has anybody else. The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) said he regarded the Bill as an honest effort at reform. Probably he was sincere in that; but when he spoke of local hospitals I think he had in mind only the hospitals of Perth and Fremantle. The Bill cannot be beneficial to outback hospitals.. I agree with the member for Mount Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) when he says we are not going to be on the same basis under the Bill as we are at present. At least we have local autonomy, have the right as subscribers to local hospitals to say who is to administer those hospitals. The Bill will rob us of that privilege, and so I cannot support it. Above all things, I object to people whose children are barefooted and ill-fed having to pay increased taxation. Until the Government show greater care and economy, I cannot support any measure of additional taxation. I will oppose the Bill.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	16
Majority for ..	4

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Broun	Mr. Money
Mr. Carter	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. George	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Mullany
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heron	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Munsie
	(*Teller.*)

Pair: Aye—J. H. Smith; No—Mr. O'Loghlen.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—MINERS' PHTHISIS.

Message.

Message received from the Lieutenant-Governor, recommending the Bill.

House adjourned at 11.1 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 23rd November, 1922.

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

PROCEDURE—QUESTION OR RETURN.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.34]: With reference to the two questions appearing on to-day's Notice Paper in the name of Mr. Harris, and with reference to other questions of the same kind which have been asked, I desire to say that while I have always made a practice of supplying all the information asked for by way of question, I would request hon. members to submit motions for returns when returns are required. The two questions standing in the name of Mr. Harris involve the preparation of returns at some cost; and returns of that nature should, I think, be called for on the vote of the House and not merely by way of question. However, the information will be ready on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT: You mean that there ought to be a motion instead of a question?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes; a motion for a return. However, I do not wish to delay the matter, and I am having the information obtained.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

New clause (partly considered):

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Just before the adjournment last night, I moved a new clause reading as follows:—"That the following be added to stand as Clause 79:—'A section is inserted in the principal Act, as follows:—104a. No licensee shall supply to any person by the glass liquor to be consumed with water or aerated water on the premises of the licensee unless such liquor is supplied in a glass capable of holding at least one and a-quarter gills. Penalty: £5'"

Hon. G. W. MILES: I offer no opposition to the clause, but I think it should not come into operation immediately, since it will mean the scrapping of about a quarter of a million glasses in this State. It should come into operation at a date which will allow people with the smaller glasses a chance to get rid of them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I always offer the strongest objection to passing legislation which will inflict hardship on anybody, or make unlawful something that has previously been lawful. But I am astonished that this most pernicious practice prevails to such an extent as the hon. member's remarks suggest. It is only of comparatively recent years that many publicans have made a practice of tendering to their customers a glass which certainly they should never have been allowed to use. However, I am content to get what I want done after the lapse of a little time.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The new clause is necessary, especially in view of Mr. Seddon's new clause proposing to increase the strength of spirits.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move an amendment—

That after "licensee," line 3, there be inserted "after the first day of July, 1923."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am under the impression that this new clause was dealt with last night.

Hon. G. W. Miles: No. We reported progress on it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But the Minutes say "Question put and passed."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: According to my recollection, the Minutes are incorrect. My recollection is that just after I had moved this new clause, Mr. Stewart asked me to report progress.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Minutes are wrong.

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

New clause:

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 113:—"On the recommendation of the chairman of the licensing courts, the Minister may exempt from the provisions of Section 149a and Section 165a any registered club where the amount paid or payable for all liquor (excluding the duties thereon) purchased by or for such club during the 12 months ended on the 31st day of December immediately preceding did not exceed the amount of members' subscriptions received by the club for such period."

This refers more particularly to golf clubs, the members of which usually play on Sunday. Most golfers appreciate a glass of beer or a whisky and soda after a walk round the golf course.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have a good deal of sympathy with this proposal, but I see some difficulty with regard to differentiating in this manner. The contention might be put up that where the subscription is large the consumption of liquor will be large. Personally I consider the restrictions against clubs altogether too severe, and I am prepared to vote for relaxing them. Clubs are on an altogether different footing from hotels.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: This does not apply to golf clubs only. I have received letters from secretaries of other clubs, such as yachting clubs, bowling clubs, and the like. Provided it is made merely permissive, I see no objection to the principle.

New clause put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON. I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 10:—"10. (1.) Subsection (1) of Section 32 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words 'more than thirty-five per centum of proof spirit,' and inserting in place thereof 'any higher per centage of proof spirit than is prescribed by the food and drug regulations under the Health Act, 1911-1919; and'"

In the Health Act 35 per cent. proof spirit is provided for, but it is contended that owing to the excessive quantity of alcohol in wines, this should be kept down as far as possible.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I see no objection to the provision. The 35 per cent. is prescribed in the Act, and in the food and drug regulations. If at any time under the food and drug regulations it be considered desirable to decrease it, I do not see why the Bill should stand in the way.

New clause put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 24B:—"24B. Section 61 of the principall Act is amended by adding to paragraph (c) of subsection (1) the words 'or officer of the Department of Public Health'; and by inserting after the word 'repair' in paragraph (d) of subsection (2) the words 'or are not in a sanitary condition or are unsafe'"

These inspectors are continually going around and insisting on public buildings being kept up to the standard requirements. Seeing that an hotel is a public building, they could very well inspect it and bring under notice any defects which require to be remedied.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In view of the closing paragraph of Section 61, I do not see any necessity for this. We cannot enumerate everything to which exception might be taken.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We should not multiply these officers. It will lead to some young officer accepting responsibilities beyond him.

New clause put and negatived.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 84:—"84. Section 114 of the principal Act is amended by adding thereto a subsection as follows:—'(2.) No licensee shall take, receive, or hold any money, bank note, or bank cheque in payment for liquor to be supplied otherwise than at the time when such payment is made, and shall immediately after the sale of any liquor return to the purchaser the balance (if any) of the money, bank note, or bank cheque remaining after payment for the liquor supplied at the time.'"

The clause is to deal with the evil of men coming in from outback with cheques and handing them to the hotelkeeper in payment for liquor, the hotelkeeper withholding the change. In remarkably short time, such men are informed that they have used up their cheques.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: They do not lamb down cheques now.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Our experience in Kalgoorlie a few years ago showed that it was a very serious evil. Men were coming in off the Trans-line with cheques and depositing them with the hotelkeepers. For a considerable time afterwards, those men were to be seen dodging about the town in a state of misery, as the result of this evil practice. It is far better that when a man pays down his cheque he shall receive back his change, and be free to leave the premises while he is still in possession of his senses.

