At Coolgardie the salaries, including £350 for a resident medical officer, amounted to £2,250, and there was another hospital within 30 miles.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was a saving of £225 in regard to Coolgardie.

MR. NANSON: Out of £2,500? That was something. Why should not a little saving be made in each of these places so as to give country districts the medical aid that was required. It was said in regard to Beverley that there was no need for a doctor because York was only 30 miles distant. If Beverley could go without a doctor because York was only 30 miles away, then it could be argued that Kalgoorlie could go without medical aid because there was a hospital 25 miles away, at Coolgardie. The Colonial Secretary should endeavour to do something for Beverley. He did not appeal for Beverley in particular, but he knew what a doctor meant to a country district.

THE PREMIER: Strike out "six months" in the Beverley item.

MR. NANSON: That would not overcome the difficulty.

THE PREMIER: It would be taken as a desire that the medical officer should be continued.

MR. NANSON: That could be done. A small saving might be effected in all hospitals so as to provide medical officers where they were wanted in the country districts. It was better to provide £300 each for medical officers in the various districts than to have large sums for hospitals ranging from £300 to £2,000 and most of the money going to nurses whose whole time could not be occupied.

Item—Principal Medical Officer, £500:

DR. O'CONNOR: The Government had cut down the principal medical officer's income by £240. Dr. Lovegrove was appointed medical officer in Perth some years ago. At that time Dr. Lovegrove was making about £2,000 a year at Bunbury; and he was appointed to succeed Dr. Waylen, but after some time the Government broke their agreement with him. Dr. Lovegrove had been drawing the vaccination fees for the last 10 years; therefore one could not understand why these fees were cut off. It was a mistake to reduce the vaccination vote at all. Some years ago there was an outbreak of smallpox in Gloucestershire which cost that county £60,000.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 1·20 a.m. (Wednesday), until the afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 19th November, 1902.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Annual report, Superintendent of Public Charities. 2, Annual report, Aborigines Department.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 110, Subsections (2) and (9):

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that after "more," line 3, there be inserted: "and by striking out the words 'one thousand,' in line 7, and inserting the words 'five hundred' in lieu thereof." The object of the amendment was to enable settlers who did not wish to take up 1,000 acres of second-class or third-class land to take up 500 acres. Last year the Minister for Lands moved that the minimum should be 300 acres; but had that pro-

posal been passed, people would have picked the eyes out of the country, and we ought not to allow them to do that. At present, however, they could not take up less than 1,000 acres, and as he had indicated, he sought to have the minimum reduced to 500.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS said he could see no objection whatever to the amendment. Now we had a large amount of settlement going on it was desirable that we should reduce the holdings. The amendment brought forward was very valuable, and he himself would have introduced it had it not been that the amendments brought forward in this Bill were only those looked upon as absolutely necessary for the time being, and it was proposed to entirely consolidate and amend the Land Act during the recess.

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

Clause 4--agreed to.

Clause 5—Zamia palm wool license:

HON. G. RANDELL asked for information.

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the clause be struck out. It seemed to him quite unnecessary. This plant was poisonous and had a very deadly effect upon cattle, and we knew there was a desire on the part of landowners in the district to eradicate it.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause was not, in his opinion, a very necessary one. It might have been introduced partly for the purpose of gaining revenue, but the revenue was very small and hardly worth speaking about. The clause did not aim at killing zamia in any way whatever. Gathering the wool did not destroy the palm, which grew again. The strewing about of this wool was sometimes a danger, and the clause was introduced more with a view of controlling those in the occupation, and registering them. In reply to Mr. Randell, the intention was, he understood, that those who removed the zamia wool would pay the tax. People did not collect it and get someone else to remove it.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: In explanation, he wished to say the operation of gathering the wool would kill the palm. The palm was cut to pieces and the wool was slipped off the lower portions of the stems.

Amendment passed, and the claus struck out.

