon the candidate but the person who signs the nomination, to ensure that the candidate has the necessary qualification for the position. The latter person is also liable to a penalty of £20. That is a very stiff penalty to impose upon a man who signs a nomination for someone else. What is the idea at the back of this? Has it ever been found necessary to have such a penalty? Have false nominations been received, or have nominations of unqualified persons been handed in?

Mr. BROWN: Why has this been inserted? Have there been any cases of unqualified persons submitting themselves for candidature? I should like the Minister to give us some reason for it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Act provides that candidates shall have certain qualifications. It may be possible for someone to submit himself for election more as a joke than anything else, and it is for the purpose of preventing that kind of thing, which might cause unnecessary expense to a road board, that the provision has been inserted. Of course it would be all right if the individual who might be responsible for the election had the necessary qualifications. The provision will not work any hardship. Road boards have asked for the amendment so that they might be protected against anything of the kind I have suggested happening.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 12, 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Repeal of Section 123 to 127, and substitution of new sections:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of proposed new Section 123 the words "the board shall elect" be struck out, with a view to inserting "the first business of a meeting shall be the election by the board of."

If the procedure is to be made clear, these words will have to take the place of those that are in the proposed section. As it is, the time of the election is indefinite and it can take place at any period of the meeting. I have been asked to move the amendment because there is every justification for it. If the Attorney General thinks it is not justified, I shall be glad if he will point out where it is wrong.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At the first meeting of a road board it is provided that a chairman shall be elected. How can there be a meeting without a chairman? A chairman must be elected immediately for the ensuing 12 months. The term of the previous chairman will have expired.

Mr. Sampson: Not necessarily.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The first business is that of the election of a chairman. At the last conference of the road boards association a resolution was carried unanimously that no amendment should be made to the Bill. The member for Swan is doing nothing else but suggesting amendments. I refuse to accept what he proposes.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15, 16—agreed to.

[*Mr. Richardson took the Chair.*]

Clause 17—Amendment of Section 135:

Mr. SAMPSON: Subsection (1) of the proposed new Section 135 should be struck out. It is possible that a resolution has been carried very early or late in the day and then the question may be resubmitted and what was originally agreed to may be defeated. It is a dangerous proposal that will make for confusion. Such a revision is not permitted in any deliberative assembly that I know of.

The Minister for Lands: At present a decision may be revoked at the same meeting.

Mr. SAMPSON: But under this provision a simple majority might revoke a decision. I move—

That the proposed new subsection (1) be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Section 135 of the Act reads—

Any resolution of the board may be revoked or altered at the same or any subsequent meeting, either by the unanimous vote of all the members, or by a vote of the majority of the board, subject in such last-mentioned case to the condition that, seven days at least before such subsequent meeting, notice in writing thereof and of the proposal to alter or revoke such resolution shall have been given to each member.

The object of the proposed new section is to clarify the position so that boards will know where they stand. The existing principle will not be altered.

Mr. SAMPSON: The effect of the new section will be to bring road boards into disrepute. Resolutions may be adopted at one period of a meeting, only to be re-submitted later because somebody has been able to win over a member and induce him to alter his vote.

Mr. MARSHALL: Some road board members are energetic and some are indifferent and should never accept such positions. If the energetic members passed a motion, the minority could round up absentee members and get the decision reversed. I am afraid that the new subsection will lead to trouble.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Often a board member who has to travel a long distance does not arrive until afternoon, but he might advance views and information on a subject that makes a revocation of a decision desirable. Unless this provision were inserted, it would be necessary to wait until the succeeding meeting before an alteration could be made. There is no danger in allowing boards to manage their own business.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Act provides for a unanimous vote, but under the proposed new subsection, a simply majority would be sufficient to reverse a decision.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the proposed new subsection (1):—"and the vote as subsequently taken is unanimously carried."

Sometimes through error or lack of information a motion is passed and it is not realised until subsequently that a mistake has been made. When a mistake is made, it should be possible to rectify it by unanimous vote of the board members.

Mr. Kenneally: Suppose the resolution was not carried unanimously?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The amendment would make it impossible to review any decision. One or two members might object out of sheer cussedness to a decision; and the work of the board, if a unanimous vote were insisted upon, would be hampered.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 18 to 22—agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Clause 23—Power of boards to lease certain reserves:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I understand this clause will be administered by the Minister for Lands. Will he throw some light on its effect? Does it mean that a number of leases have already been granted for 999 years If so, that is altogether too long a term.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the Land Act leases have been granted to road boards for that period. The Minister for Lands has power to grant the lease of certain reserves either in fee simple or for any term up to 999 years. This Bill does not give any power to the Minister for Lands. It merely enables road boards to lease such reserves for periods up to three years. Some of the reserves are vested in road boards for recreation purposes or as commons. At the end of three years a further application for the right to lease will have to be made.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24, 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Amendment of Section 160:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have been requested by the Swan Road Board to submit an important amendment to this clause. Unfortunately some little delay has occurred in putting the matter together. It is very much desired that this amendment should appear on the Notice Paper. Perhaps the Minister will agree to recommit the Bill so that this can be done.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have no desire to burke discussion, and am therefore prepared to recommit the Bill so that the hon. member may have an opportunity to move his amendment.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Amendment of Section 202:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Act authorises road boards to declare certain areas in which only brick dwellings may be erected. It seems to me the Minister under this clause is asking for authority to intercede on behalf of people who may desire to erect wooden houses in such areas. Will he please explain the clause?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The position is as stated by the hon. member. Section 202 of the Act deals with the making of building by-laws. This clause will enable the Governor in Council to set aside an area in which it shall be lawful to use wood for the external and internal walls of buildings. This will usually be done on the application of the local authority concerned.

