

hon member is not speaking to the motion. He is giving reasons and explanations and is distinctly out of order. If you allow him to do that, we shall all want to give reasons and explanations and where will it end?

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

Ayes	9
Noes	28

Majority against 17

AYES.

Mr. Davies	Mr. Money
Mr. Durack	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Angwin	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Scaddan
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Simons
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Gibson	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Mann
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

[Committee resumed.]

Mr. MANN: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the proposed new clause: "Inspectors of liquors appointed under the Health Act shall be officers of the branch of the Police Department established under this section."

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I trust the amendment will not be carried. We have done very well in the past under the Health Act without dealing with the inspectors in the way proposed.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	13

Majority for 8

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Carter	Sir James Mitchell
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Simons
Mr. Lambert	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Money
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Collier	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; proposed new clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 3.0 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 5th October, 1922.

	Page
Questions: Forests Commission Report	1004
Electoral, South-East Province	1004
Return: Industries Assistance; Loans	1008
Bill: Perth Markets, 2B.	1009
Motions: Soldier Settlement, Select Committee, publication of proceedings	1005
Narrogin-Dwarka Railway, to inquire by Select Committee	1026

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

QUESTION—FORESTS COMMISSION, REPORT.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Premier: 1, Has the Forests Commission which was appointed in December of last year completed its labours? 2, If so, has he received the report? 3, If not, has he any idea whether it will be presented before the close of the present session? 4, Will he request that it be presented at an early date, so that members may have an opportunity of analysing it before the Forests Department estimates are considered?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Premier) replied: 1, I am advised that the report is nearing completion. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3 and 4, The Commissioners expect to present their report shortly.

Hon. P. Collier: You are optimistic.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL, SOUTH-EAST PROVINCE.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: What was the cost to the Government of the last contested election for the South-East Province?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The cost to the Government of the last contested election for the South-East Province was £138 13s. 11d. (Note.—This total is exclusive of the preparation and printing of rolls, and of advertising, this work being performed as a whole for the State.)

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT SELECT COMMITTEE.

Publication of Proceedings.

Capt. CARTER (Leederville) [4.35]: I move—

That the Standing Orders having reference to the publication of the proceedings of a select committee be suspended so far as to permit the select committee appointed to inquire into the question of repatriated soldiers and land settlement policy to exercise its discretion in admitting the Press to its meetings.

I am presenting this motion in a formal way at the request of the select committee, the Chairman of which is unable to be present at the opening of to-day's sitting. The Controller of Soldier Settlement agrees with the committee that publicity of this nature would be advantageous to the work of the committee.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.36]: Unless the hon. member can give some more substantial reason for suspending the Standing Orders, I do not feel disposed to agree to the motion. It has been a well established practice in connection with the work of select committees that the Press should not be admitted to their deliberations. During the 17 years I have been in the House, speaking from memory, last year was the first occasion on which the Standing Orders relating to the conduct of select committees, were suspended and the Press admitted. That was in connection with the inquiry into the war gratuity bonds. It seems that in agreeing to the motion on that occasion, we established a precedent which it is sought to follow on every occasion. To say that the Controller of Soldier Settlement, Mr. McLarty, considers it would be advantageous to have the Press present is entirely beside the question. What has the matter to do with Mr. McLarty? I am surprised that such a reason should be urged. Because a Government official considers it would be well to have the Press present, the House is asked to set aside its Standing Orders and depart from a custom that has been fairly rigidly followed through all the years.

The Minister for Mines: What would you expect Mr. McLarty to say if he were asked whether he objected to the Press being present?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course he would say no. I would be surprised if he were asked.

The Minister for Mines: How would they know unless he was asked?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I cannot imagine such a question being put to him. It is not one for his consideration or opinion. I am not opposed to the admission of the Press if sufficient and satisfactory reasons can be given, but to suspend the Standing Orders, without any reason being given, save that Mr. McLarty thinks it would be advantageous, would be altogether unjustified. If other reasons can be given I shall not object to the motion, but I am not prepared to support it on the ground stated.

Hon. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [4.40]: The rules governing select committees are very strict, because the House agrees to the appointment of select committees in order that they might report to the House and not to any other person. Standing Order No. 352 provides that the evidence taken by any select committee of the House and documents presented to such committee, which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee or by any other person. We have no right to whittle away the rules of the House by giving concessions to certain committees and probably denying them to others. If we are going to have one select committee open to the Press, let us have all select committees open to the Press and amend the Standing Orders accordingly.

The Minister for Works: There are good reasons why they should not be open to the Press.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The House appoints a select committee to examine a certain project, and to report to the House and to no one else. Therefore we would not be acting in our own interests if we gave this select committee the power sought.

Mr. CORBOY (Yilgarn) [4.42]: As one of the members of the select committee, I can tell the House that, in requesting this permission, we had in mind that very many people were interested, either directly or indirectly, in the work of the committee, and they would probably not know what transpired unless reports were published in the Press from time to time. It is obvious that the usual report of the select committee would not be readily available to a vast number of men directly interested in this investigation—men away in the backblocks.

Hon. M. F. Troy: You have the power to advertise for witnesses.

Mr. CORBOY: I believe we have advertised for witnesses, but the point which the member for Mt. Magnet overlooks is that many of the men interested will not give evidence. On their behalf one man will probably give evidence, and they will certainly desire to know what has happened at the inquiry.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Standing Orders do not permit you to admit the Press.

Mr. CORBOY: I am not very much concerned whether they are admitted or not.

The Minister for Mines: There could be only two reasons for making such a request

—one to get undue publicity, and the other scavenging for evidence because you have not got any.

Mr. CORBOY: That statement is worthy of the Minister who made it.

The Minister for Mines: It might be.

(Capt. Carter: Absolutely unwarranted, too.

The Minister for Mines: That does not answer it.

Mr. CORBOY: I will answer it by saying that no member of the committee desires any publicity at all. In fact, the Minister can have my place on the committee.

The Minister for Mines: Not for yourselves; I am not talking about that.

Mr. CORBOY: I would certainly use any influence I might have to prevent the committee from scavenging for evidence. No committee should do that. If the evidence is not forthcoming in answer to the usual advertisement in the Press I, for one, would not scavenge for it.

The Minister for Mines: You ought to know what you are after. Go in and get it.

Mr. CORBOY: The Minister thinks everyone must descend to the methods he adopts for obtaining information.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Why not ascend to his methods?

Mr. CORBOY: Those concerned in the investigation should know what is happening during the inquiry. For that reason they should be informed through the Press as the best means of conveying to them what has transpired. Apart from that I am not concerned as to whether the Press are admitted or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pillbara) [4.47]: The Standing Order is right. It is not necessary to have the Press present at the inquiry. Many people have the foolish idea that, when they see their names and remarks in the Press, it makes them great. We should not encourage that. The Committee can get all the information that is required by way of evidence without the presence of the Press.

Mr. PIESSE (Toodyay) [4.48]: One phase of the matter has been overlooked. When a select committee is appointed it is often considered necessary to inquire into the administration or working of a department concerned in the inquiry. It is only reasonable, in the present instance, that the controller of this department should desire to see the light of day let into his work. I sympathise with him.

Hon. P. Collier: The report will deal with the controller.

Mr. PIESSE: If I were he, I think I should request that the fullest publicity be given to the inquiry.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. J. Seaddan—Albany) [4.49]: On a previous occasion I objected to the suspension of this Standing Order to permit of publicity being given to evidence taken by a select committee. There must have been good grounds for the framing of such a Standing Order. Parliament is a body that is entitled to obtain

any information it requires for the purpose of conducting the business of Parliament as well as the administration of public departments. It should, therefore, be permissible for Parliament to make inquiries in directions which it may not be desirable should be reported in the Press. There have been select committees which, by permission of the House, have been enabled to suppress evidence submitted to them.

Hon. P. Collier: Publicity might prevent them from getting evidence.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A select committee suppressed evidence at one time in a way that was injurious to the public.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That may be so. The object of appointing a select committee is to enable a committee of Parliament, instead of Parliament as a whole, to make a definite inquiry into a definite subject, and to report to Parliament for its guidance. Until such time as Parliament has been acquainted with the conduct of affairs in question, it seems to me it is not right that the public should be informed of what is happening. It may appear that there is a desire to suppress information, but that is not the point. A select committee is authorised by Parliament to make inquiries in certain directions. It should be in possession of certain material facts to enable it to prosecute that inquiry. No publicity should be necessary to induce people to tender the requisite evidence. The select committee ought to be able to know where to look for it, and ought to be able to get it. If a committee is in that position, there is no necessity for anyone to know what is transpiring. It is Parliament that should know. Select committees are frequently confused with Royal Commissions. A Royal Commission is appointed to enable the public to obtain information which might not otherwise be available. A select committee is appointed from amongst the members of Parliament to give attention to definite matters, and to submit recommendations to Parliament for its guidance. There must have been good ground for making a Standing Order of this kind. I know of no special warrant in this case for departing from it. Mr. McLarty may want the inquiry opened to the Press, but that does not alter the position. It is Parliament that requires the information. The House authorised five of its members to make this inquiry, call for papers and persons, and to report to Parliament. When their work is over Parliament is in a position to give as much publicity as it likes to the inquiry, and to suppress what it likes. It is entirely a matter for Parliament. A body organised for public purposes may desire to submit a certain matter to a special committee, but until that committee reports no one knows the direction in which the inquiry has been made. It would be undesirable that publicity should be given to the special work undertaken by every select committee that is appointed, for if that were so the minds of sections of the community might be prejudiced. Evidence

might be given in one direction, but not in another, and thus a false impression may be created. Parliament has power to make inquiries in directions in which no one else can inquire. We should keep the Standing Order intact, hold the inquiry, and let the report be submitted to Parliament.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [4.53]: So much has been said to the point that it seems to be idle persiflage to say anything more. I do, however, ask the House to stand by its Standing Orders. A request of this kind should not be treated lightly, and very substantial reasons must be put forward for departing from this Standing Order. It has been rightly said that a select committee is merely an instrument of this Chamber, and that the Chamber may inform itself as to whether any action has to be taken one way or the other. To allow the matter placed before a select committee to be made known to the public generally through the Press would, in the absence of direct authorisation of this Chamber, be a breach of the privileges of the House. The report has to come to this Chamber first. It must not reach the public beforehand, or prejudice the public mind one way or the other. I trust, therefore, the motion will not be carried. No good reasons have been put forward why we should pass it. The committee may advertise for witnesses as much as it desires. The question hinges upon the publication of the evidence. It is desired that the Press may be allowed to publish the evidence taken by this committee. Evidence might be obtained on one day that would be advertised all over Australia. On the following day a condensed report may be published which may reach only a limited number of people. A false impression may then get abroad, and even the minds of hon. members may be prejudiced, for the matter may be prejudged, before the report is received, owing to the statements that have been conveyed through the Press.

The Minister for Works: And a first impression lasts.

Hon. T. WALKER: Undoubtedly. Hon. members are thus informed through the channels of the public Press, instead of through the channels provided by this Chamber. It is a very unwise and dangerous principle. No injustice will be done to anyone by waiting until the House first of all informs itself as to the result of this inquiry. I understand that Mr. McLarty desires that the information should be made public.

Mr. Davies: No objection was raised.

Mr. Corboy: How do you know that?

Mr. Davies: That was stated by the member for Leederville.

Hon. P. Collier: Mr. McLarty thought it would be advantageous.

Hon. T. WALKER: There could be no objection to it if it did not violate a very important Standing Order. This House should first of all be informed before the public, so that it may not be swayed by Press reports that may be prejudiced. It

must have a calm and collected mind to consider the evidence and reports when they reach it. If the case requires publicity, it will receive adequate attention in that respect when it reaches this Chamber. That is the time when we can act simultaneously with the report as we think fit.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [4.56]: If full reports were published in the Press possibly no false impression would be created in the minds of the public. We know, however, that the amount of space at the disposal of a reporter is governed by the exigencies of the publisher. He may be permitted to give a full report, or he may have to cut it down. If the report is cut down, the condensation that takes place is based upon the judgment of the representative of the paper, who may have no knowledge of the documents that are before the committee, which may throw a very different light upon each portion of the evidence. Leading articles are often based upon condensed reports, and, possibly quite unconsciously, have created a wrong impression of the matter at issue.