Clauses 6 to 13, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 14—Pastoral and grazing lease may be granted temporarily on certai reserves:

HON. W. MALEY moved that the claus be struck out. One instance was know by him where a large station was held b a big firm for the low rental of £5 year from year to year. If an applicatio was made to the Lands Department reply was given that it was already let t certain people. It might surprise peopl to learn that near the border in Sout Australia there was a large residenc with tanks and conveniences which ha been utilised by South Australian stock owners to drive their flocks across th border. They sheared them at this par ticular place, and sent the sheep on to market which should be a market for ou own people in this State. For the use o that homestead, the use of the water, an the convenience of shearing their sheep they paid the munificent sum of £5 pe annum. If these things were done wit a Government so fastidious as we had a the present time, we did not know wha might happen with a Government les fastidious and less careful. Under thi clause the Government could let reserves and there was a great probability of thei doing so and letting them at £5 a year t people who already had runs.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It was only fro year to year the Government were entitle to let under this clause. It would b unwise to strike out the clause. He knew that reserves were being used, and they might bring us in revenue. People would be glad to take reserves from year t year.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The cas Mr. Maley had cited could hardly b applied to this clause. He took it thi clause applied to the very large timbe areas which at present were unoccupied and which might be grazed with advan tage. He thought it would be a pity t have the clause withdrawn. He was o opinion, moreover, that Mr. Maley wa mistaken with regard to the block h referred to. For a long time that bloc was unoccupied, and although certai improvements had been made he did no think there was anything like a per manent supply of water. He (Mr

Dempster) once applied for that land for another party, and it could then have been obtained at a very low sum, but it had been in the market ever since.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was to be hoped that the common sense of the Committee would prevail to pass this clause, one of the most useful in the Bill. Every member with a knowledge of the lands of this State must be aware that various large reserves set apart for purposes of public utility could not be made use of at the present time. The intention of the clause was merely to give the Government of the day power to lease such reserves, in order that the land might be utilised in some way. Mr. Maley did not seem quite to grasp what was the matter in hand: something else seemed to be present to his mind.

HON. W. MALEY: Why not have the lease of such reserves put up to auction?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That was not the proposal of the Government; and such procedure was unusual. It would be inadvisable to put up to auction a lease which was merely in the nature of a license, revocable on short notice.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: Looking at the clause from a common-sense point of view, and without knowledge of the circumstances to which Mr. Maley had referred, one could not help thinking that it would be a pity if the clause did not pass. At the same time, the Government should not abuse the power proposed to be given them. If reserves could not be utilised for the special purpose for which they were created, still they ought to be utilised in some other fashion. He had known instances of reserves absolutely tied up, which no one could use without trespassing. In the circumstances, it would be regrettable to sacrifice all opportunities of using reserves not appropriated to their special purpose, because of one case in which wrong was said to have been done.

HON. W. MALEY: There was no doubt as to the case he had referred to. If desired by the Minister, he would give the names of the people shearing at this particular spot. It was utterly wrong that so much of our land should be used without commensurate advantage to the State. There could be no objection to the leasing of reserves, provided kissing did not go by favour. Due notification ought to be made in the *Government Gazette* of all reserves to be leased under this clause.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Members who had followed the proceedings of the Lands Department would know that the department did not adopt the course of action described by Mr. Maley. Every precaution was taken to allow no advantage to any individual. If reserves were to be leased, the intention would be duly gazetted. Although the Lands Department was subjected to some abuse, yet from time immemorial it had never been guilty of dishonesty; and the action attributed to it by Mr. Maley was almost dishonest.

HON. W. MALEY: In view of the Minister's assurance, he asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—Amendment of the Thirty-fourth Schedule:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the clause be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the clause struck out.

New Clause:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

> Section 35 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "eighteen," in the first line, and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof.

