

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

### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. W. C. Angwin—North-East Fremantle) [11.28]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, 16th December, at 11 a.m.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.29 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 16th December, 1926.*

Question: Arbitration Court, advocates ...	8107
Motion: Metropolitan Water Supply, etc., to create	8107
Assent to Bills ...	8182
Bills: Kotoump and Dowerin Road Board Loans	8144
Validation, all stages ...	8115
War Relief Funds, Assembly's Message ...	8115
Appropriation 2a, etc. ...	8115
Government Railways Act Amendment, request	8129
for conference ...	8129
Government Railways Act Amendment Act, conference	8132
report ...	8132
Government Railways Act Amendment Act, Assembly's	8135
further Message ...	8132
Public Works Act Amendment, 2a. ...	8146
Public Works Act Amendment, Com. ...	8146
Public Works Act Amendment, Assembly's	8164
Message ...	8135
State Insurance, request for conference ...	8135
State Insurance, conference report ...	8135
Adoption of Children Act Amendment, remaining	8135
stages ...	8135
Timber Industry Regulation, Assembly's Message	8135
Timber Industry Regulation, request for conference	8145
... ..	8145
Timber Industry Regulation, conference report	8146
Timber Industry Regulation, Assembly's Message	8146
South-West Electric Power, 2a., Com., etc. ...	8147
South West Electric power, Assembly's Message	8164
Adjournment: Close of session, complimentary remarks	8164

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 11.0 a.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION—ARBITRATION COURT, ADVOCATES.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How long were agents or advocates engaged in appearing before the Court of Arbitration when dealing with the basic

wage inquiries for the year 1926-1927? 2, What remuneration was paid employers' and employees' representatives respectively?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Inquiry began on 8th February, and evidence was concluded on the 21st May. The court sat taking evidence on 20 days. 2, The amount allowed by the Court under the provisions of the Act were: employees' representatives, £312 9s.; employers' representatives, £152 19s. 9d. These amounts include costs allowed by the court for work of and incidental to the preparation of the cases.

### MOTION—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE.

*Suggested Board of Works.*

**HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN** (Metropolitan-Suburban) [11.5]: I move—

That this House is of opinion—(1) That in the interests of public health the immediate completion of the metropolitan sewerage scheme is a vital necessity; (2) That in order to secure a continuity of policy, a metropolitan board of works should be created to take over the whole of the metropolitan water supply, deep drainage and sewerage schemes, with full power and authority to carry on those undertakings.

Very few remarks are required from me to stress the urgent necessity for carrying out a proper sewerage scheme within the metropolitan area. There is probably no greater menace facing any populated centre in Australia than that which faces our metropolitan area. We have evidence of that in the Bill which the Chief Secretary recently presented to the House, granting permission to certain municipalities to undertake the installation of septic tanks. Septic tanks form only a partial relief of the difficulty. This will not overcome the main trouble which presents itself, namely the dumping of nightsoil in the various municipalities concerned. There are several of these dumps between Subiaco, Claremont, the Claremont and Peppermint Grove road board areas and others. All of these authorities have separate dumps for the deposit of this matter. This in itself is a very serious menace to the health of the people. In this morning's paper there is another striking instance of the result that has been brought about by the inactivity of various Governments on this question. I am not referring to any particular Government

because, in my opinion, they have all shown negligence. Be that as it may, in this morning's paper it was announced that the pan rates had been increased for all the people of the metropolitan area. This is brought about by the fact that the City of Perth is now being compelled to create a new dump, and to make a road of five miles in length, and cart the nightsoil from the extreme end of Crawley to five miles beyond North Perth. The onus is not upon the City Council, but upon that body whose business it should be to see that a proper sewerage scheme is immediately gone on with. It is nearly 20 years since that scheme was started. A certain amount of work was done. I understand that all the money that was borrowed for the purpose of assisting people to make house connections was repaid many years ago. I have stated in this House that within less than half a mile of Parliament, namely in West Perth, on the other side of Colinstreet, there are as yet no sewerage connections. In addition to that, there is the difficulty of getting rid of the water from the kitchen and the wash-house. At my own place many dry wells have been constructed from time to time, but, on account of the saturation of the ground, the water will not run away. We are really impotent to do anything. I view with serious apprehension the establishment of septic tanks in the metropolitan area. They may be suitable for suburbs like Claremont and Cottesloe, where there are large areas of land around each house, but they will represent a serious problem when they are established in the closely populated parts of the metropolitan area. The only way out of the difficulty is to establish a board. The whole control of these utilities must be handed over to that board, which must have full power and authority to carry on the undertaking. A similar board was formed in Melbourne some years ago. I cannot say exactly how it was created, but I know that its members are elected from all the self-governing bodies within the area affected. This is one of those schemes in which a great deal of foresight is necessary, so that those in charge may look far ahead in order to supply the requirements of a growing population. With regard to our water supply, I have been informed by a competent engineer that it is quite possible within the next 25 or 30 years it will be necessary not only to secure the Whitty Falls supply but to go even as far as the Serpentine Falls. When the population

of the metropolitan area has grown to the extent that it is bound to, the demand for water, owing to our climatic conditions and the installation of the sewerage system, is sure to be on a big scale. In Melbourne the financial position is overcome by the desire shown on the part of the people of the metropolitan area to subscribe to the Metropolitan Waterworks bonds. In that way the board is able to borrow all the money required for the continuance of the scheme. In Perth the sewerage scheme has shown a loss. That is hardly to be wondered at. For instance, there are no household connections attached to the Subiaco main drain. It is impossible, therefore, to receive the revenue from it that would be received if the connections were made. Practically the whole of Subiaco on this side of the railway, except for what is known as West Subiaco, is covered with houses. The other day I made inquiries with respect to finding a site suitable for the boy scouts. The mayor and I went over nearly the whole area. It was very difficult to find any sites that were not already built upon. The people are entitled to the first consideration. When we realise the position that exists in Subiaco, as well as in many other parts of the metropolitan area, we must see that it is only a relic of the dark ages to perpetuate the existing system. It is greatly to be regretted that we have not made greater progress in this direction than we have made. I will not speak at great length on this subject, because I feel that all Governments have realised their responsibilities, but unfortunately a certain amount of diffidence has always been shown in the direction of expenditure upon this work. Country members may feel that special consideration is being shown to the people of the metropolitan area. I speak for a large number of those people when I say that they desire no favours in this respect. What they do want is that a board should be created so that this vitally important question may be tackled immediately, and that they may get the relief they ask for. A board should be formed on the lines of the Metropolitan Board of Works in Melbourne. The duty of the board should be to secure the services of the best sewerage expert. In the search for such a man, the board should not confine its energies only to Australia. We are told that the present system of distributing the sewage into the river is causing pollution there. I do not know if that is so, but the fact re-

mains that a very offensive smell arises from the river.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There was never any pollution before the septic tanks were established.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I believe that. The septic tanks have been placed in such a position as to suggest that the water should run uphill. Had they been placed in a lower position, the results might have been better. Be that as it may, there are great difficulties to be faced in evolving a scheme that will be attended by satisfactory results. Under the Werribee scheme, located 22 miles from Melbourne, there are huge sewage farms established, from which a large revenue is derived. It may not be possible to create a like scheme in an area such as that surrounding Perth. Werribee is on the leaside of Melbourne and, therefore, the smells that, of course, may be expected from such operations, do not affect the city in any way. If a scheme were established for sewage farm at, say, North Beach, it might be disagreeable to the metropolitan area owing to the prevailing winds. I consider it is the duty of the Government to vacate the functions referred to in the motion and leave them to a board that will be able to carry out a continuous policy in the interests of all concerned. It would be wise at the outset to get the best expert advice obtainable in any part of the world, so that we may start off along sound lines. In submitting my motion I feel that it will meet with ready acceptance because there is nothing of more vital importance than the activities dealt with.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [11.17]: I heartily support the motion. The time has long since passed for bringing our sewerage scheme up to date. I have never been able to understand why in the old days the authorities allowed the septic tanks to be placed on the river bank at Burswood. Those tanks are the cause of the pollution of the river. Even if it cost £250,000, the scheme outlined in the motion should be undertaken at once. The sooner we deal with the problem, the better it will be, for the longer it is delayed the greater will be the expense. I hope the House will agree to the motion and that the Government will immediately establish a board as proposed by Sir William Lathlain. It should have been done years ago.

HON. A. BURVILL (South-East) [11.18]: I support the motion more especially on account of the remarks of Sir William Lathlain when he said that he hoped the country members would lend their support.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He was asking too much after the vote that was taken last night!

Hon. A. BURVILL: For many years past country members have advocated the metropolitan people having full control of their water supply, drainage, sewerage and tramway operations. Especially has that attitude been adopted by members of the Country Party.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Should they also have the control of their markets?

Hon. A. BURVILL: We have left them out because the markets do not represent an entirely metropolitan concern. Those dealt with in the motion affect the metropolitan people alone and they should be placed in the hands of a trust quite apart from Governmental control. If that were done, we would have to deal with less legislation introduced in the interests of the metropolitan area alone. The trust would be able to handle all those matters. There would be no difficulty experienced in improving upon the present system. Some time ago a select committee investigated the metropolitan water supply question and one of the findings was that the works should be handed over to a board or trust.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [11.21]: I appreciate the remarks of Mr. Burvill. It seems to me that, in common with some other hon. members, having got control of the Perth market, as Mr. Nicholson pointed out, it becomes necessary to keep the consumers alive in order that they may buy the produce sent by the growers to the market. In those circumstances the country people might be prepared to contribute a little towards the cost of removing the septic tanks to some other spot, where the tanks would not be a menace to the metropolitan people, and so promote the profits to be derived by the growers from the market. I hope that when we come to deal with the Bill that will be introduced in due course to give effect to the motion, the country members will support a proposal for some such contribution towards the cost of the undertaking.

Hon. V. Hamersley: We will consider it all right!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Especially when we consider what happened on a previous occasion, they should be prepared to do so, because they deprived the people of the metropolitan area from recovering some of the expense incurred in the services rendered at the market.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member is well aware that it is contrary to the Standing Orders to allude to a Bill not before the House.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am aware of that, but I was looking ahead.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the hon. member will observe the Standing Orders.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Quite so. My remarks were intended to be jocular. The remarks I was indulging in were such that one might expect the President or Chairman of Committees to overlook.

Hon. A. Burvill: Country members are quite prepared to allow you to look after your own domestic affairs.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: As we all know, Western Australia in particular presents a very unfair aspect when statistics are resorted to. Our indebtedness per head of the population, compared with that of other States, appears to be enormous. The explanation for that is that whereas we have these public utilities, the expenses of which are charged up to the public debt, other States have not. The Metropolitan Board of Works in Melbourne owe millions of pounds, but that liability is not a charge against the public indebtedness of Victoria. With the inclusion of the liability in our public debt, on account of the services referred to in the motion, Western Australia is made to appear as if it was a State of spendthrifts who owed a tremendous lot of money per head of the population, much in excess of the indebtedness per head in other States. I have a pamphlet that was recently issued in London bringing the figures up to September, 1926, and it shows how the people there regard Australian finances. If the carrying of the motion does nothing else than encourage the Government to introduce legislation to transfer these activities to a board of works and thus relieve the national debt by so much per head, it will make the comparison between our finances and those of other States not so invidious. Perhaps it will lead to disarming some of the London criticism levelled against us, as well as against some of the other States. There is no doubt that the septic tanks must go. That

is the opinion of everyone in the State. The point is, what is to be done with the sewage matter. It has been suggested that it should be conveyed to a farm in the sand hills along North Beach. Sir William Lathlain made a good point that is worthy of consideration. He referred to the prevailing winds which he suggested might blow the smell back to the city. That may or may not be so. We had it in evidence, however, when the select committee inquired into metropolitan water supply matters, that the late Mr. Lawson put floats out from shore in the vicinity of Triggs Island to ascertain whether there was a tidal flow inwards or outwards. It was discovered that the tidal flow was outwards and that any sewage or other matter that was put in the sea there would flow out and not be swept back to shore. That point was also proved by the experiences in connection with the Fremantle harbour works. When Sir John Cooke condemned the river scheme, it was on the ground that there would be no scour and that the harbour would silt up in consequence. Mr. C. Y. O'Connor proved the opposite by the same method as Mr. Lawson adopted. He demonstrated that there was a flow outwards, which would tend to deepen the harbour rather than to silt it up. That point can be considered too. I agree with Sir William Lathlain that something should be done at once from the health point of view and also from the financial point of view. It should be done in the direction indicated in the motion with which I heartily agree.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [11.25]: Had it not been for the references to country members, I would not have spoken this morning. I heartily support the motion. I assure metropolitan members that representatives of the country provinces, while perhaps not quite so proud of the representatives of the city as they might be, are very proud indeed of the City of Perth. I am sure the country members will not be a party to anything that is not for the benefit of the capital city. They will favour anything that will tend to further beautify what I believe is a wonderful city. Reference has been made to the metropolitan sewerage system. If country members choose to indulge in a little humour at the expense of their city confreres, they might well refer to the barrage through which they have to pass when travelling across the Bun-

bury bridge to reach the city. If anything more closely approaching a gas barrage could be devised to keep country people out of the city, I do not know what it could be. There is no question of the country representatives being antagonistic to the people of the city. I am glad that Mr. Lovekin explained that his remarks were more or less in a humorous strain. While we may not see eye to eye with metropolitan representatives on domestic matters, such as the metropolitan market, we stand shoulder to shoulder with them in anything that will tend to beautify the capital city.

**HON. H. SEDDON** (North-East) [11.28]: I do not wish to say more than a few words on this subject. I am fully in accord with the proposal to establish some such board, especially because of the financial aspect to which Mr. Lovekin has alluded. In that respect this State has been taken to serious account in other parts of the world. If all municipal functions are to be financed by local authorities, perhaps in the form of a trust, there is no doubt they will be able to exercise just as wide borrowing powers, on the evidence of their stability, as the State is, and will be able to encourage investors to participate in their loans and thus enable them to carry out their own works. On the subject of the disposal of sewage, I was hoping that reference would have been made to what is being done in other parts of the world for its proper employment. Members who have had an opportunity to visit the city of Edinburgh may recollect that the scheme there adopted for the disposal of sewage is very profitable indeed. There is an area of some 200 acres and the sewage is used for irrigating it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The same applies to Glasgow.

Hon. H. SEDDON: On the area crops of fodder are raised, and are used for the feeding of dairy cattle. In Paris there are some fine gardens that are largely maintained by utilising the sewage by means of irrigation, and there is not only no odour but the effluent from the sewage works, after having passed through the septic tanks, is entirely free from contaminating bacteria. That is a scheme that might commend itself to the local authorities in Perth. Here we have a similar type of soil. It is

found that the percolation into the sandy soil produces growth and changes the character of the soil, making it richer in humus and in every way more fertile. Thus sandy soil under the continual manuring may be converted into fertile land and enable profitable returns to be obtained from the disposal of the sewage. It appears that a similar opportunity is available for the City Council of Perth who, if they adopted a scheme of that description, could turn the waste into the use as fertiliser as intended by nature. In passing let me make reference to the Midland Junction abattoirs. I am informed that a stream of offensive matter from the abattoirs is permitted to enter the Helena River. Its presence in the river must be highly deleterious. The information should certainly be brought under the notice of the Government that they might ascertain if there is any truth in the statement. It seems that the contamination of the river may be arising from sources other than the septic tanks at Burswood Island. I support the motion.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central) [11.32]: I think members all agree that the two most important factors in any country are those of health and education. I feel sure that Sir William Lathlain and other members who have supported the motion have those factors in mind. Everything possible has been done by the departmental officers to discharge their duties in a thoroughly efficient way, and I think their work will compare more than favourably with that of other officers elsewhere in Australia. It is of the utmost importance to safeguard the health of the community. We must realise that increased prosperity in the country means increased population in the metropolitan area, and thus added responsibilities are cast on the authorities to ensure that the health of the people is safeguarded. This is not the first time that the question has been broached in the Council. About two years ago Mr. Baxter moved an almost similar motion and the opinion of the Government at that time was expressed by the Chief Secretary. I think that if I quote his remarks, the reply then given will be equally applicable to the present motion. I have had no opportunity to consult Cabinet since the motion was tabled, but I do not think anything has occurred meanwhile to alter the opinion of the Govern-

ment. The reply given by the Chief Secretary two years ago was—

The Government will be prepared immediately to enter into negotiations for the transfer of the metropolitan water supply to representatives of the local bodies concerned. If those local bodies are prepared to do business, they should first approach the Government. It must not be understood that, in adopting this attitude, the Government desire to part with these public utilities. At the same time, they do not seek to place any obstacles in the way of the municipalisation of the services. If Mr. Baxter's motion and Mr. Nicholson's amendment go to a division, I must vote either one way or the other. I shall vote, not as a member of the Government, but as a member for Central Province.

That expression of opinion, I think, stands good to-day. I have heard of nothing to cause the Government to alter it. If the local bodies of the metropolitan area are anxious to do business in the direction indicated, the way is open for them to begin negotiations with the Government forthwith.

**HON. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [11.35]: I should like to make a few remarks because of the fear expressed by some members that residents of the country districts might conclude that the city is about to receive some undue advantage. I wish to assure members that the whole of the people in the country districts have a very great love for the capital city of the State.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Where do you show it?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Metropolitan members do not want your sympathy; they want your vote.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: This is not a question of sympathy or vote; it is a question of the horror experienced by country residents in their attempts to enter the city. Whenever I and my friends wish to enter this one-time beautiful city, we are met with a barrier almost sufficient to keep us out. At one time I looked forward to the day when I might have an opportunity to spend some of my years in the city.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Your declining years?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have looked forward to opportunities to avail myself again of some of the pleasures of my boyhood along the river frontages and on the river itself.

Member: You are too old for that now.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I learn with regret from many of my friends that no longer do they desire to go boating on the river. I

learn from others that the bathing we enjoyed at the time is a thing of the past. I am told that if one anchors a boat in the river, when he goes to pull up the anchor chains they are in a state that is positively disgusting. All those disadvantages were predicted when the Bill was introduced to give authority for the septic tanks to be located at Burswood Island. Some of us voted against the proposal, but there was a majority who believed in the system and assured us that the effluent from the tanks would not pollute the river. Consequently the Bill was passed. As time has gone on, I have become more and more satisfied that a very grave blunder was then perpetrated, and I have since wondered how long it would be before the City of Perth would wake up to the fact that it was absolutely necessary to alter the system. There are numerous large areas between Perth and the Moore River that could be utilised without running the sewage through the sandhills to the North Beach. Those areas between Perth and the Moore River, I think, are unoccupied, and if the sewage were turned on to them under such a system as has been suggested by Mr. Seddon thousands of acres would be benefited. If some such scheme were proposed, I am sure it would receive the support of the country districts because everybody in the State would benefit from it. Under the present system we are hastening the day when a frightful epidemic will break out in the city and spread to the surrounding areas. We have only to run into a danger of that kind to ruin the fair name of the city of Perth, and if that once happened it would probably be half a century before the confidence of the community and of investors could be restored. Many people who in years gone by anticipated with pleasure the establishment of homes on the river frontages are living away from the river to-day. The value of the land along the whole of the river's banks is lower because of the water having been polluted by the septic tanks. It is a disgrace to the community that the pollution should have continued so long. Mr. Seddon referred to the pollution of the Helena River from the Midland Junction abattoirs. Presently, I presume, it will be almost as difficult to pass over the Helena Bridge as it is at present to cross the Causeway, where the odours are so frightful that no one cares to risk contact with them. We have been told of the proposal to discharge sewage into the sea and the experiments

made by the late Mr. Lawson and others to ascertain whether the tides would drive it back to the beach or the breezes would waft the odours back to the city. I have only to remind members of the fact that at the Moore River and, in fact, most of the rivers along the western coast, the fresh water accumulates for a few months and then, by sheer force, breaks through the silt bars and passes out to sea. Within a very short time, however, the whole of the soil is lifted back and the river mouth is again blocked. The same thing will happen if the sewage is discharged into the sea, and our beautiful beaches will be ruined. I appeal to the projected board of works or whoever may be in authority, on no account to lead us into a scheme whereby the sewage can be thrown back to the banks of the river or the shores of the sea. So sure as the silt is constantly lifted into the mouths of the rivers on our western coast, so surely will the sewage again be strewn along our sea beaches. Let us dispose of the sewage by running it on to level areas of sand where it will be exposed to the rays of the sun, the best disinfectant that the world has yet discovered. By adopting such a scheme we should be converting barren wastes of sand into fertile areas that could be turned to profitable account. In fact, we would get a full return for the whole of the cost incurred in disposing of the sewage in that way. I support the motion. I regret that it has been brought down at such a late hour in the session, when members perhaps have not had sufficient time to consider it fully. Certainly many more reasons could be advanced in support of the motion than those that have been mentioned this morning.