Hon. A. McCallum: The local authorities will not have the power to do this?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have not got it now, because the Bill we brought down some time ago was defeated.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The clause also authorises the Minister to hear applications from individuals. It will then remain for the Minister to agree to or refuse such application irrespective of the action that may have been taken by the road board concerned.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Land speculators have been in the habit of buying a property for subdivision and erecting upon it one or two buildings of a good class. This has enabled them to stipulate that only buildings of that type shall be erected by purchasers of their blocks. By this means persons of a limited income have been unable to erect wooden buildings in such localities. The investors have had a fair amount of influence with local governing bodies as a result of the methods they have adopted, and in that way wooden buildings have been restricted to other areas. It is now proposed to ask Parliament to agree that the Governor in Council may override local bodies in this matter. It may be recalled that when the Government wished to erect certain homes out of money supplied from the McNess fund we were refused the right to put them up. If this Bill becomes law the Government will have the right to override a position such as was created then.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 37—Amendment of Section 206:

Mr. ANGELO: This clause purports to reimburse members of road boards for their actual travelling expenses, but the amount allowed is only 10s. per individual. This is not sufficient in many cases. If a member of a road board resides only three or four miles away from the meeting place the allowance may be quite sufficient to cover the cost of motor hire for that distance, whereas the member who resides 100 miles away, as may be the case in the North-West, will still only be entitled to 10s. This may be regarded as a small matter, but in fact it is not. I have known excellent members of road boards to resign because of the heavy travelling expenses incurred in attending meetings. I move an amendment—

That in proposed Subsection (2) all words after "exceed," in line 5, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"threepence per mile from the usual place of residence by the nearest recognised route."

The amendment is equitable. A motion to the effect of the amendment was carried unanimously by the road board conference held in Perth three or four weeks ago. The funds belong to the road boards, who are entitled to recoup members actual out-of-pocket expenses. A member who is willing to serve for patriotic reasons need not draw this money.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Act allows certain reasonable expenses to road board members. The amount of 10s. represents an increase. As regards the threepence per mile, I do not know that every road board member travels by motor car,

and railway travel does not cost 3d. per mile. The conference motion was carried on the understanding that the amendment would be included in some future Bill at some future time—not in this Bill. The clause should remain as it is. Few road boards would agree to pay the money, and few road board members would accept it. Road Board members usually hold their position out of public spirit.

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister reads into my amendment that every road board member will receive 3d. per mile; but that is not so. The board is to refund a member any expenses necessarily incurred, and the limit is 3d. per mile. That rate would not be allowed for railway travelling.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the amendment were altered to make the rate of 3d. per mile payable one way only, I could support it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 38, 39—agreed to.

Clause 40—New section:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To correct a clerical error, I move an amendment—

That the word "may," in line 10, be struck out, and "shall" inserted in lieu.

The intention is that if a valuation is reduced in any rateable year, the road board shall recover rates on the basis of the lower valuation.

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

Clauses 41 to 50—agreed to.

Clause 51—Amendment of Section 270:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"(a) by deleting the paragraphs numbered secondly and fourthly and inserting after the paragraph numbered firstly a paragraph to be numbered secondly as follows:—Secondly: In payment of all unpaid rates and taxes at the time of the sale due to or imposed in favour of the Crown in right of the State or any department or agency of His Majesty's Government of the State, and also of all unpaid rates due to or imposed by the board and the local authority under the Health Act, 1911-1926, in respect of the land at the time of the sale, and of all the board's expenses of and incidental to the proceedings in the local court or the sale of the land. Provided that, where the moneys remaining after the payments provided for in the next preceding paragraph have been made are not sufficient for the payment in full of all the rates, taxes, and expenses mentioned and provided for in this paragraph, such moneys shall be distributed between the Crown, the department, the agency and the board pro rata with the amounts of their claims respectively."

If rates have not been paid on land for five years, local governing bodies have the right to sell it; but they have to take action to effect the sale, and that costs money. In the result they cannot get any of the proceeds of the sale for themselves until all claims against the land have been paid, and thus the local governing body sometimes finds itself considerably out of pocket. The idea is to protect the local governing body by providing that its out-of-pocket expenses in connection with the sale shall be a first charge on the proceeds of the sale.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why was not this suggested at the conference?

The Minister for Works: I do not know.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Where did you get this amendment?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It comes from the department. Recently the Beverley Road Board sold some land on which rates had not been paid for many years. After getting an order of sale from the local court and selling the land, they found themselves considerably out of pocket by the transaction, because all the proceeds had to be paid to the Government. The department wish to protect local governing bodies to the extent, at any rate, of out-of-pocket expenses.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Prior to the tea adjournment, the Minister chastised another member for introducing matters not agreed to by the road board conference, and not included in the Bill. Apparently the Minister himself has transgressed because, so far as we know, this matter has not been considered by a road board conference. The Minister was right in his first contention, and I would like an assurance that road boards, other than the Beverley board, are interested and agree that this provision is necessary.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am afraid the amendment will not achieve what the Minister desires. Much trouble has been experienced regarding the sale of land on which rates and taxes are owing. I refer particularly to the Perth Road Board area where a lot of land is held in fee simple.

The owners have abandoned their properties and it does not pay the local authorities to sell the properties because they cannot secure any bids for them. The Crown cannot do anything with such property. I am afraid the amendment will make the sale of such land more difficult than ever. A different procedure should be adopted. It was proposed to introduce legislation to simplify the methods by which land held in fee simple can revert to the Crown.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The notes furnished to me in respect of this amendment indicate that boards have instituted proceedings for the sale of land and that charges against the property have proved more than the proceeds from the sale. The proceeds have not been sufficient to pay both the Crown and the board in full. The object of the amendment is to divide the proceeds of the sale between the parties interested on a pro rata basis. I do not know why the Minister for Lands should oppose the amendment.

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

Clauses 52 to 60—agreed to.