Hon. T. Walker: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The only advantage to be gained by giving publicity to the evidences may lie in the publication of what may be termed the spicy parts of the evidence. The evidence is thus read by persons who would otherwise not know anything at all about the case. Some good might come of it in that direction. But the inquiries usually held by select committees are not directed in channels of sensationalism. An exception to this is the committee of which the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) was the chairman. The publication of the proceedings in that case brought the matter before a number of people in the State, and gave them an opportunity of considering whether or not they should give evidence at the inquiry. The investigation certainly accomplished a great deal of good. In the present instance the House should adhere to custom. It is entitled to be the first to read the evidence and receive the report. When that time arrives all the publicity that is needed will be given to the subject. It is no uncommon thing to find that when the evidence taken before a special committee is published, further evidence has been brought to light which has a bearing upon the question. When, however, an inquiry is held and the reports, probably written by a gentleman who may only possess a superficial knowledge of the subject, are cramped into the limited space that is available, more harm than good may ensue as a result of publicity.

Capt. CARTER (Leederville—in reply) [5.1]: I feel that I almost owe an apology to the House for not having placed the case for this relaxation of the Standing Orders more clearly before hon. members; but I was given to understand, if not in so many words,

that the permission would in this case, as in that of the select committee which inquired into the disposal of war gratuity bonds, be granted as a mere matter of form. The member for Collie (Mr. Wilson), who is chairman of the select committee, asked me to point out specially to hon. members that there is no objection from the people most concerned, namely the department. When I mentioned the Controller of Soldier Settlement, I mentioned him as head of the department. I will say now—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot introduce new matter now. He can only reply to arguments used.

Capt. CARTER: In the course of the debate I have been accused of attempting to whittle away the rules of the House. There was no attempt at that.

Hon. T. Walker: I do not think anybody accused you of that.

Capt. CARTER: I am quoting the words of the member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy), who said, "We have no right to whittle away the rules of the House."

Hon. T. Walker: That applies generally.

Capt. CARTER: I am not taking it personally. Speaking on behalf of the select committee, I say we are not attempting in any way to take away the rights of the House. In this case we are asking for what has been done in other cases, and especially within the last 12 months. The reason here is precisely the same as that which operated in the case of the War Gratuity Bonds Select Committee. That committee was, and this committee is, concerned with the settlement of soldiers in a repatriated state in their home country. As the Minister for Works has pointed out, the former select committee did a tremendous amount of good; and I venture to say that one of the main avenues open to that committee was provided through the Press, in the many points of publicity which were afforded to the committee's proceedings. The same thing will happen in this case. The select committee are about to deal with the complaints of soldiers, complaints which have been laid in this Chamber by the member for Collie, and which have resulted in the appointment of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to proceed on those lines.

Capt. CARTER: I am simply replying to what has been stated.

Mr. SPEAKER: That argument was not put up

Capt. CARTER: I feel that I have been placed in an invidious position, because I was given to understand that this would be a purely formal motion. Had I followed my own course, I would simply have moved the motion formally. However, I was specially asked to make the statement I did regarding the Controller of Soldier Settlement; and accordingly I made it. It has been misinterpreted. I made it merely with the object of giving, not any individual, but

the department concerned, and the State of Western Australia, an opportunity of defending themselves from the serious accusations made on the floor of this Chamber and circulated throughout the country. For that purpose the utmost publicity is essential. Many men in this State are affected by the inquiry, and there is a probability that a considerable proportion of them will miss the two-inch or three-inch advertisements in the papers. Their attention would, however, be attracted if the proceedings of this committee were given similar publicity in the Press to that which was given in the case of the War Gratuity Bonds Select Committee. I hope the motion will be carried.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	21

Majority against .. 11

AYES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Johnston
Mr. Carter	Mr. Latham
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Corboy
	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. O. C. Maley	Mr. Troy
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Simons
Mr. McCallum	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

RETURN—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE, LOANS.

Hon. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.11]: I move—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing in detail the amounts advanced by the Government since June, 1914, by way of loans (apart from loans for mining development) to local companies, co-operative companies, and private institutions within the State, the interest paid, if any, and interest owing, to the 30th June, 1922.

I do not know what the attitude of the Government is towards the motion, but I do not think there should be any particular objection to the return being provided. A considerable amount of money has been advanced by the Government in the manner indicated by the motion, and it is important that the House should have the information asked for. The House is alleged to have

control of public moneys, and therefore has a right to this information.

Mr. A. Thomson: I am glad you said "alleged."

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope the House will not have to insist on the information being furnished. If the motion is not definite enough, I am prepared to accept an amendment making it more definite. In my opinion, it is very important that the House should have this knowledge concerning the financial arrangements of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narogin) [5.13]: I support the motion, and only regret that it is marked by an exclusion.

Hon. P. Collier: What is that?

Mr. JOHNSTON: It says "apart from loans for mining development."

Hon. P. Collier: A return of all those loans is laid on the Table every year. There is such a return now on the Table.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Would it include allowances to oil companies?

Hon. P. Collier: It would include all loans granted under the Mining Development Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Then it would not cost anything to include that information in the return.

Hon. P. Collier: That information is on the Table already.

Mr. JOHNSTON: In that case I shall not move an amendment as I had intended.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.14]: I had not an opportunity of discussing this matter with the Premier before he went away. It seems to me that the return asked for, while giving hon. members information to which they are no doubt entitled, would mean a very great deal of work; and I do not think much of the information could be made available this session. If the House insists upon the information being obtained, it will be attended to.

Hon. P. Collier: There will not be so much work attached to it. The items have not been so numerous.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A great amount of assistance has been given to industries throughout the State.

Hon. T. Walker: It simply means a reference to the ledger.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not propose to oppose the motion but I would like members to remember that it will take some time to prepare the information sought.

Question put and passed.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Angelo) took the Chair.]

BILL—PERTH MARKETS.

Second reading.

Mr. MANN. (Perth) [5.17], in moving the second reading said: This Bill is a very short one consisting of 11 clauses.

Mr. Munsie: That is a fairly long one.

Hon. P. Collier: Especially for a private member.

Mr. MANN: As a matter of fact, the City Council already have most of the powers that are asked for in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why do they want those powers given to them again?

Mr. MANN: It is desired to put the matter in more definite form. They have most of the powers with the exception of those outlined in Clauses 6 to 8.

The Colonial Secretary: It is putting the acid on the growers.

Mr. MANN: About 1913 the Scaddan Government were in power and they decided upon the erection of city markets. Arrangements were made for their construction; property was purchased and plans prepared. A change of Government brought about a change of policy and the markets were not constructed.

Hon. P. Collier: That was only one of the minor losses the community suffered through the loss of that Government.

Mr. MANN: Be that as it may, the position is that the City Council were asked to undertake the responsibility of providing markets for Perth and the metropolitan area. The council agreed to construct them and have gone into the matter seriously from every point of view and have made exhaustive inquiries. They have considered it from the standpoints of the producers, the distributors and the consumers. They have also made inquiries, I understand, from the Railway Department regarding the engineering difficulties. As to the question of the site—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If the council want their Bill, they should relieve the Government of the site already purchased.

Mr. MANN: The council in their wisdom have selected a site, although it is not mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: Where is it?

Mr. MANN: The site extends from Pier-street along Wellington-street to Lord-street, down Lord-street to Moore-street, with also the option of the council's yard in the last mentioned street. The area embraces about 11 acres.

Hon. P. Collier: Does it include all the houses and the hotel in that area?

Mr. MANN: I think so.

The Minister for Mines: I do not think the hotel is included.

The Colonial Secretary: No. they have not secured that yet.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You had better take the site that was purchased, if you want your Bill.

Mr. MANN: The council have done all they possibly can up to the present, pending the passing of the Bill. The council are to be commended regarding the efforts they have made. It must be conceded that they have exhibited a certain amount of enterprise and have agreed to shoulder certain responsibilities which may or may not be theirs. In their desire to secure the proper distribution of produce they have decided to undertake

the erection of these markets. The present markets in Perth are privately owned, and although nothing can be said against the management of them—it is not alleged they are not properly conducted or that the growers to-day do not get a fair deal. It is alleged, however, that more economical distribution and better control could be obtained if the whole of the markets were brought under one system and one control in one area. For that reason, the council desire to secure the powers requested in the Bill. Already the council have power to establish and control markets under the Municipal Corporations Act. Further powers are desired, however, which will enable the council to borrow money, deal with it as is necessary and also to make certain regulations.

Point of Order.

Mr. Johnston: On a point of order. I notice that the Bill proposes to impose additional taxation not only upon the ratepayers of Perth, but also as a charge on the whole of the producers who wish to send their goods for sale in Perth. In view of the fact that the Bill will impose an additional charge of £250,000 on the ratepayers of Perth, I consider the measure is a money Bill, and requires to be introduced by Message from the Governor. I ask for a ruling on the point.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This has nothing to do with moneys secured from the State.

The Deputy Speaker: According to Todd, page 194, "No private member is permitted to propose an Imperial tax upon the people; it must proceed from a Minister of the Crown or be in some other form declared to be necessary for the public service. But any member may bring in a Bill to impose heavy local burdens." That being the case, I must rule that the member for Perth is in order and can proceed with the introduction of the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: I submit that if the only authority is Todd, the point taken by the member for Williams-Narrogin is a good one, because it has been recognised for some years that Todd, as an authority on Parliamentary procedure, is obsolete. The authorities that can be quoted are Keith and May, but to go back to a day when Todd was a recognised authority is to go back generations.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Some of his decisions still hold good.

Hon. P. Collier: Not only are Todd's views out of date, but our Standing Orders specifically uphold the point raised by the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Hon. T. Walker: I would draw the attention of the Deputy Speaker to Clause 6 of the Bill, which shows that the burden to be imposed is not a local one but one which will be felt all over the State. It sets out that, notwithstanding anything contained in the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, or in any other Act in force at the present time, all prescribed articles of merchandise which are brought into the metropolitan area in quantities of a value of more than £1 for sale,

otherwise than direct to the consumer, shall be, in the first instance, sold in the market.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is followed by a clause which says that no goods shall be sold in the market until the market tolls have been paid.

Hon. T. Walker: This is a direct tax on the producers in every part of the State. Under it even the banana growers of Carnarvon will be taxed.

The Deputy Speaker: Do I understand that it is desired to disagree with my ruling?

The Minister for Mines: It is not your ruling. It is Todd's.

The Deputy Speaker: It is really a decision by May given before the Joint Committee on the Despatch of Business, in 1868-69.

Hon. P. Collier: I will bow to May, but I will not give way to Todd.

Mr. Johnston: I will not move to dissent from the ruling, but the point raised by the member for Kanowna as to the tax imposed on the producers of the State is an important one.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And it includes the manufacturers as well.

Mr. Johnston: I ask for a ruling on the second point.

The Minister for Mines: On a matter such as that under discussion it should be remembered that we have a Constitution Act providing the procedure governing the imposition of taxation, and the Bill has financial clauses which are from Clauses 63 to 72. The basis provided is that a Message is required for the purpose of a Bill imposing any taxation or other impost for any purpose within the State, which is levied and paid into the Consolidated Revenue fund, for disposal by the Crown. No money can be voted out of Consolidated Revenue, once it is obtained by Message from the Governor, unless a similar Message is presented by a Minister. If the point now taken holds good and means that an impost by a local authority requires a Message, then the Municipal Corporations and Road Boards Acts would have to be repealed. We would have to do that because power is given under those measures to impose taxation.

Mr. A. Thomson: Private members never bring in amendments to those Bills.

The Minister for Mines: But they could if they chose. The difference in the methods of Parliamentary procedure, under the British Constitution as against other countries, is that we place definite responsibility on Ministers of the Crown. We expect them to introduce legislative proposals, and on all questions of the obtaining and disposal of funds there must be a Message from the Governor.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I could not understand the Government taking the responsibility of bringing down this measure.

The Minister for Mines: We are not fathering it. The Bill does not require a Message, although it may require a good deal of consideration.

The Minister for Works: It may require the consent of the ratepayers later on.

The Minister for Mines: The municipal council cannot raise funds for the purpose of undertaking this work unless they first submit it to the ratepayers. Therefore all necessary protection is provided, except perhaps in respect of the producers outside the City of Perth.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Perth may proceed.

Debate resumed.

Mr. MANN: When interrupted, I was explaining that the City Council have already tried to establish and control markets. The council now ask for further powers than are given them under the Municipal Corporations Act. They desire that from the date of the establishment of the market for the sale of prescribed classes of goods, those goods must be sold through the market, and that it shall be an offence if those goods are sold through any other channel.

Mr. Latham: Does that mean an exclusive right of sale?

Mr. MANN: Yes, in respect of those goods sold within the municipality.

Mr. A. Thomson: They are not ambitious!

Mr. MANN: They are going to spend the money, and so should have a say in the control.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They have a blooming cheek to ask us to give them authority to borrow money without the consent of the ratepayers.