**HON. J. M. MACFARLANE** (Metropolitan) [11.45]: I support the motion. The rapid increase of population in the metropolitan area demands that the sewerage system of Perth should be extended to the greater area. It is recognised that the financing of the proposal must be a very difficult one, and that it can be better done by a board than by the Government or a department. On the economic side I have no faith in the way in which the Government or the Public Works Department carry out such a huge work. It would be wise to entrust to a board, such as is proposed in the motion, the control, not only of sewerage but of drainage and water supplies as well. We have had before us this session a Bill giving

certain local authorities power to instal septic tanks. If this could be done throughout we should have the most efficient method of dealing with the sanitary arrangements of the city, a method that would ensure the best conditions of health, which under the present system is somewhat doubtful. This motion proposes to extend the sewerage to the outer suburbs. I feel that something should be done in the way of reducing the heavy costs likely to accrue from the continuance of the present sewerage scheme. There is this to be said for the proposed board, that it would take into consideration the future development of the city and suburbs. The scheme must be put in hand some day, and the earlier the better for the community at large. So I hope that this motion will become something more than a pious resolution, that something definite will come out of it, so that the charge made against the present sewerage system of polluting the river can be eliminated. I am not one to lay the responsibility for the whole of the pollution of the river upon the filter beds, for I feel that the low-lying portions of the foreshore, which only reclamation can improve, contribute their quota also.

**Hon. G. W. Miles**: It is the fault of the municipalities in not going on with the project. The Government asked them to negotiate with a view to taking over the scheme. For two years past the Government have been willing, but no movement has been made by the municipalities.

**Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE**: I know that previous Governments have been asked to turn over the scheme to a board. I remember that a proposal was put up to the City Council, but it was so one-sided that the council could not accept it. I have it in mind that it had to be turned down because of the iniquitous representation proposed.

**Hon. H. Seddon**: But would not the scheme have served as a basis for negotiation?

**Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE**: It was a scheme that the City Council could not accept.

**The Honorary Minister**: But nothing has been done by the municipalities since the Chief Secretary gave a reply on the motion moved by Mr. Baxter.

**Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE**: I remember that a proposal was submitted to the City Council. It was investigated and turned down because the Government of the

day were offering something that was not equitable. However, I hope this motion will prove to be something more than a pious wish, because only a board such as is suggested can deal with the matter economically.

**HON. C. F. BAXTER** (East) [11.50]: One wonders whether there is any real sincerity behind a motion of this kind. I was always under the impression that the City Council desired to take over what should be its proper functions, namely, sewerage, deep drainage, water supply and tramways.

**Hon. J. M. Macfarlane**: You cannot expect them to take over these services at any price at which they may be offered.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: The motion I moved two years ago left it open for the local authorities to negotiate. However, nothing has been done in that direction. The motion we have before us is for the creation of a metropolitan board of works to take over sewerage, deep drainage, and water supply. Am I to read into it that what is desired is that a board shall be established and shall carry on under the Government? If it were not so, surely something would have been done ere this under the motion of two years ago. Sir William Lathlain, who was for years mayor of the city, Mr. Nicholson, another ex-mayor, and Mr. Macfarlane, who was a city councillor for a long period, ought to know the viewpoint of the City Council. It may be said that whilst I favour this motion, I did not favour the City Council having control of the metropolitan markets. However, those metropolitan markets are not to be confounded with the services mentioned in the motion; for the producers, although living away from the city, are largely concerned in the metropolitan markets, whereas the matters referred to here are matters exclusively for the city and suburbs.

**Hon. J. Nicholson**: And are they not concerned in the other proposition also?

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: Those who come into the city have to pay for these services, indirectly if not directly. The services alluded to in the motion are matters for the control of the local authorities and should never have been nationalised.

**Hon. J. Nicholson**: Do the producers want representation on this board also?

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: Certainly not. We want to assist you to maintain proper services in the city and suburbs.

The Honorary Minister: The hon. member's motion of two years ago indicated that.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: Yes, and it opened the way for those with desires in that direction to approach the Government. They could not expect the Government to go around canvassing for somebody to take the responsibility off their hands. Now we get this motion at the extreme end of the session. Some members are always accusing the Government of bringing down important measures in the closing hours of the session, but here we have a private member exposing himself to the same charge.

**Hon. V. Hamersley**: The session has not closed yet.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: No, but it is generally understood that it will close to-day. In future that member will not be able to bring forward that old charge against the Government.

**Hon. G. Potter**: But is not this a good motion?

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: Of course it is. But I say that in future private members will not be able to complain of the Government's bringing down of important measures at the end of a session, for one private member is doing that very thing to-day. The present sewerage system is a disgrace to the city, and an economic waste as well. We have adjacent to the city large areas of land starved for want of building up with proper manures. Those lands could be turned to profitable account, as is done in other parts of the world. Instead of that, year in and year out we are using the sewage of the city to pollute one of the most beautiful rivers in Australia. As a result, instead of taking our summer visitors on the river, we are very anxious to keep them as far away from it as we can. The proposal to take the sewage out to the sea coast is another wasteful project. Were it carried into effect it would mean that we should no longer be able to use our popular health resorts on the sea coast, such as the City Beach and other magnificent beaches. I will support the motion, but I do not think it will get us very far. The local authorities should come to a definite understanding amongst themselves. The way is open for them to negotiate. It is their duty



to do that, not to come forward with motions such as that before us, which is really a pious hope that the Government will still carry on, but will appoint a board. It appears to me the city does not want the responsibility, but wants the Government to find the money and appoint the board to carry out the services. I will support the motion, but I hope those concerned will take up the matter, as suggested by the Chief Secretary when speaking on my motion of two years ago.

**HON. J. E. DODD** (South) [11.56] : While I see no objection to the motion, to my mind it seems to have been moved in the wrong place. There is really no necessity for it in this Chamber. The way is open even now for the local authorities of the metropolitan area to take the initiative in this matter. Why have they not done so? The invitation was given to them when the matter was before us on the motion of Mr. Baxter two years ago. I remember that debate. The reply read by the Honorary Minister to-day shows that the Government are quite willing to enter into negotiations and consider this matter. Consequently I fail to see any necessity for the motion here at all, except, perhaps, the first part of it, in regard to which everybody is agreed. However, I think the taking of the initiative is up to the local authorities. It is for them to get a move on and see what can be done. The scheme will then have to come before Parliament for ratification. Parliament would then consider what powers should be given to the board to be created. That is all I desire to say at present. I hope the metropolitan local authorities will wake up and enter into negotiations to see whether a board can be created.

Question put and passed.

On motion by Sir William Lathlain, resolution transmitted to the Assembly for its concurrence.

## **BILL—WAR RELIEF FUNDS.**

### *Assembly's Message.*

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

## **BILL—APPROPRIATION.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th December.

**HON. J. J. HOLMES** (North) [12.5] : I do not intend to delay the House at any great length, but must take this opportunity to answer some of the extraordinary statements of the Chief Secretary when replying to my remarks on the Loan Bill. The Minister says the reason he singled me out for particular reply was that I was known throughout the country. He did me the honour of saying that people took notice of what I said. He went further and stated that he had quoted me on the platform at the last elections as an authority. I know he did so. He said "Mr. Holmes is not one of us, but when he makes these statements you can rely upon them as being pretty near the facts." That is what he told the people of Western Australia on the hustings when standing for a seat in this House. As a result of that, and of using ammunition of that kind in order to convince the people that the Government then in power were not handling the finances of the country properly, the people were convinced that if they voted for his party, all these things would be rectified. Accordingly the Labour Government were sent back with power to control the State. What position did we find then? Last night the Chief Secretary not only championed the present Government for their methods of finance, but championed the Government he had condemned on the hustings. He goes back on the statements he made on the public platform, and falls into the very methods of finance which he told the public of this country were pernicious. Where are the politics of this State going to? Anything for office, I would assume! Those methods of finance that are all wrong in the case of other people are all right when he becomes a member of Cabinet. No matter how members of Cabinet may condemn the previous Governments on the platform for their methods of finance, prior to taking the responsibility themselves, those methods are all right when they occupy the Treasury bench. So much for that. The Chief Secretary was very careful. I do not blame him for the figures he submitted, for I know that departmental officers put up whatever figures they like to present. They can, however, be no excuse for the Chief Secretary in another direction, because of his remarks from the public platform and

his subsequent reversal of form in this House. The officers of the department who put up the figures for him carefully avoided my reference to the debits to loan expenditure, which should have been debited to revenue. Without much trouble members may find from the Auditor General's report that approximately half a million of money has been debited to loan which should have been debited to revenue. If that had been done, instead of the deficit being only £99,000, it would have been in the vicinity of £600,000. On page 5 of his report the Auditor General points out that no less than £256,000 was debited to loan, which should have been debited to revenue. Administrative expenses in connection with group settlement, amounting to £82,000, were also charged to loan. If they had been charged to the individual settlers one might reasonably have expected the amount to be credited to revenue, but those expenses are not so charged, and never will be. The Government have debited up the amount to loan. A sum of £108,000 was charged as interest to group settlements. The Auditor General points out that this is wrong. If the amount had been charged to the individual it could have been taken as a credit to revenue, assuming that the people would pay, but it is charged to loan and credited to revenue. There is also a loss on country water supplies of £14,000. There is a profit of £19,000 on the Wyndham meat works taken to credit of revenue, but it should have been taken to the credit of previous losses on the Wyndham Meat Works. A sum of £4,500 was loaned to the Fremantle harbour works, on the assumption that it would be paid back, but it was not applied to the reduction of their expenditure. That, too, has been taken to the credit of revenue. If these figures with a few others are totted up, we shall arrive at approximately half a million pounds. That is the sort of financing that the Government were sent in to rectify. I now come to the State's indebtedness, which is £70,000,000. According to the Public Accounts, to which the Chief Secretary referred last night, the expenditure on public works, etc., in accordance with the schedule, is £62,000,000. What has become of the £8,000,000. We can only assume that the £6,000,000 went into the deficit, as there is not a penny represented anywhere for that amount. It is idle to talk about the railways being an asset, or about its being possible to sell them to-morrow for more

than they cost. It is not proposed to sell them, and that does not enter into the question. What has become of the six million pounds? Not a farthing asset is represented by that amount. We have passed Bills for railways which have never been built, and we have passed Loan Bills to pay for them. All over the country there are railways and other public works authorised. For all these works that remain to be done, the cash available from loan to the 30th June was £114,000. The Minister disputed the correctness of my statement when I said that the works appearing in the Schedule of the Bill would never be built with the loan money that is now being asked for. That money will be taken to construct works that were authorised years ago. This is the pernicious system that was perpetrated before, but is being continued by the present Government. The Minister now champions the very people who preceded him. We now come to the question of trust accounts. I said that approximately one million of money had been taken from trust funds and had been used for carrying on State trading concerns, or anything else the Government desired to spend money on. The amount to the 30th June was £936,000. I said it was a million of money. I find from the "Statistical Register" that to the 30th September the debits for the last nine months to State trading concerns amount to £2,300,000, and that the credits are only £2,000,000. If we add the difference, £300,000, to the £937,000, which must have been obtained somewhere, because the Government could not pay it out until they got it, we arrive at a figure of 1¼ million pounds. It can only be assumed that this money has been taken from trust funds. Instead of stating that they have taken one million pounds I should have been nearer the mark had I added a quarter of a million pounds. I wish now to refer to the capital indebtedness of Western Australia. Part of this indebtedness is due to the fact that the Government are carrying out a lot of works, such as the metropolitan water supply and sewerage scheme, etc. The sooner such a work as that is handed over to a trust the better will it be in order that our per capita indebtedness may be reduced. I cannot blame the present Government for the delay in that regard. I remember well that some time ago, I think shortly after the Premier assumed office, he said he would be glad to be relieved of this. He threw out

the suggestion that the people of the metropolitan area should come along with their proposal, and that it would be favourably considered. Nothing has been done. I am certain that is not his fault. Mr. Macfarlane told me the other day that the City Council had had the right to build the markets for 20 years, and that the right had now been taken away from them. My reply was that it was nearly time the right was taken from them since they had not exercised it in 20 years. In 1917 the per capita indebtedness of Western Australia—and it is the per capita indebtedness which governs finance—was £116. In 1926 it is £158. That is an increase of nearly 50 per cent. And our population has only increased by 100,000!

Hon. H. Seddon: That is net, not gross.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: To show how we are spending money, I will refer to the authority quoted by Mr. Lovekin this morning—Messrs. Sidney Russell Cooke and E. H. Davenport, two of the leading financial men at the other end of the world. I will take the figures for 1924-25, which are the latest available to me. I may just remark that outside the House I am assumed to be correct, while inside the House I am assumed to be wrong. At all events, that is the final pronouncement of the Chief Secretary.

The Honorary Minister: You will lose your reputation to-day if you are not careful.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: For 1924-25 Australian Governments expended out of loan funds per head as follows:—Tasmania, £1 2s. 3d.; New South Wales, £4 1s. 5d.; Victoria, £5 6s. 2d.; Queensland, £4 17s. 3d.; South Australia, £6 10s. 9d.; and Western Australia, £11 5s. 2d. That is how we are going on.

Hon. J. Nicholson: We are leading the way.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Do you suggest the expenditure is not necessary?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I would not mind the expenditure if we were paying all the interest out of revenue or providing a sinking fund to meet the liabilities when they fall due. Listening to the Chief Secretary last night, one would think that the Auditor General ought to be dismissed. Fortunately, he cannot be dismissed, because that requires a resolution carried by both Houses of Parliament. Again, listening to the Chief Secretary last night, one would

think that the public accountants should be dismissed. They may be, but the Government will have to print a new set of public accounts before they can be justified in doing that. Mr. Seddon quoted from the Public Accounts, and I quoted from the Auditor General's report. The Chief Secretary said that sinking fund was provided. I do not wish to delay the House, but the Auditor General points out that in some cases sinking fund has been provided, and in some cases not, and in other cases it has been suspended until the Governor's pleasure. The Minister stands up here and says that I am all wrong and that he is all right, and he tells private citizens that I am all right and that the Government are all wrong. When he states here that not only his Government, but also previous Governments, have done the right thing, and that I am an irresponsible person, it is too much for me. If prospective members of Parliament on going to the country take up one attitude outside the House and another attitude when they get inside the House, there is only one thing to do—Parliament must step in and take a hand and see that this thing shall cease. I nearly succeeded once, and I will try it again. When Mr. Colebatch was Leader of this Chamber, I made an attempt to hold up the Appropriation Bill until the Government had declared what they were going to do. When it was moved that the Bill be read a second time, I moved an amendment that the second reading be deferred until February, so as to give the Government time to tell us what they were going to do by way of straightening up the finances. We divided the House, and it was 12 all. But for a desire on the part of some members, who were with me, to get away—the weather was hot and uncomfortable—I think the amendment would have been carried by 18 to 6. However, the voting was 12 all, and the Appropriation Bill was passed on the casting vote of the President. There are some members who will be with me on this point when next session an attempt is made to stop this kind of thing. I shall not attempt to do anything on the present Appropriation Bill. I give fair warning, however, that there will not be another Appropriation Bill passed with my consent until the matter has been rectified.

**HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM** (North) [12.21]: I am afraid that any remarks I may make will seem very mild after the speech of my colleague. However, I wish to say a few words on the railways. I said nothing on the Loan Bill, because it had

been discussed very fully; but seeing that the railways finished up with a loss last year, it is wise to suggest to the Government that they use a good deal of caution and prudence as regards the spending of money on railways in the future. The moneys borrowed for railway construction have always been borrowed on the condition that they are to be spent on reproductive public works. It is always an obligation on the Government to see that works constructed out of money borrowed on that condition shall be made reproductive. This, however, will make it impossible for the Government to continue the policy they started last year, first to increase wages and then to reduce hours. Under such conditions the railways cannot be expected to pay. The Loan Bill suggests that there will be several more railways. If our railways are to continue to run at a loss, it will have a severe effect on the Government finances. Part of the £4,000,000 represented by the Loan Bill is, I take it, to be borrowed on the same condition as heretofore, that the money shall be spent on reproductive public works; and therefore I suggest to the Government that they take into careful consideration the question of seeing that our railway system is made as nearly as possible remunerative. There is another point connected with the railways. I continually read in the newspapers paragraphs and letters stating that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of good farming land at the present moment alongside existing railways, or within reasonable distances of those railways, and not being made any use of, or not being made sufficient use of, or being held for speculative purposes. I am not one of those who realise that such a state of affairs exists. If it does exist, then I quite agree with the statement that it is the duty of the Government to see that those lands in close proximity to existing railways are developed, rather than that lines should be built hundreds of miles out for the purpose of obtaining new land.

Hon. E. Rose: When the Closer Settlement Bill was introduced, we were told that there was no land available within reach of existing railways.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am saying what newspapers and various people have stated. If that is the case, it is the duty of the Government to see that those lands are developed before railways are extended miles and miles into the country. When I was interrupted I was about to say that so far as my own knowledge goes, I am not aware of any such

unused lands. I have never seen them. I do not know where they are. But if they do exist, as we are assured by various newspapers and persons, it is the duty of the Government to take the matter in hand. The owners of such lands, presuming the lands exist, if they will not use them or sell them at a reasonable rate, should be allowed 12 months to improve them, failing which the Government should be empowered to resume at a reasonable price.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government wanted to do that under the Closer Settlement Bill, which did not pass.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I say those lands do not exist so far as I know.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We say they do exist and the Government want that power.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: If the hon. member can prove that, let him do so.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The House will not give the Government the necessary power.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am willing to give them the power if the lands exist, but I say they do not exist. I have always distinctly stated what I state to-day, that if such lands exist, the Government should take steps. To my knowledge they do not exist, and it is impossible to take steps to meet conditions which do not exist. On the other hand, before the Government build hundreds of miles of railway into the country for the purpose of obtaining new lands, they should resume unused lands at decent prices, if such lands exist—which I very much question.

Hon. E. Rose: That is what the Government endeavoured to do in the past.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Another point connected with the Railway Department deserves careful and serious consideration. We are told that the competition of motor buses and motor lorries is seriously interfering with the Railway Department, and preventing the lines from paying. If that is so, the question arises whether the Government should not construct roads and run motor lorries instead of constructing railways and running trains. The matter requires careful consideration, and I am merely drawing the attention of the Government to it in the hope that they will be able to do something towards making the railways remunerative as nearly as possible. Pioneer railways, of course, never can be remunerative. There

must always be losses in connection with working them as in connection with many other activities; but well-established lines should pretty well pay expenses, if not make a profit. Another point to which I wish to draw attention is the expenditure of Federal money in Western Australia. To many people it seems news that so much money is spent in this State by the Federal Government. Some time ago I asked a question on this subject. I wished to know how much money the State had received from the Federal Government in the way of old age pensions, invalid pensions, maternity bonuses, and military pensions. The reply I received was to the effect that the State Government had no information upon these matters. For the information of the State Government I shall now quote the figures, which show how advantageous it must be from the aspect of taxation to have so much Commonwealth expenditure in this State. The hard cash that comes to Western Australia from the Federal Government on account of these various matters each year, amounts to approximately £1,250,000. Hon. members will realise what an advantage that expenditure must represent to the business community of Perth.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We are in the Federation too, and we do not want secession.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: The details of the expenditure may be interesting to hon. members. The amount paid by way of pensions here is £738,000.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Invalid or old age pensions?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Neither. This represents war pensions. Incapacitated persons and dependants of incapacitated persons receive £738,000, the payments being made to a total of 25,927 persons.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Does that refer to soldiers' pensions?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Yes, to pensions paid to soldiers and their dependants. I do not wish to refer to all the particulars, but they include payments to 589 widows and 1,037 children of deceased ex-soldiers, to 5,496 wives of incapacitated ex-soldiers, and to 9,003 children of those men, as well as to many others, the total number of whom was 25,927. Those individuals received amounts aggregating £738,282. When we come to the invalid and old age pensions we find that £450,000

was paid out under that heading, while £15,000 was contributed to benevolent asylums and hospitals, and £42,000 was paid out in maternity allowances. In all, these payments total £1,245,000. I think Ministers should be obliged to me for making that information available to them. With these few remarks, I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill, and I trust that the funds we are voting will be administered carefully, particularly in connection with the railways, as I have suggested.

**HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [12.32]:** Certain statements were made in the Legislative Assembly during the discussion upon the Estimates, which I think were not in the interests of an institution that is little understood. I consider those statements should be replied to. During the debate on the Mining Estimates references were made to the expenditure incurred in connection with the School of Mines, Kalgoorlie. Doubt was expressed whether the expenditure of those funds secured as efficient results as might be expected. In fact, the suggestion was made that a reduction should be authorised owing to the decline of the mining industry. We have to admit that mining has declined, but at the same time the work that the School of Mines is doing is, in my opinion, some of the most effective that is being undertaken in this State to arrest that decline. After all, one of the soundest principles we can pursue in order to meet difficulties existing in any particular industry is to bring to bear upon that industry the highest scientific knowledge and best technical training that can be made available to those engaged in that industry. I do not know of any better way of training young men who desire to follow the profession of mining than to give them a sound technical education, such as is available at the Kalgoorlie School of Mines. As an illustration of the work the school has been doing, I have had a return prepared of the number of students attending the school. The return covers the period from 1903 to 1926, and includes particulars of the attendances during the various terms. For the information of hon. members I will explain that there are three terms each year. Students are allowed to enter on payment of what is practically a nominal fee, while there are also many students who attend without the payment of any fees. For example, a regulation was framed at the termination of the war under

which returned soldiers were allowed to attend the school and receive tuition free. That privilege was largely availed of, and many returned soldiers enrolled as students and have received the benefit of the tuition available at the school. I will not read the whole of the return but will refer to the attendances during various years. In 1904, the year in which the School of Mines was started, there were 158 students in the first term, 134 in the second term, and 107 in the third term, while the number of final passes registered that year was 35. In 1910 the attendances at the three terms totalled respectively 173, 150 and 113, while the total number of passes that year was 132. In 1915 the attendances were 234, 138 and 128, the total number of passes being 158. In 1920 the attendances were 254, 239 and 197, the passes totalling 328. During the following five years there was a decline in the number of attendances. In 1925 there were 169 in the first term, 128 in the second term, and 110 in the third term, but during that year the number of passes totalled 229. It will be seen, therefore, that the benefits derived from the school are shown in the fact that a large number of young men are completing their courses and receiving the advantage of tuition enabling them to pass their final examinations. That should be a sufficient reply to the statement in the Assembly that the School of Mines, Kalgoorlie is not fulfilling its function. As a matter of fact, young men have been trained in the school as mining men and have received practical experience on the mines, and they have subsequently taken first class mining positions in other parts of the world. If hon. members were to travel through the Malay States, Siam or Burma they would come across a large number of young men who had been given their tuition in mining matters at the Kalgoorlie school. We have every reason to be proud of the calibre of the men turned out by the school. Reference was also made in the Assembly to the tutors. It should be explained that the lecturers at Kalgoorlie are specialists in their respective lines of instruction. They keep themselves up to date. The library at the School of Mines is very valuable to any technical man. I can recommend anyone who has a mining problem that he desires to solve, to take advantage of that library in order to get the latest up-to-date information that can be procurable. That information can be found available in the

library. The suggestion was also made that possibly some of the lecturers might be asked to extend their activities to include other subjects and thus lead to a reduction in the staff. The education provided at the Kalgoorlie School of Mines is highly technical and men who are required to undertake work as lecturers there must keep themselves up to date by a wide course of reading in their particular subjects. They have enough to do in that respect without asking them to extend their spheres of tuition. From time to time we have heard comments regarding the urgent necessity for increased efficiency in the mining industry. The three greatest requisites to secure that end are, first, highly trained technical men; secondly, up-to-date knowledge; and, lastly, up-to-date equipment. Those are essentials if we are to attain any high rate of progress in connection with the development of this State. I consider that as a result of the training the young men are given at the Kalgoorlie school, and as a result of the facilities and equipment available there, we can turn out men who will be able to undertake the task and, as employees, do what is necessary to put the mining industry on a sound basis. The benefits of the School of Mines at Kalgoorlie will be felt throughout Western Australia for many years to come. It should be remembered that in addition to mining, engineering is taught there as well, and the standard attained by the engineering students is indeed high. I would not be doing my duty in this matter if I did not refer to the important work carried out in the experimental laboratory. Three or four years ago the laboratory was equipped at Kalgoorlie with various mining plants. Since then a number of demonstrators have been allotted to undertake experimental investigations. A large number of experiments have been carried out and the result of their research work has been such as to disclose possibilities in connection with the development of our mineral resources hitherto undreamt of. As an illustration of the work they have done I need only refer to the application of the flotation process to pyritic ores, as they are termed. Those experiments were carried out with a large variety of ores with successful results in each instance. The investigations were carried further, with most important results, one of the most pleasing of which was that when the experiments were tried out on the mines, the practical results were equally as good as those obtained in the laboratory. At

Broken Hill it was found that the laboratory results were reflected in those obtained in actual practice on the mine. I wish to read to the House a list of the investigations taken in hand by the demonstrators at the laboratory. Tests were made, by means of the flotation process, with lead ores from the Surprise Mine, while tests were also made with concentrates from the Ives' Reward Mine and from the Menzies Consolidated. Tests were also made with magnetic separation in connection with manganese ore from the Horseshoe Mine in the Peak Hill district and in connection with the leaching of copper ore from the Whim Creek Mine at Pilbarra. A successful attempt was also made by means of leaching crude ore in which copper was present and was extracted by means of solution. Hon. members may remember the negotiations that took place with the Copper Separation Company, which undertook to deal with the copper ores at Ravensthorpe. As a result of the difficulties that were experienced in separating the copper from the gold and silver contained in the ore, application was made to the School of Mines for the assistance of an expert. Mr. Moore was sent down and he was successful in obtaining a high-grade spongy iron which is the catalytic required for the concentration of copper. It has been suggested that the results of Mr. Moore's work were not successful. That is not correct. The work was successful, but the company failed because they had not sufficient funds to enable them to carry on. The result was that the company had to close down. That result was not due to the lack of success achieved by the demonstrator. Another avenue of investigation related to the antimonial gold ore from Nullagine. Antimony is a metal that occurs in association with gold ores and where it does so, the extraction of the gold is affected very seriously. Experiments were made with regard to the concentration of the antimonial from the ore and the results were such that a much higher extraction of gold was made possible than could otherwise have been obtained. In fact, an extraction of about 80 per cent. was obtained largely by flotations. Other experiments included the magnetic concentration of magnetic ilmenite, the roasting and cyanidation of flotation concentrates, especially from the Kalgoorlie mines, while the ores tested by flotation from Kalgoorlie were from the Great Boulder, the Golden Horseshoe, the Ivanhoe, the Lake View and Star,

the Oroya Links, the Associated, the Boulder Perseverance, and the South Kalgurli mines. As a result of the demonstration work before Dr. Edwards, a director of the Perseverance Company, when he visited Kalgoorlie, that gentleman suggested that a plant might be installed on a working scale to ascertain what success would be attained under those conditions with the flotation process. Incidentally I may stress the fact that the policy of the Government in connection with the laboratory is one deserving of highest praise. We have to recognise that a tremendous amount of scientific research work is entailed in those investigations. The Government have made available the laboratory and the services of the investigators, and the State is benefiting enormously thereby. I should like to compare that system with the system that operates in connection with some of the great universities of America. There the campaign of research is carried out on very different lines. An investigator is asked by a company, or group of companies, to undertake investigation in some particular line of commerce. He is given a scholarship, the money for which is provided by the company, and he is allowed to work for three years, at the end of which term he finally presents his report. Whatever the results of his investigation may be, he is allowed to receive 10 per cent. royalty on the application of any discovery he may have made. So the investigator is encouraged, the school gets the benefit of assistance from the industry concerned, and the industry benefits from the application of scientific knowledge and special investigation on the lines of the undertaking. There are a few remarks I should like to make bearing on the statement of the Chief Secretary last night. I was rather surprised that the Minister should have concentrated on one aspect of my remarks on the Loan Bill, in the course of which I had advised that we should restrict our borrowing policy. As a matter of fact, I touched on two or three different points. The one I wished to stress most strongly was the desirability of increasing our contribution to the sinking fund. I consider it is a question that could well receive the attention of the Government to ascertain whether the contribution is adequate as compared with the wear and tear that takes place in the life of the assets in which the money is invested. Another point I stressed was the desirability of increasing our revenue by increased efficiency of pro-

duction. We have an illustration—a striking illustration—of what can be done by increased production in this State as a result of the harvest experience of the last few years. In the year 1924 we had a bountiful harvest and the result was immediately reflected in the revenue of the Government departments, especially the Railway Department. In 1925 the harvest suffered considerably and the result was reflected again in the revenue that the Railway Department received. This year we have the prospect of reaping the best harvest that ever the State has known, and already the result in being reflected in the enormously increased traffic on our railways. If that can be taken as evidence—and I contend it can—of the increased wealth that later will roll into the State as a result of the increased production, surely we can concentrate on the question of increasing our efficiency by increasing the production per head.

Hon. J. Ewing: Are not we doing it?

Hon. H. SEDDON: To a certain extent, but not to anything like the extent that is possible. That I shall show by quoting a few figures.

Hon. J. Nicholson: We are reducing production by some of the methods adopted.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That remains to be demonstrated. If we take the figures of production in the Commonwealth "Year Book," members will see that our efficiency is increasing, true by only a small percentage, but it is increasing. My contention, when speaking on the Loan Bill, was that at the present time, when we are on the eve of such a tremendous advance in prosperity—all members will agree that we are on the verge of a tremendous advance—we should see if we cannot make use of the increased wealth that will be available as a result of the enormous increase in production that has taken place in the last three or four years and will continue, even if we do not spend another penny of loan money, because of the enormous area under production. My advice was that we should rather restrict our foreign borrowing and concentrate on raising money locally. We should make use of the money that will be available from increased production.

Hon. J. Ewing: That would mean increasing taxation.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No; why not encourage our people to invest their money locally? When speaking on the Savings Bank Bill, I referred to the need for encouraging

small investors to deposit their money in the local savings bank. If we adopted the same principle for the flotation of loans, and encouraged small investors to put their money into Government loans by offering a small advance in the rate of interest, it would be all to the benefit of the State, and certainly to the benefit of the people living in the State. On the question of efficiency let me deal with a few figures I have taken from the "Quarterly Statistical Abstract." If members examine that publication they will find that at present there are something like 30¼ million acres of land alienated from the Crown. Yet, when we examine the statistics of cultivation, cropping, clearing, etc., we find that only 9¼ million acres are being cropped or cultivated or placed under artificial grasses. That is an example of inefficiency in the matter of agricultural production. Following the theme further, let us consider the percentage of land within a reasonable distance of railway facilities. We have 3,000 miles of railway, and if we allow a 20-mile strip on either side, as representing the land that can be developed, and if all the land within that strip were put to profitable use, I contend that our harvest, large as it is, would be infinitely greater because of the development of that land. A little while ago we had a report by Mr. Bostock on the possibilities of light lands, and as a result of his investigations thousands of acres of land within easy reach of railways are being brought into profitable cultivation. All those things show where we have been inefficient in the past. They indicate where there are possibilities of increased production without our constructing another line of railway. My argument was that if we concentrated in the direction of increasing our efficiency of production and efficiency of public services, we should have such an enormous amount of money available from revenue that we could maintain our present programme largely from the increase of revenue resulting from increased production. As an illustration of inefficiency, let members imagine the absurdity of lifting thousands of tons of material to a height of 1,000 feet and then dropping it again. Yet that is what we are doing every year with all the railway freight taken to Fremantle from Northam.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is an illustration of inefficiency that has grown up in our midst, and it exists because people



have not concentrated on the problem. Let me refer to the scheme outlined by Mr. W. N. Hedges, that of making use of the natural lay of the country and allowing traffic to drift down to the natural ports, whereby the best use may be made of our railways. Instead of engines hauling, as they are, loads of 320 tons over the Darlinr Range, the same engines could haul 1,000 or 1,500 tons to Albany or to any other natural port if the railways were so laid as to take advantage of the fall of the country. That, again, is another illustration of the inefficiency that exists.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about hauling the trains up-hill in the opposite direction?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Trains going in the opposite direction would consist of empty trucks.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Not always.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The bulk of the heavy traffic is from the country to the sea ports.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The trouble is that we have grades of one in 60 instead of one in 200, as have other countries.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Our railway system has grown in a haphazard way instead of being designed and laid on scientific principles, the adoption of which are the bases of efficiency in production. Those are points I wished to stress when I was speaking on the Loan Bill. I did not intend to convey the impression that the Chief Secretary and others evidently gathered from my remarks about borrowing. I support the second reading of the Bill.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [12.55]: I should very much regret if Mr. Holmes considered that any comments of mine reflected on his reputation as an authority on finance. I had no such intention. The hon. member made a number of statements that were calculated to damage the State, and I was desirous of replying to them. In order to do so, I went to the source from which I could secure reliable information. I approached no Cabinet Minister, but I went to the Treasury officials, and the information I gave the House last night was based absolutely on the facts and figures secured from those officials.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I said that you used the figures supplied to you.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is quite right. The hon. member did not attempt

to refute anything I said, but he came forward with a long list of other charges, or semi-charges, of vicious practices.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You said that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If they are vicious practices, the majority of them have been in force ever since responsible Government. It is quite true that on the public platform I may have used figures that emanated from the hon. member, but before I did so I verified them by reports of Royal Commissions. There was no doubt about their accuracy. I must confess, however, that I was largely instrumental in other ways in giving the hon. member's statements widespread publicity in my own district, and I now feel confident that I damaged a previous Government. After the repeated bombardment from Mr. Holmes's gun, there was not much necessity for me to use the matter on the public platform. I must confess that recently I have suffered somewhat from remorse of conscience, and was glad indeed when the opportunity was given me last night to try to make some restitution to the previous Ministry who had been attacked by the hon. member.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then you ought to put them back in office.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: To accomplish that purpose I dare say I should do something in a practical way to show that I have practical sympathy. I do not wish to pursue that matter further. Several speeches have been made to-day, but I do not think that members expect me to be in a position to reply to them. They have dealt with finance, and have made reference to various departments. It has always been my practice not to submit any information to the House unless I felt satisfied that it was accurate. At times it might not have been accurate, but I go to no end of pains in order to secure verification. It is not my fault if there is anything wrong, and I am not going to attempt to defend the position at a stage when there is now no opportunity to secure reliable information.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*Sitting suspended from 1.0 to 2.30 p.m.*

*In Committee.*

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Schedules A, B and C—agreed to.

Schedule D:

Hon. J. EWING: I should like to ask the Minister whether that statement to the effect that the Bunbury harbour is a very difficult proposition is correct. Also I should like to know whether those difficulties are likely to be overcome by the Engineer-in-Chief. Any other information the Minister can give me on this subject will be acceptable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member will point to a specific item in the schedule, I may be able to give him the information.

Hon. J. Ewing: Under item Harbours and Rivers, £233,235.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is on the Loan Estimates £15,000 provided for further dredging at Bunbury to secure and maintain the original depth. Then there is a sum of money to cover investigations and preliminary work in relation to the proposed new harbour.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedule E—agreed to.

Schedule F:

Item, Gaols, £162 8s.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There is urgent necessity for attention to the needs of the prison farm as a valuable adjunct to the Fremantle prison. There is abroad a feeling of cynical complacency towards the Fremantle gaol. Everybody appears to be satisfied that the prisoners are well treated; indeed, many say they are too well treated. However, although we have up-to-date legislation dealing with prisoners, and although the prisoners are very well treated, yet we have the anomaly that all criminal classes in the gaol are virtually mixed up together. All our legislation fails because men sent down to the reformatory, if over the age of 25 years, are worked with all classes of criminals. According to students of criminology, it is very bad that prisoners of different classes should be put to work together. In the Old Country a proper classification of prisoners is made, and in New Zealand, where the most up-to-date legislation for the treatment of prisoners is to be found, the men are properly classified and kept separate, one class from another. One of the worst things that can happen to a man is idleness. In order to classify as much as possible, the rule at the Fremantle gaol is that young men under the age of 25 years are kept apart from other prisoners.

That means that there is practically nothing for them to do, and the superintendent and his officers are often at their wits' end to find some work for these men, who have nothing to do except mess about with a little whitewashing and so on.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Your party objects to their doing outside work.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I have my own views on that. Those men, having nothing to do, set up habits of mind that prove a serious drawback to them when they return to civil life. In the Fremantle prison men are taught to be bakers, tailors, printers and blacksmiths. In a country like Western Australia it is doubtful whether so much attention should be given to those men.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is doubtful, because they are all anxious to get back to gaol again as soon as they can.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That cannot be substantiated. The reformatory prisoners seldom go back. Records all over the world prove that a man who has been in gaol three or four times usually spends most of the rest of his life there.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you favour their services being utilised in country districts?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: In Western Australia, where there are vast areas awaiting development, we could not do better than devise some scheme under which those prisoners could be employed in the open air.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What is wrong with their making a few roads?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not believe in road making for prisoners. There is a big fund available in the Forests Department for reafforestation. If we could take 30 or 40 prisoners and put them into a reformatory camp under proper supervision in the forest, it would be of immense benefit. Men specially fitted for the job could be selected and given a certain acreage to develop and clear and plant.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Somewhat after the Borstal system.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: In the open air those men would have a chance to work themselves back to decent citizenship.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think it would make for reform.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Of course only a certain class of criminal could be dealt with in that way. Another class of criminal could be placed on a prison farm. They would have to be men of good conduct, and prepared to work. The supervision on that farm would require to be stricter than that in the reformatory camps. Associated with all this would

be a fair rate of pay, in order that the dependants of the prisoners, whom the State has to keep at present, would be maintained by the prisoners themselves.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That scheme was put up 14 years ago and was warmly opposed.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I can quite understand opposition to any proposal that the prisoners should work as tradesmen or to do factory work while in gaol. Also I can understand that over a long period of years the industrial workers objected to prison labour; because in the bad old days, especially on the Continent, the prisoners were cruelly treated and the products of their labour entered into competition with those of outside workers. But in Western Australia, as in New Zealand, it would be far better to let those men live open air lives and make them do real work, producing wealth and so assisting the State by supporting themselves and their dependants, in addition to helping themselves back to decent citizenship. In New Zealand it has been a gigantic success.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Why not teach them trades?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It would be better that the young men should be taught bush work and how to earn a living there. Once they get the bush atmosphere they will not want to return to the city. Most of the men who are in gaol are the product of city life, a very small proportion of the prisoners having come from the country. I have here in tabloid form the results of the system in operation in New Zealand. It is recognised that the method of giving short sentences to prisoners for petty offences is a great mistake. This system is becoming worse in Western Australia. Men are frequently given four or five months' imprisonment for committing small crimes. They are sent to the Fremantle gaol where they mix with the worst type of criminals, lose their self-respect, and come out practically as bad as the worst. In this way almost every section of the community is affected, because when these people leave gaol they represent a danger to the community. Amending legislation is urgently necessary to permit of magistrates and judges placing such men on probation without sending them to gaol. After three years of close study of this question I say emphatically that a young man who has committed forgery, or has embezzled money or committed some other minor offence, should not be sent to gaol for his first crime. I would place him on a farm on

probation, or with his former employers if they would take him. That kind of thing is done in New Zealand, where every effort is made to keep young men away from gaol. They are placed on probation in whatever occupation is found for them. In this way they are kept away from prison influences and gaol life, and have more chance of redeeming their characters. It is generally agreed that this system is a great success. It is rare for a young man who has committed an offence of this kind to be again brought before a judge.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you say that forgery is a petty offence?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I refer to petty thefts, and so on.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: If you can get your party to agree to the proposition, it will be all right.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am only expressing my own views. The objection to a prison farm is occasioned by the need that exists elsewhere for the money that would be spent on it. The Minister for Lands said that schools were required all over the State, and that we must supply the needs of settlers rather than look after prisoners. That argument is hard to answer. All kinds of utilities are required, but we must not lose sight of the danger to society by allowing our gaols to be carried on as they are at present. I am sure the authorities at Fremantle want something like this. Every year they have asked that prison farms should be established. Some three years ago a farm was offered to the Government at a cost of £12,000, in the vicinity of Perth. Although it was a cheap property I hardly think we want an expensive proposition like that.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You ought first to get caucus to approve of a thing like that.