Hon. Sir Edward WITTENOOM: I am afraid the hon. member has had very little experience of his subject. In my young days I saw a good deal of the practice. Had not the man with the cheque handed that cheque to the hotelkeeper, he would have been drunk and robbed of the lot within six hours. Not all hotelkeepers are robbers. Many are honest men. I have known them take care of a man's money for weeks. To return to a bushman the change out of a £50 cheque would be worst thing that could happen to the bushman. I am opposed to the new clause.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is evident the hon. member has not had much experience of the world, especially amongst men outback who, after working 12 months, come down to the centres of population to have what they call a good time. If at the first hotel such a man was to receive his change and go out into the street, he might there meet with a giddy young hussy and lose the lot. The man who deposits his cheque with the hotelkeeper for safe custody is very wise. To say he shall carry his money about with him and take all sorts of risks with it is to deprive him of a valuable protection. I hope the new clause will not be carried.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that the amendment would do what the hon. member intends. It would not prevent anyone with a cheque giving it to the publican and saying, "Please put that in the safe for me." The publican would not then be holding it for liquor supplied. There is nothing in the clause to prevent the publican holding the cheque at the request of the owner.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The matter may be discussed from three points of view, the first that of the unjust publican, the second the man's friend or the so-called friend, and the third, the artful hussy. Whichever of the three will rid the man of his money in the quickest way and with the least harm is the person to be commended. I am in favour of the unjust publican, and consequently will oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is the choice of two evils, the publican or the man's friend who goes with him. In cases such as have been quoted, the object of the individual is to spend the money he has in the quickest possible time. I know of an instance at the Williams some time ago when a sandalwood cutter came to the town, and when he had disposed of all his money, as he thought, had to be taken to the hospital. Then on leaving the hospital he started to return to his work, and having proceeded a couple of miles out of town, discovered half-a-crown in his pocket. He promptly walked back to the Williams and said, "I came in to spend all my money; I have now returned to spend what is left." He threw the half-crown in, and having spent it went back to his work. If the publican will not assist to rid a man of his money, the man's friend undoubtedly will.

Hon. H. SEDDON: With the permission of the Committee I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move—

That the following new clause be inserted to stand as 119:—"A subsection is added to section 167 of the principal Act as follows:—(3.) The name of any member of a club who shall not have paid his subscription within one month of such subscription becoming due, shall be erased by the secretary from the register of members and he shall cease to be a member of the club, and it shall not be lawful to apply the funds of the club to the payment of any member's subscription in arrear. Penalty: Ten pounds."

Many clubs have this proviso, but it is possible that there are clubs which are really clubs only in name and they would retain on the register names which had no right to be there.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: This seems to be an extraordinary proposal to put into a Bill. Just imagine a man who has been a member of a club for a number of years having to go to the Kimberleys and remaining away beyond the time when his subscription would fall due. The hon. member would

have it that because that man was in arrears with his subscription he should be cut off the membership roll. Surely we can leave this to the clubs instead of trying to tinker with it in this fashion. If there are clubs that are objectionable, wipe them out altogether.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Mr. Baglin could tell us how a proposal such as this would work in regard to the Fremantle Workers' Club. Suppose the subscriptions of some of the members of that club had fallen into arrears on account of the unemployment of the members of the club, those members would have to drop out. The proposal contained in the amendment will not work satisfactorily.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It has been well said that the man who gets into most clubs does so only because he is not known. After he has been there for some time, if he should have the misfortune to be struck off the roll through lapse of memory, and failing to pay his subscription, there would be no hope for him at all in the future.

New clause put and negatived.

New clause:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move—

That Section 184 of the principal Act be amended by striking out the words "together with the name and address of the licensed person."

Section 184 provides that any sample of liquor may be delivered to a public analyst together with the name and address of the licensed person from whom the liquor was taken or purchased. It is not desirable that the name and address of the person from whom the liquor was obtained should be submitted to the analyst. The proper way would be to number the sample. It is possible that the analyst may know the person from whom the liquor was taken and unless we had such an amendment as I propose there would be introduced an undesirable element.

The CHAIRMAN: It would be better if the amendment read, "Section 184 of the principal Act is amended by deleting the following words 'together with the name and address of the licensed person.'"

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I support the amendment in the interests of the analyst as well as the person from whom the liquor may be taken. We practise what the hon. member desires to put into force, in connection with analyses of milk or cream. When we are asked to conduct tests we prefer that the analysts shall not know anything about the competitors whose cream or milk is being tested. When the tests are completed the results are forwarded accompanied by the number. The girls who do this work know nothing whatever about the names of the people interested.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: If the amendment be carried, Section 184 will have to be redrafted. I draw attention also to Schedule 26 of the Act, which states that the analyst certifies that he has received a sample from——, and in brackets there appears "name and address of person delivering the sample." So that the analyst gets the sample, not from the person from whom it was taken, but from the person who delivers it. There is, however, a good deal to be said in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we delete from the section the words suggested by the hon. member, it will remain without sense.

Hon. H. STEWART: I support the amendment, although it may be necessary to modify it on the recommittal of the Bill. The principle is right, and in the case of analyses in connection with explosives, fertilisers and so forth, only the numbers and never the names are submitted to the analyst.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I suggest to Mr. Seddon that it would be necessary to insert some words, otherwise the amendment would leave the section incomplete. Assuming his argument to be right, I think he should add words such as "with an identification number attached thereto."

Hon. H. SEDDON: I accept the Minister's suggestion. I will move to delete all words after "analyst" in the section and add to the end of my amendment the words "with a suitable identification number by the inspector."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not think the mere provision of a number would be sufficient security for the licensee. If only a number is provided, the samples might be changed, or even get mixed up. Under the Health Act, provision is made for the separation of samples, one being given to the analyst, one retained by the inspector, and the other furnished to the person from whom the article to be analysed is taken.

Hon. H. Stewart: That could easily be overcome by the samples being numbered, such as 3 (a), 3 (b) and 3 (c).

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The succeeding section will have to be amended because the analyst has to set forth the result of his analysis and deliver without fee a copy to the inspector or licensed person requiring it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The section referred to covers the case of a sample handed to the analyst by a licensee for checking purposes. If the Committee is agreed on the principle, it would be as well to agree to the amendment and we will know what is desired. If the amendment does not deal with the matter properly, another new clause can be framed when the Bill is recommitted.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I do not think the explanation of the Minister quite covers the point, because Section 185 says that the public analyst shall set forth the result of his analysis to the licensed person requiring it.

The Minister for Education: That refers to the licensee's sample for checking purposes.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: It would be simple to get over the difficulty by striking out "name and address of" and inserting "identification number representing." The section would then read that "any sample of liquor taken or purchased as aforesaid may be delivered to the public analyst, together

with the identification number representing the licensed person from whom such liquor was taken or purchased.''

The CHAIRMAN: It will be better to get the decision of the Committee on the new clause as submitted by Mr. Seddon, which now reads—

That a new clause be added as follows:—''Section 184 of the principal Act is amended by striking out 'together with the name and address of the licensed person from whom such liquor was taken or purchased,' and inserting the words 'with a suitable identification number by the inspector.' ''

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move—

That a new clause be added as follows:—''Section 18 of the principal Act is hereby repealed.''

Under Section 18 it is provided that where only two magistrates are present and they disagree, the decision of the Chairman or Deputy Chairman shall prevail. Clause 7, Subclause 6, provides that in the case of only two licensing magistrates being present and they disagree, the application or matter shall be adjourned. The clause and the section cannot be reconciled and the amendment will allow the Bill to prevail.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move—

That a new clause be added as follows:—''Section 33 of the principal Act is amended by deleting the first proviso.''