Mr. MANN: That does not affect the House, although it affects the ratepayers. I think hon. members should give me a chance to get through this unpopular brief.

The Minister for Mines: Unpopular only in detail.

Mr. MANN: If we are to have the market, someone must undertake its construction. The Government have not done the job; on the other hand they have asked the City Council to undertake the work.

The Minister for Mines: On our site.

Mr. MANN: The council have gone as far as they can go without the power provided in the Bill.

The Minister for Mines: They have gone further than they ought to have gone.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Markets are becoming out of date.

Mr. MANN: Clause 2 is simply the interpretation clause.

Hon. P. Collier: We will give you that.

The Minister for Mines: No. Why should the City of Perth be defined as the metropolitan area?

Mr. MANN: Clause 3 gives power to establish markets. The council already have that under the Municipal Corporations Act.

Mr. Latham: Then let them use it.

Mr. MANN: Clause 4 gives them power to control certain streets and approaches. No exception can be taken to that.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, it can. They are not maintaining the streets they have. It is easy to break one's neck when walking along the footpaths.

Mr. MANN: It is to the credit of the council that when produce was scarce and prices high they did establish a market for the benefit of producers and consumers alike.

Mr. A. Thomson: At the request of the women.

Mr. MANN: At all events, it has been of great advantage to both producers and consumers. Now we come to Clause 6.

Hon. P. Collier: I would not touch that if I were you.

Mr. MANN: It merely gives them power to control the markets and the produce sold within the municipality. Can we ask any corporation to spend £100,000 or more, unless we give them control of the produce?

Hon. P. Collier: Even I could succeed in business if I had an Act of Parliament compelling people to come and buy from me.

Mr. Johnston: We never thought of that compulsion when establishing State enterprises.

Mr. MANN: I cannot understand members who support State enterprises opposing the Bill.

The Minister for Mines: Well, I can.

Mr. MANN: The City Council are prepared to spend their own money.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, they are not.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the ratepayers' money.

Mr. MANN: The council represent the ratepayers.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Since you are opposed to State enterprises, how do you explain your attitude in fathering the Bill?

Mr. MANN: I fail to understand the opposition to the Bill.

Mr. Richardson: You will understand it later.

Mr. MANN: The party here, representing the growers, desire some place where produce can be distributed and sold.

Hon. M. F. Troy: And we desire an open field.

Mr. MANN: They desire to dispose of the goods to better advantage than can be done to-day. On the other hand, the consumers are looking for cheaper supplies. The Bill represents a way to meet both desires; yet we have this opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: We are merely inquisitive about it.

The Minister for Mines: The council are to get all the profits.

Mr. MANN: And sustain all the losses.

The Minister for Mines: You can bet your life there will be no losses if the Bill goes through.

Mr. Latham: What about Clause 7?

Mr. MANN: Clause 8 is a simple provision.

Hon. T. Walker: What about seven?

Mr. MANN: Clause 7 is a proper clause. Would any member suggest that goods should be sold and distributed, unless the fees were paid?

Mr. Latham: We want to see the charges.

Mr. MANN: It would be unbusinesslike if there were no such clause in the Bill. Clause 8 is the usual penalty clause included in all such Bills as this. It is very necessary.

Mr. Richardson: That is why you create a monopoly.

Mr. MANN: Clause 9 is the ordinary clause to be found in Bills of this kind.

Hon. T. Walker: Where was there ever another Bill like it?

Mr. MANN: In prosecutions under the Customs Act it is not necessary to prove that the goods were smuggled. You just allege in the information that they were smuggled, and that is sufficient to put the defendant on his defence. It is all that is asked for here.

Hon. P. Collier: A very necessary provision.

Mr. MANN: It is very necessary. No honest man would take any exception to it.

Hon. P. Collier: No, but you can understand the cross-benches being opposed to it.

Mr. MANN: No honest person would oppose it.

Hon. P. Collier: Nobody except the Country Party, who are up in arms when called upon to pay.

Mr. MANN: I commend the clause.

Mr. Pickering: What about Clause 10?

The Minister for Mines: This is pioneer legislation. What is being done in Victoria?

Mr. MANN: It is not my function to draw parallels between the Bill and the legislation in any other State.

Hon. P. Collier: Certainly not. Let us strike out on new lines.

Mr. MANN: In Clause 10 the City Council seek power to borrow money.

Hon. T. Walker: Without asking the ratepayers.

Mr. MANN: The council represent the ratepayers.

Mr. Latham: Is it not usual to refer this sort of thing to the ratepayers by referendum?

Mr. MANN: It does not affect the hon. member. He does not represent Perth.

Mr. Latham: No, but I represent the people, and so it does affect me after all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Give the hon. member a chance to get on with the Bill.

Mr. MANN: It would appear that there has been some concerted action, outside the Chamber, aimed at the Bill.

The Minister for Works: No, no; don't say that!

Mr. MANN: But it does occur to me that something of the kind has happened.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are the only man I have spoken to about it.

The Minister for Mines: Even "the executive" have not considered it yet.

Mr. MANN: I only wish "the executive" would take more interest in it. If they did, hon. members on the cross-benches might get different instructions, might be told to support the Bill. Then, probably, there would be no further opposition.

Mr. Johnston: The executive might decide to issue instructions to the City Council.

Mr. MANN: If they did so, the council would take a proper stand. It is up to somebody, some institution, to resist the demands of "the executive."

The Minister for Works: Which executive?

Mr. MANN: There is only one executive known here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The executive is not mentioned in the Bill at all. I want the hon. member to stick to the Bill.

Mr. MANN: Well, if you will endeavour to keep hon. members quiet, I shall be able to get on with my task.

The Minister for Works interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister should set a better example.

Mr. MANN: Clause 11 is essential and speaks for itself.

The Colonial Secretary: What right have you to establish freezing works?

Mr. MANN: The hon. member has been clamouring for the Government to do something in his electorate in the way of disposal of fruit. He has asked not once but several times that the Government should establish freezing works in his electorate. To-day the City Council are prepared to undertake what he desires to see carried out, and yet he objects.

Hon. P. Collier: He always was a bit erratic.

Mr. MANN: I do not understand the attitude of members on the cross-benches. They too have been calling out for markets wherein to dispose of the produce grown in their electorates, and when we find that a body is prepared to undertake a work, they raise all sorts of objections.

Hon. P. Collier: It is because they would have to pay.

Mr. Johnston: The conditions are very hard.

Mr. MANN: The conditions are what I would call precautionary.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a very happy expression.

Mr. MANN: Do hon. members think that the municipal council of Perth will spend a large sum of money in erecting markets, freezing works and all the necessary appointments without taking precautionary measures to preserve their own interests? That is all they are asking and if they get what they desire they will be prepared to carry out their portion of the contract. Hon. members must blame themselves if no market is provided for the disposal of the produce grown in their electorates.

Mr. Latham: They will expect the producers to give themselves up body and soul.

Mr. MANN: That may be the hon. member's way of analysing the position.

Hon. P. Collier: Don't you know that the primary producers' executive are going to establish markets of their own?

Mr. Latham: You have more inside information.

Mr. MANN: If that particular executive should bring in a Bill as reasonable as the one I have submitted, they can expect to get reasonable support. I have explained the facts leading up to the introduction of the Bill; I have explained the Bill and the effect the establishment of markets will have on the producers, the distributors and the consumers. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Pickering: Is this the stage at which we can move to refer the Bill to a select committee?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not until the second reading has been passed.

Mr. A. Thomson: Then let us take it as read now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.50]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Mann: Why not let it go to a select committee?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not want it to go to a select committee.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	22

Majority against .. 11

AYES.

Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Richardson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Carter	Mr. Mann
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pickering
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Simons
Mr. Gibson	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Walker
Mr. Latham	Mr. Munroe

(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. S. Sampson—Swan) [5.55]: Notwithstanding the many defects in the Bill, I acknowledge with pleasure that it has at last come forward. It is long overdue. The growers have looked forward to some measure of control with regard to marketing. In its present form, however, the Bill is quite insufficient for the purpose of controlling and marketing products. Throughout, as mem-

bers will see, it is provided that the Council "may" do certain things, while in respect of the growers it is always "shall." There is nothing indefinite so far as the growers are concerned. The Bill does not set out the method of trading.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes, it does.

Mr. Mann: The council do not desire to trade.

Hon. P. Collier: Merely to control.

Mr. McCallum: Just to collect dues.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I mean as to whether produce shall be sold by private treaty or by auction. All produce which comes into the city, except that sold direct to the consumer, and is of the value of £1 or over, must go through the market.

Mr. Mann: Are you taking exception to that?

Hon. P. Collier: Why should I go to the market, and so break a contract I may have with a shopkeeper?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Exception may be taken to the fact that trade is restricted in this way, and it is easily possible to see that a burden will be placed on the shoulders of the producers. If producers desire to make private contracts with retailers, I submit they should be permitted to do so. The Bill does not disclose whether space is to be allotted to retailers or in what way the distribution of produce is to take place. I know something of the conditions which exist in the East regarding distribution. For instance, in Adelaide the growers themselves take their produce to the market and those growers are represented on the board of control. The fruit is sold direct to the fruiterers, storekeepers, barrowmen, and in fact to the retail traders who supply country customers. Where the grower deals direct, there is of course no additional burden beyond the mere payment of rent. In Melbourne private treaty is in vogue. The commission charged to the grower by the traders who dispose of fruit to retailers is 10 per cent. This will come as a surprise to those members not already aware of the fact. Undoubtedly the charge is very high. It is much higher than in Western Australia. In addition, transport charges are imposed, when the produce arrives by boat or train, or, alternatively, the grower brings in his own produce. In Sydney the same method of private treaty exists but the commission charged is 7½ per cent. There, too, we find an additional charge for transport. In communities like Perth, Auckland and Wellington, the method adopted is by auction. It remains to be proved whether private treaty or the auctioneering system is the better. A Perth company did offer some little time ago to permit the growers to test out these two systems, but, unfortunately, the opportunity was not availed of. The Bill refers to the provision of cool stores. It says the council "may" erect cool chambers. Before Parliament gives the council the privilege of controlling the marketing of produce

within this area, they should be under an obligation to provide cool chambers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You could not do that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A condition precedent to the granting of this privilege should be the provision of cool storage chambers of sufficient size to meet the requirements of the markets. Possibly a large cool chamber would not be necessary, but it is essential that one of reasonable size be provided; otherwise the growers must suffer. It has been claimed that the establishment of cool stores is not in the interests of growers. It has been urged that when a grower sends produce into the market and the whole of it is not sold, to place the balance in cool chambers until the following day is something in the nature of an unfair act towards fellow growers because the subsequent markets are injured; prices are reduced because of the presence of a quantity of produce in the cool stores. This argument is not sound. I ask that the provision of cool stores be made mandatory. It is an absolute essential of every market. No market of any size in Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, Auckland or Wellington is without a cool store. A very important omission from the Bill is that of representation for the growers. In Adelaide the growers have representation, and the same might apply in other parts.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The markets there might be under a trust.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In Melbourne and Sydney the markets are conducted by the municipal council who let the premises to the traders.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Melbourne municipal market was empty when I was last there.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A little auctioneering is carried on there now, but very little. The Bill makes no provision for representation of the traders. It is unfair to regard the traders—the auctioneering firms of Perth—as the enemies of the growers. It has often been stated and a good deal of evidence has been adduced to show, that the growers have not received fair treatment. In the metropolis, however, there is at least one company, the Producers' Markets Ltd., composed solely of growers, and naturally it is in the interests of their shareholders to extend the utmost consideration to those who forward produce for sale. Provision is made for the framing of regulations, but there is no limitation to the tolls which might be charged in respect of the produce sent in. Some such limitation should be included. The rentals for stalls and the necessary warehouse space are not expressed. We are asked to grant the Perth City Council this great privilege and monopoly without any assurance as to the charges to be imposed. We have not even the assurance that sufficient cool storage will be provided. I had hoped that the Bill would contain some reference to the cases or containers to be used, but

possibly this question might be dealt with under the by-laws. It is important that consideration be given to it. Under existing conditions, a case once used cannot again be packed with fruit. Ample opportunity will be given in Committee to consider the Bill, but I must express keen disappointment at the form in which the Bill is presented. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) has made out a wonderful case with the material at hand. His skilful choice of words in moving the second reading is worthy of praise.

