

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: They stand up to their every obligation.

Hon. N. Keenan: How many of them?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Hundreds of them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then we had better be very careful about this provision.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I know personally many of these half-castes.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Some half-castes have wished to stand for Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We go to no end of expense in educating these people—some 300 of them attend mission schools—we endeavour to make proper citizens of them, and encourage them to leave the bush life of the blacks for the life of a civilised community. Are we then to say to them, "You may enjoy all these advantages, but you cannot have a vote for Parliament"? The half-castes have to pay taxes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should like to know how many of them pay taxes; probably not 20 of them.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I myself know at least 25 half-castes who pay taxes. Many of them pay the hospital tax. Such people should be given a vote, so long as they are not predominantly black. That concession is given them by the Commonwealth.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 8th October, 1935.*

	PAGE
Bills: Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2s.	1013
Com. report ... ..	1014
Brands Act Amendment, recom. ... ..	1014
Droving Act Amendment, Com., recom., further recom. ... ..	1014
Traffic Act Amendment, 2s. ... ..	1016
Rural Relief Fund, Com. ... ..	1022
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 2s. ... ..	1025
Builders' Registration, 2s. ... ..	1026
Adjournment, Royal Show ... ..	1028

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

### BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [4.37]: I moved the adjournment of the debate last Thursday because I intended over the week-end to travel through the province I represent. I visited Lake Grace, where I was very pleased to note the excellent prospects for the coming season. In fact, one of the Agricultural Bank inspectors informed me that it was the finest season experienced in that part of the district for the past six or seven years, and he had no hesitation in forecasting an average of 14 to 16 bushels of wheat to the acre—

Hon. A. Thomson: Provided that rain falls soon.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I was about to remark, provided that rain falls soon. I visited Gnawangurup on Sunday. That district has had excellent rains, although they came somewhat late, and the lambing has not been good on account of the lack of green feed in the early part of the season. Undoubtedly there are other districts that are not as fortunate. Travelling up through Kondinin towards Bruce Rock there certainly seemed to be a decided shortage of water, and I read in the newspaper that a member had been visiting the more northern portions of the wheat areas and had commented on the shortage of water there. The water shortage is going to be the great difficulty, and it is a difficulty that the Gov-

ernment will have to face. The position in many parts of the wheat belt to-day is very similar to that which prevailed in 1914-15 when this legislation was originally introduced. At that time, however, prices were good, and the morale of the farmers was better. To-day a large number of settlers are on the breadline, and many of them need to receive only one more bump and they will leave their holdings.

Hon. J. Cornell: In 1914 settlers had very little stock to look after.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes, stock was of no great moment in those days. I understand that the Agricultural Bank authorities have advanced loans for the purchase of stock in many of the outlying districts, and it will probably be necessary for the Government to provide water in order to maintain the stock. Unless a thunderstorm occurs, it will be impossible to get sufficient water into the dams. When visiting the Kulin district a week ago, I noticed that the dams contained only 4 feet or 5 feet of water, whereas in other seasons they almost invariably had 8 feet to 12 feet. Various members have said that this Act should have been repealed years ago. Fortunately it was not repealed, and I am only sorry that we may have to avail ourselves of its machinery provisions again this season. Three months ago, when settlers were short of feed for their stock, the Government went to their assistance and provided 1,000 tons of chaff. But for the machinery of this Act, they would have had great difficulty in arranging for the purchase and supply of that chaff. The Minister for Lands (Hon. M. F. Troy) and the Premier of South Australia have approached the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Casey, with a view to obtaining extra money for the relief of farmers in need. They appear to have received a very favourable reply, and I sincerely hope that if the relief is granted free of cost, it will be passed on free to the settlers who need it. It is most important that settlers should be kept on their holdings. Quite a number have experienced such a gruelling over the last four or five years, what with low prices and lack of money for sustenance and for carrying on their farming operations, that unless they receive assistance this year, they will leave their holdings. I feel confident that the Bill will be passed without any opposition. My sole regret is that we may have to use the provi-

sions of the Act in order to assist settlers this season.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

## **BILL—BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Recommittal.*

On motion by the Chief Secretary, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 9, 10, 11 and 13.

*In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

On motions by the Chief Secretary, Clause 9 amended by striking out the letter "B" at the end of proposed paragraph 4 and inserting "A" in lieu; Clause 10 amended by striking out the letter "(h)" at the beginning of proposed new paragraph and inserting "(gg)" in lieu; Clause 11 amended by striking out the letter "B" at the beginning of the proposed new section and inserting "A" in lieu.

Clause 13—Citation of principal Act as amended:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Sub-clause 2:—"The Brands Act, 1904-1932, as amended by this Act, shall be reprinted by the Government Printer under the supervision of the Clerk of Parliaments, and in such reprint the sections shall be renumbered in arithmetical order and the cross-references adjusted."

It is the Government's intention to consolidate the various Brands Acts into one measure, so that "he who runs may read."

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

Bill reported with further amendments.

## **BILL—DROVING ACT AMENDMENT.**

*In Committee.*

Resumed from the 24th September; Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 7—New Section 15A:

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been moved to add at the end of Subsection 6 the words "or to any sheep which are removed pursuant to any sale or contract of sale from any place in the metropolitan area for consignment by rail. For the purpose of this section the Governor shall define the metropolitan area by proclamation and may by any subsequent proclamation vary or amend such definition," on which amendment an amendment has been moved to insert, after the word "area" in the fourth line of the words proposed to be inserted, the words "or from registered stock saleyards outside the metropolitan area."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I wish to withdraw my amendment, and I hope Mr. Macfarlane will withdraw his amendment on my amendment, in order that I may move a new amendment which will meet the wishes of hon. members who discussed the question.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: This matter has been discussed, and I am perfectly satisfied that the Chief Secretary will put up an amendment which will prove acceptable to the Committee. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment on the amendment.