Section 33 deals with packet licenses and the first proviso sets out that Section 98 of the Act shall not apply to that type of license. Section 98 prohibits the sale of liquor on Sundays and certain other days. Clause 72 amends Section 98 by omitting Subsection 2 and inserting another subsection setting out that it will not prohibit the sale of liquor to any bona fide lodger and so forth, if the liquor is not drunk at a public bar of the licensed premises. This matter has evidently been overlooked, and I do not see why the same provision should not apply to packet licenses.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think the proviso should be deleted. As it is, liquor cannot be sold under a packet license when the vessel is in a river or estuary, but only when the vessel is out at sea. Once the vessel is at sea, a person would be entitled to a drink under the bona fide traveller clause. If the amendment were agreed to, I take it that holders of packet licenses could not supply persons with liquor at the bar but only away from the bar. It would mean that any one having a packet license, although entitled to serve people, would be entitled to serve them only by carrying the liquor around the deck. It would not be permissible to serve them in the bar. Such a provision would impose an altogether unnecessary inconvenience.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Section 98 would allow of the sale of liquor under a packet license on Sunday, Good Friday or Christmas Day. It is essential to retain the proviso because Sunday, Good Friday and Christmas Day are the very days when a packet license would come into play.

Hon. H. STEWART: I ask leave to withdraw the proposed new clause.

New clause by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as a new clause:—''Section 192 of the principal Act is amended by deleting the proviso.''

Section 192 provides that the convicting justices may in their discretion direct that any complainant or informer shall receive a portion not exceeding one moiety of any penalty recovered under the Act, provided that the Governor may remit the whole or any part of such penalty. The Governor has power under the letters patent to remit any fine, and it is not necessary to repeat the provision in this measure.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Without the proviso the Governor would still have power to remit a fine. Probably the reason for the inclusion of the proviso is that under the Licensing Act a minimum fine is prescribed.

New clause put and negatived.

New clause:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 37a: ''Section 3 of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act, 1916, Subsection 1, line 1 is amended by striking out the words 'two-gallon license' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'brewer's license or spirit merchant's license.' ''

Section 3 of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act requires the holder of a gallon or two-gallon license to keep certain records. The two-gallon license has been done away with and the brewer's license substituted. The spirit merchant's license also covers quantities down to two gallons.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The striking out of the two-gallon license would be the correct procedure, because there will be no two-gallon license left. However, I do not think it was intended that this provision should be extended to retail licenses.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Section 3 of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act is incorporated in this measure by Clause 131. Yet we are still leaving in the reference to the two-gallon license.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The striking out of the words ''two-gallon license'' might be reasonable, but to insert the words suggested would be unwise. Clause 29 provides for certain returns, Subclause 2 referring to the returns required from

the holder of a spirit merchant's license and Subclause 3 to those required from the holder of a brewer's license. Certain returns are also required under Section 3 of the Act of 1917 and consequently there will be a duplication. If Mr. Stewart would confine his amendment to striking out the words "or two-gallon license," I would support him.

Hon. H. STEWART: Will the Minister inform me of the reason for requiring returns under the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The intention was to deal with retail sales, the marginal note reading, "Dealing by gallon licensees to be recorded, and books, etc., produced." The debate at that time turned purely on the question of the retail sale of liquor by the gallon, and the contention was that some holders of grocer's licenses were selling liquor and charging it up as tea, etc. Section 3 was adopted purely as a protection in such cases. Since both gallon and two-gallon licenses might be used for that purpose, they were included. The spirit merchant's license was in existence at the time, but no one suggested this should be put in there. It was purely intended for retail purposes.

Hon. H. Stewart: I propose to withdraw the new clause.

New clause by leave withdrawn.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That a new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 131 as follows:—"Saving of right of renewal of certain licenses under pending applications—'Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act to the contrary, a gallon or two-gallon license, or a spirit merchant's license, under and subject to the principal Act may, on payment of the fee payable under that Act, be granted or issued to any person who, at the commencement of this Act, is an applicant or the holder of a certificate for such license, but Section 29 of this Act shall apply to such license.

Provided that the Receiver of Revenue may, if required so to do, (a) issue to the holder of a certificate for a gallon license, in lieu of such license, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fee.

(b) Issue to the holder of a certificate for a two-gallon license, in lieu of such license, a brewer's license, and also, if so desired, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fees;

(c) issue to the holder of a certificate for a spirit merchant's license under the principal Act, in lieu of such license, a spirit merchant's license under and subject to this Act, on payment of the prescribed fee.

It is necessary to put in this clause at the end of the Bill.

New clause put and passed.

Title:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In view of the fact that the Bill seeks to amend the Tobacco and Spirits Act of 1917, I hardly think the title of the Bill covers all requirements. It should be amended by the addition of the words "and to amend the Act of 1911 and certain Acts relating thereto."

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better to amend the title in that way.

Hon. H. STEWART: It seems to me that the title as it now stands fully covers the position, and that the suggested amendment is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I am of opinion that the title should be amended, but perhaps that question can be gone into later.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The matter has been considered by the Crown Law authorities, who take the same view as Mr. Stewart. I will, at all events, have the matter further gone into.

Title—agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In the ordinary course of events the Bill would now be printed with amendments, because it would be assumed that at our next meeting the adoption of the report would be moved, to be followed by the third reading of the Bill. We do intend to recommit the Bill, and there will be some alterations, but it would be desirable that it should be reprinted before the next meeting of the House.

Members: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This might involve a little extra cost because of the alterations which have been made in Committee, but I think it will be more than compensated for by the fact that members will have the Bill before them as amended.

BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

BILL—MARRIED WOMEN'S PROTECTION.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council.

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendments.

Schedule of amendments made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments made by the Assembly are as follows:—

Clause 4—Strike out in the second line the words "and to fix the subscription to be paid by its members."

Clause 5, Subclause 1—Add at the end the words "an annual subscription of 1s. shall entitle all persons to full membership."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

Clause 4 as it stood allowed an association to fix the subscription, but the Assembly took the view that the subscription should be purely a nominal one. This was the intention of the Council.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendments agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.55] in moving the second reading said: It will not be necessary for me to repeat the arguments I advanced in favour of a Bill of a similar character, which has been laid aside because of the decision of this House. I shall, therefore, confine myself to a comparison between that Bill and the one I am now dealing with. In the first place, Clause 13 of the old Bill, to which exception was taken, has been removed.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Bill, with that exception, the same as the other?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will point out the other alterations. Subclause 2 of Clause 6 provided that an owner of land might elect to pay land tax at the rate of three times the tax imposed for the time being. To continue a clause of that kind in a Bill introduced in this Chamber might be held to be an imposition of taxation which this Chamber is not competent to effect. The clause, therefore, reads—

> To pay land tax at such rate as Parliament may enact in respect of land declared to be the subject of this Act.

If the Bill is agreed to by both Houses it will follow that in another place a taxation Bill will have to be introduced applying entirely to land which is made the subject of the Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is putting the acid on this House first.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No. Exception might have been taken to the Bill even if it had been introduced in the other House in that form. Under an amendment we carried last year a taxation Bill should be a taxation Bill only, and not deal with any other subject. It is, I think, the proper way of doing things, namely, to have the machinery first and then apply the tax under a different Bill. If this Bill is passed as a council Act, then the taxation Bill will be a further measure, which will have to be introduced every year, and thus it will be competent for the amount to be varied, either by being increased or by being decreased. However, I am merely pointing out now the alterations in this Bill as compared with the measure introduced some little time ago. Subclause 4 of Clause 6 is also amended. Instead of merely providing for the treble land tax, the subclause directs—

> If the owner elects, as set forth in paragraph (b) of Subsection 2, land tax payable in respect of the land under any Act for the imposition of land tax shall, as from the commencement of the then current financial year, be at such rate as Parliament may enact in respect of land declared to be subject to this Act, and may be assessed and shall be recoverable under and subject to the provisions of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907, but without any abatement under Section 17 thereof.