Persons sixteen years of age should be allowed to take up land. He trusted the Committee would recognise the great hardship caused a young man of sixteen by refusing him the benefits of our land legislation. Many lads of sixteen were very advanced, and quite capable of holding and improving land. It was to be remembered, moreover, that under the present methods of the Lands Department a boy applying at the age of sixteen was likely to be seventeen before his application was granted. The delay in the disposal of applications was a scandal. In view of the large profits made by the Lands Department, additional surveyors should be put on, so that all delay in connection with survey and classification of land might be avoided. He knew of instances in which applicants had been kept waiting as much as six and even eight months. Settlement was rapidly proceeding, and young lads were com-

pelled to go miles and miles from their parents' homes in order to select. Of course, every lad in the country would not apply. The object of the State in granting leases was to get the land improved; and what matter whether the improvements were made by a lad or by a man?

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: There could be no reasonable objection to the provision. Many new settlers arrived here with sons sixteen years of age or thereabouts, and such settlers ought to be put in a position to obtain blocks of land for their sons.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was no strong objection to be raised to the amendment; but still sixteen years was very young for a boy to go on the land and carry out improvements. It was to be doubted whether the character of a boy would be improved by his going on the land at that early age to struggle with nature. At sixteen, a boy ought rather to be learning his business with his father or some other farmer.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: But two years later the boy might not be able to select the land he wanted.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There would be no difficulty in selecting land in this State for years and years to come. Would it not be well to provide agricultural colleges and experimental farms at which boys could be taught farming, rather than adopt this amendment? Farming was becoming more scientific day by day, and it was impossible that a boy sixteen years of age could have learnt his business. Moreover, by going on land of his own at that early age a boy lost the chance of improving his knowledge. On the whole, the Act had better remain as it stood.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The idea of sending boys to agricultural colleges was excellent, so far as it went; but all boys could not be sent to such colleges. The case of new settlers referred to by Mr. Dempster was admirably in point.

HON. G. RANDELL: How could a lad of the age of sixteen live on his land?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There was no necessity for his doing that in every case. He might live within a short distance of it. A young man might have to go from his father's home to learn agriculture, and possibly the father was a more practical man than the person this youth would be going to. Seeing the amount of selection going on, let us afford a man an opportunity of selecting near his father. One plant might then be made available for both blocks, to the advantage of the State. This alteration had been asked for, and he understood the Minister saw no objection to the age being fixed at 16.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: A boy of 16 might be of great assistance in working for his father; but one could not understand how such a youth would be any good as a manager, if put in a place by himself. There would be something in the argument if the selection adjoined that of the father, where the father would be able to superintend the arrangement, and one plant would be suitable for working the selections. [HON. C. A. PIESSE: That was what was intended.] How often would it be possible for them to get a selection adjoining the father's? Again, if a father were a new selector, he would require all the assistance he could obtain from his own family to carry out the improvements necessary under the Act, without grasping for more land for a lad 16 years of age. The boy should be kept at home a little longer and taught.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: After a lad had gained his experience, there would be an inducement to him to stay at home, because he would be able to select land. He would not care if a boy lived in Perth and had that land, provided he carried out the improvements. What we wanted was that the land should return a profit to the State, and be of use. We not only wanted people on the land, but money on the land. If money were put on the land, we should have people on the land. If a person were away from the land he would probably send two men to do the work which probably he would do himself if he lived upon it. If members would not agree to fix the age at 16, let them put it at 17.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: There would not be any harm arising from this new clause. A time was coming when every farmer who expected to do well would have to work hard himself, and have the principal portion of the work done by his family, because at the present time there was the difficulty of getting labourers, when workmen de-

cleared they would only work eight hours a day, and farmers would not be able to pay the wages labourers would exact. We ought to do everything we could to encourage occupation of the soil, by reducing the age. That would enable the farmer to secure something on account of each of his sons. Experience gained at home was more valuable than that obtained elsewhere.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

Section 74 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words "and being the head of a family or a male," in the third and fourth lines, and by striking out the word "eighteen," in the fourth line, and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof.