Clause 61—Amendment of Section 313:

Mr. SAMPSON: In the event of a board appointing an auditor, will the proportionate amount, which, under the zone system, will be payable by the board, still be payable?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause will enable the Minister to decide whether he considers it necessary for a Government auditor to be despatched to a road district when the board has appointed an auditor to carry out an audit for its own purposes. If the Minister decides that an auditor should be sent, then the board will have to pay half the costs. There are only three Government auditors employed on this work, and it is impossible for them to audit the books of all road boards throughout the State in one year. The books of some boards are not audited for two or three years. Road board conferences have asked for this provision and have agreed to pay half the cost of the increased number of auditors to be appointed

Mr. SAMPSON: I wanted to know what the position would be regarding a board situated in a distant part of the State and perhaps not operating under the zone system. Would that board still have to pay its proportionate share?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I assume that certain sections of the State will not be brought within the zone system and will employ their own auditors. Even if the Minister should deem it necessary to send a Government auditor to deal with such a board's books, the board would not have to pay to-day, and I assume that, in such circumstances, they would not pay in future.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 62, 63—agreed to.

Clause 64—Amendment of Section 320:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That after "subsection," in line 5, the following words be added:—"And by deleting the words 'in the gazette, and may also be published in,' in line 5 of the said subsection."

This is merely a question of cutting down costs and may save a few pounds.

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

Clauses 65 to 69—agreed to.

Clause 70—Amendment of Section 341:

Mr. SAMPSON: The clause is very involved and exceedingly difficult to understand. The wording would puzzle even those who are accustomed to considering Bills. Perhaps the Minister will agree to the clause being re-drafted. It is possible to sense what is meant, but not readily. Legislation should be framed so as to be easily understood.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause is an exact copy of Sections 514 and 515 of the Municipal Corporations Act. If it represents bad drafting, it is strange that I have not heard of any complaints regarding it from the municipal authorities. It was found that Section 341 of the Road Districts Act, which was framed to protect local governing bodies from legal proceedings, did not meet the requirements. That knowledge was gained as the result of the experience of the Claremont Road Board. It was therefore decided to place the road boards and municipal councils on the same footing, and the sections from the Municipal Corporations Act are embodied in the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 71 to 73—agreed to.

New Clause:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move—

That new clauses be inserted, after Clause 14, to stand as Clauses 15 and 16, as follows:—

Amendment of Section 128.

15. Section one hundred and twenty-eight of the principal Act is amended by inserting at the beginning of subsection two the words "subject to section one hundred and twenty-eight A of this Act."

New Section.

16. A section is inserted in the principal Act after section one hundred and twenty-eight, as follows:—

Boards may establish an indemnity fund.

128A. (1.) Any board, or any boards acting together may, with the approval of the Governor and subject to regulations, establish and maintain an indemnity fund for the purpose of guaranteeing and indemnifying such board or boards against loss arising from the defalcation, fraud or dishonesty of its or their officers or servants, and may make periodical contributions to such fund out of the ordinary revenue of the board.

(2.) Where an indemnity fund has been established, a board contributing to such fund may, with the approval of the Minister, appoint or continue the appointment of a secretary or other officer entrusted with moneys without obtaining the security provided for in subsection two of section one hundred and twenty-eight of this Act.

Section 128 instructs the board to take out an indemnity policy in regard to certain officers. For some time past the Road Boards Association have been giving attention to the establishment of an officers' fidelity fund on the lines of that in Victoria. The cost of such a fund to the local authorities is comparatively low, the premium rates being only 6s. 8d. per cent., while the fund has built up a very substantial reserve. I feel sure these proposed new clauses will appeal to members.

The CHAIRMAN: This will have to be treated as two motions. I will put the proposed new Clause 15 first.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will agree to the amendment.

New clause put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now take proposed new Clause 16.

New clause put and passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: Does the Minister intend to have a consolidated measure prepared?

The Minister for Lands: Read the last clause of the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not think that provides for a consolidation.

The Minister for Works: I will give it consideration.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.22]: The object of the Bill is to make a variation in the grading of the whole of our dairy herds. Whereas in the past it was necessary that they should be registered annually, at a fee of 5s., there is now to be a variation, and pure-bred bulls are to be registered only once, which will hold good for the life of the bull. But the grade bulls will still have to conform to the old conditions and be registered each year. I do not know what is behind the alteration. It is true that requests have been made to do away with the registration altogether, and it is equally true that there is always difficulty in getting certain owners to register their animals, for they seem to think it an imposition. The concession is now to be made in regard to pure-bred bulls. I assume the Government are anxious to encourage the breeding of pure-bred bulls, and because of that the concession is granted and a 10s. registration fee will hold good for the life of the bull. I am not sure there is not danger in this. Provision should be made to keep track of the bulls. If a bull should be sold and transferred to another owner it is still necessary that the Department of Agriculture should know where the bull is. I do not think there is any provision for this, unless it can be effected by regulation. Clause 5 seeks to amend Section 11 of the Act. I do not know how much of Section 11 is to be deleted. Is it merely the first paragraph, or is the proviso also to come out? If the proviso is to be deleted, it means that the right of appeal from the decision of the Superintendent of Dairying, which I regard as essential, will no longer obtain.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is intended only to delete Subsection 1; the proviso remains.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Then that will be quite safe. Otherwise the right of appeal against the decision of the Superintendent of Dairying, who has power to refuse the registration of a bull below standard, would disappear. That would be reposing too much power in the official.

The Minister for Agriculture: There has been but one appeal in six years.

Mr. MILLINGTON: That is because of the right to appeal. Moreover, the official, knowing there is provision for appeal, acts carefully. It is always well that the officer shall be responsible to the Minister.