Otherwise the clause is the same as in the previous Bill. In Clause 8 there is a difference, the latter part of the clause having been struck out. Clause 8 now reads—

> If an owner, after having elected to subdivide his land for sale as set forth in paragraph (a) of Subsection 2 of Section 6, shall not, in the opinion of the board, duly comply with Subsection 3 thereof, the board may serve upon the owner a notice of his default in the prescribed form; and thereupon the owner shall be deemed to have elected, as set forth in paragraph (d) of Subsection 2 of Section 6.

There the clause stops, omitting words it previously contained, as follows:—

> and the land shall, as from the commencement of the then current financial year, be liable to land tax at three times the current rate of tax for the time being payable under any Act for the imposition of land tax, and such increased tax may be assessed and shall be recoverable under and subject to the provisions of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907.

The second part of Clause 12 as originally introduced provided—

> The Colonial Treasurer may, with the approval of the Governor, expend for the purposes of this Act such funds as under the provisions of the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act are available, or as may be appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of this Act.

That subclause does not appear in this Bill, nor does Clause 13. With those exceptions the Bill is identical with the one of the second

reading which I moved a fortnight ago. I now —

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Point of Order.

Hon. J. Cornell: I submit that the Bill is not in order. Standing Order 120 provides—

No question or amendment shall be proceeded with which is the same in substance as any question or amendment which during the same session has been resolved in the affirmative or negative, unless the order, resolution, or vote on such question or amendment has been rescinded. This Standing Order shall not be suspended.

It is not within my province to say why the previous Bill was ruled out of order. That is a circumstance which no hon. member other than the one who moved in the matter is responsible for. The House decided that the Bill was not properly before the House, and so the Bill was laid aside. Without going into any lengthy dissertation, I submit that the last Bill and this Bill are substantially the same. The preamble to the Bill which was ruled out read—

A Bill for an Act relating to the acquisition and disposal of land for closer settlement.

The short title of the last Bill was "Closer Settlement Act, 1922." The preamble to the present Bill is as follows:—

A Bill for an Act relating to the acquisition and disposal of land for closer settlement.

The short title clause reads—

This Act may be cited as the Closer Settlement Act, 1922.

The Minister for Education: What question have we resolved in the affirmative or negative?

Hon. J. Cornell: The last Bill was laid aside.

The Minister for Education: But what question was resolved in the affirmative or in the negative?

Hon. J. Cornell: A Bill was introduced into this House, and its second reading was moved. A point of order was raised as to whether the Bill was in order. The President ruled that it was in order. That ruling was disagreed with. Upon a division the House, by a substantial majority, resolved that the Bill was not in order. If that is not an affirmative resolution that the Bill should not be here, I want to know what an affirmative resolution is?

The Minister for Education: I am not disputing that resolution.

Hon. J. Cornell: The resolution effectively decided that the second reading of the Bill should not be proceeded with. A reference to "Hansard" shows that in 1912 a Bill was introduced to construct a railway line from Norseman to Esperance. The second reading of that Bill was defeated. The Closer Settlement Bill did not get a chance to be defeated on the second reading.

The Minister for Education: If it had been defeated on the second reading, it could not have been introduced again; but it was not defeated.

Hon. J. Cornell: If this House interprets the resolution to mean that hon. members would not allow the Bill to come before the House, the measure was effectively laid aside. The Norseman-Esperance Railway Bill——

The President: We are not discussing that Bill. Does the hon. member want a ruling?

Hon. J. Cornell: I want to lead up, Sir. The Norseman-Esperance Railway Bill was defeated on the second reading. Then a Bill was introduced to construct a railway from Esperance 60 miles northwards. The late President, Sir Henry Briggs, on a point of order raised by Mr. Moss, ruled that the Bill was the same in substance as the defeated Bill, and could not be introduced into the House. The Bill was, accordingly, laid aside. That is the position now, I submit.

The President: My ruling is that this Bill is quite in order. The objection to the last Bill was that it was not properly endorsed. There was no question as to what the Bill contained. The Bill was never considered at all with regard to what it contained. Therefore, in the circumstances, the question was merely one of endorsement; and I now rule that this Bill is perfectly in order.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin debate on second reading adjourned.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [6.12] in moving the second reading said: This is a very short and simple, but very important Bill. It amends the Agricultural Bank Act of 1906. The present Act provides for the payment of interest only for the first five years, and then repayment of principal in equal half-yearly instalments over a period of 25 years. The defect in that provision is that it casts the heavier burden upon the borrower from the Agricultural Bank in the early stages of his development. He has to pay equal half-yearly instalments of principal, and of course as those instalments of principal are paid the interest becomes lighter and lighter, until at the finish of his period he is paying very little indeed. Experience shows that it takes about 10 years for a man on the land to get well on his feet. Thus equal repayments over 25 years mean heavy bills in the early years, growing lighter as the principal repayments reduce the interest charges. The contention is that the diminution occurs really at the wrong period. The relief is obtained when a man has been established for 25 years, and when apparently it is not needed. It is thought to be more equitable, so long as

the system is safe, to spread both interest and principal over the whole period. This Bill proposes that the repayments, instead of commencing at the end of five years, shall commence at the end of 10 years. That is to say, for the first 10 years only interest shall be paid. Thereafter, for 20 years instead of 25—because the whole period is 30 years—there shall be payment of interest together with instalments of principal. Under this Bill there will be 10 years of payment of interest only, and then 20 years of repayment of principal with interest added. The total period is not extended, but remains at 30 years as before. The way in which this would operate, taking £100 loan as the basis, is as follows: Under the old system in the sixth year the borrower would have to pay £4 principal and £6 18s. 7d. interest, or a total of £10 18s. 7d. That payment of £4 principal would continue throughout the period, and when the borrower got to the twentieth year he would be paying £4 principal and £3 0s. 3d. interest, or a total of £7 0s. 3d., and in the final year he would be paying £4 principal and only 4s. 3d. interest. If the alteration proposed by the Bill be agreed to, the borrower will, up to the tenth year, pay interest only. That is to say, in the sixth year he will pay £7 instead of, as at present, £10 18s. 7d. But in subsequent years his payments of principal will increase as his payment of interest declines. In the thirtieth year he will pay £7 7s. 6d. principal and 6s. 11d. interest, or a total of £7 14s. 5d. His payments will vary. He will save in the earlier portion of his period, and pay more in the latter portion. The highest payment he would have to make would be in the 25th year, a total of £10 13s. 11d. Under the present system the highest payment has to be made in the sixth year instead of in the 25th. The system of calculation is very similar to that applied in the case of workers' homes, but not exactly the same, because the repayments of principal are not equal. Under the Agricultural Bank Act accounts are often being paid off in full, transferred to some private financial house. The guiding principle, however, is that which governs the Workers' Homes Board, interest and principal being equally adjusted for the whole period. Under the present system the borrower from the Agricultural Bank is compelled to pay a fixed amount of principal every half-year after the commencement of the sixth year.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Before tea I was explaining the chief principle in the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill. It is to lighten the burden during the early years and somewhat increase it during later years. The present system is, interest only for the first five years, and principal for a period of 25 years afterwards. The Bill provides, interest only for the first 10 years, and interest and principal for the succeeding 20 years. Under the existing system, directly the repayment of principal starts, it is on an even basis over the whole period; and as the interest is constantly decreasing because of the payment of principal, the total burden becomes lighter as time goes on. Under the amendment the repayment of principal will be made lighter at the outset and will increase as the interest declines, so as to make the aggregate payment about equal right through the period. At the present time in the eleventh year, on an advance of £100, the borrower pays in interest £5 10s. 7d., and in capital £4, or a total of £9 10s. 7d. Under the new system he would pay only 7s. 6d. in that year as principal, and would pay the full interest. The alteration will be of material benefit to the clients of the Agricultural Bank, without in any way interfering with the security. The second matter dealt with in the Bill relates to soldier settlement. Where soldiers have been settled on single properties purchased for them, the Agricultural Bank limits the advance to £2,000. In a few cases, where those single properties have been repurchased and the soldier has scarcely sufficient, a little more assistance is necessary. So the Bill provides that in those cases only, in none other, the limit from the bank may be increased to £2,500. It is intended that it shall be used sparingly, and only where it is necessary to protect the advance and enable the soldier to carry on. Another provision in the Bill should have been in the Act all along. A farmer not able to pay his interest promptly should be given time, subject to the payment of interest on the arrears. That is ordinary business practice. At present any farmer in arrears with his interest pays no interest on those arrears. It means to the bank a loss of approximately £15,000 per annum. It is a dead loss to the State, because the State has to go on paying interest on all money that is out. It operates unfairly on those who do pay. Moreover, the borrower, knowing he has not to pay interest on the arrears of interest, does not bother about paying interest. The new provision will work hardship on nobody. It is a definite provision that the time for the payment of interest may be extended when circumstances justify it, but that interest shall be charged on the arrears.