The CHAIRMAN: I have allowed the hon. member a lot of latitude, and must now ask him to connect his remarks with the subject before the Chair.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I shall do so. I wish now to refer to the last clause of the report of the Indeterminate Sentences Board for the year ended 30th June, 1923. It is as follows:—

The establishment of a prison farm and reformatory seems to be as far off as ever. This is a serious matter, and deserves the most earnest consideration from those in authority. If a farm colony were in existence, the majority of inmates at present in the reformatory could be sent there, and be employed to better advantage than under present conditions; and

what is most important, they would be fitted for that class of work that the board is most anxious for them to take up. They would be kept away from the city, and later on may become desirable citizens and take up land on their own account. It is to be hoped that the Government will, before our next report is presented, make available the necessary funds, so that a start can be made to give those unfortunates who are at present sent here the opportunity of becoming more useful to themselves and to the State, and also have better conditions and a greater opportunity of making good.

If the Government would make available £2,000 and take up a piece of Crown land as close as possible to Perth they could place upon it three dozen reformatory prisoners to begin with.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why spend money in that direction?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I think the experiment could be conducted readily within £3,000. Each man could be placed on parole and kept usefully employed. I am sure the Government would be only too glad to extend their activities in this direction. I will now read an extract from a report dealing with the Offenders' Probation Act of New Zealand—

A review of the cases admitted to probation during the year discloses that of the total of 760 offenders granted conditional liberty in this manner, 84 per cent. represented offences against property, and only 8 per cent. offences against the person; 658 offenders were admitted to probation by the courts, and 102 came under the provisions of the Act on account of having sentence deferred.

That is an example we might well follow here. I have here an extract from a report made by the Rev. Frank Rule, probationary officer, Christchurch, as follows:—

One case this past year goes a long way to justify the leniency provided by this Act. A youth less than 20 years of age, a member of a respectable early settler family, got into trouble. After inquiries, it was arranged to give the probation officer authority to send him to his own family,

Some people would be horror-stricken at the idea of doing that in this State.

and from far beyond the seas he writes to thank the probationer officer for the kindness that gave him this new start in life.

Mr. T. P. Mills, probation officer, Wellington, says—

During the year just ended 230 probationers passed through my hands; this exceeds last year's total by almost 40. At the beginning of the year there were 99 offenders, 80 were

placed on probation during the year, 51 were transferred from other districts. The removals were made up as follows: 63 completed the period of probation, 68 were transferred to other districts, two left the Dominion permanently, one was discharged by the prison board, five were committed to the Borstal institution, six were imprisoned, leaving 85 on the register at the end of the year. The failures were numerically the same as last year but with a slightly improved percentage. This, which works out at about 5 per cent. of those dealt with, must be regarded as satisfactory.

In welcoming the delegates to the Prison Conference last year the Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Joynton Hicks said—

The time has long since passed when executive governments can say that they have done their duty to society as soon as they had arrested an offender and placed him in safe custody. They now recognise that at that point their duties, far from being at an end, have in fact only begun. In arresting a human being and depriving him of his liberty for a period of time, which is often prolonged, the executive government has undertaken a new responsibility of the very gravest kind, namely that of the treatment and training of the offender during the period of incarceration. The State will not have done its duty if it releases him after his period of imprisonment is over, and in consequence of such imprisonment in such a condition of mind and body that he is no longer fit to take his part in society as a citizen.

Here is another extract which says—

New Zealand is essentially a primary producing country, consequently the greatest opportunity for rehabilitation exists in connection with farming work. It is now generally recognised that physical health is a necessary concomitant to a healthy mental and moral condition, and the following of a farming pursuit helps considerably in this respect. Further, a review of the present social conditions, so far as they affect crime, shows that a considerable amount of delinquency is traceable to the fact that there are so many "misfits" in city vocations. If anything can be done to inculcate in the mind of the potential criminal a love of the open air and a desire to take up farm occupations, a two-fold advantage will result.

Under the heading of payments to dependants the following occurs—

The question of crediting prisoners with wages for the maintenance of dependants has a definite relation to that of the profitable utilisation of prison labour. At present the total credits resulting from the use of prison labour cover only half the cost to the taxpayer for prison maintenance, consequently any payments made for extraneous purposes mean an added burden to the taxpayer. It is now fairly generally recognised that, in addition to the unfortunate fact that the shame and stigma attaching to the imprison-

ment of an offender is also largely visited unto the children, it is usually the family and dependants of the prisoner who suffer most as regards actual deprivation of physical needs and bodily comforts. Some years ago a scheme was inaugurated whereby weekly grants were made to dependants after the prisoner had served three months with exemplary conduct and industry. During the past year just under £8,000 was paid out from the Consolidated Fund to dependants under this arrangement. Cases come under notice from time to time where dependants have been reduced almost to mendicancy through lack of means of subsistence during the first three months, and it would appear that where the department can usefully employ the prisoner there is an obligation on humanitarian grounds, in necessitous cases, to contribute towards the support of dependants. It must be borne in mind that it is difficult to find profitable employment for short-sentence men, as on account of the practice of restoring all prisoners to the place of commitment the shortness of the term does not justify the cost of transport to places where they can be profitably employed. Critics of the use of prison labour in competition with free labour should bear in mind that each prisoner is a unit withdrawn from the ranks of free labour, and the department in using these merely acts as a mobilising agency in an endeavour to effectively utilise what would otherwise be numerous non-effective scattered units. The right to sell the product of prison labour is a natural sequence of the payment of wages to dependants.

I do not entirely agree with all that is contained in the last extract. Now I come to the clinching proof of the advantages of the system. I quote from the report of the Hautu prison land-development camp, Tokaanu—

The daily average number of prisoners in custody during the year was 27.99. The health of the men has been good, there being no cases of sickness throughout the year. The general conduct of the prisoners has been very satisfactory, one man only having been punished for a breach of the regulations. The industry of the prisoners has been good, and the majority take a keen interest in the farm work. The prison vegetable garden continues to be a success. More than sufficient vegetables for local requirements have been grown, the surplus being sent to other institutions. The following is a summary of the work carried out during the year: 300 acres cleared and stumped and burned off ready for ploughing, 229 acres ploughed, disced, tine-harrowed, 215 acres of which was sown down in temporary pasture and turnips, 12 acres in oats, 1 acre in swedes, and 1 acre in potatoes. Forest trees, consisting of 12,000 *Pinus radiata* and 1,000 black-wattle were planted in various parts of the farm for the purpose of shelter belts, and 7,200 were supplied to other institutions, also 6,000 *Pinus radiata* were raised in the prison garden and lined out for planting in the coming autumn. Four miles of fencing

were erected, consisting of three posts to the chain, and four, five and six wires.

Here is a quotation from a report on Paparua prison—

The principal farm industry is sheep, as formerly, and splendid results have been achieved during the year. Our first attempt at fat lambs produced second prize in the Royal Show, and also second in the Meat-producers Board's competition for lambs killed and dressed in the market in England. It is interesting to note that the first and third prize-winner was from the North Island; so, therefore, Paparua can claim to have produced the champion freezing lambs for the South Island. The usual crops of wheat, oats, tares, peas, and barley were sown, with medium results. A special feature of the cropping this year has been the potatoes. Great care has been taken with this crop to ensure as far as possible sufficient results to supply North Island prisons with potatoes after allowing for our own needs. The garden is now commencing to give a better result, and is a credit to the warden-instructor in charge. Surpluses are sent to the market for auction.

I now come to the report of the Rangipo prison land-development camp, at Tokaanu—

This prison was established on the 1st June, 1925, when five prisoners were transferred from Waikane prison. During the first few months they were employed excavating the site for the main buildings and building same. On the 1st September the number of prisoners was increased to eleven; from then on the muster has been gradually increased as accommodation became available. The general conduct of the prisoners has been very satisfactory, there being no breach of prison regulations. There were no escapes or attempts to escape throughout the year.

The CHAIRMAN: I would again remind the hon. member—

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I have nearly finished, Sir. I know I am straining your good-nature. In order to get back to the subject of the Superintendent of Fremantle Prison I wish to read five resolutions—

The CHAIRMAN: The item refers to the salary of the Superintendent of Fremantle Prison, which has merely been increased from £504 to £528.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I contend that there should be a further increase, if necessary on supplementary estimates. Here are the resolutions to which I referred—

(b) Every endeavour should be made to substitute in suitable cases other awards in place of imprisonment. In particular—(1). The system of production should be extended to the utmost extent. (2) The power of the

court to impose fines should be extended, and the machinery for payment of fines should be developed so as to eliminate as far as possible imprisonment in default of payment. (g) The prevention of the contamination of the less criminal prisoners by those more experienced in crime is one of the first essentials in prison treatment. (h) (1) Though the State is under no obligation to pay for work compulsorily performed by prisoners, it is desirable that it should encourage them to work well by offering a recompense. (2) Where this recompense takes the form of pecuniary payment it should not be liable to seizure, nor, as a rule, should the prisoner be allowed to dispose of it in making outside payments, except perhaps in the case of serious illness in his family where no gratuitous aid is procurable, or in the case of poverty in his family. (i) The control of persons sentenced or released under conditions should not be exercised by the police. The organisation might consist either in private societies financially supported and supervised by the State, or in official or semi-official organisations, or persons paid by the State and placed at the disposal of the courts (without any connection with the police).

I shall take an opportunity next session to elaborate on this very important question, which affects the whole State. Turning now to the question of cost, the average annual cost per head of prisoners in this State is £87 18s. 9d. In New Zealand the cost, with all these experiments, is only some £62.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Does that include the amounts paid to prisoners for the work they do?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Full balance sheets are issued. I do not think any of the New Zealand prison farms are business failures. The pay to prisoners is on a fairly liberal scale. However, the pecuniary aspect of the matter is relatively unimportant. What I have in mind is the ever-increasing danger occasioned by the mixture of prisoners in Fremantle Gaol. I hope experiments on the New Zealand lines will soon be carried out in this State.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have listened most attentively to Mr. Gray's informative speech. While sympathising with his suggestions, I must admit they are attended by no little difficulty. Shortly after our acceptance of office a proposition was put up to us for the purchase of a farm which could be utilised for prison purposes. The area was about 12,000 acres, and the price about £7,000. The land was reported upon by agricultural, dairy, poultry and other experts, who agreed in the opinion that this was a suitable farm for the pur-

pose. There was, however, not only £7,000 involved, but probably an additional £20,000 in order to provide accommodation for the prisoners. Money at that time was scarce, and the Government did not feel justified in embarking on the undertaking. I am strongly in favour of prison farms, but I daresay that if there were a prison farm, it would be expected to produce something, and what should we do with the products?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Supply the Claremont Asylum.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And perhaps the Old Men's Home. Then there would be protesting deputations to the Minister once a year—deputations from dairymen and gardeners. If it were proposed to run sheep on the prison farm, there would be deputations from farmers objecting to the competition of prison labour. I am not speaking without my book. During the period of the Daglish Government a small printery was established in the Fremantle Prison. It has a wonderful effect in improving the moral tone of the prisoners. It occupies their minds, and every man who has gone into the printery has come out much better and, to a certain extent at any rate, reformed. But, every year since, there has been a deputation to the Minister protesting that too much work is being sent to the prison printery and that men are kept out of employment in the Government Printing Office and also in private printing establishments by reason not only of the existence of the prison printery but also of the quantity of work given to it. For a long time the only work given to the prison printery has been work from the Education Department—pads requiring to be ruled and stapled for distribution among children attending the State schools—and printing required by the Hospital for Insane, the Old Men's Home, and similar institutions. But still the protests are going on. Every day I expect a further deputation of protest, because the time is ripe for it, nearly 12 months having expired since the last deputation. That has been not only my experience but also that of other Ministers. I do not at all envy the Minister who would have to control the sale of produce from a prison farm.

Hon. A. Burvill: What about the reforestation proposal?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have gone into that proposal, and if I had had some notice of this matter I could have given the

House some important information. All that has come under my notice indicates that the employment of prison labour for reforestation is not profitable, that financially it would be cheaper in the end to employ free labour. Mr. Harris asked whether the prisoners could not be taught trades. They are taught trades. About six months ago a well-dressed young gentleman got admission to my office, when I was very busy, on the representation that he was a journalist. It turned out, however, that he was after a job as a printer. He thought I could find him a position. I assured him there was no vacancy, and he said he was expert in another trade, that of carpentry. He also said he understood blacksmithing and was pretty good at tailoring, could mend boots, and was a good baker. I said to him, "You are a remarkable man; where did you get all your trades?" He replied, "I will take you into my confidence. I have just come from Fremantle after doing five years, and I want to get out of the city. I have been advised to remove from the town and get into the country." An official of the North-West Department happened to put his head through the door at this point, and it occurred to me that he might be able to find the young man a job. I called him aside and said, "We have here a man who is a carpenter, a blacksmith, a tailor; he can mend boots and work with anyone else." The officer said, "I wonder if he can cook." When the man heard that he said, "I forgot that; I am a splendid cook. For the first two years I was inside I was doing the cooking." The man got a job straight away and went to the North-West. I believe he is giving every satisfaction. Mr. Harris can see, therefore, that we do teach the men trades.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is the type of man we want in the country, a real handy man!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand that man is on the path to reform and will continue, so long as he does not come back to the city.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules G and H—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference with managers of the Council and intimating that the Assembly would be represented by three members.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That a message be transmitted to the Assembly agreeing to a conference; that the Hons. J. Nicholson, H. Seddon and the mover be appointed managers on behalf of the Council, and that the conference be held in the President's room forthwith.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I take it that the rule is that in these conferences those who represent the majority view of the House are largely those appointed as managers at the conference. The position would be impossible if members were appointed who represented the minority point of view. Will the Minister say whether the three gentlemen he has nominated will represent the majority view of the House on the amendments that will be discussed at the conference?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I would not like to object to the holding of a conference if any good were likely to result, but when we have regard to the votes that were taken when we insisted upon one amendment by 15 or 17 votes to five, and that taken on the second division when the majority was increased still further, I am wondering what the position will be of the representatives who go to the conference to uphold the views of this House. What good purpose will be served by going to a conference, having regard to the votes recorded on the second reading as well, particularly if those who go to the conference on behalf of this Chamber have to stand firm in favour of our decisions? If that is the position, the conference will be futile.

Hon. J. Ewing: They may be able to compromise.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But not if they have regard to the views of this House!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Whatever decision is arrived at must be unanimous. Mr. Nicholson was nominated by me and he took a determined stand in support of the amendment moved by the Council. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding that there may be a suspicion that Mr. Nicholson had fully made up his mind and that nothing would induce him to withdraw from that at-

titude, we should remember that in certain circumstances he may be able to yield to some extent. I admit that the general impression was that it would be impossible to induce Mr. Nicholson to depart from the decision the Council had come to. Despite that I have nominated him as one of the managers, and I have nominated Mr. Seddon as well. Unless Mr. Nicholson, Mr. Seddon and myself are in accord with the other managers, no agreement can be arrived at.

Hon. G. W. Miles rose to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Under the rules of debate, the reply of the mover of a motion closes the discussion.

Hon. G. W. Miles: May I move an amendment?

The PRESIDENT: I should say so. If another hon. member is nominated I think a ballot will have to be held.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the motion be amended by inserting the name of Mr. Lovekin in lieu of that of Mr. Seddon.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No.

Hon. G. W. MILES: My reason for moving the amendment is that in my opinion the procedure adopted in the appointment of managers is wrong. As Mr. Lovekin indicated, the majority should have two representatives as managers. On another occasion I pointed out that in the Legislative Assembly the majority had two representatives and the minority one. The same procedure should be followed in this Chamber. On a previous occasion the Leader of the House did the same thing when selecting managers. I pointed out then that the majority should have the larger share of the representation. In this instance, Mr. Seddon was opposed to the Council insisting upon its amendments and the Leader of the House was of the same opinion. Mr. Nicholson was in favour of the Council insisting upon them. I hope the House will support me in saying that the proper procedure has not been adopted. In moving to delete the name of Mr. Seddon I realise that gentleman is one of the most conscientious members we have in the House. It is not from that standpoint that I have taken this action, but merely to uphold the principle.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I would rather that some other hon. member was nominated as a manager but apart from that I support the principle enunciated by Mr. Miles.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I would draw attention to Standing Orders 322 and 323. These are as follows:—

322. Every motion for requesting a conference shall contain the names of the members proposed by the mover to be managers for the Council.

323. If, upon such motion, any member shall so require, the managers for the Council shall be selected by ballot.

I think that procedure should be adopted, instead of substituting the name of one hon. member for that of another.

The PRESIDENT: That is the form by which the intention of the Standing Orders can be carried out. As names were embodied in the general motion, perhaps the purpose Mr. Miles and other hon. members seem to have in view, can be best achieved by the method suggested.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: On a point of order, may I suggest that no one has so far requested a ballot? Mr. Miles has moved an amendment to a specific motion.

The PRESIDENT: The same purpose will be achieved.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I support the amendment. I do so without any disrespect whatever to Mr. Seddon. I know Mr. Seddon will fight for the principles against which he has argued during the course of the debate.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And he is an experienced railway man.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The fact remains that Mr. Seddon represents the minority view of the House. Quite four-fifths of the members insisted upon our amendment, and yet one-fifth of them are to be represented by two managers. The thing is absurd and is a departure from the procedure that should be followed. It can only end in delay because if the Minister gets his way and Mr. Nicholson should depart from the attitude he has taken up, we will still have to deal with the report. The only way we can reach finality is to send managers who will represent the majority view of the House.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In explanation I would point out that the idea of holding a conference is to endeavour to find some means of compromise acceptable to both Houses. My views regarding the Bill are perfectly plain. At the same time, if I am appointed as a manager for this House, I will have to represent the views of this House, although I will be arguing against my own convictions. In the circumstances I leave myself in the hands of the House.



Hon. J. EWING: This is not the first occasion that such a motion has been opposed by hon. members. I had such an experience myself. I was in favour of a certain provision and it was suggested I should not act as a manager at a conference. Exactly the same position obtains to-day. The Minister has seen fit to nominate Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Seddon. Seeing that the conference has to be unanimous, there is no danger whatever in appointing those members. They know the feeling of the House and their duty is to endeavour to arrive at a compromise. If there is no spirit of compromise, there is no possibility of reaching a settlement. I take exception to members opposing the motion as I consider it a reflection on the hon. member who has been asked to stand down. The assumption is that two members who were in favour of insisting on the amendments would stand out against the Minister throughout the conference.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: May I ask the House to nominate some other member? I raised the question and prefer not to be one of the managers.

The PRESIDENT: I shall put the amendment: "That the name of Mr. Seddon be struck out with a view to inserting the name of another member."

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

Ayes	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	9

Majority for .. 4

#### AYES.

Hon. V. Hamarley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. W. J. Mann	

(Teller)

#### NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. E. H. Gray	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Shall I be in order in asking for a ballot under Standing Order 323?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There cannot be a ballot. Only three managers have been nominated and three are wanted.

The PRESIDENT: There is a blank in the motion consequent on the striking out of Mr. Seddon's name, and I think it would be in order to take a ballot if the House desires to nominate more than one member to fill the vacancy.

Hon. J. CORNELL: My reason for asking for a ballot is that I cannot recollect such an episode having occurred before.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It has never been put up to the House until this session.

Hon. J. CORNELL: When there is such a disagreement, the only satisfactory solution is to take a ballot. Members should not be asked to range themselves on the side of one nominee or another. I wish a ballot to be taken for the three managers.

