

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th September, 1913.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1007
Questions: Kalgoorlie Reservoir, electricity contract	1007
Perth Tramways, sale of tickets	1007
Bulk handling of wheat	1008
Land selection, Esperance, Dunderberg	1008
Railway construction, Yiliming-Kondinin	1008
Vice-Regal residence at Albany	1008
State Steamship Service	1008
Government Electric Power Scheme	1009
Fruit marketing	1009
Bills: District Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 18.	
Traffic Com.	1009

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: By-law of Dowerin road board—valuation on annual value.

By the Minister for Mines: Statement of expenditure under the Mining Development Vote for the year ending 30th June, 1913.

By the Minister for Lands: Avondale estate, balance-sheet for the 22 months ended 31st December, 1912 (ordered on motion by Mr. Broun).

QUESTION — KALGOORLIE RESERVOIR, ELECTRICITY CONTRACT.

Mr. GREEN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has the contract been let for the supply of electric power to the Kalgoorlie storage reservoir? 2, If so, when was the contract let and to whom? 3, Is the rumour that the contract has been let to a private corporation correct, and, if so—4, Seeing that the Government stands for public as against corporation-owned utilities, why were not the Kalgoorlie municipal council approached and given an opportunity to tender for the supply? 5, Is not the municipal electric plant in closer proximity to the reservoir than any other source of supply? 6, Is it contended by the acting engineer for the goldfields that a "steady pressure of 3,000 volts" is necessary for the power required? 7,

Or is the contention of the municipal electrical engineer correct that a current at 3,000 volts will have to be transformed at a low standard voltage before connecting with the pumping motor? 8, On what information did the engineer base his conclusion that there was nothing to be gained by approaching the council? 9, What was the source of his information?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, On 25th July, conditions of contract agreed to with the Kalgoorlie Electric Power and Lighting Corporation, Limited. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, The Kalgoorlie Electric Power and Lighting Corporation approached the Government with an offer of electric current at a reduced rate, and urged that this should be utilised in preference to gas or steam, tenders for which had been called. Seeing that the quotes obtained for the latter were not suitable, the Government negotiated with the company, and finally arranged a contract. It is regretted that the council did not make representations at the same time, as the department understood that the municipal plant had no large margin at night, consequently the Government engineer considered it would be a waste of time to ask for quotes or commence correspondence with the municipal council, believing that no contract would follow. 5, Yes. 6, Yes. 7, No. 8 and 9, An assistant engineer at Kalgoorlie.

QUESTION — PERTH TRAMWAYS, SALE OF TICKETS.

Mr. ALLEN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, In view of the great inconvenience caused to the general public by the abolition of the sale of tram tickets by the conductors on the cars, will he cause instructions to be issued to revert back to the previous custom? 2, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: A satisfactory method of collecting fares in the interests of the passenger, the conductor, and the State, is a fairly difficult problem, and it was

decided to give a trial to the present plan, on the suggestion of the Commissioner of Railways and Tramways. After a little more experience the question can, if necessary, be again reviewed.

QUESTION—BULK HANDLING OF WHEAT.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: When does the board appointed to inquire into the question of introducing the bulk system of handling wheat in Western Australia expect to hand in its report?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: As soon as its investigations are completed the report of the board will be submitted to the Government.

QUESTIONS (2)—LAND SELECTION. *Esperance.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is it a fact that a large number of agricultural selections have been surveyed near Esperance town site from land that was locked up in pastoral leases for many years? 2, When will this land be available for selection? 3, Will he have the date well advertised in accordance with the request to this effect made by the Esperance Land and Railway League?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, On 15th October. Applications may be lodged at the Kalgoorlie office at any time after Friday, the 12th instant. 3, Notice will be given in the usual way.

Dudening.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, When will the town lots at Dudening, on the Yillimining-Kondinin railway, be thrown open for selection or sale? 2, As two stores are already established at Dudening, and other people are anxious to open business there, will he try to have these blocks made available quickly?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, On or about the 8th October. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, YILLIMINING-KONDISIN.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: What progress has been made, and is intended, with the construction of the Yillimining-Kondinin railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Tank at Yillimining completed and contains 5,000,000 gallons of water. Tank at 36m. 56c. in progress. Clearing complete to 39 miles. Thirteen miles of rails on ground and 40 miles of sleepers. 2, Good supply of material ordered and construction work will be expedited by the engagement of additional men.

QUESTION — VICE-REGAL RESIDENCE AT ALBANY.

Mr. TURVEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a paragraph appearing in the *West Australian* of Saturday, 30th ult., in which it is stated that £5,000 is to be spent in connection with a vice-regal residence at Albany? 2, Is it his intention to spend the sum of £5,000 as reported?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The matter is incorrectly reported. 2, The amount mentioned includes the cost of purchase, £3,500. On a rough estimate it is considered that an additional £1,500 will be required for furnishing, repairs, and additions for staff quarters.

QUESTION — STATE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. ALLEN asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin): 1, How many officers are employed in the State Steamship Service at the Fremantle office? 2, Their names, occupation, and salary?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: (1 and 2), The officers engaged under the old administration of the State Steamship Service at Fremantle are as follows:—Mr. Sudholz, manager, £600 per annum; Mr. Watkin, accountant, £276 per annum; Mr. Healey, passage

clerk, £260 per annum; Mr. Hancock, manifest clerk, £190 per annum; Mr. Flower, cashier, £180 per annum; Mr. Hales, correspondence clerk, £168 per annum; Mr. Bagget, accountant, 12s. 6d. per day; Mr. Butcher, engineer superintendent, £75 per annum; Mr. Brown, junior clerk, £39 per annum; Mrs. Swanson, office cleaner, £39 per annum. The officers employed on State steamships are not included in the above list. The staff necessary for the conduct of the service under the new arrangements is under consideration.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT ELECTRIC POWER SCHEME.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: With reference to the Government Electric Power Scheme; 1, As the scheme should be capable of supplying power for the Midland Junction workshops and the Fremantle harbour requirements, is he aware that the machinery ordered, which is designed to generate electricity at a frequency of 40 periods per second, is unsuitable for the motors installed in the above instances, and would, if supplied from the new system, develop only 80 per cent. of their power, and run 20 per cent. slower, which would render them useless for the work they have to do? 2, Has the system proposed any advantages to compensate for the above disadvantages, and, if not, will steps be taken to remedy the error?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The installation of a periodicity converter, which it is proposed to provide in the workshops sub-station, will overcome the difficulty. 2, Yes. Higher efficiency and, therefore, more economical.

QUESTION—FRUIT MARKETING.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have the Government consented to lease to the Produce Dealers' Company portion of the resumed area near the proposed new markets site? 2, If so, have the Government taken into

consideration the circumstances that adding another to the markets established must, by further splitting buyers, play into the hands of dealers and speculators, to the detriment of growers and without any advantage to the consumer? 3, Are the Government not already committed to the principle of centralising the marketing of fruit, and does not the suggested action negative that principle? 4, If the matter of securing a little rent for the premises is advanced as a reason in favour of assisting the dealers in the way proposed, have the Government taken into account that considerable additional cost will be involved for fruit inspectors?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, The Government have been approached to make available for market purposes Metters' building on the area resumed for railway purposes at West Perth. This is outside the area resumed for market purposes. This matter is now receiving consideration. 2, See reply to No. 1. 3, The Government are committed to the establishment of central markets and have resumed an area for that purpose. 4, This aspect will be duly considered in arriving at a decision in the matter.

BILL—DISTRICT FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

BILL—TRAFFIC.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 2nd September; Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 20—Cancellation of Licenses:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Subclause 2 stated that if a license was forfeited on account of two convictions having been recorded against a holder the licensee "shall" be disqualified during the period for which the license was issued from obtaining a license in respect of the same

vehicle. There ought to be a discretionary power; therefore, he moved an amendment—

That in Subclause 2, line 2, the word "shall" be struck out and "may" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If a man deliberately flouted the provisions of this measure he should not hold a license at all. There was nothing to prevent him getting rid of the vehicle, the license for which had been forfeited, but the Bill dealt with the licensee and if he came before the bench on a second occasion the magistrate had power to deal with him. The disqualification should not be at the discretion of the bench. He would not mind the amendment if the discretion was to be with the resident magistrate always, but some cases would be dealt with by justices of the peace, and local men would be dealing with local offenders, with the result that very often personal considerations would be allowed to outweigh sound judgment, and the general public would be penalised.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The disqualification referred only to the vehicle, and not to the owner, because he could sell his unlicensed vehicle and buy another. He was disqualified in respect of only one vehicle. There might be surrounding a case circumstances which would justify a magistrate in granting the owner a license. The Bill provided punishment for an offence, and that punishment should be sufficient without the further punishment of disqualification.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	10
Noes	26
				—
Majority against	16
				—

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Moore
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Male	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Layman
	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Leighlen
Mr. Foley	Mr. Price
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Green	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Heilmann
	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 21—Exemptions :

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Under paragraph (b) the licensing authority could grant to a manufacturer of or dealer in motor cars a general identification disc on payment of a fee of £5. Often it was necessary for a dealer to have a number of discs, but the clause limited him to one.

The Minister for Works : What does he want half-a-dozen for ?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : At present dealers in motor cars were allowed a number of discs which they attached to cars which were on trial.

The Minister for Works : The object is to give him a general dealer's disc instead of requiring him to take out a number.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : A man might have two cars on trial at the same time, and surely the Committee would have no desire to interfere with a man's business. He moved an amendment—

That in line 6 of paragraph (b) the words "a general" be struck out, and "one or more" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : There would be no check at all if more than one disc were to be issued to each manufacturer or dealer.

Mr. Broun : Suppose two buyers come along at once, and both want trial runs at the same time, how is a dealer to get on with one disc ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If a car was being sent out on trial the dealer went with it and would have the disc with him. The object of the clause

was to enable a dealer to get one general disc instead of getting a number. If the amendment were agreed to, what check would the inspector have as to whether Jack Jones was using his disc or that of somebody else? The clause was a good clause and was inserted with the object of assisting the dealer.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The clause provided that a dealer in motor cars might apply for a general identification disc which he could use on his cars if he was attempting to sell them. All the amendment said was that it should be at the discretion of the licensing authorities to allow a dealer to have more than one disc. In a big establishment cars were taken out by more than one person, and a number of cars might be out at once for trial or demonstration. Why should the dealer's business be interfered with by limiting him to one disc?

The Minister for Works: If he pays £5 for each disc there is no objection.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The clause as drafted was hardly wise, for it meant that each car sent out by a dealer for trial must have the one identification disc, or he would be liable to a fine. These discs could only be used in connection with the dealer's business.

The Minister for Works: They could be used on other cars.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Cars would not be allowed to run under hire with these discs. There would be special discs for the use of manufacturers, agents, or others, selling cars, and they could be used only when a car was being tested or sold. There could be no objection to issuing as many such discs as were reasonably necessary.

Mr. LANDER: It would be wrong for any person who was hiring a car to use one of these discs. If inquiries were made at livery stables and the number of vehicles out on hire was compared with the number licensed, it would be found that there were many out which were not licensed. The clause might seem harsh, but otherwise how would it be possible to meet the difficulty? The City council and the police had experienced much trouble when privileges were given and

it was necessary to be very strict in such cases.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Inspection could be made as strict as was desired, but we should not do anything which would cripple business. On the other hand, business ought to be encouraged.

Mr. Lander: But they will not pay the fees at all.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There had been trouble, but to limit a man to one disc to test one car at a time, when he might require half a dozen, would cripple business. The inspectors should see that the system was not abused.

Mr. ALLEN: The contention of the hon. member for Northam was correct. If a man was buying a car the proprietor might take him to Mundaring to test it, and in the event of another purchaser calling meanwhile, he would have to wait until the other one returned. The number of discs could be limited, but sellers should not be restricted to one each.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister would have the desired control, because the dealers were in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: There are dealers in Northam.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But they did not own more than one car.

The Minister for Works: You order one and you will find it there next morning.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: That might be so. Under this clause the dealer's disc would have to be attached and the matter of control would be an easy one. Consideration should be shown for the needs of the trade. Every car sold would mean additional revenue and so the sale of cars should be encouraged. Except for a mere trial, a dealer was not likely to let a car go out of his possession. Such trials would take place over comparatively short runs, and the disc would enable the inspectors to exercise proper control. It was doubtful whether we would be justified in legislating against the business of dealers to the extent which we would be under this clause.