Hon. J. Mills: Has no interest been paid on arrears in the past?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No. Suppose a man had a loan of a couple of thousand, his interest for the year would be, say, £140. He might defer that for a year, and yet pay no interest on the £140. It is obviously unfair, and it works very badly. As I say, the estimated loss to the bank per annum is no less than £15,000. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [7.35]: I am pleased to know that the Agricultural Bank is dealing fairly with the settlers, and that advances are now to be made in the South-West. It had to be done because of the soldiers being settled down there. For

many years it was impossible to get any Agricultural Bank money for the South-West. I am glad to know that policy has been altered. The Bill will be of material assistance to the borrowers. It has come under my notice that frequently it is difficult for a man to start repaying after five years. The further extension of five years will be of great advantage to him. As for the last point raised by the Minister, that in regard to the payment of interest on arrears, it seems fair, although I am afraid in some instances it will operate harshly.

The Minister for Education: If the time for the payment of interest is to be extended, surely the borrower must pay for it.

Hon. J. EWING: Still, I should like to give him every advantage.

Hon. J. Nicholson: All the financial institutions provide the same thing.

Hon. J. EWING: The State is very different from a financial institution. Every possible encouragement should be given to the men settled on the land. I am very pleased with the increase of £500 for the soldier settlers. In many cases it will serve to just carry a man over the stile. Generally speaking, we may congratulate the Government on the extension of the functions of the Agricultural Bank, and may congratulate also the manager of that bank, Mr. McLarty, on his most excellent work. It is pleasing to note that wherever the Premier goes to look into questions of land settlement, especially if there be knotty points for consideration, he takes Mr. McLarty with him. The Premier seems to have very great confidence in that officer. The late Mr. Paterson laid the foundations of the bank on sound lines, and the time Mr. McLarty had under his guidance is bearing good fruit. We should be very pleased indeed to have such able officers looking after those settled on the land.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE—ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Adoption of Report.

Debate resumed from the 7th November on motion by Hon. A. Lovekin—

That the report of the select committee be adopted.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [7.40]: The select committee have carefully placed before the House the exact position of the agreements entered into and the effect of those agreements on the local authorities. The committee should be congratulated on the thoroughness with which their work has been done. One point very evident from the result of their inquiries, is the foresight displayed by the Minister who erected the power station at East Perth. At the time there was considerable discussion as to the wisdom of the project, but all that has been effectually silenced by the increasing demand for electric current. Only now are we beginning to fully appreciate the value of that power station to the metropolis. The whole future of the station rests upon the supply of current for industrial purposes. Of recent years there have been enormous advances in electrical manufacture, demonstrating the necessity for the construction of large power stations. The erection of the station at East Perth was the beginning of the establishment of secondary industries in this State. The City Council have now awakened to the rapid expansion of those industries, and have reduced the charges for current for industrial power. We lost a valuable opportunity when we neglected to introduce, during the war period, the electrical manufacture of chemical products. At that time very great advances were made in the electrical manufacture of nitrates from the atmosphere. For this industry there is almost unlimited scope in Western Australia. It depends on cheap power and its products constitute the raw material for several products. Germany and America are manufacturing by chemical processes caustic soda, bi-carbonate of soda, and sodium cyanide. The electrical manufacture of these products does away with a previously unhealthy occupation, and revolutionises their prices. This field of manufacture was peculiarly open to us, and was of vital interest to the gold-mining industry. Had we seized our opportunity to establish these electrical factories during the war, we should have increased very rapidly the demand for current from East Perth. In addition to that, we should have seen started many new indusries manufacturing materials, which now have to be imported. We should therefore advance our power station load to enable us to reduce the charges for current to the lowest possible amount. This will encourage manufacturers to instal small plants and so permit of the extension of secondary industries. The report refers to the electrification of the railways. That is a subject on which it might be desirable to proceed cautiously at the present time, for this reason: the figures with regard to the electrification of the railways in Victoria prove that the cost of the installation of the plant for the electrification of the system has militated against the financial success of the scheme. There is also to be taken into consideration the fact that in Victoria there is a very big population which is continually moving about, and particularly is that so morning and evening. It is the case there to a greater extent than it is around our metropolitan area, and yet the Victorian figures are not satisfactory. It is desirable therefore that we should carefully consider the figures of Victoria before we proceed to any expense in the direction of introducing the system in this State.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They say it is cheaper than steam.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It may be, but the question is whether it would not be a sounder

policy in connection with our railways to go in for re-grading rather than for electrification. The advance which has been made in connection with the railways of America in recent years has been due to the enormous sums spent in re-grading, and now the locomotives take much larger loads, resulting in reduced operating charges. I congratulate the select committee on the work that they performed, and on having brought the matters referred to in the report under the notice of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.48]: I have very little to say on the motion for the adoption of the report, but I do not wish to give a silent vote for fear that my action may be misunderstood. I am quite in accord with those hon. members who have referred to the good work done by the select committee, but it will be noticed that the committee make specific recommendations to the Government, and if I were to vote for the motion I would be pledging myself, as representative of the Government in this House, to the adoption of those recommendations, whereas the most I can say is that if the motion be carried, the Government will give the recommendations serious consideration.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is all the report asks you to do.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have difficulty in reconciling the introductory paragraph in the report with Clause (e) of the summary. The introductory paragraph says—

> Each directly or indirectly—

referring of course to the two agreements entered into by the Government,

> —creates a monopoly. Each disadvantages consumers within the respective areas. Each is opposed to the best interests of the taxpayers of the State. Each, however, is unalterable by an act of repudiation which your committee cannot recommend.

Then Clause (e) says—

> As regards the agreement with the Fremantle Tramway Board, your committee is of opinion that it is in restraint of trade, and not having been ratified by Parliament is alterable if so desired.