Hon. G. W. MILES: A ballot cannot be taken at this stage because there are only two nominations and we require three managers. I move—

That the Hon. A. Lovekin be appointed a manager.

The PRESIDENT: Is there any other nomination?

Hon. J. CORNELL: If I am in order I still insist upon a ballot being taken.

The PRESIDENT: Is there any occasion for a ballot?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Propose someone else and then you can get a ballot.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I take it a ballot means that every member of the Chamber goes to the vote and that we elect three managers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If the motion had not been moved you could have done that.

The PRESIDENT: It would have been better had the original motion been confined to acceding to the Assembly's request for a conference. Then it would have been simple to take a ballot for three managers. As it was not anticipated that a ballot would be requested, I accepted the motion in its original form. Perhaps the Chief Secretary will facilitate matters by withdrawing the motion.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He cannot do that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The motion has been amended, and surely it cannot be withdrawn at this stage. Three managers are required, two have been nominated and we want a third. Why waste time on a ballot?

The PRESIDENT: One member has asked that a ballot be taken and the Stand-

ing Orders provide for a ballot. Only by simplifying what has been done can a ballot be taken.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Only three members have been nominated as managers and how can you have a ballot?

The PRESIDENT: Are there any other nominations?

Hon. J. EWING: Yes. I propose—

That the Hon. A. Burvill be appointed a manager.

Hon. A. Burvill: No, I object.

Hon. J. EWING: You cannot object.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are there more than three nominations now?

The PRESIDENT: Three managers will be appointed from the whole of the members.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I take it that Mr. Seddon is still eligible for appointment, the same as any other member of the House.

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand, Sir, that Mr. Burvill will not agree to his nomination, so only three are left.

Hon. J. Ewing: Who says he will not stand? I do not think the hon. member can withdraw.

Hon. G. W. MILES: What would be the position, Sir, if the Minister were not elected amongst the managers?

The PRESIDENT: The matter is for the House to decide.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If that be so, then I desire that my name be excised from the list.

The PRESIDENT: The House can elect whom it desires.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Are we, Sir, to vote for three names?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, for three names.

#### *Ballot Taken.*

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I should like to draw your attention, Sir, to the fact that an hon. member in the House has not voted.

The PRESIDENT: It is now too late.

Ballot resulted in the selection as managers of the Chief Secretary, Hon. A. Lovekin and Hon. J. Nicholson.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 till 5.30 p.m.*

#### *Conference Managers' Report.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.30]: I desire to report that the conference managers have come to an agreement. The report is as follows:—

Clause 2. Conference recommends that the words proposed to be inserted by the Legislative Council be deleted, and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:—"Provided that in the case of a permanent employee (as defined in Section 69) where the loss occasioned by such damage is deducted as aforesaid, then such employee shall be entitled to appeal against such deduction to the appeal board as provided in said Section 69."

The effect of the above is to leave Section 52 of the principal Act with the addition of the proviso giving the right of appeal mentioned. I will read Section 52 of the principal Act—

Every person employed on or about a railway shall be responsible for any damage caused by his wrongdoing or neglect; and the loss occasioned thereby may be deducted from any salary, wages, or emolument due to such person, or may be recovered in a summary way.

The proviso added gives the right of appeal to the person whose wages are deducted. The report concludes—

Clause 3. Amendment of Legislative Council to stand.

I move—

That the report be adopted and that a message accordingly be transmitted to the Assembly.

Question put and passed.

#### **ASSENT TO BILLS.**

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment.
- 2, Lake Brown-Bullfinch Railway.
- 3, Dairy Cattle Compensation.
- 4, Ejanding Northwards Railway.
- 5, Boyup Brook-Cranbrook Railway.
- 6, Royal Agricultural Society.

#### **BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.**

##### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 10th December.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.34]: Most of the criticisms on the Bill are based on—a not unusual confusion in meaning of the

terms "value" and "price"; an unwarranted but popular error that City values materially change in a few months; unacquaintance with what, in practice, really guides the court in awarding compensation, and what therefore also guides the Public Works Department in settling claims; misconception that bona fide sales between the 1st January and the date of resumption would be ignored by the court; misapprehension that knowledge of Government intentions gained by traffickers comes solely by leakage of information from Government departments, official or Ministerial; assumption that the principle of the Bill seeks to cause, or will in fact cause, an injustice to the straightforward property owner; failure to realise that the principle of the Bill is the only effective means of squelching manufactured evidence. Those points are responsible for a great deal of misapprehension in reference to the measure. The Bill places on the latest dealer in the land affected the onus of proof of the bona fides of any transaction that may be made immediately prior to the gazettal of resumption but after the project intended to be embarked upon has received full publicity and general discussion of the subject has taken place. Mr. Nicholson states that there have been repeated instances during the last 12 months of values of properties advancing enormously. Sir William Lathlain says, "They are advancing month by month." If the word "price" were substituted for "value" in each case, the statements would be correct. The various City transactions referred to are indications revealing the value that has existed for some time previously to the resumption. The value had been there before, and perhaps for a long time, but had not been brought to light. These transactions tend materially to prove or disclose the potentialities of the locality, and the specific land affected. Each transaction would have to be carefully investigated by the court before there could be any admission that such sale had any appreciable effect on values generally. There may be sales in which big prices have been paid, but which have not been due to the advancement of land values in the locality generally. I am advised the court invariably leans to the owner dispossessed, and favourably considers evidence indicating the value of the property to the dispossessed owner. Notwithstanding that the Act specifically refers to "probable and reasonable price at date of resumption," the court undoubtedly interprets this to mean

the value of the land with all its potentialities. Potentiality may be defined as "reasonable, probable, imminent increment." That, I understand, is the interpretation placed upon the word by the court. The award of the court is final. No appeal lies to a higher court except on a question of law, and the compensation court's interpretation cannot be questioned. Where months elapse between resumption and settlement, intervening sales of a bona fide nature are always regarded as in a measure supporting value at the time of resumption, so long, of course, as it is clear that no enhancement has been caused by the public work concerned. If land is resumed for a particular purpose, the fact that a public work is proposed and will be embarked upon should not be permitted to affect the value of the land. The value of the land apart from the public work is what should be taken into consideration. Valuers giving evidence on either side are undoubtedly affected by such transactions in their assessment of value. The onus of proof of the efficacy of such evidence rests on the claimant. The intention of the Bill is that a similar onus of proof should rest on the claimant with respect to transactions immediately before the gazettal of resumption. I can give recent instances in point. Within the last four years some 25 extensive orchard properties in the Hills district were acquired for the metropolitan water supply. Although some of these were entirely unmarketable, and not payable to the owners, they were treated as if they were paying propositions and readily saleable. The court cast aside the fact of the failure of the owners and took into consideration the question how the properties could be made payable if they were efficiently conducted. There are many isolated sales of property above the market values, caused by the business necessity of an adjoining owner or the competition of two such owners. Such a sale of specific property cannot be regarded as necessarily affecting values of land in the vicinity. Some of the sales which have been referred to are on the basis of bona fide value; others are considered to be not so. Undoubtedly these transactions have had a stimulating effect on some parts of the city, but on other parts the effect has been reactionary. Time alone can show the real extent of any increase in permanent value. The comparison of highly-improved city properties is considered by the Public Works Department to be a doubt-

ful guide to the values of vacant blocks. If any long-established city properties are resumed, there are other considerations besides the value of the land plus the value of the building. Not the least of these other considerations is the earning capacity of the property as a whole during the lifetime of the existing building. This is indicated by leases, business potentiality, and so forth. It is because of this recognition of composite value that the provisions of proposed paragraph 2 contained in Clause 2 of the Bill are limited to the intrinsic cost of the building or improvements erected or made since the 1st January preceding the date of resumption. Substantial city properties, I am informed, are not likely to be resumed in the ordinary course. If an acquisition of any magnitude is contemplated, a special Act will, I am assured, be sought, when special provisions to meet the particular circumstances of the case would no doubt be inserted by Parliament. The City of Perth Act, passed last session, is a special measure in point. If an overhead viaduct, an underground railway, or a serious railway deviation were mooted, Parliament, I am assured, would be consulted, and the resumption would not be made under the provisions of the Public Works Act, 1902.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What about the ten acres you require for the market?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No doubt that area would be resumed under the Public Works Act of 1902. It would be treated as an ordinary resumption. In the case of extraordinary resumptions, however, it might be necessary or advisable to consult Parliament. Notwithstanding allegations of injustice, the department's object in the administration of the Act, is to give a fair deal to bona fide owners, but to be firm where tricksters are suspected of being concerned. There is proof of the reasonable treatment by the Public Works Department and the compensation court of those affected by resumptions. I have not heard of a single instance in which any person whose land has been resumed has either been victimised by the Public Works Department or has failed to secure justice from the court to which reference is made in case of failure on the part of the owner and the Government to come to an agreement. Pretty good proof of what I have stated is to be found in the fact that almost every owner is pleased when the Government resume his or her land. I am informed that bona fide sales between

the 1st January and the date of gazettal would, in practice, be taken into consideration in assessing the value as on the 1st January preceding. For such sales would tend to prove, or disprove, the potentiality that always comprises an important part of value. Such treatment does not indicate a disposition on the part of the department or of the court to do an injustice, and in view of that position the amendments proposed by the Bill should not excite the suspicion that seems to have been aroused. The leakage of information is a genuine evil that cannot be overcome, except by the pre-dating proposal in this Bill. The intentions of the Government are often sufficiently known or sensed by traffickers through indications of Government policy, public announcements of the Ministerial programme, requests by deputations, agitations by local authorities, progress associations, and parents and teachers' associations. So nearly everybody in the community is aware for some time before it takes place that a resumption is contemplated; and in the meantime it is possible for traffickers to get to work and fictitiously increase land values. There should be very little leakage from civil servants, because up to the time of the disclosure of official recommendations the knowledge of specific land needed by the Government is confined to the Engineer-in-Chief, the executive engineer and the land resumption officer. It does not really matter how information or indications come to the trafficker. What we must realise is that bogus evidence is manufactured in anticipation of resumptions, and that our sole object is to squeeze all but bona fide transactions. The Commonwealth provision for ante-dating resumptions was made in 1906 as a result of experience in all the States. Investigations were made, and those in charge of the Federal Administration decided to introduce a measure on these lines. That measure has been 20 years in operation and, so far as I know, has never been criticised. It has been accepted generally as a fair and just measure.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is the Commonwealth Act the same as this?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is practically the same, and we are quite prepared to amend the Bill to bring it into strict conformity with the Commonwealth legislation. There appears, therefore, to be no remedy but the principle in the Bill. As to whether its incidence could not be modified,

and the scope of possible injustice minimised, those matters could be considered in Committee. For instance, the predating could be six months at most. The 1st January could apply to resumptions during the first half of the year, and the 1st July to those in the second half. The words "probable and reasonable price at which such land might be expected to sell," in Section 63 of the Act, could be altered to "value." This would give the same wording as in the Commonwealth Act and should therefore make it an unobjectionable measure. "Value" is in practice allowed, although "price" is stipulated. However, we could so amend the legislation as to bring it into perfect accord with the Commonwealth measure. With regard to the cost of buildings, Mr. Nicholson referred to increase in price of material. Such increase in a few months should be adequately covered by the allowance of 10 per cent. for compulsory taking. Mr. Hamersley alludes to the possible interference with a particular project the owner might have had in mind for his land. This is rather nebulous, without specific instances. It should be more generally realised than it is, that with money at 6 per cent. any sum tied up in vacant land doubles itself in less than twelve years. This means that the unearned increment on vacant land must be such as to double the value of the land in twelve years, to get back only the actual financial outlay. The department's experience is that a resumption of vacant land to an owner is a "godsend" being paid in cash, and having regard to the full potentialities of the site.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Who says this applies to vacant land?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I followed the hon. member's remarks closely, and I take it they had reference to vacant land for which the owner had certain plans. I hope the Bill will not be rejected. If it is objectionable in its present form, it may be amended in Committee in the manner I have suggested. It is quite useless to otherwise amend it, unless there is some drastic extension of the present principle in order that we may be able to combat those traffickers who, through their operations, practically rob the Government.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	17
Noes	..	..	..	9

Majority for .. 8

#### AYES.

Hon. J. B. Brown	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. W. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

## BILL—GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Assembly's further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

## BILL—STATE INSURANCE.

### *Assembly's request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference with managers of the Council and intimating that the Assembly would be represented by three members.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Ballot resulted in the selection as managers of the Hons. J. M. Drew, J. Nicholson and G. Potter; conference to be held in the President's room at 7.30 p.m.

*Sitting suspended from 6.7 to 9.30 p.m.*

## BILL—STATE INSURANCE.

### *Conference Managers' Report.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.30]: I have to report that the conference met, but failed to come to an agreement.

## BILL—ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Remaining Stages.*

Debate on the second reading resumed from the previous day.

**HON. A. LOVEKIN** (Metropolitan) [9.32]: I commend the Bill to the House. The annual report of the State Children Department shows that the number of adoptions is now 822, there having been 56 during last year. It is very much in the interests of the State that children should be adopted rather than that they should remain in institutions. One reason for this is that it is better for the child to live in a home, and secondly that this system saves enormous expense to the State. The secretary of the department says that the saving that will be effected on future maintenances is estimated at £11,000 in connection with adoptions already in force. If we were to make a calculation I think we would find that the savings were considerably above that sum. The average age at which a child would be on the State would be something like 10 years. As it costs between 9s. and 12s. 6d. per child per week it will be seen that in the course of time, with this number of adoptions, a much greater saving than £11,000 would be effected. The report also gives the class of houses and parents where these children are being placed. The first begins with parents whose income is £800 a year and who have property, and the list goes down to parents with incomes of £130 a year and some property. Under the Adoption of Children Act, the child when adopted takes the name of the adopted parent and participates in all the rights of the parent. At present the birth of these children is registered, and anyone on payment of 1s. can obtain a certificate of birth. That is not desirable either in the interests of the adopting parents or the child. Some evilly-disposed person, who bears animosity towards the adopting parents, may want to make mischief. He can secure a certificate of birth and put it up that the child is not the child of the adopting parents, but that its name is something else. The child may thus be subjected to vituperation and abuse on account, perhaps, of its illegitimacy. The Bill merely provides protection for the adopting parents and the child. It states that the birth of the child shall be registered under the proper

parentage, but that the registration shall be put aside and kept by the registrar. The adopting parents shall have the right to register the child again in their own name, so that if any busybodies want to make mischief they cannot obtain a certificate and find out that the child is in the name of the adopting parents. Such persons will then be unable to make mischief. In the case of any bona fide person, on application to the registrar a certificate can be procured. The Act provides that when a child is adopted it has all the rights and privileges of a legitimate child, for the adopting parents stand in the place of the original parents. Many of these adopted children are illegitimate, and many of them are deserted. They have, however, found their way into good homes, and have a good upbringing as well as good home teaching. This is all to the benefit of the children as well as to the community as a whole. We should not open the door to the unfortunate position in which the children were originally placed, and to the stigma to be attached to them in after life. The Bill is a step in the right direction, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

## BILL—TIMBER INDUSTRY REGULATION.

### *Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly notifying the Council that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12 to 16, inclusive, 24, 32, 33, 35, 40 and 42 made by the Council; had disagreed to amendments Nos. 8, 11, 17 to 23, inclusive, 25 to 31, inclusive, 34, 38 and 41; had made two amendments consequential on the acceptance by it of amendments Nos. 13 to 16 and 24; and had further amended amendments Nos. 1, 4, 10, 36, 37, 39 and 43, now considered.

### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Interpretation of "Bush Landing": Insert after "place" the words "used in connection with a timber holding":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly has amended this amendment as follows:—

Strike out the words "used in connection with" and insert "on" in lieu thereof.

The amendments are somewhat involved and for the guidance of members and for greater simplicity, I propose to read the amendments made by the Council and then the amendments made by the Assembly.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wish to ask the Honorary Minister whether he proposes to proceed with the 24 amendments, and amendments on amendments at this stage of the session. I for one, do not think I can give an intelligent decision at the present time.

The HONORARY MINISTER: An explanation may clarify the position. Most of the amendments made by the Legislative Assembly represent, more or less, modifications of those made by the Council and were framed with the idea of bringing the provisions of the Bill into conformity, as much as possible, with the opinions expressed by hon. members both for and against the Bill. Many of the amendments meet with the approval of Mr. Nicholson who may be said to have led the attack against the Bill in this Chamber. He has had an opportunity to discuss some of them and he will realise the position regarding many of the amendments, although some of them may be controversial.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And there will have to be a conference.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Probably so. Some of the amendments represent mere alterations in phraseology. That applies particularly to one that was dealt with by Mr. Nicholson. As the result of a conference I arranged between the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Mr. Nicholson the amendment has been framed to meet with Mr. Nicholson's approval. That being so, we will have no difficulty in dealing with the amendments, so that as the outcome of the discussion we may pass a Bill in some form. It is not my intention to attempt anything in the nature of a debate, feeling sure that as the amendments represent compromises, they will meet with the wishes of all parties.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: After hearing the explanation of the Honorary Minister and seeing that a conference must be held, I

shall test the feeling of hon. members and under Standing Order 265 I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to reserve that action until the Honorary Minister has moved a motion regarding the first amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The motion I wish to move supersedes the proceedings of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I will accept the hon. member's motion.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I point out—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There can be no discussion after the motion that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I wish to make a personal explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 266 reads—

Motions—"That the Committee do now divide," "That the Chairman do report progress and ask to sit again," "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair," shall be moved without discussion, and be immediately put and determined . . . .

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If it will convenience the Committee, I will withdraw my motion for the time being.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Honorary Minister to move regarding the first amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I ask the Honorary Minister to indicate the clauses that are being dealt with as well as the amendments, so that we may understand the position?

The CHAIRMAN: I have already stated that I will take the amendments as they were passed by this Chamber, and in the sequence in which they were dealt with. I have read the Council's amendment and the amendment made to it by the Assembly.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There has just now been delivered a print of the various amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: They have been on the Notice Paper all day.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But on the Notice Paper, whilst the number of the amendment is given, the number of the clause is not stated, and so it is difficult for members

to follow the amendment in the Bill. However, this print that has now been delivered will enable us to do so. I do not think there is any objection to the Minister's motion.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is nothing of a controversial nature about this, and it is not opposed by Mr. Nicholson. It will be found that many of these amendments present no difficulty. They have been dealt with very fully, everything has been said that can be said about them, both here and in another place, and I feel sure, because of that interchange of ideas, the Assembly's amendments will meet with the approval of hon. members.

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

No. 4. Clause 4—Delete all words after "such" in line 1 down to the end of the clause, and insert in lieu thereof the words "person as the Minister may from time to time appoint, and shall act in such districts or portions of district, as the Minister may from time to time direct":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly has amended this amendment as follows:—

Insert after the word "appoint," in line 4, the words "hereinafter referred to as the controlling officer."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will be recalled that some little question was raised in Committee as to the person to be appointed. It was thought desirable to leave the appointment to the Minister. I take it the idea of another place is to give this person to be appointed some title. Hence the term "the controlling officer."

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Is it not that they want to know whom he may be? It was suggested that we should name the officer.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It was suggested that, in place of calling him the controlling officer, we might define him as, say, the Chief Inspector of Factories.

Hon. Sir William Cathlain: You cut that out in the amendment deleting the inspector of machinery under the Factories Act.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, the object of the amendment I moved was to render it unnecessary for those in the timber industry to comply with all the provisions of the Factories Act, and of the Inspection of Machinery Act, as well as of this measure. To avoid that duplication I moved an amend-

ment, which will be considered later, rendering it unnecessary for all the various notices to be given.

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

No. 8. Clause 6—Insert after "powers," in line 3, the words "and the number of days to be given by them to the duties of their offices."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly has disagreed with this, giving as a reason that it is impracticable to prescribe the time that may be necessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the Council's amendment be not insisted upon.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not know whether members think it is practicable to prescribe the time; if so, they will insist upon our amendment.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The object in inserting a number of these amendments was to bring the Bill into conformity with the Mines Regulation Act, which has been in operation since 1906 and has worked very well. In a number of instances the same words were inserted in the Bill as appear in the Mines Regulation Act. I know of no instance where the words have proved unworkable in the Mines Regulation Act.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 10. Clause 8, Subclause (1).—Delete paragraph (d).