Mr. BROWN: The Minister should agree to the amendment. If a Beverley resident purchased a car it would be

necessary to have a disc while it was being taken to that town, and if a dealer was to be allowed to have only one disc, he would be unable to take another car out until the disc was returned. A dealer might have several cars for sale and perhaps would have two or three buyers, and in each case an identification disc would be required. If a Beverley resident purchased a car he could not take out an ordinary license until he got to Beverley.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Paragraph (a) would meet the case mentioned by the member for Beverley.

Mr. Brown: Not in respect of a dealer's license.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That made no difference. It was questionable whether a dealer and purchaser should have the right to run to Beverley to try a car. If provision was not made for a dealer's license, every motor car that went on the road would have to be licensed in the ordinary way. It would be unfair to require a dealer to have a general license for every car that was being tested, and so a dealer's license was to be issued. Then, immediately a dealer took a car on to the road, the inspectors would know from the disc that the car was on trial. If we gave dealers several discs in anticipation of them running out several cars at one time, they could farm them out and there would be no check. If a dealer had five discs, another man having an opportunity to make a deal might borrow one and the inspector would have no check. The leader of the Opposition had said that every dealer's license should bear a separate mark; that would be impossible.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Surely you intend to do that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: How was it possible?

Hon. Frank Wilson: By a special disc.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If a dealer required five discs, would it be possible to put a separate mark on each?

Mr. Allen: Have a different colour.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Even so, what check would that be? It was necessary to facilitate dealers as much as possible without unduly penalising them,

and the clause would make things as easy as possible for them. Motor cars were not sold as easily as some hon. members seemed to think; there was not the demand for them. An intending purchaser would not be likely to refuse to wait an hour for a trial run, and if he did, it would be a small matter compared with the difficulty which would result from the passing of the amendment.

Mr. WISDOM: The Minister's fear seemed to be that a dealer might use a disc for vehicles which were not on trial for the purpose of purchase, but the measure provided that such discs could be used on cars only after completion or when on trial, and it would be an offence to allow a disc to be used by any other person. The clause would prove very harsh for the dealer. A dealer might require to have several cars out on trial at the one time. His experience was that the purchaser of a motor car generally required a trial extending over two or three hours. During that time it was probable that other intending purchasers would call, and it would be a hardship if the dealer was unable to give them a trial run simply for want of another identification disc. Unless a dealer was allowed more than one identification disc, it would be necessary for him to pay several license fees in order that his business might not be hampered. The clause should be relaxed in justice to the dealer.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Hon. members of the Opposition were simply beating the air. Practically every motor car dealer had a garage, and kept a number of vehicles, and while they might be for sale, they were used for the purpose of hire.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What, new cars?

Mr. Allen: You would not buy one like that.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: If hon. members inquired they would find that he was correct.

Mr. Allen: They would be secondhand cars.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: If each dealer was granted a number of discs, there was no question that they would be used and it would be impossible for any inspector to

ascertain whether a car was being tried by a prospective purchaser, or whether it had been hired out. The occupant of the car could tell the inspector he was an intending purchaser when he might simply have the car on hire. The object of the identification disc was to allow cars to be tried on the roads. If any agent was doing such a large business in new cars as to want more than one disc he could obtain it by paying £5.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The question was not what the fee was fixed at, but he doubted whether under the clause a man could get more than one disc. His desire was to make it quite clear that more than one could be had.

Amendment negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—Minister to be licensing authority, metropolitan area:

Mr. DWYER: In order that the amendment of which he had given notice, substituting a new clause, could be considered, it would be necessary for him to move to strike out the clause in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: It was not possible for the hon. member to move to strike out the clause in the Bill; the hon. member would have to vote against it. The hon. member could speak against the clause.

Mr. DWYER: Would the Minister give some pronouncement with reference to what was intended would be done so far as main trunk roads in the metropolitan area were concerned? That would clear the way.

Mr. CARPENTER: The clause was one over which there had been much controversy, and it was regarded by many friends of the Bill as the only blot upon the measure. While he had sufficient confidence in the Minister to believe the latter did not intend to do any injustice to any municipal body, he would like to hear a word or two from the Minister to remove much misconception and possibly some antagonism. The municipality of Fremantle had just a little bit of suspicion that it might under this clause be giving up a good deal more than it had any right to give up, and certainly a good deal more than it would get in compensa-

tion. The matter had been splendidly stage-managed—he did not know whether the Minister was responsible for it, he hoped he was not—for if it was desired to exploit one or two bodies it was a very simple process to get all the bodies within a given area to meet those two and carry a motion that the majority should get something which the minority should give up.

Mr. Allen: That is what was done.

The Minister for Works: The long-suffering eighteen.

Mr. CARPENTER: It was doubtful whether those other bodies had suffered all that it had been attempted to prove they had suffered, but even if they had, was it right to inflict a greater hardship on the other two bodies, or to exploit them? A few words from the Minister might possibly set the matter right. Up to the present the Minister said he had not been able to define a main road. All knew the difficulty of having any general definition to cover every case, but no doubt the Minister could say by this time just what the machinery was to be to bring about the classification of these roads. The Minister would allay misapprehension if he would tell us what he was going to do in the matter of classifying, what basis there would be to work upon, and what roads were likely to be considered as main roads. If the Minister would do that he would remove the feeling that an attempt was being made in the Bill to work an injustice.

Mr. ALLEN: It was his intention to vote against the clause. The hon. member for Fremantle had put the position in a nut-shell. The Minister in introducing the Bill had told us he had been present at that now almost world-famed conference at which 18 municipalities decided to try and fleck from the other municipalities the fees they were collecting.

The Minister for Works: No, that is not fair.

Mr. ALLEN: That was the impression the Minister gave him. There was no doubt the conference passed resolutions asking the Minister to introduce this measure which had practically for its object the getting of what those other muni-

municipalities enjoyed. The full facts of the position should be considered. The Perth and Fremantle municipalities were supposed to be receiving a large amount in fees to which they were not entitled, because the vehicles licensed went outside and cut up the roads of other districts. So far as Perth was concerned, that was a very wrong impression, and if a toll was taken the true position would no doubt be proved. Outside the municipality of Perth all the dairying licenses were held, and those carts came into the city to supply milk morning and night. The same applied to all the market gardeners and hawkers who came in with vegetables along the Wanneroo road. Those licenses were collected by the Perth Roads Board. For the gardeners who came in from Wanneroo the Perth City Council a few years ago spent money for the purpose of providing a stand with kerbing so that the carts would not break up the road. Every one of those hawkers, no doubt, was licensed outside Perth, yet the Perth City Council had to go to that expense, beside providing a special service for clearing up the road. The Minister said the bulk of fees were collected by the Perth City Council. On the contrary a great many were collected outside Perth. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer) had suggested that the Minister was going to make himself a czar. At any rate, the Minister was going to find himself in serious trouble in complying with the request of those 18 municipalities. Until the Minister gave some idea of what he proposed to do in the matter of defining a main road, he (the Minister) was hardly justified in asking us to give away this large sum of money. There was a false impression that certain municipalities were getting a larger amount of fees than they were entitled to, but he (Mr. Allen) felt certain that far more road maintenance had to be done for outside vehicles than for those licensed in Perth. Take the amount of traffic that went down to the Perth goods shed.

The Minister for Works: If all the traffic goes there from everywhere, that is a trunk road.

Mr. ALLEN: Was the Minister going to define it as such? As a matter of fact probably the bulk of the roads in the city could be classed as main roads.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: They are getting the benefit from them.

Mr. ALLEN: It was not as though that £1,400 was more than enough to do the roads, and the money was being put to some other uses. The sum of £1,400 did not go anywhere; £14,000 was more like the sum required. The crux of the whole position was what the Minister was going to define as a main road.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It had already been conveyed by him to the Chamber that it was impossible in a growing State to put into an Act of Parliament the definition of a main road; therefore it was not proposed that main roads should be defined. The Bill provided that main roads "shall be declared." We would declare which roads in the opinion of the experts were genuine trunk roads, and then the license fees, plus an amount voted on the Estimates, would be divided amongst the local authorities for maintenance on a chainage and width basis. The member for West Perth said that we were going to take away from Perth £1,400 and give nothing in return. That was incorrect. Perth was not going to have all its streets declared main roads. That was an unreasonable request. Recently a deputation from the Perth City Council waited on him, and urged that all roads in Perth should be declared main roads, but he replied that that could not be done. There would, however, be roads which would be declared main roads. The member for West Perth stated that there was a road leading to the railway station, to and from which all classes of goods were carted, and that being so, that might be declared a trunk road and would be so subsidised. In connection with the declaration of trunk roads, Parliament each year would have the same right of criticism as it had now in connection with the distribution of votes under the Roads and Municipalities Acts. It had also been stated that the Minister was going to be

a czar, but under most Acts of Parliament the Minister became a czar.

Hon. Frank Wilson: He is not going to be; he is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The leader of the Opposition was a czar until the people removed him, and, if he lived long enough, and had a lot of luck, he might become a czar again. He was a czar inasmuch as under the Roads Act he had to do certain things, but at the same time he was subject to the criticism of Parliament, and it was because a Minister occupied such a position that he exercised care, and did what he thought was equitable and just. Wherever new reforms were introduced, there were always those who attempted to read into them many evils that would follow.

Mr. Dwyer: I admit the impeachment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Perth was included amongst those who feared the clause, but his fears were not justified. There was no need to assume that it was proposed to take all the money from Perth and give nothing in return. If an injustice were done, the Minister would receive at the hands of Parliament the treatment he deserved. With regard to the conference, reference to which had been made, it was not convened, so far as his memory served him by the Minister; it was a voluntary conference, or it was convened by someone outside Government control, and its object was to overcome the difficulties in regard to the condition of the main roads. The Perth City Council gave an undertaking to maintain part of the Perth-Fremantle road, and it could be said without hesitation that the part they undertook to maintain was one of the worst.

Mr. Allen: Yes, owing to the bad formation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The road was reconstructed and put in such a state that the Government were justified in asking the city council to maintain it, and that body undertook the responsibility of doing so, but they had allowed it to drift until even last winter it was in a deplorable condition. The

Bill would give a guarantee that main roads would be adequately maintained, and therefore he contended that the clause was equitable and would enable the Government to so distribute the license fees plus the subsidy voted by Parliament in such a manner as would permit of the roads being kept up to that standard we were justified in expecting. It had been said that the Perth-Fremantle road was the only road that should be mentioned in this Bill and the mayor of Perth stated that if the Government took it over and made it a Government road, or undertook its maintenance, there would be no agitation. That, however, was incorrect. There were agitations from all parts of the State with regard to main roads, and while this particular clause dealt with the main roads in the metropolitan area, the Bill was drafted to meet difficulties in all parts of the State. It was provided that the license fees should be earmarked and a subsidy paid on them, and that main roads would be declared and money would be spent on them. In regard to the Perth-Fremantle road, the local bodies with perhaps one exception had neglected to assume their share of responsibility. The Claremont roads board, with less assistance in the way of rating powers than the other bodies, had kept their portion of the road up to a good standard, but even what the Claremont board had done was small when compared with the work of the Belmont roads board. Anyone driving along the main road through the Belmont district would be struck by the high standard of maintenance, comparatively speaking, existing along that thoroughfare between the Causeway and Guildford. The Belmont board were taxed to a great extent, and the people were penalised to keep that main road in a good state of repair. That board claimed that it was unfair to allow Perth to collect all the license fees and that Belmont should be saddled with the responsibility of maintaining roads over which those licensed vehicles travelled.

Mr. Allen: Perth does not collect them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Perth collects the major portion of the fees, but if they did not collect all they would not suffer an injustice. It was because Perth knew that it was collecting an undue share that it was protesting against the provisions of the Bill. As Minister, he was not singling out Perth for a special penalty; every local body in the metropolitan area was being treated alike. As the conditions were to-day it was unfair to expect one local body to maintain main roads such as the Belmont board had been called upon to do for so many years, and get such little assistance. He could not see his way to amend the clause. In the new clause which he proposed to move at a later stage, it was outlined exactly how a local body should distribute the money it would receive, but it was impossible in the Bill to define main roads. Those who had criticised the Bill had not given him any assistance in that direction. He had appealed to the Perth City Council and as the reply was that the Bill was unfair he had asked them to suggest an alternative.

Mr. Dwyer : There is a suggestion on the Notice Paper.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That suggestion was that he should carry out what he proposed to do under the Bill.