I find it difficult to reconcile both statements. I cannot vote for the motion, but if the motion be carried I can say that the Government will give it every consideration.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [7.50]: The Minister might have said something with regard to the strenuous work which was done by the select committee and particularly the chairman of the committee. I was a member of the select committee and I am aware of the task which was undertaken by Mr. Lovekin to whom the thanks of the House are due. What I am more than satisfied about is that it was thought—there certainly was an impression abroad—that the select committee was appointed for the purpose of doing something of an injurious nature to the Perth City Council and to the Fremantle Tramway Board. The chairman of the committee, on many occasions in the course of the inquiry, put specific questions to the witnesses and he expressed himself very clearly on this point. If anyone will read the report he will find that there is not one word of bias contained in it, not one word that is not right or just. It contains only what the chairman and the members of the committee thought. There was no idea whatever of inquiring into anything beyond the intricacies of the questions. There was no intention whatever to cast a reflection on either the City Council or the Fremantle Tramway Board. There are many matters to which I could have referred, but unfortunately I have not with me the notes I made in connection with the remarks I had intended to offer on this motion. The position is that we found that the initial agreement made by the Seaddan Government in 1913 was prejudicial to the interests of the State. The more I think of it the more I am satisfied that the head of the Government at the time was anything but far-seeing. I give the greatest credit to the then mayor of Perth, Mr. Prowse, for his ingenuity, and for his power of observation, in connection with the making of the agreement, thus providing something for the people of Perth which they should not have had, something which is certainly not in the interests of the State as a whole. The City Council secured an agreement for a period of 50 years with the option of renewal for another 50 years, a total of 100 years. That agreement is in black and white and it is such that we cannot repudiate it. But if we cannot repudiate it, and we believe it to be something which is detrimental to the interests of the people of Western Australia, and even to the ratepayers of the Perth municipality, then we are right in pointing out that something should be done by the Government in the way of controlling the sale of current. I have nothing to say against the City Council; they did what ordinary business people would have done. They are now carrying out their agreement and it is their desire to make the best of it. I believe that the mayor of Perth and those who are associated with him have no desire other than to benefit the people, but they must do that in a way that is right. They are charging for current more than they should charge and the relief of the ratepayers should be greater than it is under the terms of the agreement. When we remember that the agreement has been ratified by Parliament, it makes it impossible for us to talk of repudiation. But something must be done to overcome that agreement so that some benefit may be given to the people by the cheap production of electricity. The position at Fremantle is totally different. The agreement made with the Fremantle Tramway Board has not been ratified by Parliament. Under that agreement the people at the port are supplied with current at a cheaper rate than that charged to the people of Perth. What I cannot understand is why the then Premier did

not ask Parliament to ratify the Fremantle agreement. He entered into that agreement on his own initiative and he gave to Fremantle what should not have been given without the consent of Parliament. No Premier has the right to enter into an agreement of that character for a term of 50 years unless he is far-sighted enough to be able to tell what will happen in 50 years' time, so far as electricity is concerned. Yet he made this agreement for 25 years with the right of renewal for another 25 years. What he did then does not stand to his credit, and I would be prepared to say that outside this House. The people of the State have now to pay the piper for all these things which should not have occurred. With regard to the report of the select committee, every line of it is based upon the evidence taken. There is not one word written in malice; everything has been written with the one thought, that of advancing the interests of the ratepayers of Perth and the people of the State generally. The report opens up a big question. It is one on which, as I have done in former years, I would like to submit a definite motion. I realise that there is not time now because there are other matters of a practical nature and perhaps of more immediate importance to be attended to during the next month or so. I have on two occasions moved in this direction, and I have received no suggestion whatever from the Minister for Railways. He has simply told me that when the time arrives, everything will be done. I wish to refer to a portion of the evidence given by Mr. Taylor, the general manager of the electricity supply. I do not believe that the Government have a better officer than Mr. Taylor. He is a very capable man and his desire is to do all he can in the interests of giving cheap current to the people of Western Australia.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What else is he there for?

Hon. J. EWING: But it is not every man who does his duty; many neglect to do what they should do. Mr. Taylor is a hard worker. He is clear headed and thoroughly understands the task he has in hand. But he is obsessed with the one idea, and it is to build up the power station at East Perth to an enormous extent. When giving evidence before the select committee, I asked him a question as follows:—"Is it your policy, as general manager, to increase the power station beyond its present capacity?" We have been told by the Minister in this House, I think, that it is not the intention of the Government to increase the power house beyond the capacity it will have when the new unit is installed. Mr. Taylor's reply to the question was as follows:—

> That would all depend on what we would see ahead of us when the station reaches that capacity at which we find we have not sufficient reserve plant. We could put in another 7,500 kilowatt without spending any great amount on buildings and foundations.

Therein lies the whole position. I have been endeavouring to induce the Government to take an interest in this matter to the extent of having inquiries made as to the best method of generating electricity cheaply. It is not necessary to say what has been done in other parts of the world, because we know of the enormous strides that have been made in electricity in America and even in little Tasmania which you, Mr. President, visited last year. I have been contradicted on several occasions when I have made the assertion that electricity was generated in Tasmania at as low a rate as in any other part of the world. Mr. Seaddan himself denied what I stated. At any rate I am prepared to say that in the near future Tasmania, when she gets her works going, will be producing electricity at rates which may easily be lower than those in any other part of the world, and certainly in Australia. The conditions existing in Tasmania for hydro-electric generation are wonderful, and if we read the history of that installation, and the great work that is being done there, work which is at present only half completed, we must realise that on the completion of the undertaking it will be difficult to find a competitor in any part of the world so far as cost is concerned.

Hon. J. Duffell: What about Morwell?

Hon. J. EWING: Morwell will not be in the same street as Tasmania according to what I am informed. The history of the world teaches us that the nations which are going to be great are those which have cheap power, and that is what the chairman of the committee has been trying to impress upon the Government. That is what I have tried to impress on the Government during the past two sessions with but little support in this Chamber. Last session, I was beaten on a division by one vote. That division was taken at a most inopportune time, when I could not get the full opinion of the House. I had to accept defeat on that occasion, as I had to previously, but I will not allow that to deter me in my determination to do my duty to the people of Western Australia generally and to the people I represent in my province particularly. Every progressive country in the world now has cheap power. During the inquiry by the committee, the chairman directed his attention to the same object. He was endeavouring to find out where the cheapest power could be generated in Perth, and why it was that the Perth City Council charged more for current than it was supplied at by the Government beyond the five-miles radius of the Town Hall. Mr. Taylor is building up, owing to the cheapness of the current supplied outside the five-miles radius, a number of industries that might well be within the city boundaries. The same thing applies to Fremantle. The Perth City Council and the Fremantle Tramway Board are not, in my opinion, dealing with the outside municipalities in the way they should. Mr. Duffell, one of the members of the committee, will be able to deal with that point as it affects more particularly the municipalities within his province. While I agree with the report of the committee, I cannot see any pos-

sible chance under present conditions of improving the position of outside municipalities.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They can generate current as cheaply if they want to.

Hon. J. EWING: I am glad of that interjection because it enables me to direct the attention of the House to the fact that they cannot do so.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Why?