Mr. Underwood: Worthy of a better cause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. Mann: That is a rather restricted compliment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member can accept it as a sincere compliment. I marvel at his ability to command such a fine collection of persuasive words in commending a Bill which strikes at the interests of growers and fails to protect them. A good marketing Bill is of the utmost importance, for it means much in the way of encouragement to growers, especially those near Perth. I acknowledge the good work of the City Council in respect to the kerbstone market. That is a part of the marketing scheme and growers have benefited from it. Everyone would welcome a Bill which would protect the consumer as well as the grower. It might be contended that the consumer is protected under this measure, but apart from the fact that ratepayers might be consumers, there is no reference to consumers. We should aim at amending the Bill to make it of utility to growers, consumers, and traders alike.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [6.10]: I cannot pay the Colonial Secretary the doubtful compliment offered by him to the member for Perth. I have never heard such lame statements made in this Chamber in a second reading speech. The Minister does not want municipal markets; he desires that the ratepayers of Perth should find the money to erect markets and then hand them over to the growers and traders. He complained that there is no provision in the Bill to give the growers representation in the management, and he added that surely the auctioneers should have some part in the management.

Mr. Davies: He also mentioned the consumers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They were a second thought; he did not suggest that they should take part in the management. The Minister also said that the amount of tolls and the rent of stalls should be fixed. How could these charges be fixed until we knew the class of building to be erected, the cost of it and the area of the stalls to be let? Very minute details would be required in order to be able to fix the amounts to be paid for the stalls. This is a matter for regulation. I think the Municipal Corporations Act makes provision for regulations for the sale of

goods, and such regulations have to be approved by Parliament.

Mr. Mann: Yes, Section 179.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: So Parliament has the last say as regards these charges. The Minister was somewhat astray in suggesting that it should be made mandatory for the council to provide cool storage. Does he think for one moment that any body of men empowered to raise up to £250,000 for markets would fail to provide the necessary requirements?

The Colonial Secretary: It is quite possible.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is it likely?

The Colonial Secretary: I would like it to be made a condition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no necessity to make it mandatory. I believe members of the City Council have sense enough to provide all the necessary requirements to carry on the trade.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Before tea I was replying to the Colonial Secretary. Most of his remarks dealt with questions outside the scope of the Bill. I will confine myself to the Bill.

Mr. Mann: Do not be too hard.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill contains a most extraordinary proposal. The City Council wish to have the city of Perth known as the metropolitan area. It was considered last night that the metropolitan area was comprised within a radius of 30 miles of the Perth Town Hall.

Mr. Davies: It is defined as the City of Perth here.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the city of Perth is only a small portion of the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: That would also interfere with the Traffic Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. It would interfere with other Acts also, in cases where the metropolitan area has been defined as that which lies between Midland Junction and the boundary of the South Fremantle electoral district.

Mr. Mann: It is desired to cater for the living the metropolitan area.

Mr. Richardson: It is very distinctly defined.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The City Corporation desire to define the city of Perth as being a metropolitan area.

Mr. Mann: I do not think that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: According to the definition of "the metropolitan area," it means the area embraced within the boundaries of the city of Perth. Every time the metropolitan area is considered in the future, people will be under the impression that it means, within the boundaries of the city of Perth.

Mr. Mann: I hope that is the worst fault you have to find with the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is all one wants.

Hon. T. Walker: That is only a slight blemish.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Perth said the markets were to provide for the produce of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Mann: To provide supplies.

The Minister for Works: That is the city of Perth only.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How can markets in the city provide supplies for the metropolitan area?

Mr. Mann: I take it the consumers and the distributors of the metropolitan area would go to the markets to buy their supplies.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some of them might do so.

Mr. Mann: They would be wise to do so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill goes on to provide what the City Council can do. Already powers are given under the Municipalities Act, but the powers embodied in this Bill differ considerably from those contained in that Act. The City Council desire power to make roads, drains, etc. Before the council can raise money for this purpose they now have to get the consent of property owners in the city of Perth, but the Bill departs from that principle.

Hon. T. Walker: It is a very dangerous departure.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill gives them power to make roads and drains without consulting the property owners.

The Minister for Works: And they seek power to construct railway sidings.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A railway siding could not be constructed without the consent of the Railway Department. Any municipality can rent a siding if desired for the convenient handling of material required for its use.

The Minister for Works: But why seek power to construct sidings?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It may be necessary to construct a longer siding than the Railway Department would be willing to put down. A railway siding is no good to any local authority unless the consent of the Railway Department is obtained to join it up with the railway system. There is one provision in the Bill which goes beyond what members would be prepared to pass. I refer to the sale of merchandise. The City Council seek power to prescribe the articles of merchandise to which the Act, when proclaimed, shall apply. These articles will be prescribed by regulation, and it may be 12 months before such regulations come before Parliament and can be altered in any way. They become law immediately they are approved by the Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Mann: You must give them credit for having some common sense.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Bill is passed it will be necessary for such merchandise to go through the markets if it is of a value exceeding £1.

Mr. Mann: It is not much use constructing markets if there are to be a number of small shops all round them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is all right. One of the principal uses to which the markets will be put will be for the sale of produce. No market gardener outside the area of the city of Perth will be able to sell his produce within the city of Perth to any fruitshop, vegetable hawker and the like.

Mr. Simons: Meat cannot be sold either.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Meat has to be inspected.

Mr. Simons: And vegetables too.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the meat is inspected before it goes to the market, it can be sold without going there. The greater proportion of the meat is inspected at the slaughter house, and there would be no necessity to force it through the market. It can go direct to the store or shop, where it is sold retail.

Mr. Mann: The Municipalities Act prevents the sale of fish except at the markets.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. There are only two places in the metropolitan area where fish can be landed. A market gardener at Jandakot, Osborne or Spearwood could not arrange to supply a fruiterer or a vegetable dealer with a cartload of his produce unless it was first passed through the markets, and he had arranged for its sale there.

Mr. Mann: Is that not in keeping with all metropolitan markets?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not affect the position. Is this the proper method to adopt? It must be sold in the markets.

The Minister for Works: That is it.

Mr. Johnston: And tribute must be paid to the City Council.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A man cannot sell the produce of his garden where he pleases. Orchardists frequently sell their fruit as it hangs on the trees.

Capt. Carter: And by contract too.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and before the fruit is ripe. It has then been sent to the metropolitan area.

Capt. Carter: It is the same with potato growers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under the Bill this could not be done.

Mr. Underwood: What about jam factories?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The same thing would apply.

Mr. Mann: Not if the stuff is not sold in the city of Perth.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Clause 6 says—

After the establishment of a market, notwithstanding anything contained in the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, or in any other Act in force at the passing thereof, all prescribed articles of merchandise which are brought into the metropolitan area in quantities of a value of more than £1 for sale otherwise than direct to the consumer, shall be in the first instance sold in the markets.

Every person who brings into the city goods of a value of £1, whether to be sold wholesale or retail, must first put his goods into the market, because they are brought into the city of Perth. This amounts to restraint of

trade and no Parliament would be justified in granting such power. It would have a tendency to prevent persons who wish by private contract to deal with their own goods from doing so. Once they get into the markets they are to be sold under the regulations made in compliance with the Act. It may be made compulsory that the goods shall be put up to auction, and an auctioneer may be appointed to sell them. If that were so a man would be debarred from the right to privately sell the produce from which he earns his livelihood.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think it is proposed to eliminate the auctioneer.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did not understand that from the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. Hon. members will, therefore, recognise that these are very extraordinary provisions to ask Parliament to grant to the city of Perth. Take the case of a man who has been in financial difficulties for some time, has run out of money, and brings into the market a cartload of produce. He has not for the moment the money with him to pay the market tolls. Under this Bill he will not be able to sell his produce until he has paid the tolls, no matter what the value of his produce. Before he does any marketing, he will have to go in for a bit of canvassing, looking for consumers of part of his goods in order to obtain the money to pay the market tolls. And then probably he would be arrested for illegal sale of his goods. Manufactured goods, for instance, cannot be hawked without a license under a penalty of £50.

Mr. Mann: Not exceeding £50.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The clause is very drastic as regards the seller of goods. There is another clause dealing with the sale of goods. If a complaint is lodged that a person has sold goods otherwise than as provided by the previous clauses—that is, if he has sold them direct to the consumer, or sold them outside the market—he can be summoned; and then it is not for the City Council to prove the offence, but the person charged must prove his innocence. The member for Perth in moving the second reading pointed out that these provisions are contained in other Acts. But two or more wrongs do not make a right. According to British justice, a man is innocent until he has been proved guilty, and those who lay the charge against him must prove his guilt. It is not for the person charged to prove his innocence. The borrowing power under the Bill is such as has never before been heard of in Western Australia. Under the Municipal Corporations Act, before any money can be borrowed for municipal purposes, certain things have to be done. Plans and specifications and full particulars of the works for the construction of which the loan is intended must be prepared, and deposited in the municipal offices for the inspection of ratepayers. Notices have to be published, and the intention of the local authority to go on the loan market must be advertised. Time is allowed within which any 20 property owners of the municipality can demand a poll of the property owners on the question of whether the

money shall be borrowed or not. In other words, the matter is entirely in the hands of the property owners of the municipality, for the reason that the property is the security for the intended loan.

Mr. Mann: I am advised that that applies to this Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not a lawyer, but I will read a paragraph referring to this matter—

Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 24 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, the council may at any time and from time to time borrow any sum or sums of money which in the opinion of the council, may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but so that the total sum borrowed shall not exceed £250,000.

What does that mean but giving the entire power to the council, without any reference to the property owners? The provisions of Part 24 of the Municipal Corporations Act deal solely with the borrowing powers of municipalities. The intention of the clause from which I have quoted a paragraph is as I state; otherwise the clause would have merely embodied the powers under the Municipal Corporations Act, which are perfectly satisfactory save in one respect, to which I have drawn attention here previously. It is that the sinking fund to be provided of not less than 2 per cent. in many cases does not provide sufficient funds to redeem the loan during its currency. Now, are we justified in taking away the rights of the property owners of the city of Perth as here proposed?

Mr. Underwood: The owners are agreeable.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know. They may be.

Mr. Mann: They have not raised any objection.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is all right. In reply to the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood), if the property owners are agreeable, then there is no necessity for the clause, because the property owners will not enforce the provisions of Part 24 of the Municipal Corporations Act.

Mr. Underwood: Are we not allowed to please ourselves?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member, being a property owner of the city of Perth, will find that he cannot please himself under this Bill.

Mr. Underwood: Don't you worry about that!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I take exception to that feature of the Bill because of the bad example which will be set to other municipalities. The measure gives the Perth City Council power to raise a quarter of a million of money without any reference whatever to the property owners of the city, whose properties will be the security for that quarter of a million.

Mr. Underwood: We can deal with that matter in Committee.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes; but it is a very dangerous provision. Before passing

the Bill we want to know whether the ratepayers of the city of Perth approve of the scheme. We should hear the ratepayers on the subject, and not the Perth City Council, because no member of that body has ever mentioned in a ward that the council proposed to borrow a quarter of a million without reference to the ratepayers. There is another phase of this market question. Some years ago an inquiry was held to ascertain the best site in the metropolitan area for the establishment of markets, the site most suitable to the convenience of the great majority of consumers. As the result of that investigation the Government of the day came to the conclusion that the best available site was one near the West Perth station, in Marquis-street; and the Government invested a sum of money in the purchase of land for a market site. Very little objection was raised at the time to the site purchased. Owing to a change of Government, as the member for Perth has said, and the war may have had something to do with it as well, the markets were not built. This House should insist, in passing a Bill for the establishment of markets, that use be made of the Government site, on which a large sum of the State's money has been invested after due consideration and the fullest inquiry, and after the obtaining of the views of experts.

The Minister for Works: What about East Perth?

Mr. Simons: That is the natural place for a market, being the natural junction of our railway system.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We must not consider Perth only as it is to-day. We must look to the future. There are more improvements and greater expansion of population between Perth and Fremantle than in the other direction.

Mr. Mann: Why are you considering the Government and their land? You have to consider the council, who themselves own a large area of land.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The council are going to borrow this quarter of a million, but I do not think they have a market site.

Mr. Underwood: The Marquis-street site should have been handed over to the municipality years ago.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When the question of the provision of markets is considered, it should be viewed broadly, and if that be done, it will be recognised that the Marquis-street site is the one that should be used, and the money expended by the State in the purchase of that site should be portion of the cost of the markets.

Mr. Mann: How would you capitalise it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The interest on the purchase money for the markets should be paid by the council and the general taxpayers should be relieved of the amount, if any, they are paying under that heading.