The Minister for Agriculture: The appeal is to a board.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Yes, in this instance it is, but ordinarily it is as well not to repose absolute power in any official. There should be some form of appeal, either to the Minister or to a competent board. If that appeal is to be retained, not much objection can be taken. As to grade bulls, the difficulty is that there is still such a number of them, and in many cases they are owned by the poorer class of dairy farmer. I assume that, the Government having given way in respect of pure-bred bulls, there will now be an agitation for grade bulls to be placed on the same footing. The farmer who is merely carrying on a whole milk business does not depend so much on pure-bred stock. To him the quality of the progeny is not nearly so essential as it is to those engaged in butter fat production, where the quality of the breed must be maintained. I find that in many instances the progeny from grade cattle is destroyed, the farmers finding that it does not pay to rear them, and contending that it is unnecessary to go to the expense of providing a costly pure-bred bull. So they object to the annual fee of 5s. for registration. Probably it will be found that the Minister will now be importuned to do away with the annual registration.

The Minister for Agriculture: You are putting ideas into their heads.

Mr. MILLINGTON: No, I have not put them there; indeed, I have stuck out against my own friends that the registration was essential. The difficulty was that we had to maintain a record in order to keep them up to scratch. I can see nothing particularly dangerous in the Bill, provided the right of appeal is retained.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: There is the possibility that the pure-bred bull with a certificate will never die.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [8.30]: I support the Bill. It appears to be an effort to encourage breeders to keep only the best of stock. It is right that we should not worry stud breeders, who are rendering the country great service, by asking them to register annually. The suggestion that that is likely to lead to losing trace of stud bulls does not cause me any concern. It does not matter where stud bulls go; they are useful wherever they are.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: I am not afraid of a stud bull being lost, but if a stud bull died, the owner might say that the certificate applied to another beast.

Mr. McLARTY: From what I have seen of the certificates, it would be difficult to ring in another bull. Most men who have stud bulls know what they are and the certificates describe them fairly fully.

Mr. Millington: I am afraid there will be a lot of pre-war bulls.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not think so. No objection can be taken to charging a fee of 5s. per annum for the ordinary herd bull. Owners of herd bulls cannot expect to receive the treatment that is meted out to a man building up a stud herd. I would encourage stud breeders wherever located and irrespective of the zone in which they live. Anything we can do to encourage breeders to undertake stud breeding should be done.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. P. D. Ferguson—Irwin-Moore—in reply) [8.32]: The object of the Bill is to encourage the use of stud bulls and to discourage the use of grade bulls. I do not think there will be any risk of a man who has had a stud bull that has died using the certificate to cover the registration of a mongrel bull. A man who goes to the trouble and expense of buying a stud bull is probably vitally interested in the type of cows he keeps and hopes to breed, and is not likely to damage the quality of his herd by using a mongrel bull. A man who once buys a pedigreed bull will probably

always have one. In the department we have over 2,000 live files dealing with the registration of bulls, and it entails a considerable amount of work to have the registration annually. The officers feel that life registration would be sufficient. In asking that grade bulls be registered annually, it is hoped that they will the earlier peter out, that it will be unnecessary to have grade bulls registered at all, and that all our breeders will utilise stud bulls. This applies to stallions. Once a stallion reaches a certain age, it has not to be re-registered every year. Life registration is allowed. The member for Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Millington) raised a question about dairymen concerned with whole milk but not with the progeny of their stock. Where the female progeny are retained they do, in course of time, get scattered through the dairying districts of the State, and the tendency is for them to reduce the standard of the herds. If we could induce people to use stud bulls, the quality, no matter whether breeders retained the progeny or whether the progeny were disposed of to other dairymen, would be infinitely better, and this would tend to improve the type of dairy cow throughout the dairying districts. We want to improve the quality and the type, and this is one way in which we can materially assist.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 6:

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: If the owner of a stud bull registers and later on sells it, is there any provision in the Act for the transfer of ownership to be notified to the department or does the certificate go with the bull?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: When a bull reaches a certain age, 12 months, I think, it is registered, and the certificate lasts for 12 months. If it is sold during the year, the certificate goes with the bull until the expiration of the year. Then the owner has to re-register it. Under the proposed amendment the one registration will suffice for life

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: When a bull is sold the department will lose record of it. A good bull will do no harm, but if a good bull died, the owner having a similar bull could use the certificate to cover that beast.

The Minister for Agriculture: It would not be to the owner's personal interest.

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: I am not so sure of that. The department should be notified of change of ownership.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 6, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—CLOSED ROADS ALIENATION.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 13th September of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.45]: This is by no means a formal and unimportant Bill. It seeks to vary a very vital principle contained in the Fruit Cases Act. That Act was framed not only to regulate the size of fruit cases but to ensure a rigorous prohibition of the use of second-hand cases except in certain instances. Generally speaking, the use of second-hand cases is not permitted. This is not in the interests merely of the manufacturer of fruit cases, with the idea of ensuring that only new cases are used, but in the interests of orchardists themselves. It has always been recognised as a grave danger to use second-hand cases. In this State we must have spent millions of money in combating plant