Mr. Dwyer : There is a basis laid down.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That basis was not definite. What the hon. member stated was that there should be commissioners and that they should be officers of the service in order that they might assist in defining main roads. That was exactly what was provided in the Bill. No one was justified in assuming that the Minister was capable of going into the claims regarding main roads and taking upon himself the responsibility of defining which were and which were not main roads. That would be the duty of the expert officers who would visit every part of the State and investigate these matters, and they would be called upon to declare which were and which were not main roads. Then the Minister

would assume responsibility by acting on the advice of his officers; if he differed from the officers he would again have to take the responsibility.

Mr. Carpenter : The expert officers will consult with the local bodies.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Certainly, but it could not be said that all their views would be acted upon. The local authorities would be consulted as to which they thought were main roads, and where there was any doubt the expert officers would be guided by the advice of the local bodies. The clause was the only solution of a difficult matter and should be passed.

Mr. DWYER : The Minister was not at all convincing in his argument for the retention of the clause. It was unnecessary to repeat what had been said on the second reading in regard to the inadvisableness of Ministerial control in the wholesale fashion contemplated by the clause. It was a pity that in a Bill otherwise so well drafted with a view to the improvement of existing conditions, we should have a blot such as this clause. The clause could easily be excised without doing any harm to the Bill, and some means provided for dealing equitably with the amounts collected in the metropolitan area by way of traffic licenses and fees on vehicles. The Minister had stated that the commissioners provided for in his (Mr. Dwyer's) proposed amendment were exactly the officers whom the Minister intended to appoint.

The Minister for Works : They are appointed.

Mr. DWYER : But it was necessary that this should be set down clearly and distinctly in the Bill. As worded, the clause was an unwarrantable exercise and extension of Ministerial authority. The Minister was made the licensing authority for the whole of the metropolitan area. Why should the metropolitan area be singled out for this special treatment? Why was not Kalgoorlie and district, or Northam and district, similarly singled out? There was no reason why the metropolitan area should be singled out in this fashion. It was unjust treatment. As he had previously stated, the proposed

system would place in the hands of a Minister power which might be exercised injudiciously, to say the least of it. When a Minister had in his hands the disposition of all these licensing fees, which were bound to reach immense proportions in the course of time, he had a dangerous power of influencing elections. It was bad politics and bad principle that such power should lie in the hands of any Minister. The Minister had said that Perth, and perhaps Fremantle, were the only places crying out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Fremantle is not crying out.

Mr. DWYER: It was to be assumed that the member for Fremantle knew the requirements of Fremantle much better than did the Honorary Minister, who was member for East Fremantle; for, after all, Fremantle was the heart, of which East Fremantle was merely one of the minor arteries. Nor could the importance of a place always be gauged by the value of its representative in Parliament. Perth was not the only place which was crying out.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Yes, it is.

The Minister for Works: It is.

Mr. DWYER: Perth was not the only place which was crying out. The Minister, in introducing the Bill, had made special reference to Perth as a place receiving at the present time more than its due share of license fees. The member for West Perth had pointed out that the streets of Perth were used by vehicles from all the surrounding districts. That hon. member might have gone further and said vehicles from all over the State. Almost every street in Perth was being used and worn by vehicles from all over the State. If a return were compiled with a view to showing what proportion of vehicles using the streets of Perth had their domicile, so to speak, in Perth, it would be found that by far the larger number came from outside the municipality. Perth streets were not exclusively maintained for vehicles domiciled in Perth.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That applies to every town.

Mr. DWYER: It applied to Perth with convincing force. Apart altogether from the injustice which under the Bill might be inflicted on Perth there was another reason for objecting to the clause, namely, that while the Minister in his proposed amendment provided that the Governor might proclaim any road to be a trunk road for the purposes of the measure, the Minister had nowhere laid down any rules for the governance of those officers who were to recommend what roads should be trunk roads. Why did not the Minister throw his cards upon the table and play the game openly? It was necessary to know what instructions the Minister would give to his subordinate officers. The Minister had complained that no help had been given him, no suggestions offered, in connection with this matter. He (Mr. Dwyer) had made a suggestion which, although not perfect, would, if adopted, help in rendering the measure equitable towards all the several districts constituting the metropolitan area. He had no desire that Perth should be singled out for specially favourable treatment. He simply wished that Perth, in common with the other local government bodies, should receive justice under the clause. His suggestion was that the basis should be clearly laid down as to what roads should be trunk roads, that the following directions should be issued to the officers entrusted with defining the trunk roads:— That regard should be had to (1) the importance of the road as an avenue of traffic and communication, (2) the extent to which the road was used by vehicles generally, and (3) the residence and place of business of users and owners of such vehicles using the roads. If that basis were adopted, something like an equitable arrangement could be made for apportioning the fees and other moneys to be collected by the licensing authority for the metropolitan area. Certainly some such basis should be laid down. The definition should not be in any sense haphazard. This or some other satisfactory basis of the definition of trunk roads should be unmistakably inserted in the Bill. The consideration of the clause and proposed amendments should be post-

poned until the rest of the Bill had been disposed of, by which time some way out of the difficulty would probably have been discovered after consultation with the officers.

The Minister for Works: They have been at it for five years.

Mr. DWYER: If the officers were experts it was surprising that it should have taken them so long to decide upon what were and what were not trunk roads. Surely it was not a task requiring superhuman intelligence on the part of expert officers. As a parallel instance of what might happen, the Minister in charge of the Electoral Department might determine to subdivide Western Australia into electorates without regard to population, geographical position, or anything else, following nothing but his own will and pleasure. In cases of the kind instructions were usually issued as to the basis on which the electorates should be distributed. A similar principle ought to be applied in the defining of trunk roads. An ever-increasing revenue was to be distributed in proportion to the mileage of trunk road in each district. It was for the officers to determine which were the trunk roads, and it was necessary to communicate to those officers the ideas of Parliament as to the basis of the definition of trunk roads. In view of the grave injustice which, under the Bill, might be inflicted, not only on the central municipality, but also on outside districts, the basis on which these trunk roads were to be defined, should be laid down in the Bill. In justice to the electorate he represented, and in view of his position as a responsible member of a deliberative Assembly, and in view also of the strong views he held as to the wrong principle contained in the clause, he felt it to be his duty to vote against it.

Mr. CARPENTER: The Honorary Minister had interjected that the Fremantle Municipal Council had refused to pass a motion objecting to this Bill. That was literally true, but the reason why the council did not carry the motion was not because it was a motion objecting to the Bill, but because it contained a suggestion which was impracticable.

A. Bolton: Why impracticable?

Mr. CARPENTER: The motion contained a proposal that Fremantle should be excluded from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Could not the motion have been amended?

Mr. CARPENTER: That had not occurred to the council.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Oh yes, it did.

Mr. CARPENTER: The majority of the council would have voted for the motion objecting to the Bill if it had not contained the proposal to exclude Fremantle from the operation of the measure.

Mr. Bolton: The majority of the people of Fremantle would vote for this Bill.

Mr. CARPENTER: One would like to know how the hon. member ascertained the mind of the people of Fremantle. On this point he knew the mind of the people of Fremantle better than the hon. member did. He did not want the Committee to be misled as to Fremantle's attitude. There was a strong feeling against this particular portion of the Bill.

The Minister for Works: Which is the Bill.

Mr. CARPENTER: It was a very important part to a Minister looking for revenue or a redistribution of revenue. Fremantle, in common with Perth, feared that it might not get a fair deal in that redistribution, and it was a pity if the Minister had to include a provision of this sort in the Bill. He did not think there was another municipality in the State which had as much of its habitable area covered by Government buildings, and which had to pay for the upkeep of roads and footpaths and for lighting for Government buildings, to the same extent as Fremantle. It would have been a fair proposition if the Minister had set that expenditure off against anything that Fremantle might collect in excess of its due. He had heard no one outside clamouring for the Bill. So far as he could understand, the whole thing had begun and ended with the Minister.

Mr. Munsie: You have heard complaints about the Perth-Fremantle-road.

Mr. CARPENTER: There had been complaints, but they were due to the fact that the local bodies had neglected their duty.

Mr. Munsie: This Bill will compel them to do their duty.

Mr. CARPENTER: But with other people's money. However, he had never heard of the Minister doing a wilful injustice to any portion of the State and he was still hopeful that, if the worst came to the worst, Fremantle would be given a fair deal. It was satisfactory to hear from the Minister that his officers would consult with the local bodies, who would give them all the information they required to prove that there was more than one road entering Fremantle which could be classed as a main road. The member for South Fremantle was in the same position as he was, because he did not know what roads might be classed as main roads. He could promise the Minister that if there was not a fair allotment there would be trouble for him in the future.

Mr. WISDOM: This clause appeared to be the best solution of a very great difficulty. He sympathised with the Minister in his statement that he had not been able to get assistance in the definition of a main trunk road, and the Minister had apparently fallen back on the next best thing. The suggestion made by the member for Perth covered only to a small extent the considerations which would require to be borne in mind in deciding what should be declared trunk roads. If this clause passed, the Minister would be inundated by claims from local authorities all over the State to have certain roads declared main trunk roads, and it would be for him to decide which were entitled to be declared such. The Committee could dismiss at once the argument that Perth and Fremantle occupied places on the same parallel with the outside districts. All cities, especially capital cities, were really centres to which great traffic flowed from the outside districts, but it must not be forgotten that the city reaped immense benefit from that traffic, apart altogether from license fees. The member for West Perth had referred to

the traffic of dairymen and market gardeners, but as the city would not allow dairies to be operated within its boundaries, it must have the dairy carts coming into the city or the people would be without milk. The revenue of the city was contributed to a large extent by the traffic from the suburbs to the city, whereas the traffic in the suburbs was mainly through traffic, from which the local bodies derived no benefit. The Perth-Fremantle road was a striking instance of the bad condition into which many of the main roads had fallen through the inability of local authorities having a small revenue to maintain them. It was impossible for the local authorities concerned to maintain the Perth-Fremantle road efficiently with the funds they had available for the purpose. Apart from that, it was manifestly unjust that they should be asked to do that maintenance when the road was used largely by traffic from which they derived no benefit whatever. Taken all round, the clause before the Committee met the case as well as it could be met, and if it were struck out the most important portion of the Bill would be destroyed. The clause was inserted to remedy a crying injustice, and to distribute as fairly as possible the revenue from traffic in the directions where such revenue would do the most good.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. DWYER: With a view to testing the feeling of the Committee on this clause and inserting more equitable provisions he moved an amendment—

That all the words after "the" in line one be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—“(1.) The Governor shall from time to time appoint three or more persons, being officers of the public service, as commissioners, one of whom shall be appointed chairman, under this Act for the following purposes:—(a) To define what roads within the metropolitan area are trunk roads for the purposes of this Act; (b) to pay and divide to and amongst the local authorities of the districts

and sub-districts comprised in the metropolitan area in such shares and proportions as may be determined on the basis of the mileage of trunk roads within the boundaries of such districts and sub-districts the fees paid each year for licenses, transfers of licenses, and registrations in the metropolitan area under this Act or any regulation.

(2.) Any person appointed a commissioner shall hold office at the will of the Governor.

(3.) In defining what is a trunk road for the purposes of this section regard shall be had to the following:—

(a) The importance of the road as an avenue of traffic and communication; (b) the extent to which the road is used by vehicles generally; (c) the residence and place of business of the users and owners of the vehicles.

(4.) The fact that a road is confined within the boundaries of any one district or sub-district shall not disentitle it to be termed a trunk road.

(5.) A portion of a road may be a trunk road for the purposes of this section.

(6.) The local authority of any district or sub-district within the metropolitan area may, if aggrieved by the share or proportion of the amount received by it under this section, appeal to the Minister, whose decision shall be final.

24. (1.) Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, the commissioners appointed under Section 23 hereof shall be the licensing authority for every district and sub-district comprised in the metropolitan area, and shall have and may exercise therein such powers and discretions (under this Act or any regulation) of or concerning the issue and transfer of licenses and the effecting of registrations as are in other districts or sub-districts vested in the local authorities.

(2.) All fees paid each year for licenses or transfers of licenses or registrations in the metropolitan area under this Act or any regulation (a) shall be paid into the Treasury to the credit of an account to be called the "Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account"; (b) shall be chargeable before any distribution is made, under Clause 23

hereof, with the costs of collection as certified by the commissioners. (3.)

The warrant of the chairman of the commissioners shall be sufficient authority to the Colonial Treasurer to make any payment provided for under Section 23 hereof. (4.) A return shall be presented annually to Parliament showing the amount collected and the proportions in which such amount has been distributed amongst the districts and sub-districts in the metropolitan area."