Amendment, and amendment on amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That at the end of proposed Subsection 6 of proposed new Section 15A the following words be added:—"or to any sheep which are removed pursuant to any sale or contract of sale from any place in the metropolitan area for consignment by rail, or from any approved saleyard for consignment by rail. For the purpose of this section—

- (i) the Governor shall define the metropolitan area by proclamation, and may by any subsequent proclamation vary or amend such definition;
- (ii) the Minister may on payment of the prescribed fee approve of any specified saleyard as a saleyard for the purpose of this section, and may also cancel any such approval from time to time at his discretion."

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments. !

#### *Recommittal.*

On motion by Chief Secretary Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clauses 3, 4 and 5.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 3 of the principal Act:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That after the word "amended" in line 1 the following be inserted:—(a) by inserting after the word "leasehold" in the definition of "Run" the words "or place," and by inserting after the word "kept" in the second line of the definition the word "held."

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

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 4 of the principal Act:

Hon. W. J. MANN: At a previous sitting it was found necessary to add a proviso to Clause 5. Subsequently, it was also found necessary to make a somewhat similar amendment to Clause 4. I move an amendment—

That at the end of the clause a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—(d) Provided that, where an owner desires to travel stock from one place to another for the purpose of temporary grazing, the way bill may be in the prescribed form and may cover the outward and return movement of the stock.

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

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 5 of the principal Act:

Hon. W. J. MANN: I move an amendment—

That the proviso inserted at a previous Committee at the end of proposed new Subsection 4 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—Provided that, where an owner desires to travel stock from one place to another, for the purpose of temporary grazing, the delivery note may be in the prescribed form and may cover the outward and return movement of the stock.

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

Bill again reported with further amendments.

#### *Further Recommittal.*

On motion by Chief Secretary Bill further re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clause 4.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 4 of the principal Act:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The letter "a" has been omitted from paragraph (b) and it is necessary that it be inserted. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) "a" be inserted before the word "duplicate."

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

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

## BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.13]: I listened with interest the other evening to the speech delivered by Mr. Angelo. I fear he drifted back considerably in the years, away back to the time of the horse-drawn vehicles, and he endeavoured to compare the conditions existing at that time with those of to-day. I remind him that even in those days people were killed by horse-drawn vehicles. In fact, those vehicles were the cause of many accidents.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: But not 69 in one year.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: No, but there were many fatalities caused in other ways, railways for instance.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: And they are still happening.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: So long as human nature exists, there will be accidents, and it will be impossible to prevent them by legislation. At the same time, we can punish those who are negligent. We have railway fatalities, air fatalities, boating fatalities and fatalities caused by stock. No one suggests that people who own horses are a dreadful class of people because of such accidents, or that people who own boats are dreadful people. Many fatalities that are put down to motor cars are caused not by those vehicles, but through the negligence of another party. All too frequently we see people run across the road in front of moving traffic, or step off the footpath without looking. I suppose we all have done that in an absent-minded way, and just avoided being

knocked over by a vehicle. The return submitted includes all those killed in motor accidents. Very often people are killed in motor cars whilst going over railway crossings. I do not know whether the return shows the people who have been killed by trains.

Hon. A. Thomson: Undoubtedly.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Some people have been killed by trains. These cases are occasionally due to the negligence of the driver of the motor car, and in other cases motorists have been killed through running into trains, or trees, or some other obstacle. Legislation will not prevent that. With the enormous increase in traffic and in the population we must expect to find an increase in the number of fatal accidents, or cases of persons being injured. We have only to compare the figures with any other part of the world to find that there is a general percentage that applies everywhere. I do not think motorists in this State are any better or worse than motorists elsewhere. No one wants accidents to occur, and I am sure every member would like to see steps taken to prevent them, if that were possible. When we speak of accidents we really speak of negligence, and we want to do all we can to prevent people from being negligent. On the other hand, we do not need statutes on our books to prevent negligence or to penalise those who are negligent. The civil law deals with those who negligently cause injury to other people. A Bill dealing with third-party insurance was promised in the Governor's Speech. I trust we shall soon have that measure before us so that we may be able to provide for some kind of compensation for those who are injured through the negligence of other people, which people are unable to pay the damages they ought to pay. It is unfortunate for a man to be knocked over by an impecunious motorist who is not insured.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: It is unfortunate for the lawyers.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The lawyers do not get much out of that sort of case. A man who has anything at all takes out an insurance policy, and the company pays. The man who has nothing says, "Go ahead, get what damages you like for it makes no difference to me. Sue me or not as you wish." He is the man we must deal with in the matter of third-party insurance.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Bill is coming down, according to the "West Australian" this morning.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I hope the present Government will bring it down. It is suggested that motorists are responsible for the death of every pedestrian who is knocked down by their cars. That is not so. It is also suggested that no pedestrian has ever caused the death of a motorist. I am sure Mr. Angelo is not fully cognisant of all the facts of motor accidents. More than one motor accident in which a man has been killed has been caused through the negligence of pedestrians in cases where the motorist has had to swing away. Dogs, too, have been the cause of fatalities amongst motorists.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: In most cases the driving was too fast.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: My impression is that it is not the fast driver who is the danger, but the slow driver.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The careless driver.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Very often it is the punctiliously careful man who drives slowly along the middle of the road who causes the trouble.