diseases and insect pests. The orchardist has to wage one continual battle against the pests that prey upon his trees. After an orchard has been brought to maturity, some people think everything is all right, but that is not so. There is one continual warfare going on to keep the orchard in order. The orchardists themselves, at considerable expense, have always favoured a rigorous prohibition against the use of second-hand cases, and a rigorous policing of the Act. The proposal to amend Section 8, the vital section of the Act, will not only create danger for the industry, but will make it almost impossible for the inspectorial branch of the Agricultural Department to do their work. Once the authorities give way on the question of the use of second-hand fruit cases, and agree to their being carried on the railways, a pernicious practice that must prove very dangerous to all orchardists will grow up. The second-hand cases covered by this Bill are for the carriage of grapes to a point east of the No. 1 rabbit-proof fence, somewhere in the vicinity of Burracoppin. Past that point not much harm might be done, but to reach that point these cases will pass through the fruit-growing district from, say, the Middle Swan to Northam. The railways would also acquire the habit of carrying second-hand fruit cases. Whereas to-day an inspector would immediately know if such cases were being carried, so soon as it became the practice to do so in certain instances he would not have the same opportunity to police the Act as he has to-day. Therein I see considerable danger. I assume that the superintendent of horticulture agrees that this is quite a safe thing to do, but he may have agreed, with the idea that although the work of his officers will be increased and made more difficult, the industry itself will be fostered. Even if the department are satisfied there is no danger in this practice—and I hope that is their opinion, and that they have seriously considered this matter before giving their approval—once these cases of fruit get past the rabbit-proof fence, and reach Kalgoorlie and other goldfields centres, as well as some agricultural districts, it will be possible for the second-hand cases to find their way also to Norseman, Salmon Gums and Esperance. Even now it is quite possible to grow fruit in the Esperance district, and whether that is done now to any extent or not, the time will come when the people there will provide fruit that is locally grown. Undoubtedly important orchards will develop in the Esperance area because both the climate and the soil are suitable. This is by no means a far-fetched suggestion. Disease will undoubtedly be carried if second-hand cases are permitted to be used for the conveyance of fruit. The Esperance district is just as much entitled to become a fruit-growing district as any other in the State, and the people there have the right to protection. This matter has always been considered an important one, and I refuse to believe that it is not now important. I assume that the second-hand cases will be bought very cheaply. I also assume that provision will be made for the cleaning of these cases and putting them into a sanitary condition before they are used. This is provided for in Section 8 of the Act. I do not suppose it is intended to override that section. Second-hand cases should be properly cleansed and put into a sanitary condition before being used. The cost of such cases would be considerably less than that of new cases. Let us assume that these are railed to Kalgoorlie, and contain table grapes which can be used for the manufacture of wine. I think the member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) will admit the possibility of that. I do not know whether the sales in Kalgoorlie will be supervised. I should say the difference between the cost of second-hand and new cases would be at least 6d.

Mr. Thorn: More than 6d.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The people in Kalgoorlie who received the fruit would get it ostensibly for wine-making purposes. They could club together to purchase a number of cases, and one man could dole them out to his neighbours at below the cost that the ordinary merchant would have to pay for fruit that came up in new cases. They could enter into competition in Kalgoorlie with the merchants by ordering fruit allegedly for wine-making purposes but actually for sale as grapes, to the prejudice of those who were carrying on their legitimate trade in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. If this concession is made, the position will have to be safeguarded by regulation to prevent the sort of thing I have described. It is just what is likely to happen. These people will be looking for a saving of 6d. or 7d. per case. We have no guarantee that they will not use this means to secure cheaper fruit and unfairly compete with others who are in the fruit trade.

Mr. Thorn: That will not be possible. Fruit gets damaged when it is picked for wine making.

Mr. MILLINGTON: That difficulty could be overcome. The people who are interested in this business are very shrewd. If they specify sound and properly picked fruit, they will get it in sufficiently good condition for public consumption. I suggest that someone has approached the Minister on the subject——

The Minister for Agriculture: The grape growers have done so.

Mr. MILLINGTON: And asked that these regulations under the Fruit Cases Act may be waived. From their point of view there may be an advantage in this, both in respect to the fruit they will be able to sell, and also on the part of the buyer. They may say, "Here is a case in which both the grower and the consumer will derive an advantage if this can safely be done." If it can safely be done, I would have no objection. We must, however, consider the viewpoints of others besides the grower and the purchaser. Section 8 of the Act was intended definitely to prohibit the carriage of second-hand fruit cases on the railways. To do so was considered a danger and a menace to the trade. I am positive that this is so, and that the average orchardist would agree with that view. There is nothing indefinite about that section. It was put there to regulate this matter, and prohibit the very thing the Bill seeks to allow. It states that no person shall sell or export fruit in a case which has previously been used for any other purpose whatever, and no person shall send or consign by any railway any case which has once been used for containing fruit, and out of which fruit has been taken, or any case from which brands and marks have been removed. Then follows a provision whereby this section can be waived in certain exceptional instances. In the main it has always been observed. I should say the orchardists themselves would insist on its observance. I am not too sure that, if the Fruitgrowers' Association as a whole were consulted, instead of only one section, they would not also raise an objection to the waiving of this prohibition. I hope they have given their approval, for that would be an indication to me that the Bill is not as dangerous as I assume it may be. It took a long time to induce the fruitgrowers to agree to the use of uniform cases. I remember being on a select committee many years ago when it was sought to bring in this uniformity in fruit cases. After a while the fruitgrowers agreed to its being done, and the law has since worked well. It is now proposed to upset that law. If we give way in one particular, other people will come along and ask for a concession. No doubt many orchardists desire to save money by using secondhand cases. They will say, "If it is safe to send them from Middle Swan over the railways to Northam and all through the fruit districts, and if it is quite safe to send grapes in secondhand cases to Kalgoorlie, why cannot we send our fruit in secondhand cases to other parts of the State?" These cases may contain any kind of fruit. They may be carriers of any kind of disease or pest, and yet it is proposed to vary the law to suit a few people in Kalgoorlie, merely in the interests of economy.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: It is not to suit the people of Kalgoorlie.

Mr. MILLINGTON: There we are! And that interjection comes from a goldfields member. If the Minister gives way in this instance, how will he be able to withstand any application from anywhere in the State that the wise provision in question shall be waived, with the result that second-hand cases will be used wholesale in place of new cases? What argument can there be in the matter? When we depart from definitely established factors, which are not mere whims, but are regarded as necessary to protect the industry —a difficult thing in view of the number of plant diseases and insect pests with which the industry has to contend—very grave risks are being taken, and without good reason. I fail to see that the proposed variation can yield any material benefit. The additional trade to be gained cannot amount to much. The arguments on the other side carry weight, and more ample consideration should be given to the question. I want from the Minister an explanation why the amendment is proposed. Are the gains sufficient to compensate for the risks involved? If so, I do not know that I should raise objection to the Bill. Again, I should like an assurance that the Fruitgrowers' Association are satisfied that from their point of view the amendment is not dangerous. If they are not sat-