Hon. FRANK WILSON : We had had a few words from the Minister in connection with the extraordinary powers sought by him, and he (Mr. Wilson) hoped that the electors represented by the member for Fremantle would feel he had done his duty and would accept his few words as a settlement of all the responsibility he carried in representing their views. On the second reading he (Mr. Wilson) had objected to this clause because it was not drafted in a spirit of equity so far as the metropolitan authorities were concerned. The great effort put forth by the member for Perth to placate his electors was amusing. That hon. member had denounced the powers outlined in the clause as pretty well equal to those held by the Czar of Russia, and indicated that he was going to do terrible things later on, and now it was all boiled down to an amendment, tantamount to what the Minister proposed, that these extraordinary powers should be put into the hands of three of the Minister's subordinate officers.

Mr. Dwyer : Three members of the public service.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Minister's officials.

Mr. Dwyer : Not of the Public Works Department.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Who else would be appointed? That was a marvellous solution of a very difficult matter. Neither the clause nor the amendment of the member for Perth would receive his support. To get down to bed-rock it was necessary to inquire into the object, and the object undoubtedly was to get the license fees of all vehicles using the roads in the metropolitan area

into the hands of the Minister in order that he might expend the money on the maintenance of certain roads. If it was not for the position regarding the Perth-Fremantle road there would never have been such a proposal. This was a drastic way to go about repairing and maintaining the Perth-Fremantle road, and, notwithstanding the indignant denial of the Honorary Minister that there was any opposition from Fremantle or from the Fremantle council, inquiry would show that the member for Fremantle was right in protesting on behalf of the members of that council. It was absolutely impossible to define a main road in such a measure unless the road was named. Therefore, he was with the Minister on that point.

Mr. Dwyer : You are living in hopes of being Minister for Works later on.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : It was easy to understand the hon. member casting envious eyes on the Attorney General's seat, but having been in charge of the Works Department two or three times he was content to let others have it.

The Minister for Works : Leave it with me for a few years.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : No, a few months, and then the electors, with the assistance of the citizens of Perth and Fremantle, would remove the Minister because of their dissatisfaction with this proposal—

Mr. Monger : That is a certainty.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : A position which the Minister now occupied with so much pleasure to himself, if not disaster to the State. The question was one of Ministerial control and on that account he was opposed to it. Why should we take away from Perth, Fremantle and the suburban municipalities powers which were left in the hands of other local authorities? The member for Perth was not voicing the opinions of those he represented, namely, the ratepayers of Perth proper. They did not want either the clause or the proposed amendment. They wanted to reserve to themselves these powers and to administer the issue of licenses as heretofore and collect the fees. If Parliament endorsed the view

that these fees should be earmarked for the special purpose of maintaining certain roads which might be designated by proclamation main roads, why not go to the root and legislate in that direction? There was not the slightest objection on his part to the greater portion of the fees being spent on the Perth-Fremantle road. If the Minister had proposed one or two clauses as outlined by him (Mr. Wilson) during the second reading providing that the fees should be collected by the municipalities in the metropolitan area and paid into the Treasury to maintain certain roads, the Minister would have attained his object without any friction or in any way touching the dignity of the Perth or Fremantle councils, and without setting up a department which would become unwieldy and which would not receive the personal control of the Minister, because that would be impossible on account of his multifarious duties. No doubt, as had been stated, the duty would devolve upon the chief officer in control of roads, so that one officer would be set up as an autocrat to deal with these funds and utilise them in addition to what the Minister could persuade Parliament to add as a bonus—though it was difficult to know where he would get the money—and distribute the sum on the different roads in the metropolitan area from time to time declared as main or trunk roads. That was highly objectionable. We should not take away from the powers and functions of municipalities one iota except to compel them to do their duty in regard to main roads fairly and equitably to the surrounding municipalities. That would be going far enough without establishing what must shortly become a very big and expensive department under the Minister, one which would be very difficult to handle, would create no end of friction, would not give satisfaction, and would probably cost the bulk of the fees collected. As he had previously pointed out, there was nothing in the Bill to say that those fees would be expended upon the maintenance of main roads. The measure simply provided that the money had to be paid into the Treasury and

then, at the discretion of the Minister, had to be distributed back to the different municipalities, going towards their general revenue, so that we were just as we were before, except that we took something from Perth which it enjoyed to-day, and said we would give a portion of it to some other municipality. The Minister had it absolutely in his discretion to distribute those fees back to the different municipalities as he thought fit and equitable. Now it was seen that the Minister proposed some amendment, which specified that the money was to be used for a special purpose, and also specified that this power of declaring main roads or trunk roads, which he was now going to vest in the Governor by way of proclamation, could be revoked at will, so we would have the peculiar position that perhaps this year we would declare a certain road to be a trunk road and get some benefit in regard to its maintenance by the Works Department, and next year the chances were that the expert officers referred to by the Minister would come to the conclusion that he had done all that was necessary on that road and it should be no longer declared a trunk road, but some other road should be proclaimed a trunk road, and so it would go on until the position was worse confused than ever. The clause was, he considered, a blot in that it was seeking to deprive certain municipalities of powers which had been vested in them. He could not go so far as to agree with the hon. member for Perth regarding the "terrible power" there was in the hands of the Minister to be used for the purpose of getting support at election time, for, no matter what the Minister did in the way of placating some local authority, he was bound to offend some others; the honours would be equally divided and so far from getting political support, the chances were the Minister would suffer.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is there no fairness in the local bodies at all?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: At the present time we were talking about fairness in the Minister. Perhaps the hon. member did not think there was any fairness in the Minister, although he (Hon. Frank

Wilson) thought that occasionally there was. As the hon. member for Perth had said the clause gave grounds for suspicion and asked the Minister to throw his cards on the table, why did not the Minister do so?

The Minister for Works: My cards are there—in writing in the Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member for Fremantle had asked the Minister to say a word or two to allay the suspicion that this legislation had aroused, but the request had not brought forth more than the reiteration that the Minister intended to put the clause through. Doubtless he would put the clause through all right; notwithstanding the thinly veiled opposition of the two hon. members who had taken the Minister to task, the clause was going through this House; apparently the effort put up by the two hon. members to show it was against the wish of the ratepayers in their respective electorates was not going to be sufficient, and the hon. members would be called to account for not having made a more strenuous battle and taken stronger means with the Minister on this occasion than they had done.

Mr. Dwyer: I think we are both more ready to face our electors than you are to face yours.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member might think so; the hon. member had been thinking a lot since he (Hon. Frank Wilson) had started his speech. The hon. member would have to go on thinking a long time before he made him (Hon. Frank Wilson) afraid to face his electors; he had been facing them for many years now.

Mr. Heitmann: You do not face the same ones too many times.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member for Perth would probably find there was no need for him to stand again.

Mr. Dwyer: You will not have the opportunity of drawing a line this time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member would perhaps have that opportunity, and it would be seen what sort of a fist the hon. member would make of it. It was his intention to vote against the clause and against the amendment.

To make this a reasonable measure and without inflicting hardship on the municipality, we must leave the same power with the metropolitan municipalities as we had left in the hands of the local authorities outside the metropolitan area, and pass a simple clause providing for the expenditure of money approved by Parliament on the roads which in the opinion of the municipalities required special expenditure.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The leader of the Opposition had taken an extraordinary attitude on the clause; he had spoken the whole time in support of it and finished up by opposing it. The leader of the Opposition first agreed to pooling, as there must be pooling in order to maintain the main roads. The hon. member said the funds should be paid into the Treasury, but instead of the Minister for Works distributing those funds the local authorities should do it.

Hon. Frank Wilson : I did not say anything of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That was exactly what the leader of the Opposition did say.

Hon. Frank Wilson : No. I did not. The Minister has not been listening.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : There was a conference to consider the proposition and 18 of the local authorities decided on this method, but the leader of the Opposition said he wanted to get a more equitable deal for the city of Perth and was going to leave it to those other authorities to decide what should or should not be main road. Would Perth sooner leave it to him (the Minister for Works) and officers of the Works Department, or leave it to those other authorities, and under which system would Perth get the fairest deal? Was the hon. member for West Perth prepared to accept the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Of course he is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If the hon. member for West Perth would move it, he (the Minister for Works) would adopt it.

Mr. Allen : Let us get rid of this one first.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : In order that there might be no misunderstanding, he would outline the suggestion. The leader of the Opposition said we must maintain our main roads, and to do that we should pool the license fees, which should go into the Treasury; the fees having arrived at the Treasury, the local authorities should then distribute them.

Hon. Frank Wilson : I did not say anything of the sort.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : If the hon. member opposed the clause and said the matter should be left to the local authorities after the funds were pooled, how did he propose to do it? As a matter of fact the hon. member spoke the whole time in favour of the clause, and then because the clause was introduced by the Government he opposed it.

Hon. Frank Wilson : I did not suggest anything about pooling.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The hon. member used the word deliberately; he said "to pool."

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Such a thing was never suggested by him at all. He had suggested that certain fees collected for the licensing of vehicles were necessary for the maintenance of certain roads, termed main roads, in the metropolitan area. We could legislate by a simple clause that those fees should be paid into the Treasury for that purpose.

The Minister for Works : That is pooling.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : It was not. And that those fees should be used by municipalities to maintain main roads, and the unexpended balance, if there was any, to be returned to the municipalities from which it was received. There we had a simple proposition. He could understand the Minister being muddled, as the Minister did not know what the effect of his own Bill would be, but knew he was going to create a stupendous department and take a mass of detail on his shoulders that he could not supervise, and take away the administration from local authorities who were the proper bodies to exercise the powers in question. What was the good of the

Minister trying to tie him (Hon. Frank Wilson) into a knot in regard to pooling. What the Minister was doing was fooling the public, fooling the municipalities, and fooling his own supporters in trying to get those excessive powers vested in himself. It was not right to take away from municipal authorities powers which they had always exercised. It was proposed to put the functions performed week in and week out by the general purposes committee of the city of Perth into the hands of an inspector. The intention of the Bill was unwieldy and wrong. The simple proposition would be for the municipalities to specify the roads they had to maintain, earmark the money for the purpose, and return any unexpended balance there might be to the municipalities.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Will there be a balance?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If there be a balance. The extravagant manner in which the Works Department was being managed to-day would, he was afraid, prevent a balance from being shown, and the chances were that the State would have to make good the deficiency. For these reasons, he proposed to support the member for Perth in striking out the words, and then he would also vote against that hon. member's amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The leader of the Opposition suggested that all these fees should go to the Treasury. That was pooling, but the hon. member said it was not. And then he went on to suggest that all the fees should be expended on the Perth-Fremantle road. Was that his proposal?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Oh, go on, go on.

The Premier: That is one of them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member wanted these fees spent on the Perth-Fremantle road, and possibly other roads.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are getting on.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Well, the hon. member first suggested the Perth-Fremantle road, and then other roads. The Bill proposed that the fees should go into the Treasury, and, plus a subsidy,

should be spent on the Perth-Fremantle road, and other roads. Therefore, the leader of the Opposition was arguing in favour of the clause. Then, to oppose the clause, the hon. member suggested that the cost of administration would be outrageous and that a big department would be created. There was no proposal to create a department. The hon. member asked why not leave it to the local authorities. There was nothing to prevent that in the Bill; as a matter of fact that was anticipated. The only thing the hon. member had anticipated under the Bill was the appointment of an inspector. We had inspectors to-day, consequently we would not increase the cost of administration, because we would only be taking over for the whole of the metropolitan area those who were appointed to-day for a portion of the metropolitan area. Therefore, instead of increasing the cost of administration, the Bill would actually reduce it. The hon. member talked around the clause, and then went back to it, while the member for Perth did exactly the same thing. The latter opposed the clause and then introduced other words to bring into existence that which the clause proposed. The member for Perth declared that commissioners should be appointed. The only difference between the suggestion of the hon. member and that of the Government was that the Minister would have expert officers, and the hon. member wanted to call them commissioners. What was the difference? The clause was sound and equitable, and there was nothing autocratic in it. All the debate on the clause had really been in support of it, and the opposition had only come from members who could not see the justice of it because they imagined the Government were going to do an injustice to Perth. Perth would only suffer if it was getting an undue proportion. If it was not it could not suffer.

Mr. DWYER: The Minister declared that the suggestion he (Mr. Dwyer) had made was practically what was in the Bill.

The Minister for Works: And I am supported in that by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DWYER: Then he would have to differ from both the Minister and the leader of the Opposition.

The Minister for Works: You are in a hopeless minority **this time**.