Hon. G. W. Miles: A man who is a bundle of nerves.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: As a rule the fast driver is a competent driver. Although he takes certain risks he seldom causes an accident, unless he has taken too much liquor.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Sometimes the police hurry a man on too.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes, and in some cities there is a minimum speed, not a maximum. If the present law were enforced, no motorist driving between Perth and Fremantle could exceed 15 miles an hour at crossings.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He should not do so either.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I trust the hon. member will endeavour to follow the law and see that he does not exceed 15 miles an hour at any crossing. He will then find out how many people will be tooting behind him, and telling him to get out of the road. It is a matter of cross-streets or corners all the way to Fremantle. The law says that a man must reduce speed to 15 miles an hour at a crossing, and that of course slows down the people behind him. If any members have driven in a long line of traffic at

a set speed they have found they had to travel at the rate of the slowest vehicle in the line. At the rate provided it would be practically impossible to get to Fremantle at a speed greater than 15 miles an hour. Members may have driven to funerals. A funeral travels at more than 15 miles an hour, and it is exceedingly difficult not to bump the car in front. It is not the fast driver who is the danger, but the negligent driver, the reckless person, and he is the one who should be punished. People are often charged with manslaughter. Unfortunately I have had to prosecute individuals on that charge. No one suggests that any motorist ever desired to cause the death of any person while driving his car. Some little act of negligence, however, may cause a man to be charged with manslaughter, such as having his attention momentarily distracted, and his falling into a careless act on the instant. If during that moment of distraction he kills someone, in theory he is guilty of manslaughter, and is liable to a penalty of 20 years' imprisonment. That is sufficient to prevent any jury from convicting the accused. Juries never convict on charges of manslaughter unless the offence is accompanied by reckless speed or drunkenness. I was under the impression that a Bill was to be brought down to alter the charge from manslaughter to some other offence. It may be that a man could be charged with negligence causing grave bodily harm or death to someone. If that were done I would suggest that instead of the penalty being made one of 20 years or imprisonment for life, or hard labour for seven years, the penalty should be made a pecuniary one of say £500, with imprisonment up to and not exceeding a certain period. It would then be found that judges would probably inflict the pecuniary penalty, and the jury would convict. I feel sure that people would be far more careful in their driving if they thought they would be liable to a big pecuniary penalty, not only if they killed a person but maimed him. That would be more effective than the present system.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: That might be very useful.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It would be no good without the third-party risk.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: There must be the third-party risk to compensate the unfortunate individual. I have often won-

dered why it is necessary to appoint traffic inspectors apart from the police. There is a growing tendency to get inspectors to do the work that should ordinarily be done by the police. In a country town one finds, if one commits a breach of the traffic laws, some gentleman comes up to one and points out the breach. I may see a man standing at a street corner some Saturday afternoon in a country town, with a hotel nearby, and bookmakers and punters lounging about. This man may hold up his hand, and I may want him to get out of the way, only to be informed by him that he is a traffic inspector. With a policeman one knows what the position is, and would immediately pay attention to him. I understand there is an objection on the part of local governing bodies to police controlling the Traffic Act in the country for the reason that the local authority gets the penalties that are inflicted. I do not see why the local authority should not retain all the penalties and allow the Police Department to do the work.

Hon. H. Tuckey: There are no police in some towns.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: If a town were not large enough for a policeman, it would not warrant the appointment of a special traffic inspector. On the other hand if a town is large enough for a traffic inspector it should be large enough for a policeman. A policeman would carry out the duties in his stride. They would not add to his burdens. He must be about the place. The mere fact of a policeman being on duty suggests in any British community that the law will be carried out.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The average country policeman has many duties to attend to.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: If there is only one policeman in the town I imagine it would not be necessary to appoint a traffic inspector every time he was called away. If there are not sufficient policemen it is better to add to the number than to appoint more traffic inspectors. A policeman is a more useful individual than a traffic inspector. A policeman is there to protect the persons and properties of all citizens, and he can do that while he is doing his traffic work. He could do the work of the traffic inspector in conjunction with his police duties.

Hon. W. J. Mann: But the local traffic inspector does other work, such as the collecting of rates.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I do not object to the local authority appointing a traffic inspector but I think it would be infinitely better if the police carried out the whole business. At present the police are the only people who can issue drivers' licenses and they have power to refuse a license, although that is subject to an appeal. If that is the position, what is the use of having separate traffic inspectors in any town? Why not leave the work entirely to the police? If that were done, some could extend their activities and do a little more than mere traffic inspection. On roads that are notorious for speeding or careless driving, the mere appearance of a policeman would stop such practices, whereas the presence of a traffic inspector makes no difference at all. Should anything happen, the damage is done and a prosecution may follow. The point is that the presence of a policeman would protect citizens from injury or damage. There is a growing tendency, in my opinion, for police officers to be placed in a number of small compartments. As a result, we have the traffic police, the plain-clothes police, the liquor police, and so on. In my opinion that procedure is bad. It is quite true that some particular individuals will be selected every now and again for special duty. Once a policeman, always a policeman. That should be the system. If an officer is about the streets for the purpose of seeing that the hotels close at a certain hour, he should also be able to attend to any breaches of the Traffic Act, or any other Act. On the other hand, there is a tendency at present for the man on the liquor business not to touch anything else, and that is wrong.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You think he should add a little water.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I was not thinking of the inner man at the moment; I do not think an officer on that work would touch liquor at all, because he would be too scared to do so while on that special duty. This tendency to place sections of the police in separate compartments is quite wrong.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But some men are selected because of their fitness for special jobs.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: That is the trouble. There are too many of these special jobs. Why cannot the ordinary,