isfied of this, I must offer opposition to the measure. This is not a small thing by any means. Anything tending towards looseness in the policing of the existing Act is risky. The Bill affords a loophole, in my opinion; and I want an assurance from the Minister and from the Superintendent of Horticulture that the measure is safe.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [9.3]: I fully agree with the ex-Minister for Agriculture that we should exercise the greatest care to protect the fruit industry against disease. However, I assure him that I have paid close attention to that phase of the amendment, and that I would be one of the last ever to take action that would tend to involve a danger of spreading disease in the fruit industry. The growers ask for the Bill because there exists on the fields a market for approximately 100 tons of wine grapes. On account of the scarcity of petrol cases, which formerly were used for containers, growers have had to pay 14s. per dozen for new cases, whereas secondhand cases can be obtained for 2s. per dozen. The saving is approximately £100 even on so small a consignment of grapes to the fields. The growers have asked for the measure, and will get the benefit of it. The goldfields have not asked for the Bill. As regards grapes passing through various areas, first of all let me state that grapes do not carry fruit fly. Further, in transit to the fields the grapes pass through a fruit fly area. As the member for Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Millington) mentioned, fruit fly exists at Chidlow's Well, and in country where quandong exist. I know that fruit fly is to be found in the quandong. Thus the amendment involves no danger to the industry from that aspect. If permission was being asked to send grapes in secondhand cases through other fruit-growing areas, I would take a different view.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What about wine grapes and other grapes?

Mr. THORN: Wine grapes are packed roughly during handling, and are not nailed down; there never is a lid on a case containing wine grapes. These grapes become damaged to such an extent during the journey that it would be most difficult to get them bought by the community. They are a poor type of grape, very second-grade. I ask hon. members to support the Bill, but not because I want to encourage wine making on the fields in any shape or form. The market exists, and while it exists the growers desire to take advantage of it. The inspectors are always on the job, and whenever fruit leaves Midland Junction they make a close inspection. There will be no danger in that respect. I agree with the hon. member that cases should be put in a thoroughly sanitary condition, and I assure him that that will be done. I hope the House will agree to the small amendment proposed by the Bill. Though small, it is most important to grape growers. The amendment has been repeatedly put up, and agreed to by the department. I have had the pleasure of discussing the position with the departmental officers, and they agree that no danger of spreading disease is involved.

MR. WANSBROUGH (Albany) [9.9]: One point has been overlooked. It is not only empty cases that are to be feared, but returned empty railway trucks. During this portion of the year the trucks are being rushed to the South-West for export fruit. That is where the trouble will be found; that is where disease will be spread. The Minister by this Bill is asking for something which will rebound on him like a boomerang, and before long. The Act, when first passed, definitely sought to protect the fruitgrowers. I am greatly afraid that if the Bill is carried, there will be serious trouble; and therefore I cannot support the measure.

MR. NULSEN (Kanowna) [9.10]: Seeing that my district is situated east of the line which protects the fruitgrowing industry, I enter an emphatic protest on behalf of Esperance growers. I do not think the amendment will be of great benefit to Western Australia, which has spent so much money in trying to cope with fruit fly and other pests appertaining to the industry. From what I learn, the cases carry disease; and undoubtedly large fruit would find its way into the district at times. After that the disease would spread in the various districts, through business people sending out goods in cases. I think it would be injudicious and unfair, especially to the Esperance district, to make the proposed amendment. I shall vote against the second reading. Fruit is grown in the Esperance district, and it is of most excellent quality. Around Esperance all sorts of fruit are grown, and they compare favourably with

fruit grown in any other part of Western Australia, in point of flavour.

Member: Is there fruit fly around Esperance?

Mr. NULSEN: Not so far as I know; but if the Bill is passed, I am afraid fruit fly will be found there.

Mr. Thorn: Much fruit is carried in cases in motor cars, without our knowing anything of it.

Mr. NULSEN: Seeing the amount of money spent in protecting orchards, it would be highly inadvisable to make this amendment.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [9.12]: The fruit that goes into the markets is subject to inspection. My view is that the danger, if it exists at all, is extremely remote.

Mr. Millington: It is not permissible to take the cases back.

Mr. SAMPSON: This question has been considered by the Growers' Marketing Association, who are aware that the amendment is now before Parliament. They are convinced that the fruitgrowing industry runs no danger from the possibility of the spread of fruit fly. The member for Kanowna (Mr. Nulsen) has mentioned that there is no fly at Esperance. To a large extent the atmospheric conditions of the South keep that district free from the fly. Were it not so, there would be fly at Esperance, Albany, Bridgetown and Mt. Barker; in fact, throughout the southern districts. If the fly ever got there, I am assured, there would be no possibility of its thriving. Although the regulations do not permit fruit to be carried over railways from fruitgrowing districts north of Yarloop, further south than Yarloop by one line and further than Narrogin by the other line, no restriction is imposed upon the carriage of fruit by motors, because there is no supervision in that direction. Cases of fruit are conveyed by that means almost daily. Fruit can be purchased in districts affected by fruit fly and taken to outside clean areas, although I fail to see that there is the slightest danger in consequence. As pointed out by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) this matter is important to the grape growers. If they consider that there is any danger, the proposal should not be agreed to, but those with whom I have discussed the matter agree that no objection can be maintained against the Bill, and that view is shared by the Grape Growers' Association.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. P. D. Ferguson—Irwin-Moore—in reply) [9.17]: The member for Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Millington) suggested that someone had got at me in this matter. The proposal was first placed before the department by the grape growers of the Swan valley and the Hills districts. Their suggestion was that if they were allowed to send grapes to the goldfields in secondhand cases, their business could be extended and they would be able to show an additional profit of £1 per ton, or, at least, would be able to sell at £1 a ton cheaper. In other words, the difference between the despatch of grapes in new cases as against the utilisation of secondhand cases represents about £1 a ton. As a rule, fruitfly does not affect grapes. There are one or two instances where grapes have been affected, but, generally speaking, the fruitfly does not affect them. The member for Mt. Hawthorn wished to know whether the Superintendent of Horticulture approves of this proposal. He does; without his approval, I would not have placed the Bill before Parliament. When the parent Act was passed in 1919, practically the whole of the transport of fruit throughout the State was by rail. To-day the great bulk of it is by road. While there is an embargo on the carriage of fruit in secondhand cases over the railways, that embargo does not extend to motor lorries, nor yet to persons travelling by motor car or train. Practically every day fruit is taken from the city into areas where trains are not allowed to carry fruit in secondhand cases. It is more or less a farce to attempt to prohibit the spread of fruit-fly and other pests by the methods mentioned in the Act. While I do not suggest we should run any risk by allowing the use of secondhand fruit cases for the despatch of grapes to the goldfields districts, it has to be realised that the risk involved is so negligible that we may well assist the growers in the districts I have mentioned by enabling them to profit to the extent of £1 per ton.