By striking out the words "and being the head of a family or a male," the measure would apply to females who were not the heads of families. We had given them a vote. There were instances where big families of girls were away from home, and their desire was to take up land. Why debar them from taking up a free homestead farm? There were in his own district girls supporting a sister and father and mother. It was a hardship, if a girl had an ambition to possess a home and land of her own, to deprive her of the opportunity of doing so. If members were not in favour of the former portion of the new clause, he did not want the clause to be sacrificed altogether.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would be better to divide this amendment into two, the first part reading thus: "Section 74 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words 'and being the head of a family or a male,' in the third and fourth lines."

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not think it would be found anywhere that girls of 16 took possession of homestead farms and carried out the working conditions of them. He should say it was absolutely impossible for them to do so. It would not be well for the community that we should have girls of that age living in a solitary fashion in the bush.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: If this clause were passed it would be giving an opportunity of carrying on what was known in the States as the great evil of dummying. This matter of trying to reduce the ages of people who could take up land had been brought up on three different occasions. It would be a step in the wrong direction to give female members of a family the right to take up land as proposed in this new clause.

Question (first part of the clause as originally submitted) put and negatived.

New Clause:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

Section 74 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "eighteen," in the fourth line, and inserting the word "sixteen" in lieu thereof.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause:

SIR. E. H. WITTENOOM moved that the following be added as Clause 8:—

Section 115 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "lease," in line 2, the words, "unless with the consent of the Governor," and by striking out all the words after "acres," in the third line.

The section would then read: "Timber leases shall be granted for a term of not less than one year, and not exceeding twenty-five years. No lease, except with the consent of the Governor-in-Council, shall include an area of more than seventy-five thousand acres; and, except as hereinafter provided, no person or corporation shall hold more than the aforesaid area of seventy-five thousand acres." The sole object of this proposed clause was to allow the large timber company which recently took over eight local timber companies to become registered as the proprietor of the timber leases held by those eight companies individually. The difficulty, however, was that under the Act not more than 75,000 acres could be held by any one person or corporation; and therefore it was necessary to make some arrangement by which the big company could become the leaseholder of the areas held by the eight smaller companies. He asked the Committee to adopt this amendment on the ground that it would prove advantageous to the timber industry of Western Australia. The combination had not been formed for the purpose of putting up the price of timber. Even if any such desire

were entertained, it could not be given effect to, seeing that our timber had to compete in foreign markets with timber from all parts of the world, much of it cut by cheaper labour working longer hours. The export trade in Western Australian timber, it was to be remembered, was many times larger than the local trade. By combining, the timber companies hoped to reduce expenditure and so attain a better footing. The result, if achieved, would be highly beneficial to the State, since it implied the establishment of a permanent industry employing large numbers. The amendment did not ask that the big company should be allowed to hold a single acre more, but merely that the areas held in the names of the eight smaller companies absorbed should be transferred into its name.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It might seem that there was some risk in this amendment, but all danger was obviated by the circumstance that anything done under the clause was subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. As a matter of fact, the areas of the individual companies could not be transferred to the amalgamated company even if this amendment passed. The Governor-in-Council alone could do it; and no doubt the Governor-in-Council, which meant the Government, would look carefully into the matter before granting the necessary permission.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: While not opposing this amendment, he wished hon. members to understand its exact meaning. Under the Act as it stood, not more than 75,000 acres of timber land could be leased to any one person or corporation. This amendment if passed would confer on the Government the power of granting single lessees larger areas than 75,000 acres.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: In exceptional circumstances.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment extended the powers of the Government, and of course he did not oppose it.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The procedure adopted in the case of the Salvation Army, which held a larger area than permitted by the land regulations, was, if his memory served him rightly, the introduction of a Bill into the House for the purpose of dealing with the matter. The companies, therefore, had two methods open to them. Still, we were quite safe in trusting the Government to guard the interests of the State.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

LOCAL INSCRIBED STOCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, read a first time.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, read a first time.

DROVING BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the 12th November.

The Legislative Assembly having agreed to an amendment made by the Council in Clause 7 and returned the Bill to the Council, the Bill was now formally reported from Committee, and the report adopted.