everyday policeman also attend to the closings of hotels, rather than have a special section of the police whose duty it is to attend to hotel closing?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: But surely they do other work than that.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I do not know; perhaps the hon. member knows better what happens in his province than I do. Under existing conditions, we know that policemen are appointed to carry out special work, and should a traffic offence occur alongside of them, they take no notice of the affair at all, because they are on their own particular job. That is wrong and the principle is fostered by such measures as the Traffic Act, which invites local governing authorities to have officials for their own purposes under the provisions of that law. We know that in England the counties have their own police forces, but in Western Australia, while we have a State force, the members of that body should carry out the duties and we should not get amateur policemen to do some of their work. After all, a traffic inspector in a country town is largely an amateur policeman. If one were unfortunate enough to meet with an accident in a country town, the first thing to be done would be to inquire if there were a traffic inspector; if there were, where he was, and how it was possible to get hold of him.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: But in country towns the police take action straight away.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Do they? The fact is that the motorist would have to find the traffic inspector and report to him. It would be infinitely better if the police were to do all that class of work. Of course, from the point of view of the motorist, it is better for traffic inspectors to have control because, should the latter institute proceedings and the motorist be successful, costs could be secured against the traffic inspector. On the other hand, if a policeman laid the charge, the motorist, even though he should be successful, could not secure costs against the official. I am sorry the Bill has not been drafted so as to do away with the control of motor vehicular traffic by local governing bodies. I trust that the Bill that will deal with third-party insurance will be introduced soon and that the charge of manslaughter, or unlawful killing, as it applies to motorists, will be altered in such a way that there will be a reasonable prospect of the guilty party being justly punished.

Although a motorist may be found guilty of manslaughter through his negligent driving of his car, a judge may decide whether a caution, fine or imprisonment will be sufficient penalty, but he has no power to interfere with the driver's license. At the end of the year the Commissioner of Police, if he so desired, could refuse to issue a license to the individual concerned. As it is now, if a motorist were to take out his license on the 1st July and caused an accident on that day, he might stand his trial in August. If he were fined, he could still go on driving his car until the 30th June in the following year. That position should be altered so as to give some authority the right to cancel the offender's license.

The Honorary Minister: Have there not been instances of magistrates suspending licenses?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes, but I have been speaking regarding a manslaughter charge dealt with before a judge. It has been suggested that accidents due to dangerous driving of cars by persons in an intoxicated condition are not minimised in their frequency because of the leniency respecting penalties imposed. I do not think it is a matter of leniency if the driver's license is taken from him. That is a penalty invariably inflicted upon men who are found guilty of driving their vehicles when they are drunk. Of course, the mere taking away of the license does not get away from the fact that the damage has already been done, but the loss of a license is a severe penalty, especially to those who have to earn their living through driving motor trucks. I think the penalty is sufficient, in addition to the fine that may be inflicted.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [5.40]: While I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, there are some observations I desire to make regarding it. One of the first and most serious provisions in the Bill is that which will prevent the licensed motorist from taking friends on tour, unless the person he desires to take with him is his wife, mother-in-law or some other relation. That clause could be greatly improved in Committee. In the country districts we often have opportunities to pick up friends and convey them to the city. It seems a pity that we are to be debarred from giving

our friends a little pleasure, without bringing ourselves into conflict with the law.

Hon. J. Cornell: What is the reason for that provision?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I presume it is to make the motorist take out a license for carrying passengers, while, I suppose, it is also to protect the railways.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is mostly to protect the railways.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: As it applies in the suburban areas, I take it the intention is to protect those people who take out licenses for motor buses and so forth.

Hon. J. Cornell: You could understand such a proposal in one of the American States where they are always taking people out for rides.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: And do not bring them back! I was astounded to hear Mr. Parker talk about taking away the rights of local authorities regarding traffic inspectors. Some time ago the Automobile Club in Perth approached the Minister with a proposal that all fees should be collected in Perth. I am pleased that the Government did not accede to that request. Surely there are members of the Automobile Club in the country districts, and, in those circumstances, I do not think it would be right to institute a centralised method of collection. I received many letters from road boards in my province asking me to combat that provision if it were inserted in the Bill. However, the Government are to be congratulated upon not adopting that course.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I did not suggest centralised collection.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The hon. member suggested that the police should be appointed traffic inspectors in all country centres. That would merely be the thin end of the wedge to securing control of not only licenses but motor transport in the country.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They would collar the lot.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is what we must fight.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Even the Government you are supporting would not collar the lot.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I support the Government when they turn down a request such as that submitted to them by the Automobile Club. As a motor salesman, I

have attended conferences at which I have heard interested people discussing the fact that if there were a central registering organisation, it would be so much more helpful in keeping check on where the motor cars were sold in Western Australia. Probably that is one reason why the Automobile Club moved in this matter. There is another point. When in the Eastern States one is always struck by the high numbers on the registration plates of cars. In Western Australia we have the finest system of registration that I know of. With the use of letters to indicate the districts of registration and our smaller registration numbers, it is easier to pick up people who come from country districts to the city.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a bit embarrassing at times.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: It may be. Yet it is much better to have the lower numbers of registration, together with a descriptive letter on the number plate, than to have one central registration, and of course a central collection of fees, under which we would have no idea as to how much of those fees would be received by the local authorities. We find it difficult enough as it is to maintain our businesses in the country, without any more centralisation. We have heard a lot about motor accidents. No doubt careless driving is the cause of a large number of accidents, but I agree with Mr. Parker that the accident is not always due to fast driving. It is often want of training, or neglect to carry out the regulations that has a disastrous result. That is one of the reasons why I am pleased to note in the Bill that, where deemed necessary, a man applying for a license must submit a medical certificate of health. In many instances where a driver has been accused of being under the influence of liquor, an examination by a doctor has shown that his failure to avert an accident was due to some nervous complaint. In fairness to the public, those who suffer from nerves or other ill-health should not have licenses unless they can furnish medical certificates with their applications. The last clause I wish to touch upon is that dealing with car watchers. Frequently I have to leave my car out all night, perhaps in St. George's-terrace. I remember one night going to a theatre in Perth and, as I parked my car, a man came up and offered to watch it.