Mr. Nulsen: Norseman will be included under this proposal.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, it is east of the rabbit-proof fence. There is but small risk of the secondhand cases being sent to Esperance. The bulk of the grapes sent to the goldfields will be wine

grapes, mainly unfit for human consumption, and will be made by foreigners into wine at Kalgoorlie. The cases will be destroyed. They will never be sent back, nor will they find their way to Esperance. Their probable fate will be their use as firewood in the vicinity of Kalgoorlie. The value of those cases would not justify the owners in sending them back to the fruit-growing districts. The risk is so small that in the interests of the grape-growers we can afford to take it. At the outset, an objection was raised by the wine-growing section, but I understand that it has been overcome by the amendment which the member for Toodyay has placed on the Notice Paper.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 8:

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of the proviso, after "rail," the words "along the eastern goldfields line only" be inserted.

It is possible that fruit may be over-carried on the railways and may reach Wagin or Narrogin. The amendment will assist the member for Kanowna to prevent secondhand cases reaching Esperance.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I fail to see the object of the amendment, which will do no good. There are two railways only by which the fruit could be sent east of the rabbit-proof fence—the eastern goldfields line and the northern line to Meekatharra. The amendment will not protect the Esperance district. Fruit could reach Wagin or Narrogin only by being sent to some centre other than that to which it was consigned.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I differ from the Minister.

Mr. Millington: Of course; it could be sent several other ways.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: Should there be a washaway between Northam and Merredin, the railway authorities would despatch consignments by any one of four other routes, and I think we should protect the South-West in every way possible.

The Minister for Lands: The grapes would not be worth much if they were sent that way.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. THORN: I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 of the proviso "the factory of a registered factory buyer which is" be struck out, and the words "a point" inserted in lieu.

The buyers affected should not be registered because they are not in the business commercially. They buy grapes in order to make wine for their own use. They should not be registered because of the danger of their hawking the wine. That should not be encouraged, and they should not be allowed to compete with the legitimate wine makers. I do not wish to encourage wine making on the fields, but that market is available.

Mr. Hegney: You merely wish to give the foreigners the opportunity to buy grapes if they desire to do so.

Mr. THORN: That is so.

Mr. MILLINGTON: There appears to be an assumption that this will permit the carriage of wine grapes only. The provision is for the carriage of grapes in second-hand cases to the eastern goldfields.

The Minister for Agriculture: Not to a factory, in second-hand cases.

Mr. MILLINGTON: But the factory will disappear shortly. The member for Toodyay proposed to give them an open go. Where is there any restriction in the clause against the carriage of grapes? There is no proper conception of what this will open up. This will be the thin edge of the wedge. Once we give way on the principle of using new cases for this purpose, others will demand that they also be allowed to use secondhand cases, and the whole of the goldfield's trade will become a secondhand cases trade.

Mr. Thorn: That will do away with the danger of their selling wine grapes.

Mr. MILLINGTON: If "registered factory" be struck out, anyone will be able to buy them, and advantage will be given to those who get grapes in secondhand cases. The Minister had better find out how wide the gate is opened by amending the Fruit Cases Act, which was enacted in the interests of the fruitgrowers. One would think

that fruit fly was the only disease in our orchards. As a matter of fact secondhand cases may be contaminated with any or several of many diseases.

Mr. Thorn: That applies all over the State.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Then the Fruit Cases Act can safely be repealed. That so much fruit is being carried on motor trucks is made an excuse for loosening up the Act.

The Premier: Can you tell the difference between a new case and a secondhand one?

Mr. MILLINGTON: A new case is branded with the name of the grower.

The Premier: So is the secondhand case.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Under this the Middle Swan growers will be using the cases of fruitgrowers from down the country. That is not advisable.

The Premier: They are used now.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Then the Agricultural Department is not doing its job.

The Premier: And they were used in your time.

Mr. MILLINGTON: No, this law was rigidly enforced in those days, and was considered essential by the fruitgrowers. However, if those who are so concerned with the primary producers of the State are prepared to take this risk, it is not for me to give further warning. It means more than carrying grapes in secondhand cases. Give the Middle Swan growers a chance to send grapes in secondhand cases costing 1s. less than new cases, and they will soon be sending second-class grapes.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: The wording of the proviso is bad enough, but that of the amendment is a thousand times worse. A grower from the Great Southern will send his fruit to Perth, and the cases will be used again to be sent to Kalgoorlie. One point the Minister should have replied to is the haulage of the empty truck after being discharged at Kalgoorlie. That is where the trouble will lie.

The Minister for Lands: At that time of the year it will be so hot in Kalgoorlie that all the pests will be shrivelled up.

Mr. HEGNEY: I will support the amendment because I do not think there is any weight in the arguments advanced against it. The member for Mt. Hawthorn (Mr. Millington) spoke of the cases being contaminated with fruit fly. But if there be so much fruit fly in the State, the sending of secondhand cases to Kalgoorlie will not make things any worse. All that the amendment proposes is that the people of Kalgoorlie shall have opportunity to get grapes in secondhand cases if they so desire. The officers of the department will see to it that no danger to the fruit trade will result from the use of secondhand cases beyond the rabbit-proof fence. The market there for the sale of those grapes will help those in the industry, and no great danger will threaten growers in other parts of the State.