Mr. DWYER: To illustrate what he was about to say, he would ask members to glance at Clause 23 and the suggestion on the Notice Paper. The Minister declared that the suggestion was what he undertook to do. It was only what the Minister undertook to do, but we had no further undertaking as to what his successors might do. It was a widely different thing to have commissioners with certain powers conferred upon them than to have extra plenary powers placed in the hands of the Minister. In this case he (Mr. Dwyer) advocated the appointment of commissioners who would have to submit to Parliament an annual report as to their doings and in regard to the appropriation of funds. This point of difference arose, and it was really the crucial point of the proposed amendment. It was that certain principles were placed in the Bill which were to guide the commissioners, or even the Minister, as to what were and what were not main roads. That was the point the Minister had missed. When the commissioners or officers of the Works Department intended to define what were main roads, they would have to define them on certain principles laid down in the Act. The Minister had conveniently forgotten that point in the amendment, which was really the most important point in it. The Committee should not legislate in that direction without laying down principles which were to guide and control the deliberations of Government servants when they were asked to declare what were and what were not main roads.

The Minister for Works: Your definition is too limited.

Mr. DWYER: That might be. He had already said it was far from perfect, but it was an honest attempt to do something towards solving the problem of laying down some rule for the guidance of the public servants who were to say what were and what were not main roads.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The desire of the member for Perth was that the funds should be devoted towards providing a board of commissioners.

Mr. Dwyer: Civil servants.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No matter who the civil servants were, they would require other officers.

Mr. Dwyer: That is the fault of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): And if the civil servants were formed into a board, in a very little time they would have a large staff, and they would use not only the license fees but the whole of the Government subsidy in their work of administration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Would not the Minister do the same thing?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Jolly near it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): On many occasions he had approached the leader of the Opposition when Minister for Works in regard to grants for main roads. Did the Minister go out and see whether it was necessary for such a grant to be made? The Minister sent one of his officers to report, and he was guided by that report and acted accordingly. The same thing would apply now so far as main roads were concerned. The officers would report, and if an injustice had been done, an appeal could be made to the Minister, who would see that justice followed. Hon. members would also have the opportunity of raising their voices in Parliament. When the leader of the Opposition was Colonial Treasurer, and submitted an estimate for the maintenance of the Perth-Fremantle road, a large majority of members opposed him strongly in making that provision from State funds. He (Mr. Angwin) supported him on that occasion, but the only difficulty was that the Treasurer left him on his own. The then Government thought it advisable that they should alter their attitude regarding the maintenance

of this road. Fremantle, however, was the principal port of the State, and all roads led to Fremantle, so that every main road mentioned was a Fremantle road, and, for the sake of saving his own vote, the hon. member at that time thought it necessary to promise Parliament that certain action should be taken, and that action was that the vote should be reduced by 33 per cent. every year until the total amount was wiped out. This had been forced on him by his own supporters. The subsequent result was well known. It was known that the main roads around Perth had been neglected. It was necessary that something should be done, and that these main roads leading to Perth should be properly maintained. The only way to do it was by collecting the fees, pooling them and distributing them over the main roads. No better proposition had been brought forward. As the representative of a large portion of Fremantle, he had received no complaints in regard to the Bill, except from one source. The greater portion of his electorate approved of the Bill, although, of course, all those people would be quite willing to see the clause knocked out if the Government would take over the maintenance of main roads in its entirety. Of course Parliament would not agree to that, nor would the country. Therefore it was necessary to the maintenance of the main roads that the license fees should be pooled. It had been said that we were likely to rob Perth of some fees, and that vehicles from all parts of the State came into Perth. If it were not so it would be a case of God help Perth, for Perth depended largely on the trade from the country and suburban areas, which was bringing in those vehicles to take out the merchandise sold.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the vehicles going out?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): There were very few of them. The vehicles used the main roads, and those who had the responsibility of maintaining those roads received very little in fees. Many suburban vehicles took out licenses in Perth as passenger vehicles, to

use the roads outside. Frequently they were refused licenses as passenger vehicles because they had not paid the wheel tax. That was wrong, and should be avoided. As an objection against the clause it had been urged that some towns contained large public buildings and other Government property. Even the member for Northam would not object to the transference of a number of Government buildings from Perth or Fremantle to Northam. The presence of such buildings was a privilege to the towns in which they were located, for they not only brought trade to the town, but they provided employment in the town and so increased the number of rate-payers. As a matter of fact, towns in which large Government buildings were located should be prepared to pay something for the privilege. He hoped the clause would be agreed to. The Bill was absolutely necessary and it had the support of all the local governing authorities in the metropolitan area, with one exception.

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment had been moved to strike out all the words of the clause after "the" in the first line. The Minister for Works had an amendment on the Notice Paper to strike out Subclause 4. It would be necessary for the Minister to move as an amendment on the amendment that all the words of the clause down to the end of Subclause 3 be retained.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In accordance with the Chairman's suggestion, he moved an amendment on the amendment—

That the words "down to the end of Subclause 3" be added after the word "the."

Amendment on the amendment passed.

Amendment (Mr. Dwyer's) as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	28
				—
Majority against	14
				—

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. Broun	Mr. Moore
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bath	Mr. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Green	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).
Mr. Munsla	

Amendment thus negatived.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That Subclause 4 be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	28
Noes	14

Majority for .. 14

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bath	Mr. Price
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Mullany	(Teller).
Mr. Munsla	

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. Broun	Mr. Moore
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clauses 24, 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Effect of regulations and by-laws:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: A camel used by a prospector was not to be licensed, but one used for breeding purposes would require to be licensed.

The Minister for Works: Not if it does not come into traffic.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was clear according to the Fourth Schedule that a breeding camel would require to be licensed, and that should not be.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Unless a vehicle was on the roads it was not required to be licensed. The same thing applied to a camel. If a camel was on a station and was used only for breeding purposes, no license would be required, but many camels used for breeding purposes were also put into traffic, and, therefore, breeding camels could not be specifically exempted.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Fourth Schedule was explicit on this point, because it provided for a fee of £1 for camels used for carrying goods for hire, of 10s. for camels used for draught purposes for hire, and 7s. 6d. for camels "not used as above mentioned."

The Minister for Works: Those are riding camels.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The schedule did not say so. It further provided that any bull camel of three years or over, no matter for what purpose it was used, would be required to pay a license fee of £5.

The Premier: You cannot compel a person to pay a license for a vehicle until he uses it on the road, and it is the same with a camel.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Maximum weight of vehicles:

Mr. MALE (for Hon. H. B. Lefroy) moved an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that it shall not be necessary under this section for the bearing surface of the tyres of any

wheels to be more than six inches in width.

Speaking on the second reading the member for Moore had pointed out that this clause might be imposing a hardship on the people in the North where they had to cart for hundreds of miles and it was necessary to put on as big a load as possible. In carting wool, a load of 10 or 12 tons might be put on a waggon and it would not be advisable in those circumstances to carry out the provisions of this clause. To do so in some instances would require an absurdly wide tyre.

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

Clause 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—Name of owner and weight of vehicle to be displayed :

Mr. MALE (for Hon. H. B. Lefroy) moved an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"Nothing in this section shall apply to any private passenger vehicle not plying for hire and ordinarily used for private passenger purposes only, even if on any particular occasion goods are carried in such private passenger vehicle."

A similar provision appeared in the Victorian Act. It should not be compulsory for farmers and station owners using private vehicles to have to comply with the clause requiring their name and the weight of the vehicle to be displayed. Station owners who had private vehicles going 50 or 100 miles into the town often carried back goods or passengers to a neighbouring station. Such vehicles should not be brought under the law.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment could not be accepted, because if a dozen people were riding in a vehicle the damage done to the road would be as great, irrespective of whether the occupants were members of one family or of several families. It would be distinctly unfair to include the provision and it would be dangerous because it would amount to an invitation to people to use their vehicles in competition with licensed vehicles. Each vehicle used the road in the same way.

Hon. J. Mitchell : Not to the same extent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Broun : Clause 33 does not apply.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Then where was the need for the amendment? The clause applied only to vehicles constructed to carry goods and passengers. It was possible to get a wagonette built for carrying passengers and another for a private family, but to exempt the latter would be unfair.

Mr. Broun : Apparently the member for Moore had misinterpreted the clause, because "passenger vehicle" was defined as one used to ply for hire. Therefore a private buggy would not have to comply with the clause.

The Minister for Works : It would not apply to buggies.

Mr. MALE: If the Minister was sure that the clause would not apply to buggies, that would meet the difficulty.

The Minister for Works: It was never intended to.

Mr. MALE: Such things did happen, even when they were not intended. In Victoria the necessity for the amendment had been realised.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Would the inspectors penalise people for doing a thing once?

Mr. Monger: Most of them would.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If most of the civil servants would do as he told them, he would be pleased, as the State would get better results. A civil servant did not deliberately do wrong, and an inspector would not penalise the owner of a vehicle because he had once happened to carry a bag of chaff. A similar point had been raised by the member for Murray-Wellington in regard to the licensing of a vehicle built in Perth and travelling over the roads to get to the farm. No inspector would enforce the clause in question because on one occasion something was done which might bring the owner of a vehicle within the scope of the law.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Would the Minister assure the Committee that any farmer driving from the market town in a wagon-

ette and carrying some parcels was not required to put his name and address on his vehicle? According to his own reading of the clause such a person would be exempt.

The MINISTER for WORKS: Of course he would.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The Minister's explanation was clear that drivers of vehicles carrying passengers and parcels for themselves need not be licensed or have their names on the vehicles.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause would not apply to buggies and vehicles used for private purposes, but, in the case of a wagonette carrying a number of people regularly, the clause would apply.

Mr. Allen: A family wagonette?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If it was carrying a number of people it should come under the measure. In the case of a buggy going into the town casually and carrying private persons and their parcels, it would not apply, but he would not go to the extent of saying that it would not apply in the case of a wagonette belonging to private individuals irrespective of how much it used the roads. Taking the ordinary farmer's vehicle in the ordinary course of his business the clause would not apply.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister was certainly right insofar as the interpretation of "passenger vehicle" was concerned, but he was wholly wrong in regard to the interpretation of "vehicle." According to the definition clause, "vehicle" included every description of vehicle and it must include the vehicle described by the member for Wagin. Any means of conveyance must be a vehicle and, in face of the definition, Clause 33 could not decide the point. The Minister might explain the matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member had not read far enough, because there was a definition of "goods vehicle" which specified a vehicle used for the carriage of goods for reward. If goods were being carried for reward, the name of the owner of the vehicle must be displayed.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister could not have noticed the interpretation of vehicle which included every description of vehicle or locomotive engine or machine with certain exceptions; therefore all kinds of vehicles must be included whether they were used to carry only a driver or a family. If any vehicle was once used on the road it must come under Clause 33.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The idea of the member for Moore was to exempt such cases as one farmer obliging another by occasionally carrying a bag of flour or something of the kind. It should not be necessary to pay a special fee or display the owner's name on the vehicle as in the case of those who carried for reward. No inspector would question the right of one farmer to carry for another, even if a small reward was paid, but the amendmen had been moved to make the position clear.

Mr. WISDOM: The Minister had explained that it was not his intention that anyone simply carrying goods for his own convenience and not for hire should comply with this clause, but the word "vehicle" had been used instead of the words "goods vehicle." If the words "goods vehicle" were inserted the difficulty would be overcome.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause was clear, as it specified a vehicle constructed to carry goods.

Mr. Wisdom: Say "for hire or reward."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The interpretation clause gave that and it prevented this clause from applying as hon. members feared it would.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 34, 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Vehicle to be weighed if required:

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That the following proviso be inserted at the end of the clause—"Provided this section shall not apply if the owner has a certificate of the weight of such wagon from any inspector, and the distance to the nearest weighing machine erected, or recognised by, the local authority is greater than two miles."

The Minister would see that this was reasonable. If the waggon had been weighed by any inspector the certificate should be sufficient, and if the vehicle was miles from the nearest weighbridge no hardship should be placed on the owner.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment could be accepted.

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

Clause 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Licensing of drivers:

Mr. BROUN moved an amendment—

That after "motor vehicle" in line 1 the words "for hire" be inserted.

His object was to protect owners of cars used other than for hire from paying a double tax; that was, having to pay a tax for the motor itself and for the license to drive the car, as that would be to a certain extent a hardship, especially to people in the country. The wife or daughters of a motor car owner in the country were often able to drive the car, and in such cases they would have to take out licenses, which, in his opinion, would not be fair.