Feeling a bit generous, I gave him a shilling to watch the car, but when I came out from the theatre I found the car had a puncture. I said to the so-called car watcher, "What about mending that puncture?" and he promptly replied, "What do you take me for?" So I had to secure a man from a garage to carry out the repair. All that the so-called car watchers, or some of them, are prepared to do is to stand by and take your money, and entirely neglect to watch your car. Those men are a positive menace to motorists in Perth, and since that night I have not given a shilling to any of them.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Have you not had any more punctures?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Yes, I have had several since then. More recently I was driving a new car, and I pulled up in the Terrace. At once a man came forward and offered to watch the car, but I explained that there was no need, that I would be in the club for only a few minutes. When I came out of the club, my rear mudguard was dented, and it cost me 30s. to have it fixed up. Of course I could not say it was the disappointed car watcher who did it, but at all events it was a peculiar coincidence that I should have refused him a shilling, and that a few minutes later an accident happened to my stationary car. On one occasion I, with three or four other directors of an insurance company, was discussing car watchers, particularly one man on the Esplanade. In answer to a query, one of the directors said he gave that man 6d. every day, and immediately it came out that each of the others gave the same man the same amount. We pay the cost of our cars, and we pay for our licenses and we pay petrol tax, so surely to goodness it should not be necessary to pay to have one's car watched in a main street. We should not be put to this expense. If the so-called car watchers gave any service whatever, it would be a different thing, but in my experience they do nothing whatever for the payment. According to the Notice Paper, we are to have an amendment dealing with car watchers. Undoubtedly that amendment will have my approval, and I hope the Government will be able to deal effectively with those gentlemen. I will support the second reading.

**HON. J. M. MACFARLANE** (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.50]: I will support the second reading, and I wish to congratulate

the Government upon the amendments brought forward, many of which were overdue. Under this measure we shall have some sort of control over pedestrians in thickly populated areas. Frequently I have to drive my car about the city, and it is always a nightmare to me when passing through Hay-street, Murray-street, Wellington-street or St. George's-terrace, where the pedestrians are allowed to stroll across the road without any control whatever. In Sydney, and in Melbourne, the people are largely protected against themselves. In Melbourne there are the traffic lights at intersections, and pedestrians must cross only at intersections. We have the same in Sydney. Even in Pitt-street, between the street intersections they have marked out crossings in the middle of the street blocks, and a policeman stationed there guides the foot traffic. Here in Western Australia, however, we have nothing of the sort, and I feel that the provision in the Bill will be a great improvement in empowering the police to take some action for the control of pedestrians in our streets, and so they will be doing a very good job indeed. In Hay-street we have one-way traffic, and one tram-track has been pulled up, leaving the other within 12 or 14 feet of the kerbing on the south side. Nevertheless the motor traffic, instead of being allowed to park on the north side, must park on the south side. Consequently it is a nightmare for anyone driving along Hay-street, and the wonder is there have not been a great many more accidents that we have had. I take it as a tribute to the care of the drivers using Hay-street that no more accidents have happened in that thoroughfare. I agree with the attitude taken up by Mr. Parker, who suggests that uniformed police should be in charge of the traffic in country towns. I keenly support that, for I feel that the innovation would be of great benefit to motorists. Obviously it would be much better to have traffic controlled by a uniformed man than it would be to have in charge a man who is not in uniform. The local authorities, we are told, are against the proposal because it would mean less revenue to them. However that may be, I am sure that if we had uniformed policemen controlling the traffic, it would be a very great improvement, at all events from the point of view of motorists. The Bill,

I am afraid, goes too far in prescribing that a motorist shall not pick up on the road any person other than those mentioned in the Bill. Those of us who have to drive through the country a good deal frequently overtake a man trudging along, and we feel the impulse to give him a lift. Yet if the Bill becomes law we shall no longer be at liberty to do that. And again, not infrequently one has to travel alone, perhaps over a long distance, and a friend may express his readiness to come, just for company's sake. However, if the provision in the Bill is agreed to as printed, one will have to get permission before taking a friend with him in his own private car.

The Honorary Minister: The hon. member is putting a wrong construction on the Bill. I shall be pleased if he will indicate which clause will have the effect of preventing a motorist from taking a friend with him.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Well, I have been given to understand that, under the Bill, it will be an offence for a motorist to take his friend on a journey.

Hon. A. Thomson: Under the Bill a man will not be permitted to advertise a vacant seat in his car.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The Press will object to that.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: We do not want to tighten up the Act beyond reason, and I should be sorry to see it pushed too far. However, I can honestly commend that provision which will control the pedestrians moving about in the streets.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Hall, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—RURAL RELIEF FUND.**

### *Recommittal.*

Resumed from the 2nd October. Hon J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 8—How applications are dealt with in first instance:

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That after "instance" in line 2 the words "and the charge for any such application shall not exceed one pound" be added.

Last week I explained my reason for wishing to make the charge one pound for any farmer applying to have his debts adjusted under this measure. I proposed a new

clause, but it was suggested that the amendment should take this form. Many men who will be applying for a writing down of their debts have very little ready money, and should the costs imposed under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act be adopted, those men would have to find £5 or £6.

The HONORARY MINISTER: As indicated previously, I cannot accept the amendment. Under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, when an injustice would be done by insisting on payment, the fees have been waived, and the same procedure would be observed under this measure. A special scale of fees might be desirable. As a large amount of work would be involved before the application could be placed before the trustees, some fees should be paid. The trustees are to be given wide powers to deal with large sums of money, and we might well leave it to them to determine what charges should be imposed. Under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act the application fee amounts to £1, and other fees total £4 4s., in all £5 4s. I do not know whether that amount would be charged under this measure.

Hon. L. Craig: The amendment would not limit the charges to £1. It says that the application fee shall not exceed £1.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The idea is that the fee shall not exceed £1.

Hon. L. Craig: There might be other charges afterwards.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment indicates that any fees connected with the application should not exceed £1.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: My amendment provides that the charge for any application shall not exceed £1.