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

Clause 3—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—EAST PERTH CEMETERIES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. KENNEALLY (East Perth) [9.40]: Having attended to the fruit fly, it is only right that we should now give some attention to the cemeteries. The Bill is a proposal by which certain land will be revested in the Crown. A number of allotments of land were given for cemetery purposes, but not in all instances did the deeds say they were for cemetery proposes; in some cases they were for church purposes. The Bill provides that part of that land shall be revested in the Crown. I am sorry it does not embrace the lot, but I am hopeful that as a result of negotiations now proceeding those blocks not embraced in the present measure will be attended to later. It is time something was done about the East Perth cemetery. A few years ago those associated with the district endeavoured to make provision by which the custom then rife of games being played in the cemetery, fences being pulled down, graves laid bare and tombstones knocked over, should cease. Unfortunately not a great deal of improvement has been effected in that respect. A suggestion made in a newspaper—although public sentiment seems to be against it—was that the cemetery site be made available for park lands. In other places where cemetery land has ceased to be used for its original purpose, the practical

viewpoint has been taken. There is a very good illustration in a cemetery at Hobart which has been closed a certain number of years. I admit the cemetery in East Perth has not been closed for the same number of years. In Hobart arrangements were made by which the tombstones have been lifted and placed around the boundary of the cemetery, while the inner portion has been converted into park lands.

The Premier: But this cemetery has been too recently used.

Mr. KENNEALLY: That is what at the moment stands in the way of that improvement. We have had a meeting of the various religious denominations in conjunction with the city council, in order to see if we could get a consensus of opinion from those people which would enable us to take a further step. But owing to the opinion expressed by those bodies, we have been content with a measure of improvement, in the hope that when the cemetery has been closed a sufficiently long time we shall be able to effect the full improvement. The proposal is that the land be revested in the Crown and that the State Gardens Board be charged with the responsibility for its upkeep. I hope that under the new management it will not be long before a big alteration is made. There is certainly room for improvement. If the board get busy, there is no reason why the essential improvements should not be made promptly.

The Premier: It should be cared for.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Under the new system I think it will be. Incidentally, the increased responsibility being placed on the State Gardens Board should demand attention to the need for adopting a different system of constituting the board. The electors should be represented.

The Premier: It is a pretty good board.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am not finding fault with the board.

The Premier: Leave well alone.

Mr. KENNEALLY: As the system is extended, and as the board are given increased responsibilities, the members should be appointed or elected to give interests an opportunity to be represented.

The Premier: If you wanted 12 apostles you would want to elect them.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I do not know which apostle the Premier would be

The Premier: I knew which one you would be.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I would be more generous than the Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing the apostles.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The measure will result in good to the cemetery. With the passing of the years, I hope that the land will ultimately be made available in perpetuity for park land purposes.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—SWAN LAND REVESTING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. MILLINGTON (Mt. Hawthorn) [9.51]: I have examined the map laid on the Table by the Minister and have consulted the local authority, the Wanneroo Road Board, who have asked for the Bill and who agree that revesting is the only course to be taken. The land in question is a narrow strip at right angles to a point 11 miles on the Wanneroo-road, running not from that road but from the further road on the old stock route to the beach. The board desire that the land be revested in the Crown to give access to the coast. I have no objection to the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2, Schedule—agreed to.

Preamble:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 "road" be struck out, and the word "Land" inserted in lieu.

This is a misprint; the reference should have been to the Swan Land District.

Amendment put and passed; preamble, as amended, agreed to.

Title:

On motion by the Minister for Lands, Title consequentially amended by striking out "road" and inserting "Land" in lieu.

Title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and an amendment to the Title.

House adjourned at 9.57 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 27th September, 1932.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Chief Secretary and Mines Regulations.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.34]: I desire to make a personal explanation. During the debate on the motion for the disallowance of certain regulations under the Mines Regulation Act, several members requested that a schedule should be attached to the regulations concerned defining to what mines they would apply. I had not the opportunity of getting into touch with the Minister for Mines until yesterday, but I have now done so. I assure members that if the motion is withdrawn the Government will be prepared to amend the regulations by adding to them a schedule enumerating those mines to which they will apply.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Thirteenth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.36]: Before dealing with the Address-in-reply and members' comments on the Speech, I should like to add my congratulations to those which have already been tendered to you, Sir, upon your re-election to the Chair, and to echo the hope that this Chamber may long be privileged to conduct its debates under your able, suave, and impartial guidance. And may I also be permitted, as Leader of the House, to welcome our new members. Mr. Bolton has long been a prominent figure in the State's business world, and possesses considerable experience in public life outside these legislative halls. His utterance in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply was, if I may say so, a notable maiden effort, and shows the hon. member to be no political tyro. Mr. Clydesdale is an old friend within a new place. I trust that the calm atmosphere pervading this Chamber will prove even more congenial to him than the breezier air of another place. The hon. member's wide knowledge covers a large variety of men and affairs, and I have no doubt that his experience of life, business and sport—this last being an important element of the Australian scene—will aid materially in our deliberations. Mr. Moore is an old and even better known friend with an unaltered countenance. The hon. member will, I feel sure, pardon my describing him, for the nonce, as a strayed sheep restored to the fold, since my only alternative would be to recall the prodigal son. That cordial fellow-feeling which is so marked and so agreeable a feature of Western Australian politics, always finds pleasure in the re-appearance of a familiar face, especially in a Chamber which has no eye for political complexions. Mr. Moore is too well known to members to allow of my doing more than allude to his Parliamentary and personal qualities. In Mr. Harold Piesse the House receives another accession of strength from a distinguished family, whose name is written large across the history of Western Australian self-government. Since the Hon. F. H. Piesse, nearly forty years ago, accepted the portfolio of Railways under John Forrest, this Parliament