Mr. Underwood: They are paying something.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know if that is so, because some rent is being received in respect of buildings on that land. I hope the House will assist in making it compulsory that any markets to be constructed in the city of Perth—I cannot interfere with those owned by private people—shall be erected on the site in the purchase of which the State has expended a large sum of money. That would be a fair and just amendment to the Bill.

Mr. Mann: You should bear in mind that the council had to pay a large amount of money for an area they were compelled to take over.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In what way?

Mr. Mann: When they took over the gas works.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That was not a large area.

The Minister for Works: It was nothing compared with this.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Marquis-street site would suit the people better than the other site. Let hon. members have regard for the position at Subiaco. If the Perth people are not careful, Subiaco will be outshining the city.

Mr. Pickering: Why victimise the rest of the people?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then there is the position of Fremantle. Many market gardeners are going to Spearwood and the Fremantle end of the Jandakot district. We have to think of the metropolitan area as a whole and the market should be central.

Mr. Richardson: There is a lot of cheap land to be used, too.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Marquis-street site is suitable from a railway standpoint. The construction of sidings can be carried out cheaply, as well as everything necessary for the markets. The State should be relieved of the cost of that area which was purchased for market purposes.

Mr. Mann: Would you make that imperative, if the land could be used for some other purpose?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That land was purchased as a site for the markets and no better or more convenient situation could be obtained.

Mr. Pickering: That was the site recommended by the Commissioner of Railways.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not only by the Commissioner of Railways, but there were several conferences of producers and others interested who agreed upon that site before the purchase was made. There was no objection to it at the time and the majority of those interested in the establishment of markets realised that it was the best site.

The Minister for Works: Why has that site been turned down?

Mr. Underwood: The Government would not give it to the council.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not believe in giving it to the council. It should be given to the municipal authorities at the price the site cost the State.

Mr. Richardson: That would be a good bargain.

Mr. Underwood: The Council offered to take it at that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Government will insist on the markets being erected on this site and that the price of the site to the council shall be that paid for it by the State. I do not wish to see the State make any profit out of the deal, although the land is more valuable to-day than it was when it was purchased. There are several provisions in the Bill which should receive due consideration by the House and they should be altered before the measure is passed through Committee.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. H. K. Maley—Greenough) [8.5]: It may not be necessary for me to say why I voted against the motion for the adjournment of the debate as moved by my colleague, the Minister for Works. It will be understood that the object of the member for Perth in introducing the Bill is to assure it going to a select committee and being examined from every point of view, so that the interests, not only of the consumers and producers, but also of those who have businesses already established in Perth, may be considered. The Auctioneers and Packers' Association and produce merchants are vitally affected by the Bill. All those interests should receive proper consideration. The negotiations for the provision of city markets have been going on for a long time. A deputation from the city council approached the Premier regarding legislation to be submitted and asked that the Solicitor General should be allowed to draft a Bill for this particular purpose. The Premier told the representatives of the council that they should draft the Bill and it could then be reviewed by the Solicitor General. When this Bill was placed before me, I hesitated to take charge of it in its present form. While the negotiations were proceeding, I was approached by a deputation from the Auctioneers and Packers' Association, the Bridgetown Fruitgrowers' Association, and other interests, with the request that I, as Minister for Agriculture, should convene a conference between the council and the various bodies interested. The council said they had already met those bodies and they refused to meet them again. That was the position until I recommended that the Bill should be brought forward by the Council and introduced in this Chamber by the member for Perth.

Mr. Underwood: It should have been introduced by a Minister.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I recommended the adoption of the course I have mentioned so that the Bill could be referred to a select committee and the interests of those concerned investigated. I shall not delay the House at any length because I understand that the Bill cannot be referred to a select

committee until the second reading has been agreed to. Some of the powers sought under the Bill are, to my mind, somewhat debatable and of an extraordinary nature. It will have the effect of practically closing up some of the old-established produce merchants of Perth, because under Clause 6 no man can sell more than £1 worth of produce outside the market. Knowing as I do the quantities of chaff and grain that will be available for sale in the markets, when open trading commences, I realise that this provision will vitally affect the interests of the producers, not only in the wheat belt but throughout the fruit-growing districts. I merely rose to make this statement. The House should protect itself by appointing a select committee to inquire into the various interests concerned, and I ask members to allow the Bill to pass the second reading stage so that the select committee may be appointed straight away.

Mr. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [8.10]: In supporting the second reading of the Bill, I welcome the remarks of the Minister for Agriculture and congratulate the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) on introducing such a Bill. Many overtures have been made to the Government in the past to establish some better system of marketing produce. My constituency is a great fruit growing district and our trouble in the past has been the absence of some adequate system of marketing. We have been at the mercy of private individuals—I disagree with the contentions of the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin)—and private firms, and during my remarks I will show hon. members something of what has happened when fruitgrowers have sent their products to Perth for sale, and the discrepancies that have been recorded. I approve of the appointment of a select committee to go into these matters. I will place before hon. members proof of what I have said, and I am not afraid to mention names.

Mr. Mann: That information could be given to the select committee.

Mr. Mr. J. H. SMITH: I will put it before the Chamber to-night.

Mr. Simons: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I have a letter from Mr. W. McKenna, who is growing fruit at Balingup. He asked me to place this information before the House as proof of what has taken place when fruit has been marketed in Perth. The metropolitan area acts as the great distributing centre for our produce. The two firms affected are F. W. Lantzke and Berryman Bros. A consignment of 17 cases of apples were sent by Mr. McKenna to the Perth markets, six cases being despatched to Berryman Bros., and 11 cases to F. W. Lantzke. Exactly the same class of fruit was packed in all cases and they were taken from the same tables. I will read the result to the House. Of the six cases consigned to Berryman Bros. one case brought 11s., one 9s. 6d.; two brought 12s. 6d. each, making £1 5s.; one brought 12s. and another 12s. 6d.; giving a total of £3 10s. As against that, the charges were: Commission, 3s. 6d.;

railage, 5s. 5d.; cartage, 9d.; giving a net result of £2 0s. 4d. I do not desire to boost Berryman Bros., but in that instance, I consider the result disclosed that there was no ring operating. A small man could come in and buy his case of apples. It is well known that a ring does exist, and that its members buy the fruit at their own price, and so rob the producer. I welcome the Bill, because I think it will lead to better conditions. If the Government had accepted our overtures years ago and provided markets, the producers would have had a better chance to realise something for their labours, instead of being, as they are, at the mercy of the bloodsuckers in Perth. Now 11 cases of the same fruit were sent to Lantzke. Lantzke sold the apples in one 11-case lot. He showed in his return that the price obtained was 4s. 9d. per case, that the commission was 2s. 6d., railage 7s. 11d., cartage and handling 1s. 2d., total expenses 12s. 6d., net return £1 14s. 3d. If that is not an argument for a select committee, I do not know what is. Clearly there is something radically wrong. With the greatest pleasure in the world will I support the second reading.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.18]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	14
Noes	19

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lutey
Mr. Collier	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Corboy	Mr. McCallum
Mr. George	Mr. Munse
Mr. Heron	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Carter	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Plesse
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Simons
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Davies
Mr. Mann	

(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [8.22]: I voted for the adjournment at the start of the debate, because there are in the Bill many points which in my opinion require to be closely scrutinised by the Crown Law

Department. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) has pointed to certain provisions, and there are others, demanding serious consideration. I will not deny that the establishment of markets on proper lines in Perth would be of value; but that the Bill provides those proper lines, I stoutly deny. We have here clauses which will greatly interfere with that part of the metropolitan area without which Perth could not exist. Perth exists, not as a sort of culminating point, but merely to perform its services to the suburbs and the country districts. Those interests have to be considered. Then there are also to be considered other Acts which the Bill affects. Therefore, it would have been only just and reasonable if the adjournment had been granted. It may be argued that the select committee will get out all the essential facts. Still, that committee's task would be much easier if, on the main points of law and present conditions, competent direction could be obtained. The Public Works Department has a branch known as the local government branch. The officers of that branch are all trained men. The whole of their time is given up to the study of questions affecting local government. It is not unreasonable to claim that the Bill should have been submitted to those officers, so that when we again met it would be possible for me to convey to the House their considered opinions of the measure.

Hon. P. Collier: I have never before known an attempt to bludgeon a Bill through at the one sitting.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: An important Bill such as this, dealing with the capital city, should have been circulated, and opportunity given to members to study it before attempting to debate it on the second reading. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would not have opposed the first motion for adjournment had he entertained any idea that we were to have a long second reading debate such as we have had. It was generally understood that the Bill was to be referred to a select committee. But the House is not in as good a position to consider the advisability of sending the Bill to a select committee as it would have been had we had the advice of the Crown Law authorities and of my officers as a guide. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) has spent the greater part of his life in following direct action, and has not yet acquired the ability to combine direct action with those powers of reflection which no doubt he possesses. In consequence, he is over-ready to jump into the breach.

Hon. P. Collier: The Bill will go into the waste-paper basket.

Mr. SIMONS (East Perth) [8.27]: I hope the House will give every encouragement to the City Council in their endeavours to place on a logical basis the marketing of produce coming into their area. I am astounded at the embittered hostility the Bill has brought

forth. I cannot understand it, except on the theory that it arises from that general hostility to any innovation, anything that makes for civic improvement. One of the most saddening experiences I have had in the House is that every time a proposal involving a big enterprise or large expenditure is brought before us it is exposed to an almost insane fire of critical remarks and embittered attacks.

Mr. Lambert: What about the Bill?

Mr. SIMONS: If members wish to bring in something creative, they are immediately made targets for attack. Whenever, during the last 18 months, a big scheme has been launched here, members have busied themselves to discover how best it could be blocked.

Mr. Lambert: What about the Bill?

Mr. SIMONS: What about the Bill! The hon. member has a bill like a pelican's, and he is always sticking it in where it is not wanted. In Perth we lack co-ordination in the handling of produce. We have some members contending that a proposal launched eight years ago should not be subject to change, that because in 1914 evidence was taken which, perhaps, is not applicable to-day, we must adhere to what was done eight years ago. We must give the City Council an opportunity to review the question of the site of the proposed markets. No matter what evidence led the select committee to determine the site, it was a most illogical and uneconomical and unwise decision to say that the whole of the produce from the hinterland to be marketed in the city environs should be hauled right through the heart of the metropolis. If we review our great railway system we find we have four main lines coming into East Perth, one taking in the traffic from the goldfields main line and the eastern wheat-belt, another from the Great Southern, another from the Midland districts and the other from the South-Western districts. The logical point of distribution of the produce coming in by these big main railway arteries is the point at which the railways junction. I do not know whether engineers or land jobbers fixed the market site down in the west end of the city, but I should say they were certainly not engineers. It must have been some land jobbing considerations that decided to put the markets there.

The Minister for Works: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SIMONS: Then it was a very unwise choice of position.

The Minister for Works: It might have been, but it was not what you say.

Mr. SIMONS: It was not a position which could be justified on any ground of economy or commercial consideration. It certainly is not justified from any standpoint of engineering. The main point of our railway system where a great volume of passenger traffic is handled is the Perth central railway station, and it is proposed to confuse and congest that, the charges were: Commission, 3s. 6d.;

every ton of produce brought over our big railway arteries. Any engineer who tried to justify such a policy does not know his job.

The Minister for Works: You do not know the facts, my son.

Mr. SIMONS: It is most uneconomical to make of the Perth railway station a bottle neck through which we have to haul every carcass of beef, every cabbage and every turnip from the country. Although I have great reverence for the experience of the Minister, I maintain there is nothing economical in such a policy.

The Minister for Works: I simply said you do not know the facts, nor do you.

Mr. Lambert: Facts are strangers to you.

Mr. SIMONS: I am a stranger to the arts and wiles practised by the member for Coolgardie. No matter what the Minister for Works may say, the average layman knows there is nothing logical in unnecessarily hauling dead cargo right through the big passenger channels of this city. The logical place for establishing markets for the distribution of the produce brought from inland is where the lines come together, and that is near East Perth.

Mr. Richardson: That is the spot.

Mr. Marshall: Who represents East Perth?