Hon. L. Craig: That would not limit the total charges to £1.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have in mind the charges under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act. When I submitted the amendment in the other form, I was told it would have the effect of reducing all the fees under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act to £1. I do not wish to interfere with those charges. Under this measure, we are aiming at securing an adjustment of farmers' debts, and I consider that a charge of £1 would be sufficient, particularly as the money is being provided by the Commonwealth free of interest.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope that the amendment would be accepted. The Commonwealth Government have provided the money, and it is definitely laid down that no charge for administration should be levied against the fund. Therefore we are justified in asking that the fees be fixed.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The State would have to bear the cost of administration.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But by charging fees, the State would be deriving direct benefit. If it is fair for a man coming under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act to pay £5 4s., surely one who is merely submitting an application under this measure should not have to pay more than £1.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am afraid a little misunderstanding exists. Because a man makes application under this measure, it does not follow that he would have to pay fees amounting to £5 4s. He has to make an application in the first place, and under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, the cost of the application is £1. Probably under this measure his case would be so clear and the Director would have such a knowledge of his affairs that there would be no need for any further investigation.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: That is why I wish to make certain that the fee shall not exceed £1.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Director might be in a position to make a recommendation straight away, and if that were so, I understand no further fees would be charged. In other instances a large amount of accountancy work on the part of debt adjustment officers would be necessary to prepare complete statements, and any fees that could be charged would not cover the cost. If the charge were merely nominal, many farmers who knew they were not entitled to relief might apply on the ground that it would cost them nothing. Then time, trouble and expense would be incurred before it was ascertained that the men were not entitled to relief. I ask members to have sufficient confidence in the trustees not to charge fees to a man if he cannot afford to pay them.

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

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: In reply to the Honorary Minister, the clause is not intended to interfere in any way with the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act. These

fees should be such as applicants for debt adjustment would be able to pay. I want the exact cost to the farmer definitely stated in the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I hope the amendment will not be carried. A million and a half of Commonwealth money is to be distributed. The State is to pay the commissioners. It is only right that a man applying for relief should pay some fee. The extra charge will be for services rendered, and the State will get nothing out of it.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: Everybody has expressed the opinion that the men in the farming industry should be given all possible assistance to enable them to make good. Suppose a farmer received some assistance though not deserving it, is there any great detriment to the State? The body appointed to distribute the Federal money will judge who is deserving, and who is undeserving, of assistance. I fail to see why any charge should be made.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	7
Noes	..	..	..	14
				—
Majority against	..	..	7	—

#### AYES.

Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. H. V. Piesse	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. C. G. Elliott	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. H. Seddon
	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—Form of relief:

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 1, after the word "instalments," there be inserted "in whole or in part."

The amendment empowers the trustees to deal with the money in cases where they consider it should be repaid by the farmer. The Committee having decided, in their wisdom, that this money should not be a free gift, I ask hon. members to reconsider this special point. Some farmers may be

able to repay the loans, but the Honorary Minister has said that a large proportion of the money is not expected to be returned. Why not give the board power to decide who can repay, and to what extent, and who cannot repay anything? Farmers obviously unable to carry on successfully would not share in the Federal money.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment is merely a variation of a previous proposal. The trustees should not be called upon to discriminate between who shall and who shall not repay. Before making a grant, the trustees would satisfy themselves that in ordinary circumstances the farmer will be able to repay. Moreover, the period of repayment may be extended over 20 years. The farmer who can repay will be only too glad to do so. If creditors will not agree to an arrangement, the trustees have power to suspend certain debts.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope the amendment will be carried. It merely endeavours to express here something contained in the Victorian Act. In introducing the Federal measure Dr. Earle Page said—

It has been brought forward in fulfilment of undertakings given in the policy speeches of both the Prime Minister and myself during the last election campaign. The debt of the community generally to the primary producers of Australia for their efforts during the depression has never been properly realised, and in my opinion it can never be adequately repaid. Although the prices of primary products were unprofitable, the farmers of Australia during those years, in order to enable Australia to meet her financial commitments overseas, grew more wheat and produced more wool, and by continuing to export a huge volume of primary production they contributed in no small measure to the maintenance of Australia's credit, and thus made it possible for other industries to carry on and keep in employment a large number of persons who in other circumstances would have lost their purchasing power. This may be achieved in some measure by the introduction of legislative proposals to ease the debt burden which at the present time presses so heavily upon them.

Those are the remarks made by the Minister who made this money available with the desire to ease the burden imposed on the primary producers of Australia. I have always contended that the money should have been a gift, but in view of the fact that this House has seen fit to vote otherwise, I think we can with justice to the producers, who have done so much to keep the flag flying, see that the trustees are given the right to remit the whole or part

of the money. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Suppose a composition has been agreed to and through adversity, and perhaps prices not having been satisfactory for the previous five or six years, it becomes necessary to further adjust that man's debts. Why not give the board power to say that they do not expect the money to be returned, or if it is returned, then in a certain proportion?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment does not appear to be complete. It proposes after the word "instalments" to insert "in whole or in part." In part of what?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The trustees would have power to cancel the instalment.

The CHAIRMAN: It does not say so in the amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The amendment has to be repaid by instalments, and we know that instalment means repayment in part. The object Mr. Piesse has in view is to leave it to the discretion of the trustees to make a gift to any farmer of the whole or any part of the debt.

The CHAIRMAN: He will not achieve his object by this amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will be necessary to add a proviso to the clause giving power to the trustees to exercise that discretion which has been indicated, and to write off in its entirety or in part the amount that has been given to the farmers. Mr. Piesse would be well advised to withdraw the amendment and redraft it.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: With the permission of the House I will withdraw the amendment. The Bill can be recommitted and in the meantime another amendment can be framed.

Hon. T. MOORE: I believe Mr. Piesse would gain his end if he were to allow the whole clause to stand as it is and insert a proviso.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what he proposes to do.