Mr. WISDOM: While sympathising with the hon. member for Beverley in his contention that it might be a hardship on the family of owners if individual members had to take out licenses, he thought the clause was necessary, not only in the case of vehicles used for hire, but in the case of drivers who were employed by the owners of cars. The personal license of chauffeurs had been a great advantage and a protection to the owners of cars. It had worked excellently in England as a restraint and a check upon chauffeurs. There was no doubt that the fear of a license being endorsed or cancelled was the greatest means of restraint on reckless driving by chauffeurs, and for that reason he thought the owners of cars were entirely in favour of the licensing of paid drivers. He believed the Automobile Club of Western Australia looked with favour on the licensing of such drivers.

Mr. S. STUBBS: No doubt the Minister would agree that if he had a motor-car of his own and the members of his

family, including his wife, learned properly how to drive that car, that he would think it a hardship if he were called upon to pay a license fee for each member of his family who learned to drive a car and went out for pleasure. The amendment ought to meet with the approval of the Committee. If a man was getting a living by driving a motor car, he should pay a license fee in addition to the tax on the wheel. Having once paid his license fee it would be a hardship on a man if he had to pay for three or four licenses for members of his family. In the country districts the members of numerous families had learned by experience how to drive a car carefully and well and it would be a hardship if each one of them had to pay for a license. If an accident happened, it would be easy to ascertain the owner of the car from the number.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment was not one which he could accept. He could understand hon. members opposing the amount of the fee, but could not see why the driver of a private motor car should be exempt from a license. The license fee was not imposed for the sole purpose of raising revenue, but to give some guarantee of safety to the general public. A person would have to demonstrate ability to drive a car.

Mr. S. Stubbs: To whom?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In country districts to the local authorities.

Mr. S. Stubbs: They may not know anything about a car.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There were uniform regulations dealing with motor traffic, and the driver was supposed to know those regulations and drive according to them. There were a number of persons who attempted to drive motor cars, and could not do so.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Many persons cannot drive a horse.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The difference was that if they could not manage a horse they got injured themselves; if they could not manage a motor car they hurt someone else. The license was imposed as some guarantee that they

knew something about a motor car before they drove one. The amendment would exempt those who did not understand a motor car, and those who drove only at irregular periods were not so expert as the man who drove for hire. The owners of private cars were in proportion less expert than those who might be called professionals, or men driving for reward, or who were being paid a fee by the owner to drive a car for his safety.

Mr. Heitmann : So far as safety is concerned, you will find fewer accidents with amateurs than with experts.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That he was not prepared to admit, but he considered the amateur was more dangerous to the general public than the professional was.

Mr. Heitmann : Familiarity breeds contempt, and they take risks.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : That did not apply in motor driving. Generally speaking accidents were more likely to happen with the inexperienced driver than with the experienced driver. In the city of London there was exactly the same provision; in that population of millions everyone driving a car had to be licensed and it was the same here. It was not a question of the population but the safety of the population, irrespective of numbers. He could understand hon. members protesting against the amount of the license fee, but when they wanted to exempt the driver from holding a license he could not agree with them at all, as he did not consider it was in the interests of the travelling public that they should be exempt.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : It could be well understood that the Minister wanted drivers to submit to some test before driving motor cars in the city of Perth, or even at Claremont, or Fremantle, but in the country it was not necessary. The average man who had a motor car was very careful indeed. The clause would cause a good deal of annoyance and some hardship, and would not do much good. In some families mothers and the children learnt to drive cars, and was it pro-

posed that each one should pay the license fee ?

The Minister for Works : I want them all to be competent to drive.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : As far as the country was concerned, at any rate, there should not be a license fee charged.

The Minister for Works : The amendment exempts everyone, in the town and country.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Would the Minister agree to exempt those outside the metropolitan area ?

The Minister for Works : I have some regard for the safety of the people in Northam.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The Minister should consider the amendment, because the Bill would work a hardship upon a section of the people without imposing a benefit on anyone.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS : The amendment would not accomplish what the member for Beverley desired. Everyone realised that some control should be exercised over those who drove motor vehicles in the country or in the city. It would be unwise to allow anyone, irrespective of their ability to manage these vehicles to be in charge of them without paying a license fee, but he could see that a hardship would be imposed on members of families, if everyone had to pay the license fee provided for in the Bill. The matter could be overcome by providing that one fee should cover every member of the family who might have learnt to drive, but all should be compelled to undergo a test. Apart from that, however, the fee for the license was fairly high. It should be nominal.

Mr. BROWN : The Minister might agree to an amendment that the owner of the car, or any member of the family, might be exempt from paying the license.

The Minister for Works : Provided they demonstrate their ability to drive.

Mr. BROWN : How would the Minister prove that ? It was a very simple matter to learn to drive a car.

The Premier : It is a matter of knowing what to do in exceptional circumstances.

Mr. BROWN: If a proviso were added exempting a private owner, or any member of his family, it would be found that no accidents would occur. The owner of a private car always refrained from exceeding the speed limit and never did anything which would be likely to damage his car.

The PREMIER: What the hon. member desired was a reduction of the license fee.

Mr. Brown: Not necessarily.

The PREMIER: And that there should be some difference between the amount paid by a private owner and the man who was using his car for the purpose of making a living. Under those circumstances a different fee might be charged. The owner of a private car must be licensed, otherwise the object of the clause would be defeated. If a man were licensed and he committed an offence it would be possible to prevent him repeating it by removing his license. Whether the fee was too high or not was for the Committee to decide. Every person who ran a car on the highways should be compelled to take out a license, and it would not be a difficult matter for a man who was able to run a car to find 10s. with which to pay the license fee. It might, however, be a different matter in the case of a man who was earning a livelihood with the aid of a car. If an hon. member desired that every member of a family should learn to drive, then all should comply with the conditions, and if there were ten in the family it would cost only £5, and the head of the family would be getting off cheaply. A motor car could not be taken on the highways in any part of the British dominions unless the driver was in possession of a license, and that license had to be produced at any time. There must be some method of preventing reckless driving of motor cars in this State.

Mr. Brown: Taking out a license will not prevent it.

The PREMIER: That was true, but the fear of losing the license would have a good effect. The proposal in the Bill was in keeping with the law in every

other part of the world where motor cars were run upon the highways.

Mr. BROWN: In the country towns to-day cheap cars were necessary factors and in many instances they were only used to run into town once a week. It was a different thing where cars were required for everyday use.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 43—agreed to.

Clause 44—Notice of traction engine:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Was it necessary that notice should be given in every case?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause provided that notice should be given before driving a traction engine through any township. It was not a difficult matter to give such notice. All knew the danger of rushing a traction engine through a town without notice.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You limit its speed to two and a half miles an hour.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The very presence of such an engine was sufficient to frighten horses. It was recognised throughout the world that notice should be given before a traction engine entered a town. One object of the clause was to impress upon drivers of traction engines the necessity for exercising special care.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There were many instances of several small townships being controlled by the one local authority. Suppose it was desired to drive a traction engine through Tammin. Would the driver be required to give notice to the roads board secretary at Meckering?

The Minister for Works: If there is no local authority domiciled in Tammin the provision would not apply to that place.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The office of the local authority domiciled in Tammin the situated at Meckering. The clause should be rendered reasonable.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If there was no local authority in a town the prescribed notice could not be given. Notice would have to be given in respect to Kellerberrin, because there was there a local authority, but, there being no local

authority at Doodlakine, a traction engine could pass through that town without notice. The provision would only apply where local authorities were domiciled.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Under the clause a driver wishing to take his engine through Cunderdin or Tammin would be required to give notice to the roads board secretary at Meckering. Of course nobody would ever bother to observe such a clause. It was further provided that the notice should be not less than three hours nor more than 48 hours.

The Minister for Works: The provision gives the local authority a chance to say whether its bridges and culverts can withstand the weight of the engine.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In a great many small towns it would be impossible for the notice to reach the local authority within the 48 hours as prescribed. In some instances the provision would be useful as enabling the local authority in a town like Northam to direct that the engine should take a certain route when passing through the town in order to avoid traffic or a bridge of questionable strength. However, such instances would not often occur.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Minister for Works might well consider the point raised. Under the interpretation clause "local authority" meant municipality or roads board. If the provision were allowed to stand it would mean that a man who desired to enter Bellevue with a traction engine would have to leave his engine three miles outside while he went into Bellevue and sent notice up to Lion Mill, where the local authority was domiciled, after which he would be required to wait three hours.

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Of course that was not the wish of the Minister. It was quite clear that the member for Northam had found a weak point in the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The local authority must be given some protection against traction engines. It was impossible to limit the provision to certain towns. The clause provided that before entering a town with a traction engine notice must be given to the local

authority. Of course if there was no local authority the clause would not apply.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The local authority might be 50 miles away.

The PREMIER: It was to be remembered that a traction engine was not a motor car or cycle which ran about from point to point at a moment's notice. A traction engine set out with a definite object in view, for the purpose of doing some class of work, which, probably, was arranged days or weeks ahead. All that the owner required to do before starting his engine on its journey was to notify the various local authorities that at a certain time on a given day the engine would be passing through certain towns. Upon receipt of the notice the local authorities could direct the owner of the engine to take a certain route through the town in order to avoid traffic, or it might be, to avoid passing over a culvert or bridge regarded as unequal to the strain imposed by a traction engine.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Not long ago, I saw a huge traction engine drawing tremendous loads of wood and it was used daily. What would happen to it?

The Premier: The driver could give notice to the local authority each day.

The Minister for Works: He would simply write to the local authority to say that for the next month he would be through a particular town every day.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The clause provided that the notice should be not more than 48 hours old. Later on traction engines would be as plentiful as motor cars were to-day, and there would also be road trains which would be just as useful as Government railways. Already there were many traction engines in the State, and it was surely just as necessary for the Premier to give notice that he intended to run his motor car through a town as it was that traction engine-drivers should give such notice. He moved an amendment—

That after Subclause 1 the following proviso be added:—"Provided that such notice shall not be necessary unless the office of the local authority is in such township."

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Bill would be better without the clause altogether. The Premier's visit to the Old Country must have taught him that these traction engines carrying goods were to be counted in thousands in the streets of London. In the definition, traction engine meant "any vehicle not being a motor vehicle which is propelled by mechanical power," so that ordinary steam trolleys such as had been used for some time by the Swan Brewery would come under that definition, and it was manifestly absurd to compel a delivery wagon of that description to give not less than three hours or more than 48 hours' notice before going into the streets to deliver goods. The clause was not going to achieve the object which the Minister anticipated, for, whilst it might prevent a certain bridge or culvert from being utilised, it would restrict commerce by interfering with the carrying of goods to and fro by mechanical power. He suggested that the Minister should allow the clause to be struck out, or, if he insisted upon retaining it, in order to apply it specifically to ordinary traction engines, he should insert a proviso that to traction engines ordinarily engaged in delivering goods in a township the clause should not apply.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Whilst not prepared to accept the amendment moved by the member for Northam, he would consider the proposal made by the leader of the Opposition. It might be necessary to make another interpretation to cover vehicles that usually plied in one given township, as in the case of the Swan Brewery's motor delivery van.

Hon. Frank Wilson : The Minister might also at the same time look into the previous clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. WISDOM : Two and a half miles per hour was rather a low rate of speed for traction engines and was a quite unnecessary restriction. A reasonable restriction would be about four miles per hour.

The Minister for Works : If you move it I will accept it.

Mr. WISDOM moved an amendment—

That in Subclause 3 "two and a half" be struck out, and the word "four" inserted in lieu.

Hon. Frank Wilson : That does not apply to these delivery waggon's?

The Minister for Works : No; I will look into that.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 45 to 48—agreed to.

Clause 49—Disqualification :

Mr. WISDOM : Under this clause two years disqualification must be the penalty on a third conviction. It would be harsh to make that a hard and fast rule. If a person was convicted of trivial offences, he would be prevented from earning a living for two years. It should be left to the magistrate to take all the circumstances of the offence into consideration.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : There would be no objection to reducing the term to twelve months as that would teach an offender a lesson. Two years was rather drastic. At the same time this was the penalty on the third conviction. If the safety of the general public was at stake, it was questionable whether a man should not be severely penalised or even disqualified for life if he persisted in such conduct. He would agree to minimise the penalty, but he desired the Bill to indicate to the justices that disqualification must follow after three convictions.