BREAD BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson) said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I would remind hon. members that the measure is an old friend, and that this House duly passed the Bill last session, but unfortunately it has come back to us again owing to there not having been time to pass it through all its stages in the other place; so I am again asked to bring it before members as a necessary measure. We have had an interval of some eight months, and we think the Bill is as necessary now as it was then. It seems to be a trifling thing from some points of view to bring in a Bill to insure that we shall be provided with good bread; but, after all, what can be more important than a Bill of this kind? I think that perhaps in some respects, although a small Bill, it is the most important measure of the session--

"An Act to amend the law relating to the sale and making of bread." You will see that bread is classified under Clause 3 into fancy bread, household wheaten bread, mixed bread, standard brown bread, and standard wheaten bread —different classes of bread; and under Clause 4 household bread is to be marked with a Roman H and mixed bread with a Roman M, so that you can know at once what you are supposed to be buying. If you buy bread without those marks upon it, then of course you will know that you will be eating some other bread—fancy bread or standard brown bread or standard wheaten bread; but you will not be using the household bread. In this State at the present time we find that there are a good many breads that are adulterated, particularly adulterated with alum, which is a very pernicious adulteration indeed. It has a very bad effect often upon the health and digestion, particularly of children, and so you will find here a very stringent clause dealing with adulteration. No bread is to be sold if made of impure flour. Clause 6 provides that no bread shall be sold or offered or exposed for sale which is not made of pure and sound flour or malt of wheat, barley, rye, oats, buckwheat, Indian corn, peas, beans, rice, or potatoes, or any of them, with common salt, pure water, eggs, milk, barm, leaven, potato or other yeast, sugar and malt extract, and with no other ingredient whatever. This I look upon as being perhaps the most important clause of the Bill, laying down clearly what you may expect to find. So long as you do not go outside those things you may be quite sure you have very sound bread; indeed if this should do nothing else than prevent alum from being inserted into these breads in their preparation I think it would do a great deal to assist the general health and betterment of the community. We hope, of course, to be a great nation. We have a very large proportion of children at the present time in the State, and it is of the utmost importance that above all they should have the staff of life of the very best quality, and that we should be able to know that when we go into a shop and buy bread we really are buying bread and not something else. I think I can hardly go over all these clauses. We have done them all before. They are merely machinery clauses for effecting the objects in view, to insure that the bread is pure, that it is of proper weight, that scales are kept, that inspectors and justices may enter premises to see that these conditions are carried out, that no person is hindered, and that there is no baking on Sunday; that I think is very desirable in so far as it has been carried. I think that these machinery clauses, if only well carried out, will effect all we demand at the present time for the regulation of the bread supply. I do not wish to press them farther, except perhaps to dwell again upon what I think to be the very great importance of this matter. I remember several years ago meeting a German statesman, a man of great power of mind and very famous indeed, and I asked him what he thought were the advantages of Germany over England with regard to legislation. He said: "There are a few things which occur to me. One is that the Germans can get justice much more cheaply and more easily than the English; the legal costs are not nearly so great. And in the second place, we have such laws in regard to the adulteration of food that we know that all our young rising population are getting good and sound food." This is a measure in that direction. We only desire physiologically that our children shall grow up strong in health, that we shall get a fine, sturdy race of people; and it is by such measures as this we attain that end. I ask the House to support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the leader of the House, and I am assuming in doing so that considerable adulteration is practised in the bread which is made use of by the public. I think it is clearly the duty of the State to intervene and endeavour, if possible, to secure that the bread shall be made of pure ingredients. The hon. gentleman has referred to the word "alum." That word does not appear in this Bill, but still at the same time Clause 6, to which it relates, does not need it.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: We do not want it.

HON. G. RANDELL: It is in the Act from which the Bill now introduced is compiled.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: In the old English Act.