Mr. SIMONS: It is very ably represented. If we study the trend of city development since 1914 when this old site was selected, we must realise that the business heart and main commercial arteries are trending westward. We have warehouses coming westward all the time; the mercantile centres and the great merchandising areas are coming westward, and to plant a produce market in amongst the mercantile establishments is against all the practice of modern cities. It has been mentioned by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) that the land purchased some years ago involved a big expenditure. Certainly it did. With perfect fairness the hon. member mentioned that the land had since increased in value considerably. It would therefore be a wise business procedure to dispose of that land at the enhanced price, the State getting the benefit of the unearned increment. I believe that site was wrongly selected, but I believe it could be disposed of to great advantage and without harm being done to anybody. In every big city we find the civic bodies and State bodies aiming at bringing together the scattered interests of every defined activity. The keynote of modern organisation in marketing and commerce generally is co-ordination, and unless we have our marketing system for the city co-ordinated and brought under one head, we shall never have any systematised handling of our produce. The position we are in to-day is we have two markets in Stirling street, two in James-street, two in Roe-street and one in Wellington-street. Altogether we have seven defined markets in different parts of the city. Apart from economy of handling commodities, let us look at it from the health

standpoint. Every market area is to a great extent a breeding place for flies. From a health standpoint it is uneconomical to have to apply fly preventive measures at seven different points.

Mr. Corboy: Do you want them at East Perth?

Mr. SIMONS: The point I wish to make is that if we centralise the markets at East Perth or in any other part of Perth—

Mr. McCallum: You will centralise the flies there.

Mr. SIMONS: The hon. member will be among them.

Mr. McCallum: Then I would blow you.

Mr. SIMONS: If we establish the markets at one point we shall be able to bring in economical methods to apply to the whole area and thus banish the fly problem at the markets. This is going to be one of the great advantages of the centralised scheme. If we centralise, we can apply to the one point of the city methods which cannot be economically applied to seven scattered points. Another question has to be considered: The examination of vegetables and kindred produce should be just as strict from a health standpoint as the examination of meat, and it should be of great advantage also from the standpoint of the Department of Agriculture. At present it is necessary for inspectors to visit seven different marketing points in order to ascertain whether pests are being brought in on the fruit and vegetables. If all the fruit were passing through one great receiving hopper, as it were, the examination and inspection and opportunities for tracing the source of any pest infecting the fruit would be considerably improved. From the standpoint of the producer apart altogether from the advantages of marketing and fair dealing, there is a lot to commend the centralised scheme. The Bill is not perfect, but I believe in its main essentials and general principles. The measure should commend itself to every member.

Capt. Carter: It has not been attacked on that ground.

Mr. SIMONS: Nor on any broad ground. I admit the Bill is not perfect, but with reservations which will doubtless be recommended by the select committee, I believe the general principles, after a close examination, will meet with the full approval of members of the House.

Mr. Latham: We shall not require a select committee after the debate is finished.

Mr. SIMONS: All the better; but I intend to say what I set out to say because it looks as if there has been an attempt to smother this Bill in its infancy.

The Minister for Works: There has been no attempt to smother it at all.

Mr. Corboy: They tried to smother all discussion.

Mr. SIMONS: We wanted a full discussion right from the start. I regretted to hear the Minister for Works reproaching the member for Perth as a man who loved direct

action. I do not think there has been any administrator in office in Western Australia who has been such an advocate of direct action as has the Minister for Works. I remember where there was a bridge at William-street and the Minister had it removed in the night.

The Minister for Works: It was done in the daylight and the council were notified by letter.

Mr. SIMONS: It was direct action of a most extreme kind and the letter was posted at a time when the postal authorities had no opportunity to deliver it before the demolition. The Minister for Works has given many examples of direct action, and yet he reproaches the member for Perth on the same score.

The Minister for Works: I did not intend it as a reproach.

Mr. Latham: You do not suggest he is going to demolish the markets in the same way.

Mr. SIMONS: He might try to talk them into demolition, though he is hardly likely to bring them down by sheer physical force. The member for North-East Fremantle mentioned that the House should be more solicitous of the rights of ratepayers. This Bill has been under review for several days, and I have not heard of one ratepayer having protested, and I live amongst the ratepayers of this locality.

Mr. Johnston: We only got the Bill to-day.

Mr. SIMONS: The matter has been discussed in the City Council and among the marketing people of Perth—

The Minister for Works: There have been no newspapers to give us reports of the council proceedings.

Mr. SIMONS: We had some wonderful newspapers during the strike. Some 15 or 16 ratepayers have approached me as a metropolitan member and asked me to support this measure. This alone gives me an indication that the Bill has not been kept quiet or hushed up as some members would have us believe.

Mr. Mann: There have been several deputations and conferences.

Mr. SIMONS: It has been a matter of broad public discussion for at least a year, and the Bill represents the culmination of a long series of discussions. The member for North-East Fremantle said the rights of the ratepayers should be protected. This is the position we should take up: The ratepayers have duly accredited representatives to whom they have given powers. These representatives are the city councillors and they are responsible to the ratepayers of the city. They have to answer for the authority they are asking from us. I do not think it is the function of members who live many miles from Perth to show such a new-born solicitude for the ratepayers of the metropolitan area. All the functions of the City Council have been derived from the ratepayers, and the council are for the time being the custodians of the interests of

the ratepayers. It is not our function to question the wisdom of the City Council in a matter of this sort. I hope, therefore, that the Bill will receive the full support of members, and that the modifications which the select committee contemplate will make of it a very passable measure, which will put Perth in line with all the cities of the Eastern States and with practically all the cities of the world. The successful cities of modern times are those which have aimed at common sense co-ordination, and this pooling of the products of the community for intelligent marketing and advantageous handling will represent a very long step forward in the art of co-ordination. I do not believe we shall have any serious opposition from those who give the measure close attention, especially after the report of the select committee is presented to the House for consideration.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.45]: The member for East Perth (Mr. Simons) was certainly sparring at arm's length with the Bill. It is a very cheeky and clumsy conspiracy to obtain further power for the City Council.

Mr. Mann: You do not give them credit for honest intentions.

Hon. P. Collier: You are afraid to let the people judge for themselves. You want to bludgeon the Bill through on the first day.

Mr. LAMBERT: I know nothing of their intentions, but it is sufficient for me to know that we are dealing with the City Council. There is of course a great deal in co-ordinating our merchandise and handling it properly in centralised quarters. The Bill, however, goes further and ignores all the principles of finance in regard to the rights of taxation as embodied in the Municipal Corporations Act. It seeks to give the City Council an absolute monopoly to market merchandise for all time. It is not necessary for me to read Clause 6.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the clauses of the Bill on the second reading.

Mr. LAMBERT: That clause gives the City Council full and absolute power to handle certain specified goods. Power is sought to frame regulations whereby any merchandise can be brought under the authority of the City Council. We have heard the big drum beaten by my eloquent friend, the member for East Perth, and we have heard of the desires of the City Council for central markets, but we have heard nothing as to the protection of the producer who will send his produce to the market, and hand it over to a band of bungling bumbles whose powers should be carefully and properly circumscribed before they are given any more.

Mr. Mann: Did you hear the member for Nelson speak on the Bill?

Mr. LAMBERT: I am usually greatly impressed by the speeches of that hon. member. I was just as much impressed to-night as I have usually been, so that the member for Perth will now know how much I was influenced by his remarks. This is a matter

which affects the foodstuffs of a big consuming community. It will also affect all the eatable produce sent in to the metropolitan area. It is an impudent and cheeky conspiracy to give power to the City Council.

Mr. Mann: The Government asked them to take over the responsibility.

Mr. LAMBERT: I know. Ever since the Government have been in office they have frittered away every vestige of the responsibility of government.

Hon. P. Collier: And have selected other people to do their work for them.

Mr. LAMBERT: They have appointed Royal Commissions in great number, and have even gone so far as to ask the member for Perth to saddle himself with the responsibility of this iniquitous measure, which constitutes an insult to the intelligence of members.

Mr. Mann: I do not wish to shirk the responsibility.

Mr. LAMBERT: We will see that he does not do so. Before this Bill sails into smooth water it will have a stormy passage.

Hon. P. Collier: He will not know his bantling.

Mr. Mann: I think his bark is worse than his bite.

Mr. LAMBERT: Not one clause in the Bill has merit enough to warrant the appointment of a select committee to deal with it. I am opposed to making the slightest departure from the principle guiding the borrowing powers of municipalities. No municipal corporation should be allowed to borrow a quarter of a million of money without referring the matter in the ordinary way to the ratepayers, the people who own the taxable property of the city. The member for Perth, who for the time being sits in the Nationalist nest, should have greater regard for the interests of property owners than he has so far displayed.

Mr. Mann: They are not objecting.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that. We have only had the Bill before us for a few minutes, and they have had no opportunity of objecting. They do not know that it affects the finances of the metropolitan area to so great an extent, or that it will give the city bumbles power to spend a quarter of a million of money without reference to them. The whole thing is monstrous.

Mr. Mann: You should commend their enterprise.

Mr. McCallum: Their cheek.

Mr. LAMBERT: And their impudence.

Hon. P. Collier: They should clean up their streets and make their footpaths.

Mr. LAMBERT: If they had some regard for the elementary principles of local government, and showed that they could make ordinary footpaths and drains which would not endanger the bones of almost every citizen using the highways and byways of the city, it is possible we might allow them to run sanitary depots and other things. Until then we must hesitate to give them any additional power such as would be given by this Bill.

The whole principle of local government, as the power is delegated under the Municipalities Act, is monstrous. It is absurd to ask an honorary body of bunglers to manage the affairs of a municipality. That is going back to the dark ages. If the city affairs were run by three good engineers or commissioners, on the money that is collected from the rateable property, and spent as it would be, judiciously and scientifically, we should probably have one of the finest cities in Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a beautiful city ruined by bunglers.

Mr. LAMBERT: We have one of the most disgracefully kept highways in any city in Australia. It is akin to the old Spanish rubble roads of centuries ago. Harvest-terrace remained for years an eyesore and a disgrace to any community, and was only patched up recently because a pistol was virtually held at the head of the City Council, which was compelled to do the work.

Mr. Mann: That is hardly fair.

Hon. P. Collier: They have defaced the face of nature.

Mr. LAMBERT: They sit in an abstract kind of way and talk airily about town planning and the city beautiful. They have no more conception of the city beautiful than an aboriginal. They have now induced a private member to bring here an impudent demand, that we should hand an unrestricted power to these town bumbles to control all the edible goods that come to the metropolitan area. The thing is unthinkable. The member for East Perth (Mr. Simons) set up many high ideals. He chastised members because they could not take a big conception of this scheme. He urged us to be large and expansive in our views upon a matter of this kind, but he had not proceeded five minutes before he descended to the most miserable parochial view by claiming that the scheme should be established in his own constituency. What a broad conception of National ideals! In any other place they would be established in a bottle neck. If the neck were like that of the hon. member it would indeed be a bottle neck.

Mr. Simons: You are going well.

Mr. LAMBERT: If it is seriously contemplated that we should waste the State's money by referring this Bill to a select committee, it should at least be one that would serve as a working basis. The Bill should have some semblance of common sense and decency. It has no semblance of either. It represents a conspiracy to give these bungling bumbles power that was never contemplated. No man in his senses would arm such a body with so much power. The City Council have had a taste of payable monopolies, in the electric lighting supply.

Mr. Pickering: They did not make a bungle of that.

Mr. LAMBERT: No. If we give them the right to handle all the merchandise that comes into the metropolitan area they will not make a bungle of that either.

Mr. Simons: It is a bold proposal.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is. I intend to vote against the submission of the Bill to a select committee. I would welcome the idea of a big central market, having regard to our railway system, but until we have placed before us a measure embodying the necessities of the metropolitan area, and the fundamentals of common sense, it is not worth wasting time and money over the matter, particularly when we are dealing with the City Council.

Mr. LATHAM (York) [8.58]: It is apparent that members intend to deal with this measure without submitting it to a select committee. It does not appeal to the party to which I belong.

Mr. Mann: Are you speaking for the party?

Mr. LATHAM: I am speaking for myself.

Hon. P. Collier: The executive have not seen it.

Mr. LATHAM: We do not worry about the executive. They do not dictate to us.

Mr. Mann: Do you say it does not appeal to the party?

Mr. LATHAM: It does not. Markets are needed in the city, and I hoped we should have a proposition placed before us that would be of benefit to the community. I will vote against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [8.59]: I protest against some of the arguments that have been put forward. The member for East Perth (Mr. Simons) condemned some members because they dared to criticise certain stages of the Bill. This Bill was only presented to us to-night. It is not giving members a fair opportunity to discuss it to rush it through in this way. I want to enter a protest against any such action, because this Bill is taking precedence of many other measures awaiting consideration. Very few members except those immediately interested in the municipality of Perth have had any opportunity of knowing beforehand the provisions of this particular measure. There is a certain degree of arrogance shown by the persons putting forward the Bill in that they take to themselves the term "metropolitan area." The metropolitan area actually extends from Midland Junction to Fremantle, as we know. The Bill represents one of those innocent little things of which the House must be careful. In the near future we shall probably have a small amendment proposed bringing under this measure the whole of the districts which actually constitute the metropolitan area. My own electorate does not wish to be included under this Bill. However, I believe in the principle of the measure. I believe that with a proper Bill, duly considered by a select committee, the Perth City Council would be capable of managing a market successfully. From my experience of metropolitan councillors I say that they are as good men individually as are members of this House; and I want to declare that.