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly has amended this amendment as follows:—

Substitute "amend" for "delete," and add the following: "by substituting the following paragraph: 'For the purpose of such examination or inquiry to require any person to answer any relevant questions.'"

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Paragraph (d) empowered a district or special inspector for the purpose of examination or inquiry to require the attendance of any official or employee, and the objection was that an official might be required to come to Perth. The Assembly's amendment will merely require any person to answer any relevant questions.

Hon. H. STEWART: Whereas the paragraph in the Bill specified the attendance of any official or employee, the Assembly's amendment relates to any person.



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

No. 11. Clause 8, Subclause (1).—Delete the words "with the authority of the controlling officer" in line one of paragraph (e).

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to amendment No. 11 is because the controlling officer should control the actions of the inspector in respect of the initiation of prosecution.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 13. Clause 10, Subclause (2).—Insert after "of the," in line two, the word "accredited."

No. 14. Clause 10, Subclause (2).—Delete "the," in line three, and insert "any industrial union of."

No. 15. Clause 10, Subclause (2).—Insert after "employed," in line three, the words "in the timber industry."

No. 16. Clause 10, Subclause (2).—Insert after "authorised," in line four, the words "in writing."

No. 24. Clause 15.—Insert after "any," in line one in the word "fatal." Insert after "accident," in line one, the words "or accident causing serious bodily injury."

The CHAIRMAN: My interpretation of the Assembly's message is that amendments Nos. 13 to 16 made by the Council have been agreed to by the Assembly consequential on the Council agreeing to insert the following paragraph in Clause 2 of the Bill:—

"Accredited representative" means the president, or vice-president, or secretary of the industrial union or any member thereof acting with the authority in writing of the secretary or president.

Amendment No. 24 has been agreed to by the Assembly consequential on the Council agreeing to insert the following paragraph in Clause 2 of the Bill:—

"Serious bodily injury" means "such bodily injury as is likely to result in the injured person being disabled from following his ordinary occupation, and earning his usual rate of remuneration for two weeks or more."

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If members had devoted to the various amendments the consideration that you, Mr. Chairman, have given them, they would be able to follow the purport intelligently. The amendments you have quoted, Sir—Nos. 13, 14, 15 and 16—

are consequential on the acceptance of something else which, I understand, we cannot discuss just now. The definition clause has been recommitted twice, and we have had three divisions on it. I feel confident that the House will insist on its amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I will treat amendments Nos. 13 to 16 separately from amendment No. 24.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the consequential amendment made by the Assembly on the Council's amendments Nos. 13, 14, 15, and 16 be agreed to.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We have discussed this matter almost ad libitum. The short way would be for the Council simply to insist on its amendment. There is no use in arguing the point any further.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	5
				—
Majority for	..	..	..	11
				—

#### AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)
Hon. A. Lovekin	

#### NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Assembly's consequential amendment agreed to.

No. 24—Clause 15, insert after "any," in line 1, the word "fatal"; insert after "accident," in line 1, the words "or accident causing serious bodily injury":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly agrees to the Council's amendment conditionally on the acceptance of the following consequential amendment:—

"Clause 2, insert the following paragraph: 'Serious bodily injury' means 'such bodily injury as is likely to result in the injured person being disabled from following his ordinary occupation and earning his usual rate of remuneration for two weeks or more.'"

On motion by the Honorary Minister, the Assembly's consequential amendment agreed to.

No. 17—Clause 13, Subclause 1, delete the words "and to the controlling officer":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing with this amendment is, because all accidents should be recorded by the head of the department for statistical purposes, and further, the district inspector may be absent and the notice may not reach him within a reasonable time.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The carrying of the motion will mean duplication of notices. This House struck out the words "controlling officer" to avoid that duplication. Perhaps the Honorary Minister will accept an alternative amendment striking out "district inspector" instead of "controlling officer." Then the notice will have to be sent to the controlling officer direct. If the district inspector is going to be absent, as suggested by another place, it is useless serving him with a notice. If it is considered better to give the notice direct to the controlling officer, I have no objection. A man does not look up an Act to see whom he has to give notice to, and, under the clause as printed, if he does not give two notices he is liable to a penalty.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Those responsible for the Bill certainly wish to avoid duplication. The retention of the words "controlling officer" is desirable for the sake of the compilation of statistical information more than for any other reason. It may not be necessary to report immediately to the controlling officer. That could be done at a later stage. I would prefer the words "the controlling officer" to be retained.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an alternative amendment—

That in lieu of the words "the district inspector," the words "the controlling officer" be inserted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: This is a small matter and may involve sending the Bill back to another place. Let us press for something that is of consequence.

Hon. J. EWING: Another place has sent us a most involved question, and Mr. Nicholson is making it more involved. The whole thing should be left to a conference.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not want to involve members, but I maintain it is not fair to expose a manager to the position outlined in the clause.

Alternative amendment put and negatived.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 18.—Clause 13, Subclause 1, Delete the words "or incapacitates any person from work for more than 24 hours," and insert in lieu thereof the words "or causes serious bodily injury":

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for not agreeing to the Council's amendment is that all accidents which incapacitate a person for more than 24 hours should be notified."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It was felt that if a man injured a finger or received a minor injury, he would be compelled to notify the district inspector or the controlling officer. Notification of accident should be in harmony with the Inspection of Machinery Act, which provides that serious bodily injury is such as will prevent a person from following his occupation for two weeks or more. If a man is incapacitated for 24 hours, he cannot work during that time. Why should we extend the period?

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 19. Clause 13, Subclause (2).—Insert after "death," in paragraph (a), the words "or accident causing serious bodily injury."

No. 20. Clause 13, Subclause (2).—Delete paragraph (b).

No. 21. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Delete the words "the controlling officer," in lines two and three, and insert "the Minister."

No. 22. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Delete "officer in control and the."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly disagreed with these amendments made by the Council for the following reasons:—

Amendment No. 19. Clause 13, Subclause (2).—Dealt with under (b).

Amendment No. 20. Clause 13, Subclause (2) (b).—Consequently upon disagreement with No. 18.

Amendment No. 21. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Because the controlling officer should have the power to cause an investigation to be made in the absence of the inspector.

Amendment No. 22. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Because results of investigations by inspectors should be reported to the controlling officer.

On motions by the Honorary Minister, the foregoing Council's amendments were not insisted on.

No. 23. Clause 14, Subclause 1.—Delete "industrial," and insert "police or resident" in line 7:

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly disagreed with this amendment for the following reason:—"Because it is considered that industrial magistrates should exercise authority under the measure."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	12

Majority against .. 2

## AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. A. Stephenson

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. H. Harris

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 25. Clause 16—Delete "or agent" in line one:

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment is "because it is necessary that the representatives of foreign companies should be held responsible."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The reason given by the Assembly is not adequate. The responsibility for providing efficient guards for machinery should rest with the owners, and not with the agents, who may be in Perth, which would be inequitable. We should insist upon the amendment.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	6
Noes	..	..	..	16

Majority against .. 10

## AYES.

Hon. J. B. Brown	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. H. Gray

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. W. T. Glasheen

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 26. Clause 16—Insert after "shall," in line 9, the words "so far as reasonably practicable":

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly is as follows:—

Disagreed to because there should be no such limitation of the obligation to provide guards.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I cannot see any justification for the suggestion made by the Assembly. All that we have asked for is that guards should be provided as far as is reasonably practicable.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That would make it unworkable.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 27. Clause 16—Insert after "so far as," in line 8, the word "reasonably":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is similar to the reason given in connection with the previous amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 28. Clause 16—Insert after "shall," in line 9, the words "unless same be removed or altered without his consent":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is because the manager should have sufficient control over employees to ensure that they will not remove or alter guards without his consent.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—  
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Hon. members will recognise that the amendment made by the Committee is fair because no man could possibly be on the spot all the time. No one

could do more than provide the guards, and if an employee wilfully removed the guards, the owner could not help it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: His foreman would be there.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Despite that, the hon. member knows that guards are removed.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	6
Noes	..	..	..	16
				—
Majority against	..			10
				—

# AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. R. Brown
	(Teller.)

# NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamerley	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. Sir W. Lethbridge	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovelace	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. J. Ewing
	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 29.—Clause 19, delete:

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly disagrees to this for the reason that precautions should be taken to prevent accidents.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I draw attention to the words in the clause, "likely to produce danger of any kind." Anything is likely to produce danger. If we reinsert the clause we ought to strike out those words and insert in lieu, "anything that is apparently unsafe."

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 30.—Clause 20, Subclause 2, delete "controlling officer," in lines eleven and twelve, and insert "inspector."

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to this is that the controlling officer should exercise the authority.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 31.—Clause 20, Subclause 43, delete "controlling officer" in line six, and insert "Minister":

The CHAIRMAN: For the same reason the Assembly disagrees to this.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 34.—Clause 21, Subclause 1, insert after "or," in line one, the word "employed." Insert after "of," in line two, the words "or an employee working in":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to this is that it would create a difficulty in empanelling a jury.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This deals with juries. I hope the amendment will be insisted on.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If these words are not inserted it will mean that only persons interested in the management of a timber holding will be disqualified from sitting on a jury. Our amendment included also employees. They are just as likely to be biased as are those interested in the management. If it is good to have the first provision, it is equally good to have the second.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 36.—Clause 22, delete subclause 13:

Assembly's amendment: Substitute "amend" for "delete," and add the following: "by substituting the following subclause: 'For the prevention of the entry of smoke into the mill to the danger of workmen'":

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is the provision dealing with the erection of smoke screens. This Committee formed the firm opinion that it was impracticable. The Assembly's amendment is equally so, and I trust it will not be agreed to.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment not agreed to.

No. 37.—Clause 22, delete subclause 15:

Assembly's amendment: Substitute "amend" for "delete," and add "by omitting 'to a prescribed width.'"

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This gives power to make regulations requiring bush lines to be cleared of dangerous trees, etc. In view of the long discussion that took place here, I trust the Committee will insist on their amendment.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: In deleting the words, "the prescribed width" the Assembly's amendment makes the position very much worse than it is at present.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In an earlier discussion it was stated that the provision had for its object the harassing of mill-owners. Actually it is to allow of the making of regulations for the clearing of dangerous trees. Its sole object is the safety of travellers.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment not agreed to.

No. 38.—Clause 22, delete subclause 19:

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for not agreeing to this is that power to regulate the construction and layout of housing and accommodation of workers is deemed necessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I hope this will be insisted on. Other provision in this respect is made at present, and also there are the provisions made under the Industrial Arbitration Act.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 39.—Clause 22, delete subclause 21:

Assembly's amendment: Substitute "amend" for "delete," and add "by omitting the words 'not expressly provided for'":

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

The Solicitor General states that it is necessary. There is no Act, State or Commonwealth, that does not contain provision to make regulations requisite to give effect to the measure. The Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment removes the objection that was raised previously.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If his power is conceded we might as well abandon the discussion. The words pro-

posed to be deleted will not alter the effect of the paragraph. When making provision for apprentices a similar paragraph that would have given almost unlimited power was deleted.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I share the views of Sir William Lathlain. The words of the paragraph are so wide as to embrace almost anything.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment not agreed to.

No. 41. Clause 27.—Delete the words "appointed as an industrial magistrate for the purposes of the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1925":

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to this amendment is because it is desirable that industrial magistrates should exercise authority under the Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. H. STEWART: There is nothing in the measure that requires the appointment of an industrial magistrate.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 43. Insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 28, as follows:—The provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920, and the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, and of all amendments or re-enactments thereof, in so far as same may apply to any sawmill, mill, timber holding, machinery, mill gearing, mill landing, bush landing, or yard as herein defined, shall not apply to this Act, and no owner, manager, or agent, as herein defined, shall be required to comply with said first-mentioned Acts in addition to this Act:

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly has amended this amendment as follows:—

Strike out all the words after "provisions" in the proposed new clause, and insert the following in lieu thereof:—"of Sections 13, 14, 16, 17, and 20 of this Act, and of the regulations made under paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), (9), and (18) of Section 22 of this Act, shall be in lieu of the provisions of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, and any amendment thereof," and of the Factories and Shops Act, 1920, and any amendment thereof, and the regulations under those Acts relating to similar matters, which provisions and regulations shall not apply to the timber industry; but nothing in this Act shall affect

the provisions of the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, relating to boilers, or to the certificates required to be held by engine-drivers, crane and hoist drivers, boiler attendants, and other persons."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Hons. J. Nicholson, V. Hamersley, and J. W. Hickey drew up reasons for disagreeing to the Assembly's amendments on the Council's amendments. Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

*Sitting suspended from 11.56 p.m. to  
12.30 a.m.*

## **BILL—KOJONUP AND DOWERIN ROAD BOARD LOANS VALIDATION.**

### *First Reading.*

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [12.31] in moving the second reading said: The necessity for this Bill is to legalise the action of the Kojonup and Dowerin road boards, in the raising of loans, owing to their failure to comply with certain formalities laid down in the Road Districts Act. In the case of Kojonup, the board entered into negotiations with the Primary Producers' bank for the raising of a loan, and actually obtained the money prior to the adoption of the necessary resolution authorising the transaction. The Primary Producers' bank wished to treat the matter as an overdraft, which would have meant the payment of 8 per cent. interest instead of 7 per cent. The bank then endeavoured to transfer the loan to another institution, but as the board had not adopted the resolution within the specified time, negotiations could not be completed until this omission was validated. It is to rectify this omission that the Bill is required. In all other respects the Statute is being complied with. This matter was only brought under my notice yesterday, and I have not had an

opportunity to investigate it. Probably members representing the districts concerned will be able to speak with some authority on the subject. With regard to Dowerin, the board originally advertised the raising of a loan of £1,300 at 6 per cent but then found they were unable to obtain the money at that rate of interest. Furthermore, owing to the increase in the cost the board found it necessary to raise another £200. The board then completed their arrangements for raising the loan for £1,500 at 7 per cent on the assumption that the original advertisement was all that was necessary. This, however, has not met the case, as Section 284 of the Road Districts Act provides that the full particulars must be advertised showing amongst other matters the rate of interest to be paid a month before the loan is raised, so as to give an opportunity to the ratepayers to object. The ratepayers might approve of a six per cent. loan, whereas they might not agree to a seven per cent. loan. In other respects the provisions of the Statute have been complied with. It is now necessary to put the matter on a proper footing by the passing of the Bill. In both cases the board secretaries are inexperienced in the matter of raising loans under the Road Districts Act. I very much regret that the Bill should have come down. It was not contemplated by me, but evidently it is a matter of great urgency and importance to the local authorities concerned. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. H. STEWART** (South-East [12.37]: On this subject I can speak only with reference to the Kojonup Road Board. I know how the trouble arose, namely, through the bank interested taking action that was not contemplated when the arrangement was made. I ask members to support the second reading so that the action which has been taken may be validated.

The Chief Secretary: There is nothing improper in the transaction.

Hon. H. STEWART: Everything is all right.

**HON. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [12.38] I have not been approached in any way by the Dowerin Road Board. I regret that it has been necessary to validate any error the board may have made, through being obliged to pay 7 per cent. for the money required

I am rather astonished that the Government have not been able to see a good investment in this for some of their Savings Bank money. I can hardly understand why the Government have allowed a private bank to get the benefit of such an investment as this. It would be a good thing if arrangements such as this could be met out of savings bank funds rather than that a Bill should have to be introduced to enable a private institution to make so good a business deal. The security of these road boards is gilt-edged. In this case a private institution will get 7 per cent. I wonder what is happening to the State Savings Bank that it was not looking for an investment of this kind. I have no wish to place any obstacle in the way of the Bill, but I do think that good business has been lost to the Government institution.

**HON. A. LOVEKIN** (Metropolitan: [12.40 a.m.]): I am surprised that the local bodies should be paying such a high rate of interest. In this case the Government might well have come to the rescue. They have in hand by way of uninvested trust fund balances a sum of £2,496,292 13s. 4d.

**Hon. G. W. Miles**: That is money lying idle.

**Hon. J. Cornell**: That is the No. 2 trust account.

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN**: Some of these local authorities might be only too glad to get a portion of it. I see, too, that the cash available at the close of the year was £1,574,399.

**Hon. J. Nicholson**: Where do they keep it?

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN**: It is available. I do not know of any business firm that would allow such large amounts as those to lie idle, and cannot understand the Government doing so when the road boards are paying 7 per cent. or 8 per cent. for their money. I do not know that we are justified in passing the Bill. If the Chief Secretary will look at the balances and will see the Treasurer, possibly the difficulty attendant on paying these high rates of interest can be overcome. This provides a really good investment for money that at present is earning nothing.

**HON. C. F. BAXTER** (East) [12.4 a.m.]: The matters referred to by previous speakers do not enter into the question before us. The Dowerin Road Board have done something that is not strictly legal.

These things are bound to happen. Members of road boards are laymen, and are for the most part farmers. The secretaries are underpaid, and are not up to the standard that should be demanded of road board secretaries.

**Hon. V. Hamersley**: If we paid more the rates would go up.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: I saw the other day an advertisement for a road board secretary. This official was to receive £250 per annum, find his own motor car, and be paid an allowance for fuel of £25 a year.

**Hon. A. Lovekin**: They ought to form a union.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: One can understand mistakes like this occurring. The Government do not look for investments for the money they have in the Savings Bank. If road boards in their turn look to the Government they generally apply for subsidies which are not forthcoming. The Dowerin Road Board set out to borrow money at 6 per cent. but they made a mistake which has to be rectified by the passage of this Bill. Even suppose they did borrow from the Government, the loan would still have to be validated. I trust the House will agree to this, for although small it is a very important Bill.

**Hon. A. Lovekin**: Should not the Government come into it a little?

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER**: It is not a question of that at all, but a question whether Parliament is going to validate the mistakes of these two boards. Local authorities are composed of men acting in an honorary capacity who are now placed in a very unfortunate position. I trust the second reading will be carried and the Bill become law.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Remaining Stages.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

### **BILL—TIMBER INDUSTRY REGULATION.**

#### *Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference with managers of the Council and intimating that the

Assembly would be represented by three members.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the Assembly's request for a conference be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Ballot resulted in the selection as managers of the Hons. J. W. Hickey, A. Lovekin and J. Nicholson, the conference to be held in the President's room forthwith.

*Sitting suspended from 1 a.m. to 4.20 a.m.*

## BILL—TIMBER INDUSTRY REGULATION.

### *Conference Managers' Report.*

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have to report that the Conference managers, having met, recommend the following amendments:—

No. 23. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Insert after "nearest," in line seven, the words "police, resident, or"; and consequential amendments throughout the Bill.

Nos. 25 and 28. Clause 16, Subclause (1).—Council's amendment agreed to in line one and in the ninth line after "shall," delete the Council's amendment and insert the following:—

"unless he shall prove to the satisfaction of the Court that same has been removed or altered by some particular person without his consent."

No. 34. Clause 21, Subclause (1).—Council's amendment deleted; Clause to stand as printed.

No. 36. Clause 22, Subclause (13).—Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 37. Clause 22, Subclause (15).—Subclause to be altered to read as follows:—

"Requiring bush lines to be cleared of dangerous trees."

No. 38. Clause 22, Subclause (19).—Re-drafted to read "for the inspection of the housing and accommodation provided for workers."

No. 39. Clause 22, Subclause (21).—Subclause re-drafted to read as follows:—

"Generally for carrying this Act into execution."

No. 41. Cause 27.—Delete the words "appointed as" in line 3 and insert "or"; and after "magistrate" in same line insert the word "appointed."

I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question put and passed.

### *Assembly's Further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

## BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

### *In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 63:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1 the words "the words 'at the date the land was taken' in paragraph (a) thereof are deleted, and the following words are inserted in place thereof, 'namely that on the first day of January last preceding the notice in the *Gazette* of the taking of the land, or'" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"Delete paragraph (a) of Section 63 of the Public Works Act, 1902, and insert the following in lieu thereof:— (a) The value of such land with any improvements thereon or the estate or interest of the claimant therein as on the first day of January last preceding the notice in the *Gazette* of the taking of the land if the notice is gazetted before the thirtieth day of June, or if the notice is gazetted after the thirtieth day of June, then as on the first day of July last preceding such notice, without regard to any increased value occasioned by the proposed public work."