HON. G. RANDELL: I do not think it necessary to have the word "alum," because if members look at Clause 6 they will see that no other ingredients than those mentioned there are to be mixed up with the flour. I should have been much better pleased, I think, if whoever drafted this Bill—I understand it was not the Parliamentary Draftsman—had followed out exactly, except in a few particulars, the legislation which prevails in Victoria. In Victoria the legislation is founded on the English law on the question. I have taken some little trouble to look at both, and I certainly think that in a great many particulars the Victorian Act is much more explicit and clear than the measure introduced to our notice. The draftsman has been trying to shorten it as much as he could, and I think he has confused some of the clauses of the Bill. That, however, is more a matter for us to deal with in Committee than on second reading. I have some amendments which I propose to bring to the notice of the Committee when we get to the Committee stage which I think—and I hope the Committee will think with me—will improve the Bill. It is with the intention of making the Bill much more explicit than it is at the present time, to remove perhaps one or two objectionable features. For instance, members will have noticed—I dare say it struck them as it did me—that Clause 3 says: "Standard wheaten bread means bread made of pure and sound flour of wheat, and which flour (*a*) contains no mixture or division of the whole produce of the grain (other than the bran or husk thereof); and (*b*) weighs two-thirds parts of the wheat whereof it is made." Those words are to be found in the Victorian statute, but not in the same order of arrangement as here. Section 5 of the Victorian Act says: "All bread made of the flour of wheat, which flour without any mixture or division shall be the whole produce of the grain, the bran or hull thereof only excepted, and which shall weigh two-thirds parts of the weight of the wheat whereof it shall be made, shall be called and understood to be standard wheaten bread." I would observe here that the word "husk" is an improper word, I think, to use, because it applies to the sheath which encloses the grain; I suppose it will be the leaf, scientifically. It was only after reading this section from the Victorian Act that light dawned upon me as to what was intended in the present Bill. I think I see it clearly, although I am still in doubt whether any real force remains in paragraph (*b*) "weighs two-thirds parts of the weight of the wheat whereof it is made." It is well known that one bushel of wheat produces from 38 to 40 lbs. of flour. I believe that sometimes it reaches about 36, but I believe it is not nearly as wholesome as flour from wheat producing 40lbs. of flour to a bushel, weighing 60lbs. That may be the meaning here, but how it is to be ascertained I really do not know. I think it is right and proper that a letter should be placed upon the bread. I propose to move that the words, "person who sells bread, and every person who conveys or carries out," in lines 1 and 2 of Clause 9 be struck out. Members will see by this that every person who sells bread has to carry out scales. That is not what the draftsman intended. What was intended was that when bread is sent out in a cart, for sale, scales shall be carried. I propose to insert the words I find in the Victorian Act: "Every baker or seller of bread, and every journeyman, servant, or other person employed by such baker or seller of bread, who shall convey or carry out." I think that will put more explicitly what is intended. In my opinion it is objectionable to authorise any justice of the peace or police constable to enter premises. I hear that in one town there are two bakers, and one of them is a justice of the peace. Members will see that some difficulty may possibly occur from that fact. I propose to strike out the words "justice of the peace" and to leave it to the inspector whose business it is to inspect. I think it would be much more satisfactory in every way to let the clause remain as it is in the present Act. Then I see that the provisions with regard to penalties in the Victorian Act are superior to these. In that Act they provide different penalties for different offences, and these are embodied in the section which deals with each offence. I think that is much better, but here the draftsman has imposed one penalty for all offences which may occur under the measure, and he also has put the penalty