Hon. T. MOORE: The proviso could be to this effect, "Provided also that the trustees may remit the payment of any instalment or part thereof." When an instalment falls due, the trustees should have the right to say whether they will collect the instalment or remit it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments.

# **BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

## *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

**HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [7.56]:**

I intend to support Mr. Thomson in his desire to provide for an appeal to a resident magistrate or some other authority where it is felt by aggrieved persons that their interests have been overlooked or have not been properly considered by the board. There have been a great many grievances, and a number of people in various districts have been dissatisfied with the way the Act has worked out. Under the Bill before us, not only the individual but road boards would be able to take up a case. When the Act was being debated in this House, my impression was that there would not be any undue interference. In fact, that was the general impression of those who had established themselves in the transport business. It was thought that those who were already established would be permitted to carry on as they were doing, because it was recognised that they were rendering good services in various country centres. But as it turned out, there was almost wholesale slaughter of many of those who were doing so much good for the community for whom they were trading. The railways were not carrying out their job, or if they were, their services were not to be compared with those rendered by the motor vehicle owners. The latter appealed to the board and asked for a reconsideration of their case. In many instances the board were able to give a further extension of six or 12 months. The board, however, did not carry out the intention of the Act, that is to say, they did not visit the centres to inquire into the services that were being rendered to the community. Truck drivers had built homes for themselves and had a good connection, and were giving good service to the district concerned, but suddenly found they had lost their business. They then had either to sell their homes or abandon them, and endeavour to find a new living in the metropolitan area. The residents of the districts concerned were left without that service, and were put to a great deal of inconvenience. Some of the settlers had begun to build up the dairying industry, but were obliged to dispose of their cows, as they no longer had the use of trucks whereby to get rid of their cream. The rail-

ways have not been able to carry on the work that was given up. Those who were licensed as carriers should have had the right of appeal. Had they been able to put up their cases I am sure it would have been to the benefit of all concerned. I hope something will be done to provide for action of that kind. It may be that numbers of these people no longer desire to carry on that work. In several instances other truck owners have come into the centres, and to some extent been able to carry out the work that the original truck drivers were engaged in. It is a great pity we did not provide in the original measure for an appeal, when we felt it should be done, as that would have made for the convenience of those living outback. No doubt there will be many instances in the future of people who desire to make better use of our roads and the facilities that are at hand for the development of the land. What is required is help in the form of transport facilities. If such facilities can be increased, it will stem the flow of people to the metropolitan area, and no doubt will be of great assistance to those who desire to follow their occupations in outback places. I support the second reading.

**HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.5]:**

The right of appeal is allowed in respect to most things, and I fail to see why it should not be allowed in this case. I do not want it to be said of me that I am throwing bouquets at the Transport Board. I have every reason to believe that the members of that tribunal are anxious to do the best they can for the State, and to discharge their duties in a conscientious manner. I have had the pleasure of appearing before the board on matters connected with my province, and they have always been satisfactorily adjusted in the interests of the people concerned. I understand this particular question is affecting people in the Kojonup district. What affects Kojonup to-day may affect other parts of the State to-morrow. Whilst I give every credit to the board, I think there is such a thing as unconscious bias. I recently read a letter in the "Primary Producer" from a man who is a returned soldier, and stands very high in the esteem of all who know him. I have heard him speak. He wrote fully about this matter, and he greatly impressed me by the case he put up on behalf of his district. I fail to see why the board cannot do some-

thing to relieve the undoubted disabilities from which the district is suffering. It would be a wise and proper thing that the right of appeal should be given. It is not as though it was not recognised in the original Bill, because it was allowed there. True, it was allowed to those people who were already on the road when the board was established. I cannot see any reason for the remarks made by the Chief Secretary. Mr. Thomson had every right to bring this matter forward without being charged with having wrong motives. The hon. member did not desire to give any power to local authorities, but wanted authority vested in a magistrate, or some other person, who could deal with appeals. Magistrates have to deal with all sorts of questions. It is ridiculous to suggest that they would not be able to sift the evidence for or against in a matter of this sort. A magistrate is fully capable of inquiring into the rights and wrongs of a case such as might arise in this connection. The principle involved is an important one. I hope the House will support Mr. Thomson.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—BUILDERS' REGISTRATION.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

**HON. J. T. FRANKLIN** (Metropolitan) [S.10]: I support the second reading. The Bill will do good, both for builders and for the public. As an old builder, I realise it is time a measure of this sort was brought down. Doctors, plumbers, dentists, architects and others have to be registered, and those who are registered have had to qualify themselves for the position they hold. The Bill will not do any harm to those who wish to erect their own houses or business premises. It will afford them an opportunity to see that the work is carried out by competent people. It will ensure that the builder is a man who thoroughly understands his job. Such a man should be qualified not only to prepare an estimate, but to see that the work is carried out by his employees in a satisfactory manner. It is not the duty of a tradesman to see that the material is good and that the quality of the work is what it should be. The builder has a good name to maintain, and he re-

quires the support of the public so that he may continue to get contracts. With my long experience I know how local authorities pass plans and specifications, etc. In the Perth City Council we are lucky in possessing a competent building surveyor who has passed through all stages of the trade, and is able not only to pass plans and see that they conform to the by-laws, but to read specifications and see that they set out the class of work to be performed. After the plans are approved by the Perth City Council, the building surveyor issues his permit. While the work is going on, he visits it on various occasions. If the job is a large one he goes to it every week, and if it is a small one he may see it at the beginning and once or twice afterwards. Some people have complained that this Bill will debar persons from carrying on the occupation of a builder. In greater Perth itself I gather there are about 200 builders. If we think any more are required, we shall have to put the brake on.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Is that the object of the Bill?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Not to put the brake on, but to see that the builders themselves are competent to discharge their duties, and that they are prepared to give a fair deal to the person who employs them. The Bill will not impose any hardship upon builders because there are already sufficient in the metropolitan area for all requirements, and in the outlying districts there are many other builders who will not be affected by the measure. Those who are practising their profession at the time the legislation is passed will not be required to submit themselves for examination before registration. The same principle was adopted in dealing with the plumbers, architects and so forth. The Bill will not increase the price of building and the very fact that there are so many builders in practice will prevent any ring from becoming established in connection with the industry. The erection of certain types of building makes it essential that the builder shall see to it that the workmen he employs are competent. If the person who supervises the work is not competent himself, there is always a danger that some of it will be skimped. If a builder has a good reputation, he will be anxious to see that any work entrusted to him is carried out in a proper manner. He