Mr. Simons: Well meaning men, too.

Hon. P. Collier: Well meaning men with limitations.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They give their time and their capacity gratuitously. Looking around this Chamber I observe that the great majority of members here have graduated in the municipal councils.

Hon. P. Collier: That is why the municipal councils are now so poverty stricken. All the cream has got here.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Many members of this House are still connected with municipal bodies. I propose to deal with one or two phases of the Bill. One provision which strikes me as somewhat severe is that the Perth City Council shall be authorised to declare any public street a market reserve. No previous speaker has alluded to that point.

Mr. Mann: It is a necessary precaution.

Mr. RICHARDSON: But there must be a safeguard to it. The Perth City Council may not at all times consist of such good councillors as compose it to-day. There must be a proviso to prevent future councillors from possibly going to extremes. Clause 6 has been the subject of discussion to-night. Practically the whole of the produce consumed in the suburbs west of Perth has to come through the city of Perth, and therefore I strongly object to Clause 6 in so far as it provides that all produce coming through the Perth municipal district must pay a toll before it can be sold. The whole of the produce coming to Subiaco must go there either by rail, or else by road from Osborne Park, and therefore must pass through the Perth area. As a result Subiaco will be subject to a fine, because its people reside outside the Perth municipality.

Mr. Mann: The clause does not say "brought through," but "brought into."

Mr. RICHARDSON: Can one bring anything through a district without bringing it into the district? This is another of the innocent little provisions that now and again come before the House.

Mr. Mann: You do not think there is an attempt to deceive the House, do you?

Mr. RICHARDSON: No, I do not. I am drawing attention to these matters in order that the House may not be deceived. The Bill lays it down that the Perth City Council may "prescribe" for the Perth market the following: Fruit, vegetables, fish, meat, poultry, butter, eggs, dairy produce, chaff, hay, corn, straw, or other products or provisions. Whilst I am prepared to assist the Perth City Council by every reasonable means to secure produce for their market, I cannot agree to such a clause.

Mr. Mann: To what do you take exception?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Particularly "other products or provisions." "Provisions" means practically everything that we eat and drink. If the Perth market is to take the whole of the provisions used by the residents of the metropolitan area, where is the thing going to end? The member for East Perth

(Mr. Simons), naturally, urges the extension of the market into his area. He put up good arguments, too. One thing he urged was that if the municipal market went to East Perth, there would be a concentration in that locality of the seven markets now existing, which would mostly be done away with. But let me point out to the hon. member that the same thing would happen if the municipal market were established in West Perth.

Mr. Mann: The member for East Perth said it would do away with the bottle-neck.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is why I shall object to the Perth market being built in the East Perth area. The experts of the Railway Department tell us that all produce coming in by rail must come into the main yards, as there is no room to lay down another line from East Perth into Perth.

Mr. Mann: The main yards are going to East Perth.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Notwithstanding that, it is claimed by the member for East Perth that if all produce has to go into the Perth station and thence on to West Perth the effect will be to create a block in the bottle-neck. No matter where the Perth municipal market may be built, it will be necessary to bring the produce into Perth station; and certainly a more severe block will be created if the produce has to be shunted back from Perth to East Perth. Therefore, and also because of the market site purchased by the Government at West Perth some years ago, West Perth is the better proposition for the market. Another consideration is that the extension of the city is now westward. Thus a market at West Perth would be much more central for the city as a whole than one in East Perth. The Perth City Council must recognise that a very large proportion of the supplies comes in from Osborne Park and that therefore it would be better for the railways if the West Perth site were adopted. I was not prepared to take up the discussion to-night, because I had not seen the Bill previously. Consequently, I speak now after merely glancing through the measure. However, I hope it will go to a select committee. I believe quite a number of persons are anxious to give evidence. Whilst this House, in my opinion, is leaning too much towards select committees and Royal Commissions, yet on this occasion I shall support the appointment of a select committee, so that we may know exactly where we stand and what we are doing when the measure comes up for further consideration.

On motion by Mr. Corboy, debate adjourned.

MOTION—NARROGIN-DWARDA RAILWAY.

To inquire by select committee.

Debate resumed from the 14th September on the following motion by Mr. Hickmott—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the advisability of con-

structing the Narrogin-Dwarda railway, and that all work on that line be suspended pending report of committee.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [9.14]: In dealing with this motion the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) passed quite a number of strictures upon the actions of the Government generally and upon mine in particular. I can quite understand that the hon. member feels very much disappointed at the idea of a railway which he has so much at heart, and which had actually been started, being stopped for reasons which to his mind were not conclusive. Therefore I take very little notice of some of the statements made by the hon. member, since I know that his goodness of heart was overcome by his sense of grievance. It is not necessary for me to go into the genesis of the Narrogin-Dwarda railway. The line was fully discussed years ago, and it was passed by a former Parliament. Its construction has been retarded by various causes into which it is hardly necessary to enter. I take up the attitude that although it is right and proper to say that regard for the promises and actions of previous Governments should not be entirely and without reason set aside or even hindered, still incoming Governments have a duty, as well as a right, to make such inquiries as they may think fit. If they should find that there are reasons for alterations, such as that complained of by the hon. member, it should be their duty to act accordingly. In this particular case there was no hesitation so far as the Government were concerned, nor is there now, in agreeing that the line should be dealt with. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott) introduced a deputation to the Premier and drew his attention to the great diversity of opinion in that neighbourhood, as to whether the route proposed to be followed was the right one.

Hon. P. Collier: When was that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think it was on the 11th August of this year. The line was already being proceeded with. We had a gang of between 30 and 40 men engaged in work in connection with the line, and sleepers had been ordered to be cut at the State Sawmills and stacked along the line ready for operations to be commenced. There was no intention of trying to defraud those who have built their hopes on the construction of this line, of the work. Had not the member for Pingelly brought this matter forward, I would have been going ahead to-day to be in readiness for plate-laying when the rails arrived from Great Britain.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Angelo) took the Chair.]

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Pingelly brought it forward in 1916.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am dealing with the recent position so far as

the department I control was concerned. What happened before that, hardly affects my point.

Hon. P. Collier: Certainly it does. The hon. member protested in 1916, and notwithstanding that, the position still remains.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the Leader of the Opposition says that the protest was made in 1916, I will not deny it, but the line was started under instructions from the Premier to get on with the work. I was getting on with it. Whatever promise was made in 1916, was revived in August of this year. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Johnston) with a deputation waited upon the Premier to explain their views.

Mr. Johnston: The Premier promised to push on with the work.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As soon as the member for Pingelly waited upon the Premier with his deputation, and as soon as he gave notice of his intention to move for a select committee to be appointed to inquire into this question, it became the duty of responsible Ministers of the Crown to consider the position. Immediately that took place, as can be found by reference to the files—the report of the advisory board which had been referred to by the hon. member, was sent for by myself, by the Engineer-in-Chief, and by the assistant engineer, Mr. Tindale. We made inquiries from the Surveyor General, Mr. H. S. King.

Hon. P. Collier called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The existence of that advisory board's report was unknown to the Engineer-in-Chief, to Mr. Tindale, or to myself until it was brought under our notice by the hon. member. How it came to pass that it was not brought under the notice of the Works Department is not clear. We were informed that no such report existed. I can only take it that Mr. King, who gave that information to the Engineer-in-Chief, had forgotten about it. In the meantime, I referred the matter to the Premier, because I wanted to know where I was to go to with the line, as I did not desire to waste money. When the Premier found that I had not received the report of the advisory board, he got to work and I duly received it. I went through the report and found that while the board did not deal with the line from Dwarda to Narrogin itself, they dealt with a line from Dwarda proceeding to the northward, the idea being that it would reach and serve the rich lands along the river bank and enable soldiers and others settled in that vicinity, on what is known as Michael Brown's property, to be more favourably situated by having a railway more conveniently placed than the one proposed from Dwarda to Narrogin.

Mr. Johnston: And which they had not inspected.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was stated in the report they recommended an extension of 13 miles northward from Dwarda to serve the settlers along the river and to some distance north and south of it, as well as up the Hotham Valley to Coajatakin Pool. It is true they did not condemn the route from Dwarda to Narrogin.

Mr. Johnston: Nor did they inspect it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is true that it might be taken from their report that they suggested a spur line to Coajatakin Pool. It can be argued that way and I make that admission, because I want to be fair.

Mr. Johnston: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When we have professional officers and, in addition, a Minister who knows something about the construction of railways, it is the duty of each of us to examine the question, not in any circumscribed manner, but in order to see how it affects the whole district adjacent to the proposed line. The only thing that could be done in the circumstances was to bring the matter under the notice of the Premier. There were only two courses that could be pursued; either I was to go on with the line as proposed originally from Dwarda to Narrogin and ignore completely the advisory board's report, or suspend action for the time being and inquire more closely regarding the line to Coajatakin Pool. In view of these facts, there could be only one course to pursue unless one was criminally foolish and was prepared to waste State money. Therefore, on receiving instructions from the Premier, I gave orders to suspend the work. I think about 22 men were engaged on the line and we transferred them to the Nyabing-Pingrup extension. I admit it was probably an awful step to take in the eyes of the member for the district, and that he probably thought we could not retract. Let me tell the hon. member, and the House as well, that if we received instructions to go on with the line to-morrow, by Monday next I could have operations in full swing, and all that would have been lost would be the few weeks involved in making the full inquiries.

Mr. Johnston: Will you do that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will tell you about that directly. I want to show the House and the country, so far as it is interested, that officers of my department realise that their duties are more than to draw their salaries and sign minutes. I can say that the officers who have been dealing with the railway have advised me, and through me the Government, as to a course which is calculated to place the Government in a better position to judge than they were in before. I do not know at present what will be the result of the investigation by the officers dealing with the line, but I can say that I have reason to believe that it will lead to results.

Hon. P. Collier: Are they still making inquiries?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have tabulated their report and the House is now making the inquiries. The line has been

gone over and they have been making inquiries to see whether the line itself can be deviated further north for a distance of about five miles. Should that be so, we will be able to keep faith with those who have shown such concern in this matter and give the people to the north of the line a railway within reasonable distance of cartage. I do not know whether that will prove to be right, but I have reason to believe it will be so. At the same time, the member for Pingelly has asked for the appointment of a select committee, and until that motion is dealt with, it will be impossible for us to do more than to get ready, if it be so decided, a draft Bill to place before the House for permission to deviate the line for a distance of five miles northwards. The present Act only authorises a deviation of one mile to the north or the south. If, as the result of the investigations, the engineers find that they can secure a better grade or serve the people better by deviating for a greater distance, they should have the opportunity to do so. I hope the member for Williams-Narrogin will realise that he has allowed his outraged feelings to overcome his sound judgment for the time being, and that this difficulty is not so great as he imagined. I advise him to wait and see the result of these investigations.

Mr. Johnston: We have been waiting since 1914.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Perhaps so. The Government have no objection to the appointment of a select committee if the House deems it advisable. We will furnish all the information as quickly as possible, but I ask the House to come to a decision quickly. I do not like having these operations hung up in the air. We desire to be ready for the work and if it is to be deviated to the north, as I have indicated, it will not matter. Already some £840 worth of work has been done on the line and it is not desirable to have any portion of that money wasted. Of course, if it should be shown by the evidence before the select committee that it is advisable to take the other route, the £840 will not be wasted. However, I want to get on with the work. I have the men, the plant, and the money, and so I do not like the delay. But I do not want the member for Williams-Narrogin to run away with the idea that I have done more than indicate possibilities. He must not send out messages saying that I have promised anything, beyond the offer to give the select committee every information. In my opinion probably the solution of the trouble will be found by asking the House to give us a deviation of five miles instead of one mile. Then, perhaps, we shall be able to make everybody happy.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.32]: I gather from the remarks of the Minister that the Government are supporting the motion for a select committee. If that be so, it reveals in full measure the extraordinarily lackadaisical methods which characterise the administration of the Government in matters of public concern. Here we have a railway which

was authorised in 1914. There was never any question about the route of the line until the middle of 1916, when the Labour Government were succeeded by the party now on the Treasury benches. It was in the first month of their tenure of office that the member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott) brought under the notice of the Minister for Works the question of deviating this line. That was in July or August of 1916. Full of the zeal and energy which is generally associated with youthful experience of important office, the Minister for Works decided that he would not only review the route of this line as requested, but that he would also give full consideration to the routes of all railways authorised by the Labour Government but not then constructed.