Hon. J. EWING: Because the quantity supplied would be so much smaller that it would not be possible to generate current at a cost as low as that of the City Council and the Government, who are able to command so much greater supplies. That is not the point, however. The point is that these outside municipalities must get the power at cost price. What that is, is one of the points which has yet to be determined. The meaning of Clause 10 of the agreement has not been made clear. It has been referred to prominent lawyers by the City Council and they are not able to say what it means. They cannot say what should be paid for current supplied under that clause. We do not know what is the intention under that clause and that is one point on which the report of the committee dwells. We consider that Parliament should say what is meant by Clause 10. I cannot fathom what it means. We could not say what should be charged under its provisions. I do not think any member of the committee, the City Council or the Fremantle Tramway Board, can say what the position is in that regard. They simply do not know, but make the best bargain they can with the smaller outside municipalities, who, seeing that they cannot generate current at so low a cost, take the current as it is supplied to them. It should be supplied at a lower cost and under better conditions. I want to stress one recommendation of the committee and that is that electricity commissioners should be appointed. During the war cheap power was of such vast importance to the Empire that an Electricity Commission was appointed to inquire into the position. It was found that chaos reigned supreme. Thousands of various generating plants were scattered throughout the British Isles and that proved detrimental to the development of cheap power for industrial purposes in particular. The Commission is going into the matter thoroughly and concentrating the generating stations at advantageous points, thus enabling industries to be supplied more economically than was possible before. It is the duty of the Government here to make these inquiries. We have the Minister for Mines, Mr. Scaddan, going round different parts of the State and declaring open, or turning on, electricity supplies, and making statements regarding the future. He made a speech at Kalamunda, and on several occasions he has made the statement emphatically that the electrification of the railways was a great necessity and should be carried out at once.

Hon. E. H. Harris: He will make a lot more statements after he reads your speech.

Hon. J. EWING: The Minister's statement, however, is not in keeping with what the Government are doing at present. I think Mr. Taylor stated that when the Government power station was generating—I am speaking from memory only—some 50 million units, the plant would have reached its full capacity. That is as much as can safely be generated. During the last five years the increase in the production and distribution of electricity from that station has been great indeed. Something like 31 million units were sold last year, or will be sold during the present year. At that rate it will be only a year or two when the station will have reached its full capacity of 50 million units. If the Minister for Mines has any idea of electrifying the railways, he is up against it already. He will have to consider what his policy is to be regarding the supply of cheap electricity apart from the East Perth power station, which he has built up at the present time. That is in the mind of the Minister and he will not listen to anything I say to him regarding inquiries being made into the cost of opening up a supply of electricity at Collie or elsewhere. I am not speaking of Collie any more than any other place, but if Collie is the centre of the coal supply, and it is in a position similar to those places in Great Britain where they develop electric power at the source of fuel supply, I think the Minister could very well benefit from the experience of the Old Country and make these inquiries, so as to ascertain the cost of a scheme there.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I suppose the Minister does what Mr. Taylor advises.

Hon. J. EWING: Mr. Taylor does not make any bones about it. He is a very straightforward man. I asked him the question and he said that when that time arrived he would be prepared for it and it would take him only a month or two to get all the information that the Government required. I do not know that he is a superman and it certainly would require a superman to get all the information necessary on such a problem. If Mr. Taylor attends to his business here and looks after his multifarious duties properly and efficiently, I contend he has no time to go round the country inquiring into such a big problem as I have outlined. Mr. Taylor, when I questioned him on the point, said, "I have only to sit in my office, and calculate what the cost of running a double transmission line from Perth to Collie would be." Of course, anyone can do that, but that is not the way to deal with such a problem. Inquiries would have to be made throughout the State to find out where the lines would go, what centres would be touched, what the consumption was likely to be, and how it was likely to work out from the financial standpoint. I am satisfied that Mr. Taylor cannot do all that and at the same time attend to his duties. He has not the necessary time at his disposal. He is certainly clever enough to carry out the inquiries but I do not believe that any man in the employ of the Government has the time at

his disposal to attend to these investigations. I would be willing to advocate the engagement of a man like Sir John Monash, who has handled the development of the Morwell scheme. That scheme for the cheap supply of electricity will help to build up Victorian industries. New South Wales is a great State and will be a still greater State in the future because they can see what has been done in Tasmania and Victoria. They are making inquiries regarding Burrenjack and other enormous reservoirs where great supplies of water are retained, to see what can be done regarding hydro-electric generation. Everywhere this is being done except in Western Australia. We are told we must stand still, because a certain man says he does not want the scheme. Because of the policy of the Minister for Mines—I will not say of the Government—everything is to be kept at a standstill. We are told that it is intended to put in a 7,500 kilowatt plant at the Government power house so as to cope with the extra demand. I do not think the Government should be allowed to do that. We should accept the responsibilities of our position in this Chamber as a house of review. Ever since I have been a member of this Chamber, I have recognised that it is an active and splendid House. Members here desire to do everything they can to assist in the development of the State. Why should we not make the necessary inquiries into these matters? In other parts of the world, they do not hesitate to make full inquiries concerning the production of cheap power. In Western Australia we should have the problem investigated by a first class electrical engineer. Current is being supplied to the Perth City Council at ¾d. and that is disposed of at a loss, while the public are being supplied at .9d. or 1d. per unit. We have made a recommendation that the Perth City Council should supply at 1d. per unit and they can do it.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They have been supplying at lower than that for some time past.

Hon. J. EWING: I am very pleased to hear it. I can assure Mr. Macfarlane I am not making an attack on the Perth City Council. My idea is to secure the cheaper generation of electricity, so that the Perth City Council can get the full benefit of the agreement. If that can be done, everything between the cost of distribution and the ¾d. per unit which the City Council have to pay will be a profit for the municipal authorities. I am sure members representing the metropolitan area will aid me in an endeavour to get the price below ¾d. We do not want to stop at a supply of ¾d. per unit merely because a profit can be made at that price.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A loss of only £167 was made this year.

Hon. J. EWING: My idea is that the Perth City Council should be supplied at under ½d. per unit. Sir John Monash is aiming to supply current from Morwell at under ½d. per unit.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They get cheap coal there.

Hon. J. EWING: Yes, at 2s. 6d. per ton, but that is because they simply quarry the coal there. They do not mine it. If hon. members interject they are liable to keep me on my feet for a considerable time for the reason that when they speak about Morwell coal, they should realise that it is not comparable with Collie coal. Morwell coal is about the poorest in the world with the exception of some of the German and French coal. It is very inferior to the Collie article and, in fact, there is no comparison whatever. Collie coal may cost 10s. or 12s. a ton at the pit's mouth, but the result from one ton of Collie coal is more than the result to be obtained from an equal quantity of Morwell cal.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It would need to be at four times the price.

The Minister for Education: One ton of Collie coal would not be equal to four tons of Morwell coal.

Hon. J. EWING: About that. Morwell coal contains 39 per cent. of moisture, and that moisture has to be evaporated before it is possible to get the proper combustion.

The Minister for Education: I understand that two tons of Morwell coal is equal to one ton of ours.