will see to it that the foundations and other parts upon which the life of a building depends, are properly constructed. I am afraid that the Bill, which was introduced by a private member, requires some further consideration because Clause 6 provides that there shall be a board of three, two of whom shall form a quorum. In view of that, surely an error has crept into Subclause 3 of that clause because, after providing that a quorum may lawfully exercise the powers vested in the board, it says, "notwithstanding any vacancy or vacancies in its membership." I hardly know how to construe that clause.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We will not get down to that.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Possibly not. Obviously if there are vacancies in the membership, there cannot be a quorum at all. There cannot be a board, because the chairman could not vote and give a casting vote and say that the two votes represented the votes of a quorum.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What is the object of the Bill? To improve building?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Yes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And you suggest registering all the jerry-builders, and keeping others out!

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: That principle was followed in regard to plumbers and others who have been dealt with by legislation. It may be said that two wrongs do not make a right, but in this instance I do not think there is anything wrong, because the Bill will provide the person who is finding the money with additional security and assure that work will be carried out in a satisfactory manner.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The person finding the money will see to that.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: That is not always so. I heard of an instance—I will not say where it occurred—of a person who agreed to find money by way of a mortgage on a building already existing, but first said that he would require an architect to examine the building to see that the job had been carried out properly. The architect who undertook that duty evidently knew his business. When he arrived at the building he asked for a shovel. He went to the foundations and by means

of the shovel found that instead of the foundations being constructed to the proper depth, they had been laid on the surface or within three inches of the surface. Obviously, with brick or wooden buildings, it is of importance that the foundations shall be sound. Architects' specifications set out that the foundations shall be excavated to the virgin soil. In Western Australia it is necessary to go down 18 inches or more before coming to the virgin soil, which is the yellow sand.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The incident you have related referred to one of the builders you are going to register?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I indicated that I would not say if that happened in Western Australia or elsewhere. The registration of builders is a step in the right direction because if a builder should do anything that was wrong, he would be brought up with a round turn by the board.

Hon. L. Craig: By a board of one.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: No, by a board of three.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Two men form a quorum and that means that one man may impose his will by his casting vote, so it is a one-man board.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I advocate a board of three members. I am wondering who will pay the expenses in connection with the work. The Bill has not been sponsored by the Government and the board will have to carry on with the work. I know that the Bill provides for a fee of three guineas to be paid for the examinations that will be held, but at the outset there will be no examinations, because those who are in the profession at present will be registered. Regarding the limit of £300 that is imposed by the Bill, that will not debar builders who are not registered from contracting to do work. Many houses are being erected and sold to the working classes at prices that do not reach £300, apart from the land.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Let the poor man's house be put up anyhow.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Anyone that would put up a shoddy house for a poor man would have no honesty in him. If the poor man can afford to pay a certain price only for a home, he should be pro-

vided with as strong and substantial a building as his money will permit.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is no harm in taking the rich man down!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I do not know to whom Mr. Holmes refers as a rich man. If he refers to himself, we all agree it will require a smart man to take him down. The Bill has my wholehearted support. It is a step in the right direction, and I hope members will realise the advisableness of following in my footsteps. It will not work any injury to builders. It will do more good than harm.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.28]: I strongly oppose the second reading of the Bill. The Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill was mild as milk compared with this measure. It is a terrible Bill. I can quite understand why the Government did not sponsor the measure. The members of the Government are very brave, but they have not the audacity to introduce such a Bill, especially with an election looming next year. The Bill amazes me. In country towns there are, as a rule, one or two builders only. If the Bill be agreed to, they will have a monopoly for many years to come. As Mr. R. G. Moore pointed out, the board to be appointed will be purely a one-man board. One man by his vote will have the power to call up any registered builder who may do something of which the member of the board does not approve. With the advantage of his one vote that board member may exercise the power of deregistering the builder. Mr. Franklin claims that the Bill will improve building operations. Anyone who calls himself a builder to-day can demand to be registered. In effect, the advocates of the Bill say that everyone who builds houses to-day is a competent builder. We cannot allow legislation of that sort to go through the House, and indeed I wonder why the House has wasted so much time on it. I hope the Bill will be thrown out as quickly as possible. I oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.31]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday next.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 8th October, 1935.*

	PAGE
Question: Sewerage, Claremont, septic tank instal-	
lations ... ..	1028
Mining, oil leases ... ..	1028
Bills: Health Act Amendment, 1A. ... ..	1029
Electoral, Com. ... ..	1029
Adjournment, Royal Show ... ..	1044

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

## QUESTION—SEWERAGE, CLAREMONT.

### *Septic Tank Installations.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Water Supplies: Is it incumbent upon a resident in the Claremont electorate who has installed and is using a septic tank, to connect up to the departmental sewers, or is it sufficient if he pays the annual sewerage rate?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES replied: Connection to sewer is compulsory. Septic tanks serve w.e.s. only whereas deep sewers dispose of all household wastes.

## QUESTION—MINING—OIL LEASES.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Mines: 1, How many leases or prospecting areas for oil are in existence at present in