The effect of the amendment will be to substitute "value" for "probable and reasonable price."

Hon. H. STEWART: I want to be certain that this amendment deals only with the first subclause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Paragraph (a) of the section in the original Act is struck out, and Subclause 1 of the Bill is deleted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is no fault of the Chief Secretary that the amendment is put before us at such a late hour, and in its present form. I do not suppose a single member of this Chamber, apart from the Minister, understands what it is we are asked to agree to. We have not been able to peruse the amendment, but this is the legislation we are asked to pass after sitting for 17½ hours! I enter my emphatic protest against being asked to attempt to do our duty in these circumstances.

Amendment put and passed.



The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (2), after "last" in line 5 of the proviso, the words "or the first day of July as the case may be" be inserted.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## BILL—SOUTH-WEST ELECTRIC POWER.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th, December.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.38 a.m.]: It was my intention to speak at some length on the Bill, but having regard to the early hour of the morning and the fact that members are tired after the long sitting, I shall curtail my remarks and not detain the House any longer than is necessary. There are many reasons I can advance in support of the Bill, but there are two only to which I shall refer. The first is that I look upon the scheme as the initial step taken in this State in the direction of some real progress in provincial industrial development. The second is that I believe, before many years are past, electricity will play a prominent part in the agricultural development of the State. It is unnecessary for me to remind the House that the conditions of the world have materially changed during the last few years. Whether we will or no, we must face the reality that, thanks to electricity, the economic problems of the world have taken on new phases. Cheap power is now recognised as the source of all successful industrial effort. In America, on the Continent, and particularly in France, Germany and Italy electrical energy has been applied in a marked degree to industry and agriculture. The success that has followed the application of that energy has been most gratifying. Other countries are rapidly following suit, and even here in Australia some progress has been made. In Tasmania cheap power is available and is attracting the attention of manufacturers to that part of the Commonwealth. In Queensland extensive investigations have been and are being made with the idea of providing cheap current.

Even in districts so far removed from the metropolis as Cairns, quite a lot of thought has been given to the question of harnessing such waters as the Barron Falls with a view to providing cheap current. It shows that the question of applying electrical energy to the work of rural districts is being earnestly taken up. In Victoria the Morwell brown coal scheme is now producing cheap current, and at the same time the Hydro Electric Works on Sugarloaf, Rubicon, are in progress, and there is still a third scheme being investigated in Victoria. In Perth cheap power is available; so cheap that the City Council are in the happy position of being able to utilise current that is being generated at a loss. That is due to the fact that they were able to make a very hard bargain extending over a long term of years. No such advantages are available in the provinces of this State. In many places people are paying a shilling per unit for lighting, and sixpence per unit for power. On those figures any great industrial progress is practically impossible. The Bill is designed to remedy that condition of affairs. For some years the people of Bunbury have felt the need for cheap current. Moreover the plant they have to rely upon has been unable to cope with their requirements. It is disastrous for any progressive community to be handicapped in this way. Collie, outside the mines, has experienced the same disadvantage. The people of that town are more or less at the mercy of the coal companies from which they purchase their current. Such a condition of affairs cannot be permitted to continue. By a minute of Executive Council a committee was formed to investigate the prospects of a South-West power scheme. After long and laborious effort they have been able to present a report and recommendations the result of which, it is felt, will be to provide current over a very large area and at a price that will enable industry to progress and the people to benefit in consequence. The transmission, as provided for in the Bill, is at present limited to a 40-mile radius. That is but a small radius, for the Morwell scheme in Victoria is transmitting over a distance of 110 miles, and I believe that in America distances up to 500 miles are being successfully operated over by power schemes. If the Bill be carried, as I hope it will be, the benefit that will accrue to the South-Western portion of the State will be immeasurable. The Collie coal mining companies have realised

that a larger scheme than they can handle would be advantageous. They have agreed to take 63 per cent of the estimated output, and the municipalities of Collie and Bunbury are equally anxious to get the current and so extend their activities. My only fear is that, notwithstanding that the plant is designed for a capacity of double the estimated output for the first three years, it will prove too small. I feel that shortly the quantity of current required will be in excess of the capacity of that plant. I have here a lot of figures that I had intended to give to the House but, as I have said, the hour is not late but early, and so I will not worry members with them. Let me mention the State of Victoria and point out the increase in industry that has taken place as a result of the supply of cheap electric current. A few years ago the Victorian factories were comparatively few. Today Victoria has 7,289 factories employing 156,162 people and paying £27,472,000 in wages annually. Those factories by reason of being able to operate with cheap power, are manufacturing articles worth nearly £114,000,000. That is a fine record for such a small State, and I know that in Western Australia we have a country many times greater than Victoria and with all that State's natural advantages. Consequently, we can make some attempt at visualising what will happen in Western Australia when our population grows and can obtain such advantages as cheap power. The South-West scheme is designed for about 40 centres, a plan of which I have before me. The people in those centres are enthusiastic about the scheme, particularly those of Bunbury and Collie and are prepared, if necessary, to make some sacrifice in order to have it brought into operation. People outside of those municipalities desire an extension and I have no doubt, if this Bill is carried and the power scheme is consummated, that the advantages to the whole State will be very great. I wish to say a word or two regarding the agriculturist. I believe it is quite possible to distribute electric current throughout the South-West at a price that will enable the farmer to utilise it to real advantage. There is no question that the use of electric power is a very great factor in eliminating the drudgery that has been more or less inseparable from farming. It will lead to better working conditions and better living conditions, and I am satisfied that from those points of view alone the Bill is entitled to the sympathetic consideration of the House.

Some members, in speaking to the Bill, have referred to the question of bringing electric power to Perth from Collie. I hope some day that will be done and I feel sure when it is done, it will be found to be a profitable undertaking. The electrification of the metropolitan railways has been referred to, and I hope to live to see the day when we shall be able to electrify some of the agricultural lines as well, for there, again, a great saving could be effected. It would also eliminate any risk of fires to crops and obviate the necessity for importing Newcastle coal to run our railways. I congratulate the Government on having introduced the Bill. I hope it will receive sympathetic consideration from members and will be passed. If the scheme presents any difficulty, let me inform members that in February next there will be a conference in this State of electrical engineers and experts, and any question about which the Government are doubtful might be referred to those gentlemen for elucidation. I support the second reading.

**HON. A. LOVEKIN** (Metropolitan)  
[4.55]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	12
Majority against				2

#### AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. V. Hamersley

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. J. Ewing

(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

**HON. H. STEWART** (South-East)  
[5 a.m.]: Much as the Bill is desirable it seems to me that we can hardly give it proper consideration at this stage of the session.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is simple enough to understand.

Hon. H. STEWART: Quite so. We have dealt with other measures in other sessions that have been far more important than this one, but which have been considered for as

many days as this Bill has been considered for hours. I wish to protest against the Bill coming forward at so late an hour, in view of the fact that for three years constituents of mine and of other members in adjoining provinces have been overlooked. I refer to the settlers in the Kalgarin, Kondinin, Jilakin and Lake Grace districts. When a railway was built in the neighbourhood some time ago, an alternative route was mentioned by the advisory board, but the route chosen catered for only a section of that district. The Bill before us involves the expenditure of certain moneys. The money advanced by the Government will be provided through the medium of the Industries Assistance Act. On the other hand, money is being provided from loan for railway purposes. In the part of my province to which I refer, people have been profitably producing wheat a long distance from the railway, for three years. They have been depending upon the second report of the advisory board, hoping that it would lead to the construction of the much needed railway. It was also hoped that the report would lead to the introduction of a Bill for the construction of the line. The Bill before us is not nearly of such immediate, urgent and vital importance, that I can allow it to pass without recording, on behalf of my constituents, their disappointment at the delay that has occurred in the matter of their railway, and the bitter disappointment they will feel now at being obliged to continue carting their wheat over tremendous distances when they had every reason to anticipate that the Bill would be brought forward in accordance with the report of the advisory board. Provision was made on the Estimates, but it seems that Parliament will close without any steps being taken in this direction.

**HON. A. LOVEKIN** (Metropolitan) [5.5 a.m.]: I am compelled to rise at this early hour of the morning to protest against the Bill. I can hope to make but little impression upon members, no matter what arguments I may bring forward upon the subject. Members are exhausted. We can see that this is so from the positions they have taken up in the Chamber.

**Hon. E. H. Gray**: We are as lively as crickets.

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN**: The hon. member has done no work to-day. He has gone slow. Some of us have been here for over 18 hours on end. We have had three conferences with another place, and are not in

a fit state to legislate, even on small matters, much less upon a big matter such as this. I oppose the Bill. No one can accuse me of having any lack of sympathy for a power scheme at Collie. I have advocated it ever since I have been in the State.

**Hon. J. Ewing**: You are not showing much sympathy for it now.

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN**: This is not a Bill for a scheme that will be helpful to the State. My reading of it suggests that it is what in days gone by was referred to as a boodling Bill. I wish to have nothing to do with it.

**Hon. J. Ewing**. How do you justify that statement? You cannot do it.

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN**: I shall endeavour to show that it is a boodling Bill. By that I mean it is more in the interests of individuals than of the community. Possibly I shall be able to show that as I proceed. I admit that the position of America and other industrial centres is largely due to power. They place power first. Mr. Mann has given illustrations of that. In Great Britain recently a great effort has been made to obtain power in all directions on a large scale, in order that the Mother country might compete with other countries with her manufactures. In Canada I saw immense power schemes. I have some figures showing the results of cheap power. The Ontario Power Company transmits current to 143 different municipalities. Winnipeg has another large scheme. Its increase in production amounts to no less than 1,770 per cent. since the scheme was started, while the increase in population has been 446 per cent. At Calgary, where there is a great deal of power generated, there is a steam plant operated side by side with a water plant. There they have found that the steam and the water plants are about equal as regards the cost of production. They charge two cents a unit down to three-quarters of a cent per unit. The transmission is over 52 miles and the current is being sold at a cheap rate. A portion of the current is generated from coal, because there is not sufficient water to generate the whole of the current required. The municipal year book concerning Calgary shows that the current is generated as cheaply from coal as it is from water. Water power needs immense and costly dams which carry a lot of interest, in order that the water may be supplied all the year round. I was reading through a paper yes-

terday written by Mr. C. H. Attwood on the power resources of Alberta in Canada. The writer said—

It should always be kept in mind that under many circumstances power generated from coal-fired steam plants can successfully compete with water power.

Knowing this, I am in favour of generating power on a colossal scale. I say that because the consumption from the East Perth power house is already up to 20,000,000 units. If power were developed at Collie on a colossal scale, current could be transmitted to Perth, and the plant here used as a distributing station. It will not be many years before the East Perth power house will reach its limit of production. When that time comes, we will have to go to Collie to secure power in unlimited quantities. We should get it from that centre because, I have been informed, there is a railage charge of 13s. 6d. on every ton of coal hauled to the city. On the other hand we could transmit current over high tension cables at an interest cost that would not be anything like that involved in hauling coal to the metropolis. There is then to be borne in mind, too, that the cost of transmission by cables, once they are erected, is stationary. I would go further because, when considering this matter yesterday, I turned up a letter I sent 26 years ago to the late Lord Forrest, when he was Premier. He sent it to the Public Works Department. I suggested to him that power should be generated at Collie and transmitted as far as Boulder so that the local line that was run in those days from Kalgoorlie to Boulder, could be worked by means of electricity. I also suggested that the line could be tapped at the various pumping stations of the Coolgardie water scheme, so as to save haulage of coal. That would have helped towards making the scheme payable instead of it becoming a burden on the taxpayers. If that suggestion had been adopted, there would have been a saving on account of haulage of coal and also in respect of the locomotives that were used for hauling water. The position to which I drew attention in those days, applies equally to-day. I pointed out the following advantages to be derived from that scheme:

Besides working the Boulder line, the mains could be tapped en route and the power applied at the pumping stations of the Coolgardie water scheme. Some of the advantages of this system are—(a) the use of our local

coal; (b) the saving in the haulage of fuel to the Boulder railway and the pumping stations; (c) the saving of the cost of water in connection with the railway; (d) the saving of water for the boilers at the pumping stations enabling all water pumped to be sold; (e) the probable saving in the cost of duplicating the Coolgardie water pipes in the immediate future, by reason of the fact that no water would be required to be drawn off for railway and pumping purposes—

I was wrong in my estimate in that respect, for I was too optimistic.

—(f) the saving of capital cost on locomotives, the value of electric motors being about one-seventh of the cost of the locomotives of equal power; (g) the saving of 50 per cent. in labour, one man being only necessary to drive the electric motor, whereas the steam engine requires two; also large reduction in number of cleaners required; (h) the enormous saving in respect to the repairs of locomotives; (i) the relief of trucks for haulage of coal and water will save the Colony large capital sums for the purpose of additional trucks; (j) the saving of large capital expenditure on railway workshops. There are other advantages, but I need not set them out.

That was what I suggested in 1900 and I have been agitating for it ever since. It cannot be said, therefore, that when I oppose the Bill to-day I am prejudiced against Collie. On the contrary I am well satisfied that Collie is the one source from which we can get a supply of electricity in unlimited quantities. The proposal was turned down at that time, the reason given being that it was not then practicable. It was stated that the engineers considered that it was impracticable to transmit electricity at a higher pressure than 3,000 volts. At that very time in America electrical engineers were transmitting 30,000 volts! Of course since then it has been proved that there is no limit to the transmission of electricity so long as good insulation can be provided. In America, at Chepawa they are transmitting 300,000 volts. The higher the pressure, the less line area is required and the cheaper are the cable costs. I suggest we should take the bull by the horns and embark upon a big high tension scheme to supply not only Perth but to electrify our railways and to distribute current throughout the South-West areas. But it must be a big scheme if it is to be done cheaply. That cannot be done with a small scheme such as that now proposed at Collie. I contend, therefore, that the scheme must be of such magnitude that it will supply current at less than 1d. per unit. If we cannot supply power at

such cheap rates, the scheme will be practically of no use to us. I do not want it to be thought that I am prejudiced against Collie.

Hon. J. Ewing: It looks like it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wish Collie to be used as a national base for the distribution of electricity on a big scale in the interests of Western Australia. I do not want any petty parochial scheme to be provided.

Hon. J. Ewing: This is the nucleus of a big scheme; it is not a parochial matter at all.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest that we do not start the nuclei of big schemes in this way.

Hon. J. Ewing: But this is the nucleus of a big scheme.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A small amount like £250,000 to be spent on the nucleus of a big scheme!

Hon. J. Ewing: So it is.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Has the hon. member any idea at all of the cost of a big electrical plant? The amount provided for in the Bill will merely be sufficient to put in a little miserable footling scheme, but will not provide for a scheme of the magnitude I desire to see established.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The money provided will only be sufficient to buy a squib plant.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. Hon. members can appreciate the position regarding this scheme, with the capital set out and two little municipalities having to shoulder the responsibility, and money to be advanced under the Industries Assistance Act. Yet Mr. Ewing says this is the nucleus of a big scheme!

Hon. J. Ewing: I repeat that it is so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Let the hon. member get a bit bigger!

Hon. J. Ewing: You do not know all about it yourself.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have endeavoured to explain the position to the House. Mr. Ewing bases his advocacy of the Bill on his statement that Mr. Taylor regards it as a good scheme. The hon. member cannot rely upon that too much. Mr. Taylor has for many years been opposed to such operations at Collie.

Hon. J. Ewing: Well, we shall see.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know what has happened recently. It is on record on the files of the House that Mr. Taylor has been long opposed to any operations at Collie and he has contended that he can produce current cheaper here in Perth by

hauling coal from Collie than he could procure it if he transmitted it by cable from Collie. I oppose this Bill because the scheme is not big enough. I want Collie to be used for a national scheme. If the Bill be passed it will shut up Collie against the establishment of any such national scheme of the magnitude it should be. Under the Bill the trust will have an absolute monopoly within a radius of 40 miles of Collie.

Hon. J. Cornell: It should be a national scheme or nothing.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. Fancy locking up in a scheme of this sort the whole of our available coal fields and giving a monopoly to a trust composed of two small municipalities, so preventing the establishment of a big national scheme!

Hon. J. Ewing: You do not understand it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand it very well. Another point: Clause 14 provides how they are going to get capital for this scheme. It says the Treasurer may, under Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act, 1915, advance to the trust £110,000 on the security of the debentures of the trust. Where are the funds under the Industries Assistance Act? Session after session have we been trying to get rid of the Industries Assistance Act, and we renew it only from year to year. This session, I understand, there was the usual protest in this House against the renewal of the Act, and the usual reply from the Minister. If the Bill is to be passed we cannot again limit the operations of the Industries Assistance Act to another year, because it will then have to go on forever, or so long as the advance made to this trust is outstanding.

Hon. J. Cornell: It will have broken out in a fresh place.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so. Where are the funds that the Treasurer has to handle under the Industries Assistance Act? Not only have the Industries Assistance Board not a bean in credit, but they have a big debit. Where is the Treasurer to get £110,000 under the Industries Assistance Act? If he is going to borrow it to put into the Industries Assistance Board, he must raise a loan. Is he coming to Parliament for authority to raise that loan, or is he going to raise it without authority?

Hon. J. Cornell: Out of that No. 2 trust fund the Chief Secretary referred to yesterday.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The fund shows cash in hand one million odd, and the uninvested trust moneys two millions odd, when, as a matter of fact, I know they have not a bean and are actually trading on an overdraft from the Commonwealth Bank, and are overdrawn in London to such an extent that a loan flotation must occur in January next. Yet, according to the figures put up here, there is a cash balance in hand of £1,400,000 and £2,000,000 trust funds not invested. The Bill says the Treasurer may draw on the funds under the Industries Assistance Act for this £110,000. He has no authority from Parliament to advance this money on debentures if it were available, except so far as the Bill may be taken to give him authority.

Hon. J. Cornell: And then Clause 15 comes in as a dragnet provision.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I see that. It is supposed that under the Industries Assistance Act this money can be advanced. But can it be advanced under Part III. of the Act? Section 24 of the Act provides that it shall be lawful for the Treasurer to render financial assistance by making advances to any persons engaged in mining or in any other industry; and there are two provisos, one to the effect that it must first be proved to the satisfaction of the Treasurer that in the interests of the State such assistance should be given, whilst the other is that the Treasurer must be satisfied it is not practicable for the applicant to obtain assistance through the ordinary financial channels.

Hon. J. Cornell: Evidently it is not possible in this instance.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We have had no evidence that it is not possible. If the Government will give me the rights that this trust are to get under the Bill, I will find every penny of the money to be raised for this scheme and I will pay £25,000 for the monopoly rights prescribed here, and still I will make a very nice little thing out of it. A monopoly over a 40 miles radius around our only possible coalfields from which to obtain power, what is that worth? Just consider it. However, I submit the Treasurer cannot advance under this Act because it cannot be shown to be impracticable for the applicant to obtain assistance from the ordinary financial channels. Again, we must look at the objective of the Industries Assistance Act. For what purpose was it passed? Section 9 shows it. It provides

that the Colonial Treasurer may, for the purpose of affording assistance to settlers affected by drought or other adverse conditions, make advances, etc. And when we come to Part III., the clear intention was that this Act was to be used to assist existing industries that were languishing. It was never contemplated that the Act should be used to start a new enterprise altogether and bring into being such a scheme as that proposed by the Bill under the Industries Assistance Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Act was intended to apply to industries of substance, not of speculation.

Hon. J. R. Brown: If hon. members did not roll him up he would soon stop.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am certain that any body of financiers would pay money to the State for a monopoly such as this.

Hon. E. H. Harris: If you call for tenders for it, you will get a pretty good price.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It practically means that only these two local bodies can use the coalfields for a scheme for the generation of electricity. The trust will have a monopoly over a radius of 40 miles. No one else could put up a pole or a line over the area even if they could buy a block of land and put up a plant. The only person who can do that is the Commissioner of Railways and then only for a specific purpose, and he must not sell sixpennyworth of current within the area of the monopoly.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They have been negotiating for power in Kalgoorlie for a long time.