at what I consider the enormous amount of £20. We all know the tendency is that when a penalty is very heavy the provision lies in abeyance: that happens in many instances. The highest penalty I find in the Victorian Act is £5. I think that when we come to the clause I shall move to strike out the word "twenty" and insert the word "five." However, that possibly is a matter for difference of opinion. I think the measure is much more likely to be carried into effect if the penalty be reasonable, than if the penalty be exorbitant and oppressive. With these qualifications I think that, knowing as we do of the existence of a tendency to adulterate bread, it is desirable we should have the measure on our statute book. I quite agree with what the leader of the House has said as to the paramount importance of providing pure bread for the young people of our households. This Bill may obtain for us that most proper desideratum. I second the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): It appears to me that the passing of this Bill will raise the price of bread. We are now being treated to far too much legislation. If we go on appointing inspectors at this rate—we already have meat inspectors, and we are to have bread inspectors—we shall speedily have inspectors for everything we eat, drink, wear, and do; and the long and short of it will be that we shall be all governors, and that there will be no subjects. The measure now on the statute-book is, in my opinion, quite adequate, subject to a little amendment, for dealing with adulteration by means of alum, and I see no necessity for the introduction of an entirely new Bill. Of course I cannot profess to be a baker, but it does seem to me that certain ingredients necessarily used in the manufacture of bread are not mentioned in the exemption clause. The Bill should have been referred to a select committee, so that evidence might be called to let us know whether we shall be doing right or wrong in passing such provisions dealing with what is termed the staff of life. Anyhow, the Bill is before us, and those clauses of it which I consider essential I shall certainly support. Nevertheless, it seems to me that one or two clauses are unnecessary and unworkable. I regard as ridiculous the clause providing that every baker's cart shall carry a pair of scales. It is well known that a baker's cart is not the easiest-running vehicle in the world, and that scales carried on it are liable to be shaken and knocked out of truth. The clause may prove useful eventually, when all bakers' carts are fitted with india-rubber tires.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: Greengrocers' carts carry scales.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: As regards penalties for being found in possession of unsound flour, I have to point out that it is impossible for every baker to know whether the flour supplied to him is sound or not. A good deal of the blame for unsound flour should be laid on the shoulders of the miller, who has a knack occasionally of selling flour not altogether up to the standard. This clause seems to throw every responsibility on the baker. During all the years I have spent in Western Australia I have not seen much occasion for complaint as to the quality of bread sold here. The bread supplied to most families is assuredly of good quality. Indeed, I see no necessity for legislation on the subject at all. Some evidence ought to be taken with regard to Clause 16, providing for the time at which journeymen bakers shall start work on Sunday evening, from the master bakers of the city and of the surrounding district. I believe another place has inserted seven o'clock, whilst the master bakers desire that work shall commence earlier—[MEMBER: Five o'clock]—so that bread may be ready on Monday morning in good time for customers. As it is, we are legislating on the subject without knowing whether we are doing right or wrong.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): I support the Bill subject to certain amendments, most of which have been mentioned by Mr. Randell. I join with that hon. member in saying that the Bill shows evidence of careless drafting. The Victorian Act, from which this measure is taken, defines all offences in language of excellent clearness, and sets out its various sections in such a manner that a layman can understand them without difficulty. The draftsman of this Bill, however, seems to have lumped all the clauses into one, and provided the same penalty for all offences, large and small

alike. No doubt the penalty of £20 represents a maximum, but still the whole question is left to the option of a magistrate. Now, different magistrates are apt to differentiate: one may consider a small penalty adequate to a certain offence, while another for the same offence may award a heavy penalty. Personally, I should like the whole Bill to be redrafted; but that cannot be done. I hope, however, that in Committee the measure will be considerably altered. I quite agree with Mr. Brimage's remarks that it will be practically impossible and unworkable to force bakers' carts to carry scales. Where scales are carried, I am assured, they get rusty for want of use. The inspector under this measure will carry scales, and that should be quite sufficient. If the bakers are satisfied—and I understand they are—to accept the inspector's scales, no reason exists for compelling the carter to carry scales as well. Proof that the inspector's scales are true will be sufficient for the court. I propose to move an amendment rendering Clause 10 clearer, and providing definitely that not only bakers but also millers and merchants and agents shall be responsible for the sale of impure flour. Accordingly, if a baker has impure flour on his premises, the miller, merchant, or agent will be equally responsible with him, if he can prove the purchase.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: If a man is not capable of judging flour, he ought not to be a baker.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: One cannot always judge these things. A man perhaps buys by sample, and finds the article delivered not up to sample. As regards Clause 16, I have taken some little trouble to get a few facts. I understand there is no objection on the part of either employers or employees to the starting time being made two hours earlier than proposed. The employees, I am informed, stop work on Friday night, and do not resume until early on Sunday evening, at about five o'clock. Thus, they have practically all Sunday off. The desire is that work may be resumed at five o'clock instead of seven, and that wish is supported on the ground that the amendment will make the conditions much easier for the employees themselves. Beginning work at five o'clock, they will stop so much earlier on the following morning. If they do not start till seven they will have to work a long shift and in the afternoon resume work after an insufficient rest. [MEMBER: Strike the clause out.] No; I do not wish the clause to be struck out, because I believe in restricting as far as possible the employment of labour on Sunday. I certainly think, however, that the hours should be extended, seeing that this will meet the views of both employer and employee.