Mr. WISDOM : It would have been preferable to him to retain the two years disqualification as a guide to the justices, and to have made it optional. If the Minister objected to that, he would accept the lesser penalty. He moved an amendment—

That in line 2 "two years" be struck out and the words "one year" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 50—Powers of road authority to recover expenses of heavy or extraordinary traffic :

Mr. TURVEY : Under the clause power was given to recover expenses of

heavy or extraordinary traffic. In addition to this, was it proposed to impose a special fee for heavy traffic? Under the Roads Act power was given to the local authorities to impose a special fee on heavy traffic. Consequently, the various local authorities imposed different fees and placed an entirely different interpretation upon the definition of heavy traffic. Some imposed a wheel tax to the extent of £2 a wheel. One roads board, he believed, desired to make it something like £12 a wheel. Where heavy traffic, caused considerable damage to roads, it was necessary for those carrying on such traffic to pay an increased wheel tax, and the majority would agree to an increase of 50 or even 100 per cent. When, however, a roads board proposed to increase the tax to the rate of 800 per cent., it was little wonder that people clamoured against the powers which had been granted in the past. If, in addition to this clause, power was given to impose an extra fee for heavy traffic, it would be unfair.

The Minister for Works : That is not proposed.

Mr. TURVEY : Then he understood that the owner of a vehicle engaged in heavy traffic would pay the same license fee as any other vehicle of a similar nature, and if any extraordinary damage was caused there would be power to recover. Was that so?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : There was no difference in the fee but this clause was intended to make it possible for the local authorities to collect a special impost from those who did special damage to the roads. This would take the place of the provisions in the Roads Act dealing with traffic, and those provisions would cease to exist when this measure came into operation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 51—agreed to.

Clause 52—Penalty for unauthorised use of vehicles :

Mr. PRICE : The Minister should give some explanation of this clause. It seemed to be a matter which really ought to come under the Criminal Code.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The object of the clause was to assist in putting down joy riding. Considerable damage had been done to cars and property and individuals by people taking charge of cars which they had no right to use. The object of the clause was to give a direction in the Traffic Bill that cars should not be so utilised, and if they were, this special penalty was provided. This would give traffic inspectors control without leaving it to the police in a general way to supervise what, under the Criminal Code, would be regarded as the theft of a motor car.

Mr. WISDOM : With the clause he agreed, but he was surprised to hear that it was intended to put down joy riding. There was nothing in the clause to prevent joy riding, and he proposed to move a new clause later on to deal with that matter. The flaw in this clause was that the person who usually did the joy riding could give permission to someone else to go joy riding. The clause would fail in this object, although it would be useful in other respects.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : There would be no objection to the striking out of the words "or person in charge of a vehicle." If the hon. member, while away on a trip, left his car in charge of some person, action could not be taken under this clause against such person for joy riding without the consent of the owner and the owner would not be here to assist the prosecution. The person in charge was the owner for the time being, and unless these words were inserted there would be some difficulty. He was not keen on the clause at all, because he did not think it would put down joy riding, but it was copied from Victorian legislation, in which it had been inserted for this special purpose.

Mr. WISDOM : The Minister failed to realise that if a car was left in charge of some person that would imply consent on the part of the owner. In the case of joy riding, the only one who could acquaint the authorities of the fact was the owner who desired to put a stop to the practice.

The Minister for Works : If you were in England you could not give the authorities notice.

Mr. WISDOM: A person would be left in charge.

The Minister for Works: That is why the words are put in.

Mr. WISDOM: That implied consent. Joy riding as a rule was done by the chauffeur, and he was the person in charge of the car. If the chauffeur gave consent to a chauffeur friend to go joy riding, it would be impossible to get a conviction. As he was afraid this clause would not be likely to prevent joy riding, he had prepared one which he calculated would do so. He would like to see the existing clause remain in the Bill and have his own as well, so as to make assurance doubly sure.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was not his intention to have the two clauses. If the hon. member for Claremont would put his proposition on the Notice Paper he (the Minister for Works) was prepared to consult the Crown Law authorities to see whether it would meet the case better than the one prepared by the Parliamentary Draughtsman. In the event of it doing so, he would be prepared to delete the existing clause with a view to inserting that of the hon. member.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 53—Roads may be closed:

Mr. BROWN: Why was this clause in the Bill at all, as the local authority was already given power under the Roads Board Act?

The Minister for Works: This will come out of that Act.

Mr. MALE: Why was dual control given over the roads, and why was the Minister to have the right to overrule the local authorities in this matter? It appeared that if the local authorities said the road was safe or unsafe, the Minister could come along and alter that decision.

The Minister for Works: No. Subclause 1 gives the Minister power and Subclause 2 gives power to the local authority. We must give the Minister power as there are certain roads which he wants control over.

Mr. MALE moved an amendment—

That after "control," in Subclause 2, the words "but any order made by a

local authority hereunder may be annulled by the Minister" be struck out.

That would have the effect of preventing dual control so far as Subclause 2 was concerned.

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

Clause 54—agreed to.

Clause 55—Application of Act to Crown and local authorities:

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Was it intended to exempt the driver of a Government motor-car from the necessity of being licensed? It would not be right to do so as those were the very people who should be licensed, especially after a Ministerial picnic. From the clause it appeared clear that the driver of a Government car would not need to be licensed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The position was that where the Government came into competition with trading concerns, the vehicles used were licensed. The Crown was usually exempt, not only in connection with licenses for motor cars but in various other ways, and of course he was not prepared to insert in this Bill what was not found in any other applying to taxation or rating with regard to Government property.

Mr. BROWN: The drivers of Government cars should be made to have a license.

The Minister for Works: I do not know that there is any objection to those drivers being licensed, but this does not deal with them.

Mr. BROWN: All the same, the clause exempted them.

The Minister for Works: That would have to be done under "drivers' licenses," not under this clause.

Mr. BROWN: The Minister for Works should have something inserted here dealing with the point raised, as the drivers of Government motor-cars should be licensed. He had been on St. George's terrace and seen Ministers driven at a greater rate than any ordinary individual.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Just now the Minister was anxious about the safety of the public in the country and it was grossly inconsistent that he should show any lack

of care for the safety of the public in the city. The drivers of Government cars drove much more frequently in the city than in the country and, therefore, there was the necessity of having more skilful drivers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It should be recognised that the Government were paying a subsidy, and were therefore paying the highest license fees of the lot. In his opinion any driver of a Government motor-car was going to be an efficient driver, and not only a driver but a mechanic as well.

Mr. Broun: They go beyond the ordinary speed very often and the Minister for Works knows it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Any time that I have had an opportunity of being in a motor-car it has not gone beyond the proper speed.

Mr. Broun: The Minister was hurrying for his dinner on one occasion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): When the question of licensing Government vehicles was raised the same argument could be applied as that which held good in regard to the rating of Government buildings.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If it was good for everybody to be licensed he was prepared to admit that it was good for the drivers of Government cars to be licensed, and as he had taken up the attitude that everybody should be licensed, he did not see how we could exempt Government drivers. The clause could be recommitted. He thought, however, that the Government drivers were particularly careful and only on rare occasions had they exceeded the speed limit. He recalled one occasion when the hon. member for Wagin was present and was in a hurry to get to his dinner.

Mr. S. Stubbs: No. You said, "Let her go, Jock."

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 56, 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—License to be produced on demand:

Mr. MALE: Was it always possible and convenient to give effect to the last portion of the clause, "and also any

license which is required to be held by the owner"? It was not easy for every person to carry a license about with him for every trap in respect to which he held a license.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Unless the license went with the vehicle there was absolutely no evidence that it was licensed. How was an inspector to know the vehicle was licensed unless the driver in addition to his own license, had the vehicle license? If the evidence of the license was affixed to the vehicle it was all right. No doubt it usually would be so affixed, and, therefore, it was produced because it was on the vehicle. The clause would make the driver see the evidence that his vehicle was licensed was affixed to the vehicle or he would have to produce it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 59—Appeal:

Mr. MALE: Was it usual when making an application for a license, and it was refused by the local authority or inspector, that a person should have to appeal to the Minister.

Mr. LANDER: It would be a very good thing in cases of a few crone councillors objecting to a man getting a license.

Mr. MALE: As he did not see the necessity for the clause he would oppose it.

Mr. BROUN: The clause did not appear to be necessary. It was absolutely essential that a local authority must issue a license, and could only refuse in terms of Clause 49. It was not right to give any local authority power to refuse issuing a license unless it had some just cause to do so.

Mr. LANDER: All sorts of objections might be raised to a man, and in the event of injustice being likely there should be some means of appealing to the Minister. The clause was necessary.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was only in very exceptional cases that it would apply, but there must be some appeal. Under the Roads Act there were several matters the local authority had power to deal with. If an individual felt aggrieved he had the right to appeal to the Minister, but it was seldom that

appeals came along. In the course of his experience extending over two years, there had only been one appeal, and in that case he decided against the local authority.

Mr. Broun: If a local authority refused me a license I would use my vehicle and then appeal to the court.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The court could not give the hon. member any protection against a local authority, but under the clause he would have protection by being able to appeal to the Minister.

Mr. MALE: The Minister was not right there because a local authority had no power to refuse to license.

Mr. Lander: They do refuse sometimes.

Mr. MALE: They could not refuse. He remembered an instance where a local authority tried to refuse a license. The matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor, and he said that the local authorities were bound to issue the license if the fee was tendered.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 60 to 64—agreed to.

New Clause:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved—

That the following be added to stand in Part IV., as Clause 50: "(1.) The Governor may from time to time place to the credit of a local authority, for the maintenance of trunk roads within the district or of any particular trunk road, any sum of money out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the maintenance of trunk roads. (2.) Such sum shall not be deemed to be ordinary income of the local authority, but shall be expended only for the purpose for which it has been allotted, and a separate detailed account of the expenditure thereof shall from time to time and whenever required be furnished to the Minister. (3.) The moneys received by any local authority for license or registration fees under this Act or any regulation shall, after payment thereof of the costs of collection, be applied to the maintenance of trunk roads within its district and not otherwise. (4.) Moneys received by a local authority under section twenty-three

shall be applied by the local authority to the maintenance of trunk roads within its district, or when only portion of its district is within the metropolitan area then to the maintenance of trunk roads within such portion. (5.) The Governor may proclaim any road to be a trunk road for the purposes of this Act, and may at any time revoke any such proclamation. (6.) The expression 'trunk road' in this section means a road as to which any such proclamation is in force and any part of such a road."

The object was merely to define that the license fees should be used for the purpose of trunk roads. It provided the machinery by which these fees should be used, and outlined the provisions as set out in Clause 23 and other parts of the Bill.

Mr. WISDOM moved an amendment—

That after the word "fees" in line 2 of paragraph 3 of the proposed new clause, the words "and fines and penalties" be inserted.

The fines and penalties should be allotted to the same purpose as the license fees, and the proposed new clause did not make that provision.

Amendment passed.

Mr. WISDOM: Paragraph 4 provided that the moneys received by a local authority under Clause 23 should be applied to the maintenance of trunk roads within its district or when only portion of its district was within the metropolitan area, then to the maintenance of trunk roads within such portion. Did that mean that all moneys received by a local authority which had a district partly in and partly out of the metropolitan area should allot all that amount to the portion inside the metropolitan area?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The metropolitan area was so drafted as to take them in.

Mr. DWYER moved an amendment—

That after the word "road" in line 1 of paragraph 5 of the proposed new clause the words "or any portion of a road" be inserted.

Amendment passed; the new clause as amended agreed to.

First and Second Schedules—agreed to.

Third Schedule:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : When on the clause dealing with license fees he had promised to go into the matter of cycles. In accordance with this he had obtained from the Crown Law Department an amendment which, however, did not, to his mind, meet the requirements of the House. Therefore, if members would pass this, he would recommit the Bill with the object of inserting an amendment which would be satisfactory to all concerned. The trouble was that in some places it was desired to tax cycles up to 5s. per wheel, while in others, as in the metropolitan area, it was not desired to do more than impose a mere registration fee. It was desirable that roads boards and local authorities who had to maintain special cycle pads should have the right to impose taxation. The cyclists themselves desired it, because it meant the maintenance of the pads, while the local authorities desired it also. It was necessary to again point out that this principle of licensing cycles had been adopted by the local authorities, not merely those of the goldfields, but the local authorities all over the country. Yet it had been stated by the Press that it was an innovation devised by the Government. As a matter of fact, it had been introduced, or at least adopted, by the local authorities themselves, and had been given a place on the Roads Act for many years past.

Mr. Wisdom : Do you propose to recommit the whole of the schedule ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : No, the remainder of the schedule could be dealt with on the present occasion.

Mr. WISDOM : To carry out his purpose, the Minister would require to allot the fees collected from cyclists on a system different from that prescribed in the Bill, under which all fees were to be allotted to trunk roads. The cycle fees would not be allotted to trunk roads.

The Minister for Works : That will be covered in the proposed amendment, for which the Bill will be re-committed.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The license fee of £1 per month to be imposed on traction engines was very stiff indeed.