Hon. J. EWING: I do not think that is correct. If the moisture were driven off, it might be possible to get a calorific value of 9,000 B.T.U. compared with 10,500 of Collie coal and 13,000 of Newcastle coal. The Leader of the House is always generous and does what he can to assist us, and I am satisfied that what is said here is brought under the notice of the Government by him, but I want him now to place this matter seriously before the Government and see if we cannot institute inquiries which will redound to the advantage of the State. I do not ask for the expenditure of a large sum of money. The Government should set aside £5,000 and get Sir John Monash to come over and report. There would be no reflection on the manager, Mr. Taylor, or anyone else, although the Minister for Railways says Mr. Taylor is the alpha and omega of all things and leads one to believe that he is a superman. I am satisfied that Mr. Taylor is an ordinary man with a thorough knowledge of his business, but no superman. No man can claim a knowledge of everything. There are electrical engineers in America, England, and in Australia with whom Mr. Taylor probably would be proud to consult, and it is up to the Government to make inquiries in the hope that some good will be the outcome.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We have had a Royal Commission on railways, and what has been the outcome of that?

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Chair is that the report be adopted.

Hon. J. EWING: I appreciate the latitude you have allowed me, Sir, but the principle involved in this report is that of the cheap production of electricity. I have tried to

impress upon the Government that we have within our grasp the possibility of generating probably the cheapest power in the world. If we generated the electricity at the seat of the coal supplies, it could be made available in Perth at ½d. a unit, and where is the man who would say that would not be a good thing for Western Australia? I ask the House to support the motion and to place on record its appreciation of the splendid work done by the chairman of the select committee.

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

BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 8th November; Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

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

Postponed Clause 3—Registration of premises:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

> That the following proviso be added:—"Provided also that notwithstanding anything to the contrary therein contained, the provisions relating to the inspection of factories under the Shops and Factories Act, 1920, and Amendment Act, 1922, and the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1922, other than the provisions therein relating to the registration and inspection of boilers may be vested in the inspector for butter factories under this Act."

Under the definition in the Factories Act dairies will be liable to registration and inspection, but it might be possible in many instances to secure economy of administration by allowing a combination of duties as indicated in the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Will Mr. Stewart state what provisions of the Factories Act would prevent an inspector under this measure being called upon to carry out duties under the Factories Act? There is nothing at all to prevent an inspector under this measure being appointed an inspector under the Factories Act if such a course were deemed advisable. I do not think such an inspector would be able to do the work, because it is outside his line. His work involves not inspection, but advising. We have only one inspector and we do not intend to have more than one. A large number of dairies will have to be attended to, and if the inspector does the work contemplated under this measure, he will not have much time to bother about the Factories Act. If we found it possible for him to discharge duties under that Act also, there would be nothing to prevent his appointment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No harm can be done by adding the proviso so that one inspector may do two jobs. We have too many inspectors going about the country, and if we can telescope them, so much the better. An inspector under the Factories Act must have certain qualifications.

Hon. E. H. Harris: How about that man inspecting the dairies?

The Minister for Education: Do you propose to allow a man without qualifications to do the work?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A man who knows something about churns can inspect an internal combustion engine just as well as a highly qualified factories inspector. We do not want to burden the dairy farmer with the expense of two sets of inspections and two sets of fees. The one inspector and one set of returns should suffice. Without the amendment I do not see how an inspector under this measure could inspect an internal combustion engine. We should minimise the costs as much as possible.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I cannot see that the amendment is vital. The two measures come under different departments, and as there is little to be gained I do not think it worth while to insert the proviso.

Hon. H. STEWART: A proposal which indicates a measure of economy in administration should be worth adopting. I doubt whether the services of a dairy inspector would be availed of under the Factories Act unless authorised under this measure.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendment is utterly out of place. It has nothing whatever to do with the clause. The hon. member has brought forward this amendment because another amendment which he desired to get made when the clause was previously under discussion was found to be impossible. The former amendment might have been applicable to the clause, but the hon. member is now seeking to insert an amendment dealing with inspectors in a clause dealing with the registration of premises, a clause which has nothing whatever to do with inspectors.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we agree to the principle, we can add the words in the right place. A factory inspector has all the powers of an inspector under the Health Act. Instead of an inspector of factories performing the duties of a health inspector, we can by the amendment provide that the one inspector shall carry out the job and obviate the necessity for another inspector doing similar work.

The Minister for Education: Make the amendment to Clause 8, where it will have some sort of application. That can be done on recommittal.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not see how we can vest the provisions of an Act of Parliament in an inspector. The amendment requires alteration.

Hon. H. STEWART: I agree that the amendment had better be made to Clause 8.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It had better be left out altogether.

Hon. H. STEWART: My intention was to save over-lapping of registration and inspection.

The Minister for Education: I am going to recommit the registration clause.

Hon. H. STEWART: With the permission of the Committee I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill *reported* with *amendments*.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Minister for Education, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 5 and 8; Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair.

Clause 5—Application for registration:

The *MINISTER FOR EDUCATION*: When the question first arose the objection taken was that this was placing an undue hardship upon people who would be compelled to pay a fee for registration under a number of different Acts. The Committee first struck out the words "and the fees to be paid in connection therewith," I now propose to strike out other words. I move an amendment—

That the words "prescribed fee not to exceed £1" be struck out and "a fee of 5s." be inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 8—Inspectors:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that notwithstanding anything to the contrary therein contained the provisions relating to the inspection of factories under the Shops and Factories Act 1920 and Amendment Act, 1922, and the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1922, other than the provision therein relating to the registration and inspection of boilers may be vested in the inspector of factories under this Act."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the amendment be amended as follows:—Strike out "the provisions relating to the inspection of factories" and insert in lieu "the powers, obligations, and duties vested in inspectors"; and strike out "vested in the inspector for butter factories under this Act" and insert in lieu "may be carried out or undertaken by an inspector appointed under this Act."

The Minister for Education: I see no necessity for this.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No good purpose can be served by passing the amendment. If, however, the hon. member made it apply to all classes of inspectors, I might be inclined to support him.

Hon. H. STEWART: It would not be sensible to provide for all inspectors. We only want to provide for three, those who would ordinarily visit butter factories.

Hon. E. ROSE: The health and dairy inspector should be one. Very often the dairy inspector will give certain instructions, and the health inspector will come along and give others. To obviate that sort of thing, there should be an amalgamation of the offices of inspectors.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we say "shops and factories" we are including the health inspector, because the shops and factories inspectors are endowed with the powers and duties of health inspectors under Section 14 of the Shops and Factories Act. Instead of saying "health inspector" we should say "shops and factories inspector." The Machinery Inspection Department, too, might authorise the health inspector to look at an internal combustion engine in, say, Gnowangerup. It is not long since a pane of glass was broken in a Government school, leading to the following results: A man was sent by the Public Works Department to see what was wanted, and he inspected and reported. Then a glazier was sent, and he came back again. What the ultimate cost of replacing the pane of glass was I do not know. I am trying to help the Government to reduce the huge deficit.

The Minister for Education: While saving five bob on this, the hon. member is prepared to move disallowance of departmental regulations.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Much red tape exists among the Government departments. The economy effected by sending one inspector, as suggested by Mr. Lovekin, would be just about eaten up by correspondence between the various departments as to allocation of the inspector's expenses.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move a further amendment—

That "vested in the inspector for butter factories" be struck out, and "may be carried out or undertaken by an inspector appointed under this Act" be inserted in lieu.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If this further amendment is carried, will it not also be necessary to make appointments under the Inspection of Machinery Act?

Hon. A. Lovekin: If the Government like to make such appointments, they can do so.

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

Bill again reported, with further amendments.

House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.