HON. G. RANDELL: Clause 10 does provide for the case of the miller.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Yes; but the clause would be better had it been drafted more explicitly. The Bill, with the various alterations suggested, will be a good measure, and I shall have pleasure in supporting certain of its clauses.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): Mr. Brimage's observations give me cause to fear that I had not made sufficiently plain the great necessity for this measure. The hon. member referred to the existing Bread Act of this State; but we have no Bread Act at the present time. It is strange that it should be so, for Great Britain as long ago as 1836 passed a Bread Act, and this is the only Australian State which at the present time is without a Bread Act. Thus, the measure is more than necessary.

HON. G. RANDELL: We have the Adulteration of Foods Act.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: True; but that measure does not specifically apply to bread. Seeing that the mother country passed a Bread Act so long ago as 1836, and that every Australian State, including New Zealand, has a similar statute, I do not think the Government can be accused of unnecessarily multiplying legislation in bringing forward this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

MINES DEVELOPMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the 12th November.

Clauses 10 to 29, inclusive—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

DISCHARGE OF ORDER.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the order for resuming consideration of this Bill in Committee be discharged. By an amendment passed we had gone back to the original Act.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The regulations which were passed were not understood by the people, and the Minister should take some steps to have notices posted up. In the other States everywhere he went he found notices printed on canvas explaining what the Act meant. If something of that kind were carried out here, the Act as at present framed would be workable.

HON. R. G. BURGES: If some such suggestion as that mentioned by Mr. Piesse were carried out, it would not be necessary to amend the Act. The Act was most misleading as it was at present. If amendments be (Mr. Burges) suggested had been carried out, they would have done away with that altogether; but he did not suppose the House would agree to them. He believed that under the Victorian Act a notice was put up at every watering place on the roads throughout the country. We ought to make it compulsory on the roads boards to clear a space so that men who camped could make fires with some safety around every watering place. If those notices were posted up, the Bush Fires Act could be carried out.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS said he had no hesitation in giving an assurance that this should be done. He had indeed already given instructions that it should be, so that the Act should be made clear in the country districts.

Question put and passed, and the order discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6·21 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 19th November, 1902.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—SHOPS, CLOSING TIME.

MR. W. D. JOHNSON (Kalgoorlie) presented a petition, signed by (approximately) 8,000 residents of the Eastern Goldfields, against the enactment of Clause 50 of the Factories and Shops Bill.

Petition received, and ordered to lie on the table.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: Return under Goldfields Act Regulations.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—SUPREME COURT LIBRARY.

MR. REID asked the Attorney General: 1, Whether it is a fact that the Law Library of the Supreme Court of this State is carried on privately by State officers, in State buildings, the upkeep of which is paid out of State revenue. 2, Whether any plaintiff or suitor who had paid his court fees and dues, and who had been conducting his own case in person, has been refused permission to consult the books containing the Supreme Court orders and rules and the other law books in the Supreme Court library. 3, Whether any plaintiff or suitor has been refused access to the Supreme Court Law Library on the ground that such library was only for use of members of the Bar.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, No. The law library is composed of books purchased by the Barristers' Board, and is conducted in accord-