The Minister for Works : Look at the damage they do.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : They were responsible for any special damage done. The fee was far too heavy. He moved—

That "£1 per month" be struck out and "ten shillings per month" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : In proportion to the other license fees contained in the schedule, £1 per month was not excessive for traction engines. To alter that fee would be to throw it out of proportion with the rest. The fees had all been fixed in proportion to the damage done to the roads. He could not agree to the amendment.

Mr. Brown : Have they the same fee in the Eastern States ?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Without stopping to look it up, he could not state definitely that the fee was precisely the same in all the other States.

Mr. DWYER : It would be noticed that this was the only class of license which was not on an annual basis. Presumably the reason was that a traction engine worked for only a certain period in the year. Consequently whatever amount was decided upon, it should be made monthly or weekly.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : As already pointed out, "traction engine" covered any vehicle driven by mechanical power other than a motor vehicle. Therefore it did not necessarily follow that what was understood as a traction engine was worked intermittently. The proposed fee of £1 per month seemed an excessive tax. A brewer's delivery waggon drawn by three or four horses would only pay 5s. per wheel annually, whereas a vehicle driven by mechanical power and engaged in the same work would be required to pay £12 per annum.

The Minister for Works : I have told you I will amend the definition. I will accept 10s. per month.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Passenger vehicle licenses were proposed to be 2s. 6d. per wheel annually. It was an extraordinary thing that the tax on a settler's cart was 5s. whilst that on a cab was only 2s. 6d. In his opinion a person who paid rates should not pay wheel tax at all, but certainly a carriage used by a person perhaps once a month should pay a lower tax than a vehicle plying constantly for hire.

The Minister for Works : I think it ought to be 5s. for passenger vehicles.

Mr. LANDER : The passenger vehicle was a man's sole means of livelihood, whereas the settler made his money out of the land and not out of his vehicle.

Mr. DWYER : Two and sixpence per wheel was an ample tax on a cab, because it was equivalent to a tax on the cabman's tools of trade. There was no true parallel between a cab and a farm vehicle, because a man driving a cab made his living out of that vehicle, whereas the farmer used his vehicle only as an accessory.

Mr. BROWN : It was essential that the license fee for a passenger vehicle should be the same as the carriage license. The farmer was required to pay £1 per annum for his vehicle, which might be used only a few times in the year, whereas according to the schedule as drafted a cabman would pay only 10s. per annum.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : There was no desire to increase the license fee for passenger vehicles if the Minister would reduce the license fee for ordinary carriages.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : It would be distinctly unfair to charge 5s. per wheel for carriages and only 2s. 6d. per wheel for a passenger vehicle license. He moved an amendment—

That in passenger vehicle licenses "2s. 6d." be struck out and "5s." inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Mr. BROWN moved an amendment—

That in the license fee for motor car of 10-horse power or under "£2" be struck out and "£1" inserted in lieu.

Motor cars for hire were used practically every day, and covered a 200 or 300 per

cent. greater mileage than the ordinary motor car used in the country. Therefore, the amendment had been moved to meet the cases in the country of farmers who used their motor cars to come into the nearest town about once a week. The schedule provided for the same fee per car for all cars, irrespective of whether they were for hire or not.

Mr. LANDER : It was to be hoped the Minister would not agree to the amendment. If a farmer could afford to keep a motor car he could afford to pay a license fee of £2, especially in view of the damage done to the roads by the cars.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The fees were distributed equitably in proportion to the damage done, and no amendment could be accepted. He would be prepared to consider any proposal to increase the fees but not to decrease them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : The Minister should accept the amendment. People who could afford to buy motors should be encouraged to use them. Motor cars damaged the roads more than buggies, but not four times as much, and a £5 fee was fairly stiff.

Mr. WISDOM : In his opinion the license fees were too low. They were just half of the amounts charged for similar powered cars in the old country.

Hon. J. Mitchell : They have good roads there.

Mr. WISDOM : If we were going to get good roads here the revenue would have to be found.

Mr. Brown : They get their cars for half the price in England.

Mr. WISDOM : A car for which he would have to pay a license fee of £3 would cost £6 in the old country. As the fees were to be devoted to the construction and maintenance of trunk roads he, as an owner and driver, would not object to pay a higher fee.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE : The Minister should not be guided by the member for Claremont. This was another bleeding process. The Minister was getting quite an adept in applying the Treasury leech. Already heavy roads board, land and water rates were paid and with all the impositions, life was scarcely worth liv-

ing. This would be distinctly a class penalty. The Minister ought to be reasonable and accept the amendment. There was no hope of getting good roads by these means.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The Minister should agree to reduce the fees. There was a mistaken notion among supporters of the Government that because a man owned a motor car he was rich.

The Minister for Works: It usually keeps him poor.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The present and past Administrations had unfortunately settled a number of men at greater distances from railway stations than they could profitably carry their goods to and from. A pair of horses cost £40 and a trap another £40, and a Ford or similar car could be purchased for a little over £200. The statement that so much damage was done to the roads by motor cars was all moonshine.

Mr. Lander: You must be blind.

Mr. S. STUBBS: It depended on the size of the tyres used and the speed. No more damage was done to a country road by a motor car travelling at 12 to 15 miles an hour than a buggy driven at eight miles an hour.

Mr. Wisdom: Whoever travels at that speed?

Mr. S. STUBBS: A careful man would not travel at a greater speed than 15 miles an hour.

Mr. Taylor: So that there is not a careful man in the State.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If such a car was driven at a greater speed expenses equivalent to its value would be incurred in the space of 12 or 18 months.

Mr. Taylor: Ask the hon. member for Pingelly.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The fee was an excessive one and he supported the amendment.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The schedule provided that a motor wagon of a gross weight not exceeding five tons should pay 25s., and surely a 30-horse power motor car should not have to pay £5 a year.

Mr. BROWN: The Minister should concede the reduction or perhaps he could give the roads boards power to fix the

licenses as the present Cart and Carriage License Act provided. Many farmers were living far from the nearest town and could only just afford to buy a car, and the license fees would prove heavy for them. A motor carrier used for the carriage of persons would cost £1 and a 10 to 20 horse power car £3 per annum.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If any license fees at all were justified under the Bill it was those on motor vehicles. He was sorry some hon. members argued that some settlers should pay taxes on carts, but defended the proposal to leave the license fees on motor-cars as they were. The Minister ought not to accept any reduction. He did not know any farmers owning motor-cars who were not prepared to pay the very reasonable rates proposed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was not possible for him to agree to any reduction, but he was prepared to go into the question of seeing whether a special impost could not be charged against motor-cars plying for hire. There was no getting away from the fact that motor-cars did a tremendous lot of damage to the roads.

Mr. Brown: Heavy cars.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Even the light cars. The Ford car was a light car, but it was of high horse-power.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Does it not depend on the speed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It did depend on speed. Motor-cars did damage out of all proportion to what was done by the ordinary carriage and the license proposed was fair in the circumstances.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The Minister seemed to think motor-cars and motor tractors did an extraordinary amount of damage to the roads, but such was not the case, as could be seen from the main road between Perth and Toodyay, only one small section of which was at all affected. The State had not reached that stage when the effect of motor-car traffic was perceptible to any alarming degree and, therefore, the proposed fees were too high.

Mr. LANDER: Members on his side were prepared to fight for the little man, not the big man with the motor-car. It was to be hoped the Minister would stand firm to the clause, and recognise the liberal-mindedness of the member for Claremont, who was willing to consider an advance, whereas with some members on the other side, directly boodle was affected we saw them fighting for it, but on no occasion had they fought for the small farmer in relation to his wheel tax.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. WISDOM: There had been some discussion earlier in the evening with regard to drivers' licenses, and he did not know if he had been clearly understood in what he said, namely, that he was entirely in favour of drivers' licenses. The Minister seemed to think he (Mr. Wisdom) was not, but he was. At the same time it must be admitted there might be something in the contention of the hon. member for Beverley that the owner of a car, having members of his family who were able to drive it, should have some consideration. With that view he would move an amendment to the schedule—

That the following words be added:—

*"Owner's license (of car not for hire),
10s. For owner's family, each member
2s. 6d."*

Mr. DWYER: The amendment was evidently intended to meet the case of private motor vehicles, and we had to consider, not only the owner, but the chauffeur, and in addition the members of the owner's family. Probably a definition would be required for "members of family." In the case of private cars a fee might be charged to apply all round, covering not only the owner but the driver, if he was a special driver or a member of the family. The fee might be made 15s. for them all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was his intention, as he had already stated, to go into the question as to whether there should be a special impost on motors for hire. If the hon. member would withdraw his amendment, the matter would be gone into properly and an effort made to meet his desires. All that was wanted was that drivers should be

registered. There was no desire to collect a big fee.

Mr. TAYLOR: When the Minister was readjusting the schedule it would be well for him to consider whether the suggested fee of 2s. 6d. for each member of a family should only apply to those families, the members of which drove cars.

Mr. WISDOM: Having had an assurance from the Minister that the question would receive attention, he would ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Schedule, as previously amended, put and passed.

Fourth Schedule:

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Would the Minister explain why it was proposed to make the license fee for camels so high?

The Minister for Works: It is the same as is charged to-day.

Mr. DWYER: They are only the maximum fees.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Some people engaged in the breeding of camels in the State, and it would be a pity to allow the fee of £5 for a bull camel to remain. The owner of a camel would see that it did no injury to anyone. The amount might well be reduced to £1.

Mr. DWYER: The Minister might adopt the same course as was proposed in the other schedule, and where a camel was required for breeding purposes a similar provision might be made. Where camels were being used for other purposes, they ought to pay the full amount.

Mr. TAYLOR: It ought to be remembered that the Bill before the Committee was not one to deal with stud stock; its object was to deal with traffic, and we found in the schedule that camels were specified as working camels. The Minister had explained that the fee was similar to that charged under the Roads Act. If it were a stud matter it might be wise to impose a heavy tax so as to insure a good breed. The object of the heavy impost on a bull camel was that protection might be offered to the public against attack. The penalty, however, would not make the camel any less vicious.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The provision was identical with that in the

Roads Act. This was the maximum fee and in certain cases it would be regulated according to the local conditions.

Mr. TAYLOR: Again it might be pointed out that the Committee were dealing with a traffic Bill and the taxes which had been set out had been worked out on a scale according to the damage done to roads by vehicles. Could anyone tell him that a bull camel carrying six cwt. would do more damage to a road than a cow camel carrying a similar load?

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 11.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th September, 1913.

	PAGE.
Papers presented	1043
Questions: Perth Tramways, bathing tickets	1043
Government Abattoirs at Kalgoorlie and Midland Junction	1043
Railway employees' vision and hearing tests	1044
Swine fever, recrudescence	1044
Kimberley horses and the Stock Department	1044
Leave of Absence	1044
Bills: Declarations and Attestations, 1a.	1045
Fremantle Improvement, 1a.	1045
Perth Improvement, 1a.	1045
Legisl Practitioners Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	1053
Health Act Amendment, 2a.	1070
Land Act Amendment, 2a.	1076
Motions: Agricultural Settlers' Liabilities, to inquire	1045
North-West, development	1052

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Petition of Inmates of Claremont Hospital for the Insane, with papers in connection with Rudolph Hein.

QUESTION—PERTH TRAMWAYS, BATHING TICKETS.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS asked the Minister for Railways: As the Premier has several times made the statement that there would be no alteration in the tramway fares until such time as the new power-house was completed, and as the bath ticket which was attached to a return ticket from any part of the City or suburbs to Nedlands Park was withdrawn on or about the 28th May last, or some months after the Government had paid the purchase money for the Nedlands Park trams, will he take steps to have the agreement with the lessee of the Nedlands baths reinstated, so as not to make it prohibitive for the public, and especially the school children, to make use of those convenient baths?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The issue of combined tram and bath tickets was discontinued before the tramways were taken over by the Government. The question of re-introducing them is under consideration.

QUESTIONS (2)—GOVERNMENT ABATTOIRS.

At Kalgoorlie.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What was the original cost of the Kalgoorlie abattoirs? 2, The total cost of subsequent alterations and additions? 3, Who designed these abattoirs? 4, Who prepared the plans? 5, Were these officers qualified men?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, £22,617. 2, The only alteration or addition was the lengthening of the skin-drying shed at a cost of £400. 3, The chief architect of the Public Works Department, acting under the expert advice of the State controller of abattoirs. 4, The chief architect. 5, Yes.

At Midland Junction.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What area has been secured for the Midland Junction abattoirs? 2, Is this area freehold or leasehold? 3, Who selected this site? 4, Who