The Minister for Works: There was no harm in that, was there?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, except that it was characteristic of the Minister. He was going to review, not only the decision of the Labour Government, but the decision of Parliament by whom each of those lines, including route, had been sanctioned. The Minister for Works had decided to set himself up in judgment, not only upon the policy of the Labour Government, but also upon the Parliament which had authorised construction of the line.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Each of them recommended by the advisory board.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, everyone of them. On the 6th October, 1916, the Minister wrote a minute to his Under Secretary as follows:—

All these will be submitted to the Railway Advisory Board, so P.W.D. should have comprehensive précis of the position ready for submission, and also their views. So instruct.

The Minister for Works: That is all right.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Very much all right. The Minister was going to review the routes of all those lines authorised by Parliament. I can understand the Government deciding to reconsider the question of what course a line should take when the matter is brought up in the House, or a request made by a member or by any considerable section of the community for a deviation of the route. But this was a gratuitous desire on the part of the Minister to review the routes without any request having been made by anybody, except the member for Pingelly—and that was confined to this line alone. Because the hon. member asked for a reconsideration of this particular line, the Minister thought, "Well, there might be something wrong with all the lines authorised by that party." Pursuant to the request by the hon. member the question of the route received consideration from the Government. There the matter rested until a few months ago, when the request for the construction of the line was renewed by those interested, and the Government decided to begin the work. When the work began the question of route was again raised by the member for Pingelly. The Minister commented upon the proposal for an alteration of route to the effect that there should be no tinkering with it, that the line was begun, and that construction should be pro-

ceeded with. Then we had the acting Premier most emphatically declaring that, it having been decided to begin the construction, the Government would proceed to complete the line. The Minister for Works endorsed that view, and the Premier, in response to a large deputation of something like 40 persons, also declared that the line should proceed to its completion.

Mr. Johnston: That was on the 11th August.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Suddenly the work was stopped after £840 had been expended. But this is the point, showing how complete and thorough is the administration of the Government departments affected: After the work had been proceeding for several weeks and £840 had been expended, it was stopped, and it was only then discovered that an advisory board had been appointed in 1920, and had made a recommendation to the Premier for a deviation of the route. Three responsible officers, Messrs. Lord, Anketell and King, constituting the advisory board, had lodged a report, the existence of which, we are told, was unknown to the Minister for Works.

The Minister for Works: Quite correct.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How are these things done in a well conducted department? A board can be appointed, necessarily by some responsible Minister, can investigate the matter, can submit a report to the head of the Government, and that report is pigeon-holed, lost or forgotten, and, unconscious of its existence, the Government, two years later, proceed to construct the railway!

The Minister for Works: Mr. King, one of the signatories, told us there was no report.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Well, how are these things done in this well administered department?

The Minister for Works: Apparently the report did not reach the Works Department.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not holding the Minister responsible for his want of knowledge of the existence of that report. Still, somebody is responsible. But for the agitation for cessation of work on that railway, the line would have been carried to completion. It is a mere accident that the construction of the line is not well advanced, and that we are not saddled with a railway traversing a route not the most suitable. How are affairs run in the department when these things can happen? And, in order to complete the farce, we find that the Government say, "We do not know, we have no opinions of our own in regard to the route." That is what the Minister has said, "I am awaiting instructions from the select committee. My officers, keen and alert, are ready to make an advance on this line, north, south, east or west—it is all the same to them. My officers, whose one object is to serve the country, are straining at the leash to carry out instructions." But, unfortunately, the Minister and the Cabinet have no definite ideas on the line at all. That is what the

Minister has told us to-night; he is awaiting instructions from the select committee.

The Minister for Works: No, no.

Hon. P. COLLIER: When the Minister for Works was speaking on the extension of the Wyalcatchew-Mt. Marshall line he made an important statement respecting the construction of this line under review. He said—

At the present time a Bill is being prepared for submission to the House to show where, in the judgment of those responsible as advisers to the Crown, a deviation of this line should be made.

The Minister made that statement in reference to this particular line.

The Minister for Works: And it is quite correct.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He says a Bill is being prepared for the deviation. So they must have already decided where the line is to go, or they could not prepare a Bill for the deviation. Yet the Minister is asking the House to agree to the appointment of a select committee to decide upon the route.

The Minister for Works: No. It is merely for them to advise us.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is the situation after all the bungling that has taken place and even after commencing the construction of the line. Cabinet have now decided to deviate the line and have decided where it is to go.

The Minister for Works: They have not.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Surely the Minister did not make to the House a statement which was incorrect.

The Minister for Works: No; it was correct.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He said the Government were preparing a Bill for submission to the House, on the advice of their responsible officers, as to where the deviation should go. If the Government have decided where it is to go and are preparing a Bill to give effect to that decision, why do we want a select committee?

Mr. Johnston: He said the terminus will still be Narrogin.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why is the time of the House and the money of the country being wasted by the appointment of a select committee if the Government have already decided the matter? It is an absolute farce. The Government should have some definite opinion.

The Minister for Works: So they have. They always have definite opinions and definite actions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We could not have had greater evidence of indefiniteness than that they began the construction of the line, but all that work has been dissipated. A couple of weeks ago we were told that the Government had formed the opinion that the line should be deviated. Now we are told that they have no opinion whatever and are awaiting instructions from a select committee.

The Minister for Works: No, we are not.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Government should stick to their views, and not waste the time of the House and the money of the country in inquiry by select committee. Would anyone say that the member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott), who submitted the motion, made out any case whatever in justification of it? Would any member who heard his remarks or has since read them in "Hansard" say he made out any case to justify the hanging up of the construction of the line or any further investigation? The only point he made was that the Commissioner of Railways did not agree with the route authorised by Parliament, and the reason given by the Commissioner—no doubt a sound one from his point of view but very unsound from the point of view of the general welfare of the country—was that from the 17 miles extra distance, he would be able to collect more revenue by way of freights and fares. I consider it an insult to ask the House to appoint a select committee in view of what has taken place. Have the Government no opinion on the question at all?

The Minister for Works: Any number of opinions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Quite so. To-day they start the construction of the railway and tomorrow they stop it. Then they decide on some other route and they abandon that again and want to leave the question to the recommendation of a select committee. If the Government have already decided where the line shall go, they should state emphatically that that is the route to be followed and that further inquiry by select committee is entirely unnecessary.

The Minister for Works: We like to study the feelings and ideas of all members.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because one member comes forward with a motion and makes out no case at all—

The Minister for Mines: Why, a member of another place threatens to resign, and we cannot allow that, you know.

The Minister for Works: And apparently is ready to back up his action with £1,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because one member comes forward with a motion and makes out no case, is that any reason why the Government should run away from their opinions on the matter?

The Minister for Works: We do not run away; we stand up to them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is making a farce of administration. The line has been authorised for eight years and the route has been confirmed by every Minister of the Cabinet, and now simply because one member comes forward with a motion for inquiry by select committee, the whole thing is to be thrown overboard and the Government are prepared to say in effect, "Probably we were all wrong in the past. There was a board we appointed whose report we knew nothing about. We have only discovered it two years after it was made and all we have done was wrong. We

have no definite opinion on the matter. We shall plead guilty, throw ourselves on the mercy of the court and appoint a select committee to advise us as to where the line should go, notwithstanding that we have made up our minds and have a Bill drafted to give effect to it. We are prepared to tear the Bill up if you will appoint a select committee." It is an absolute farce. If all the public works contemplated, upon which many millions will be expended in the near future, are to be carried out in this fashion, commenced and then stopped, and then submitted to inquiry by select committee, we shall not get very effective public works construction. The Government should take the responsibility.

The Minister for Works: Let us get our second wind.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is a positive farce. Because a supporter who perhaps may be considered a more loyal supporter than the one who is interested in the original route—

The Minister for Works: That is not fair.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because that member drops in a letter of five lines to the Minister saying that some unnamed persons at some unnamed spot—probably at Dead Dog Gully—desire a deviation of the route, the whole thing is to be suspended, and everything thrown out of gear and the question submitted to a select committee.

The Minister for Mines: It might adjust a very serious difficulty in the ranks of the party.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am afraid the white ants are so well established in the foundations of the party that any attempt by the Government to placate them in this fashion will only lead to greater disintegration.

The Minister for Mines: What would you do if a valued member of your party threatened to resign?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Probably the Government will lose the support of a straight-out loyal supporter, the member affected by the original route, and get a doubtful one in the person of the member who moved for the select committee. I should like to know whether the Minister for Railways has considered the proposal to deviate the line.

The Minister for Mines: I cannot give away Cabinet secrets.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that, but I can well understand what has taken place. It is another instance of the Minister for Railways becoming influenced by environment.

The Minister for Mines: No, I am only anxious to work the railway.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister says his officers are all ready, that he does not care where the line goes—north, east or south—he only wants instructions to get at it. Why not submit the question to the office boy or to someone in the department to definitely decide to go ahead? The Government have discovered after all these years that they are wrong. The £800 spent on the line will probably be wasted.

The Minister for Works: No, it will not.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should not be surprised if, after it is commenced again, another agitation arises and another suspension results. The Government should have a definite opinion as to where the line should go. They have all the information necessary. Years ago before the Bill was first introduced, there was a report and recommendation by a well-qualified advisory board. The Bill was passed pursuant to the recommendation of that board. The Government have another advisory board and they have responsible engineers in the department, and surely with this wealth of recourse and opinion available, they should be able to make up their minds where the line should go, and take the responsibility for their actions.

The Minister for Mines: We have too many opinions.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Government should not throw the responsibility on a select committee. It is reducing responsible government to a farce. Such an irresponsible attitude involves the squandering of tens of thousands of public funds, which will eventually lead to the Government losing their majority. I protest against this lackadaisical method of dealing with public funds, and shall oppose the appointment of the select committee.

On motion by Minister for Mines, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.57 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th October, 1922.

	PAGE
Select Committee, Fishing Industry, extension of time	1030
Question : State sawmills	1030
Bills : Federal Referendum, 2a.	1030
Supply (No. 2), £668,000	1032
Wyalcathem-Mt. Marshall Railway Extension, 1a.	1032
Property, as to procedure	1033
Adjournment, Royal Show	1034

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

SELECT COMMITTEE—FISHING INDUSTRY.

Extension of Time.

On motion by Hon. F. A. Baglin, the time for bringing up the report was extended until Tuesday, November 7th.

QUESTION—STATE SAWMILLS, DE TAILS OF OPERATIONS.

Hon. A. BURVILL asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many loads of timber have been milled at the State Sawmills since work started, including timber used for public works? 2, What is the percentage of waste between timber treated in the round, milled, and the finished product? 3, What royalty would have been paid by a permit holder in respect of the timber referred to in answer to question 1? 4, Has any royalty or railway freight been charged against the State Sawmills? 5, What amount of railway freight would have been payable in respect to timber milled at the State Sawmills, and carried over the State Railways, including the 17 miles used for shunting? 6, Is the forest cut by the State Sawmills taken on a face or are only the best patches cut out? 7, Can the Minister explain why the State Sawmills charge 1s. per dozen more for fruit cases than the privately-owned mills?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The number of round loads of karri and jarrah timber milled since the inception of the State Sawmills—£672,758. 2, This varies from 48 per cent. to 60 per cent. 3, Exactly the same as has been paid by the department. 4, All royalties and all railway freights have been charged and paid. 5, The railway freight actually paid during the year 1920-21 was £81,397. The cost of transit over the 17 miles used for shunting is included in mill expenditure. 6, The cutting of the forest is subject to the same regulations as other timber cutters have to observe. 7, The State Sawmills' price for fruit cases is governed by the railway freight that has to be paid, and, if the hon. member refers to patent collapsible cases, this entails more work and is a better case than supplied by anyone else. Recently the State Sawmills have reduced their price 1s. per dozen, and latterly, in consequence of this, outside companies have brought down their prices accordingly.

BILL—FEDERAL REFERENDUM.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [4.37]: I am rather surprised that Mr. Lovekin should have brought this Bill forward, in view of the fact that it deals with a matter the subject of an inquiry by a Royal Commission appointed by this House and another place. Five members of this Chamber and five members of another place make up the Royal Commission. The inquiry is being made by these 10 members into the question of the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States, especially Western Australia. It is an extraordinary thing that a Bill dealing with that very matter should be brought forward now. I am sure, if the hon. member had given the matter much thought, he would not have brought it forward at the present