Hon. E. H. Harris: If the Bill is passed the plant may not be erected for 30 years.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is so. No time limit has been imposed.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why worry about it?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The "West Australian" of yesterday morning raised a point which in itself ought to ensure that the Bill be held over for further consideration.

The article said—

It is known, however, that Mr. Taylor, the Government's chief adviser on electrical matters, has expressed a preference for the 40-cycle system, which is the system operating at the central power station at East Perth, being installed at Collie. Not, be it said, because the standard 50-cycle system in operation everywhere else in Australia would be less economical, but because the Collie system may ultimately be linked up with the Perth station.

I would point out that motors, cooking utensils, and such like things are made by massed production in America and elsewhere to the standard of 50 cycles. One can buy 50-cycle motors of one-sixth or one-eighth horse-power for £3 5s. 6d. each, but when it comes to a question of buying 40-cycle motors, one has to pay £31 10s. each, because they have to be specially wound. As the "West Australian" properly pointed out, we are going to perpetuate the 40-cycle system for the reason that we have already installed it. For all time, therefore, the people of the State will be penalised. The more electric current they use, the more they will be penalised when they come to purchase their electric appliances. This is a matter which ought to be considered and ought not to be rushed through at an hour such as this. It is stated that 63 per cent. of the current will be taken by the coal companies. I presume that the other 37 per cent. is to be taken by the general public. I ask members what the price of current will be. Obviously the coal companies will not mind what the price is, for the higher it is the better it will be for them.

Hon. J. Ewing: I do not see that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: And it will be all the worse for the general public.

Hon. J. Ewing: Certainly not.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Does not the hon. member see that the coal companies will be selling their coal to the trust and that they must receive any price they ask from the trust for their coal. They will not care two-pence how much they pay for the current, but however extortionate the price may be, the 37 per cent. of current will be consumed by the public, who will have to foot the bill.

Hon. J. Ewing: You are quite wrong.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: These coal companies are not going into this scheme and taking 63 per cent. of the current without getting some advantage out of it. The great advantage will be the enormous discount on their current bill. Whatever charge the trust may make for the current, the companies will raise the price of their coal to meet it. That is a matter which requires looking into before we pass the Bill, and before we place the farmers and the settlers in the district at the mercy of these charges practically for all time, in order that we may let in the coal companies to take what amounts to a control of the trust.

Hon. J. Ewing: Did you call them sharks?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I did not say that they were sharks. I said we were letting in the coal companies to take control of the trust.

Hon. J. Ewing: They have no control.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: They are taking 63 per cent. of the current.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They could get other current if they so desired.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: People who take 63 per cent. of the output must have control.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They could get their current where they liked.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The people will be getting their current for 2d. a unit instead of a shilling.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I guarantee that the people will not get their current at 2d. a unit, or anything like it, seeing that the coal companies will supply the coal and will be the best customers of the scheme.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Have the people down there been consulted?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know. It would be a sorry day for the settlers and farmers in those districts once they have allowed the scheme to come into being. It will be a monopoly in the hands of the large customers, those who supply the fuel. In the light of these things, are we at this stage of the session, when many members are half asleep and cannot listen to any argument I may put up, justified in passing the Bill?

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is no argument against it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Are we justified in passing the Bill and saddling the people of the State for all time with it?

Hon. J. Ewing: You are talking the Bill out; that is what you are doing.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am almost asleep myself. My one anxiety is that whatever is done at Collie should be done on a national basis. We ought not to begin on a footling little scheme like this, which savours of monopoly and also of being a boodling scheme. If we want money for a big electrical scheme, it can easily be obtained. There is plenty of money for such schemes. We need only say to financiers in London or anywhere else that we want a million or two millions to put up a big generating plant at Collie to supply the country around, and also Perth—because I am sure that power could be generated at Collie much more cheaply than at East Perth—and the money will be available. Moreover it will be available

on less disadvantageous terms than the money required for the scheme under the Bill, which proposes nothing but a monopoly over the country within 40 miles of Collie practically for all time. In the circumstances I am sorry to say that I must oppose the measure, and if necessary I shall divide the House upon it.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.42 a.m.]: Mr. Lovekin, in his opening remarks, described this as a boodling Bill. Less than three minutes afterwards he said the scheme was a squib scheme. He ended up by saying it was a miserable scheme. I ask the hon. member, who are the boodlers? Are the municipal council of Bunbury boodlers? Or are the municipal council of Collie boodlers? And if they are boodlers, as has been insinuated, are the ratepayers and property owners of Collie and Bunbury boodlers?

Hon. A. Lovekin: I said nothing about them.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I do not know what the hon. member's object was, but the effect of his remarks would be to get it into circulation that this was a boodling Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: So it is.

Hon. J. Ewing: That is a scandalous statement.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: The logical conclusion from Mr. Lovekin's statements is that the mayor and councillors of Collie and the mayor and councillors of Bunbury are boodlers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I did not suggest that.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: The hon. member said it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I explained what I meant by boodling.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: The hon. member referred to the Industries Assistance Act. That Act was brought into existence for the purpose of assisting farmers during periods of drought. The hon. member knows pretty well that that is done under Part II. of the Act, which is administered by the Industries Assistance Board. But, at the same time, there is Part III.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I quoted it.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: Part III. deals with the mining industry and other industries.

Hon. J. Cornell: But the Minister will not dispute that nothing like this was ever

put before Parliament or the public previously.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: Ever since the passing of the Act various Governments have given assistance under Part III. in order to help jam factories—

Hon. A. Lovekin: To help existing industries, not to start new industries.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: New industries have been assisted under that Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: Can the Minister name one of those new industries?

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! I must ask hon. members to allow the Minister to reply. When other members are speaking the Minister usually keeps silent, and I would ask hon. members to extend the same courtesy to him.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I repeat that new industries have been assisted.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Which new industries?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I refer the hon. member to the public accounts. I could supply numerous instances if I had time to look them up. Undoubtedly money has been advanced by the Government from time to time to assist various industries. Considerably more money was advanced by the previous Government than by the present Government. It has been said that the Act can be repealed at any time. If it is repealed, all agreements made under it will be preserved, if necessary for a hundred years after the repeal. Surely Mr. Lovekin knows that.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That means that the Act is to exist for a hundred years.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: According to the hon. member, Parliament has been trying for years to get rid of that Act and if we pass this Bill the Act will go on for ever. The hon. member must have a very poor appreciation of the intelligence of the Chamber if he expects such an assertion to be swallowed here. There is legal authority under the Industries Assistance Act for the Treasurer, without approaching Parliament, to assist industries; and that has been done.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Where is the money?

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: Only last night the hon. member quoted from the financial returns to show that the Government had in hand on the 1st July this year a sum of £1,500,000.



Hon. A. Lovekin: That is all a tarra-diddle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Has it all gone since the 1st July? Before this Bill will be anything more than waste paper, there must be an endorsement of the scheme by the property owners of Bunbury and the property owners of Collie, under the Municipal Corporations Act. The hon. member knows that.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a sort of love affair.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It has been asserted that the mines will get control of the trust. The hon. member did not, however, show exactly how they were to do so. Before the trust is formed, no doubt the municipalities of Collie and Bunbury will enter into some agreement with the mining companies—a satisfactory agreement—as otherwise they would not dream of launching the undertaking. Those councils would preserve themselves from any monopolistic leanings on the part of the mining companies. Surely these municipalities can be trusted to carry on their own business. Why should we dictate to them? We pass the Bill which provides the necessary machinery, and it is suggested that therefore we should dictate to them what they are to do. Surely the people of Collie and Bunbury know exactly what is to their own interest, and know how to proceed in this matter. Surely they know how to safeguard their own welfare. I cannot think that they require assistance or advice either from Mr. Lovekin or from anyone else.

Hon. J. Cornell: But the Minister will acknowledge that many people know not what they do.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: During the second reading debate it was asserted that this scheme represented a monopoly and would later on prevent the transmission of power from Collie to Perth. The rights of the trust, however, extend only within a radius of 40 miles of Collie.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is all!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The trust will have no power to extend to Perth, nor will they have any power to interfere with any other scheme that might be adopted for the purpose of transmitting current to the City of Perth.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Except the Commissioner of Railways, I said.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member did not make the assertion to which I refer. An inquiry was made as to the sinking fund. The sinking fund is provided for under the Municipal Corporations Act, which applies to this scheme. That is not to be disputed. Section 453 of the Act reads—

When any municipality has incurred a loan under the provisions of this Act, a sinking fund shall be formed to liquidate the same in manner following:—The council shall, in every year after the issue of debentures for such loan, cause a sum (being such percentage of the principal sum secured by such debentures as is named therein, not being at any time less than £2 per centum of such principal sum) to be invested by the Colonial Treasurer in inscribed stock or other Government securities of the State, in the joint names of the Colonial Treasurer and the municipality.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I did not say anything about a sinking fund.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not referring to the hon. member at all. The sinking fund provisions have been modified by the Bill, seeing that there is to be no contribution to the sinking fund until after the expiration of two years. Another question asked was respecting the interest rate to be charged. The interest is provided for under Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act. The sole reason for the reference to that measure in the Bill is to provide approved machinery.

Hon. J. Cornell: But you propose to take debentures?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Subsection 2 of Section 24 reads:—

Advances under this section shall be repayable at such times or by such instalments as the Colonial Treasurer may determine, with interest at a rate to be fixed by the Colonial Treasurer, but not less than six per cent. per annum, and such interest shall be calculated on the daily balance.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Bill proposes that debentures shall be accepted for the money advanced by the Government, so that there will be no interest charge.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will be 6 per cent. under the provisions of the Industries Assistance Act. One hon. member wished to know if the money could be borrowed under the one per cent. scheme. It cannot be borrowed under that scheme, because that applies only to money borrowed in connection with work having some bearing on migration. That work must also be approved by the Migration Commission, who would not find

money for the Government in order that they might lend it to municipalities!

Hon. A. Lovekin: Anyhow, 6 per cent. will be less than your average cost of interest.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: References were made to Mr. Taylor. Mr. Lovekin poses as an authority in connection with electricity.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, nothing of the sort.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is what the hon. member would lead the House to believe.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I got into touch with Mr. Taylor through my clerk, and he assures me that the amount provided for in the Bill is more than enough to carry out the work that is contemplated.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes, a footling scheme!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Taylor wanted to be on the safe side. In conjunction with Mr. Williamson, he investigated the matter, and they are satisfied, without any doubt whatever, that the work can be carried out for the amount stated. What is the opposition to the Bill?

Hon. A. Lovekin: What kilowatt plant will you get for that amount?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not our concern.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes, it is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Competent men have gone into the question, and the municipalities will have to approve of the scheme.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The confidence to be imposed in such matters was exemplified at Kalgoorlie, where a scheme for an electric plant was proposed, but the Government withdrew it after it had been punctured by the electricity committee!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We must leave these matters to those most concerned. They are not hoodling municipalities.

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

Ayes	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	9

Majority for .. 4

	YES.	
Hon. J. Cornell		Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. V. Hamersley		Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Harris		Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. G. A. Kempton		Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain		(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

### *In Committee.*

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

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—The Trust:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It has been suggested that sooner or later Western Australia will have to electrify the metropolitan railway system. If that is to be done we cannot under existing circumstances, obtain power without hauling the coal to East Perth. If a monopoly were granted to cover a radius of 40 miles from the pit's mouth at Collie, the combine would have the power to prevent us from bringing current from Collie across that 40 miles and on to Perth.

6 o'clock a.m.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. This trust would have no such power. It has only power to supply current within that radius of 40 miles.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And current can be conveyed over that territory?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly. If it were necessary to bring current from Collie to Perth it could be done, so long as the current was not distributed within the 40 miles radius.

Hon. G. W. MILES: This is one of the points I raised on the second reading. I think we are giving this trust too much power in allowing them to have a monopoly over that 40 miles radius. If this scheme be brought about, the Government should reserve the right to distribute current all along the line. The clause ought to be amended in that direction.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I agree with the last speaker. It is too much of a monopoly to give. It will continue for at least 50 years, and I hope that long before that period has elapsed we shall have a national scheme for electrifying the railways and lighting Perth and all the intermediate stations and towns. It is a great mistake to give this monopoly and so prevent any

### AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. B. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	(Teller)

greater scheme from being carried out on a proper basis. I move an amendment—

That the following further proviso be added: "Provided further that nothing herein contained shall prevent any corporate body establishing and carrying on within such district a generating power plant with all buildings, machinery, and equipment deemed essential, with power to erect and maintain in and through such district, poles, electric wires, mains, transformers, cut-outs, fixtures, fittings, plant, and appliances for the conveyance or transmission and supply of electric power or current to places beyond such district; but so that no such corporate body shall supply electric current or power within said district unless with the consent in writing of the said municipalities."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill gives power to the municipalities of Collie and Bunbury to erect this plant and distribute the current. Now it is suggested that under the same Bill we should allow anyone else to come in after the trust has gone to the expense of providing an up-to-date plant. The situation is fully safeguarded in Clause 25, under which the Commissioner of Railways can do anything he likes, except distribute current within the 40-mile radius.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Appointment of Chairman of Trust:

Hon. G. W. MILES: The point I raised about the Chairman having a casting as well as a deliberative vote should come in here. I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause 1 the following be added:—"who shall have a casting as well as a deliberative vote."

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Miles has overlooked the fact that there are five members of the trust and therefore five votes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What if one of the members was absent?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Then there would be three votes, apart from the chairman.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There would be four votes, and what would happen if the voting were equal?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If the chairman were to give a casting, as well as a deliberative vote, it would mean six votes for the trust as a whole.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If there were only four present and the acting chair-

man was in the Chair, he would have two votes.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I have never known the acting chairman of an organisation to be given two votes, while the chairman had not a casting vote.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If the chairman was present and one member was absent, there would be equal voting. The chairman is certainly entitled to a casting vote.

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

Clauses 10, 11, 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—The municipalities may raise £110,000 and advance the same in exchange for trust debentures:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Can the Chief Secretary say where the municipalities hope to raise the money? Are they going to raise it in the market, or will the Government find it if they cannot get it from a bank? The Industries Assistance Act states that the Treasurer may render assistance if the money cannot be raised in the usual financial channels. If it cannot be raised in the usual financial channels, will the Government find the municipalities' proportion?

The Chief Secretary: I do not think so.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 14—Advance by Treasurer:

Hon. G. W. MILES: Every session for years we have continued the operation of the Industries Assistance Act, and the present Government have indicated that they want the Act to be terminated. If we agree to this clause the Act will continue for all time. The Government can find the money in some other way. I hope the clause will be deleted.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This provision will not effect the life of the Industries Assistance Act. All agreements made under the Act in respect of advances will continue and will not be affected by the termination of the Act. The repeal of an Act does not affect any agreement made under it.

Hon. G. W. MILES: When the Act is repealed is it proposed by the Government to start a State bank and to transfer the moneys that have been advanced under the Industries Assistance Act to the bank? The Government must have some scheme in view when the Act is struck off the statute-book. Why cannot the Government issue debentures to meet the case?

The CHIEF SECRETARY : Probably the advances will be placed under the Agricultural Bank. All agreements which have existed previously will still remain, until cancelled by some other agreements.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the Chief Secretary is going to carry on agreements for all time that have been made under the Industries Assistance Act, this will amount to carrying on the Act itself. It is the same thing.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Is it not a fact that all the clients of the Industries Assistance Act have been taken over by the Industries Assistance Board, and that for some time past the Act has not been functioning?

The Chief Secretary: The Industries Assistance Act is still functioning. It is in full life and vigour.

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

That the following words be struck out:—  
“Under and subject to Part III. of the Industries Assistance Act, 1915.”

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Industries Assistance Act provides for the repayment in moieties. If these words are struck out, we shall have to put something in stating the terms on which the money is to be repaid.

The Chief Secretary: If the amendment were carried, we should be deprived of the whole of the machinery dealing with these advances.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I cannot see why the Treasurer, in making advances and accepting debentures, could not limit the terms of the debentures and take a mortgage over the assets of the trust. If the amendment were carried, it would not interfere with the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If it were possible to adjourn until to-morrow and consult the Solicitor General I would do so, but I am trying to get the Bill through as it stands. I do not know what the effect of the amendment would be.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That shows that we should not go on with the Bill.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	..	..	12

Majority against .. 4

## AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. Ewing	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15, 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Powers of trust:

Hon. G. W. MILES: Subclause 2 gives the trust too much power. How is a national water supply ever to be established if the trust are given full rights over the Collie river and the Minningup pool? The subclause should be either amended or struck out. Water, I understand, is a main requisite in generating electricity. Let us adjourn consideration of the clause. There is no use in rushing the Bill. Presently we may see the Government going cap in hand to this trust.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	9
Noes	..	..	..	..	10

Majority against .. 1

## AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitchin
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. A. Lovekin	
Hon. G. W. Miles	

(Teller.)

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 20—Supply of current to mines:

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Does the clause include mining companies in the Collie district only, or also mining companies within the 40-mile radius? A coal field is being proved now. Would mining companies on that field be included?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. The district is defined by Clause 3.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 21 to 24—agreed to.

**Clause 25—Saving:**

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

That the following words be struck out:—  
“but the Commissioner of Railways shall not supply electricity within the district except for railway or other Government purposes, or to the trust.”

My object is that the Commissioner of Railways, in the event of a national scheme being inaugurated, shall have the right to supply current along the railways.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: You want to have competition between two public bodies!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am informed that what I have stated is correct. The Government should have that power. All I want to safeguard is that when a national scheme is inaugurated, it will not be hampered by this smaller undertaking. I do not wish to deprive Collie or Bunbury of their rights, but the Commissioner should have the right to supply current from his mains.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If Mr. Miles desires to set out to destroy the Bill, his amendment will enable him to achieve his object. I cannot understand Mr. Stephenson. I do not think he could be induced to invest one penny in such a scheme if competition were to be allowed to come in. I do not think the ratepayers of Bunbury or Collie would agree to the local authorities borrowing the necessary money if the amendment were agreed to. In fact, the Government would be wrong in contributing to such an undertaking if competition were to be allowed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Baxter is right. What do hon. members, who are opposed to the measure, want? If the municipalities are to establish the scheme, do they wish the Government to come along and start another State trading concern?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I contend that we who are opposing some of the clauses are protecting the interests of the State, and that is not what the Government are endeavouring to do under the Bill. We are told that the scheme is to be part of one of larger operations that will come later on, and that when that day comes this scheme will be absorbed in the larger one. If that is so, why object to the amendment? It would appear as though the Government were a Bunbury-Collie Government and not a Western Australian Government.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*Recommittal.*

On motion by the Chief Secretary, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 17 and 20. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 17—Powers of the trust:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—  
That Clause 17 be reinserted.

This clause is the most vital one in the Bill. If it be deleted, the Bill is defeated.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you prepared to omit Subclause 2?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the trust is not able to impound waters in the Minningup Pool, it will be impossible for them to erect the generating plant at Collie. It is needless to prolong the argument.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 2 be struck out.

If that is agreed to it will enable the trust to erect the electric generating plant, transmission cables and lines, to acquire all land and machinery plant, and so on, as is necessary, and to carry on business as suppliers of electricity. That will exclude from their powers the impounding, diverting or taking of the water of the Collie River and the Minningup Pool.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That will kill the Bill!

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Where would the trust get their water?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The trust will be able to use that water while it is there. But it must be wrong to give the trust a monopoly of that water against everybody else for all time.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Suppose the Railway Commissioner wanted water, what could he do?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: He could not get it under this. A tremendous lot of water will be wanted for the generators. In fact, the last scheme was that the water should be pumped back, so that it might be kept running to cool the machinery. It is scandalous to give all this water to one small trust.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am afraid some members do not quite realise the position. The works are to be placed alongside the

Minningup Pool. I am informed that in the Collie River there is available for the scheme five times as much water as there is in Perth. There will be ample water in the Collie River for two or three such schemes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Well, why give the trust the whole of it?

Hon. J. EWING: I cannot understand the attack made on the Bill by Mr. Lovekin. He told us he is entirely in favour of electricity for the South-West. I say without fear of contradiction that this is the nucleus of a big national scheme. There has been a good deal of talk about monopoly. I can see no monopoly about the scheme. Two members of the trust will represent Collie and Bunbury, and the other members will be appointed by the Government. And they will be appointed for only three years. So how can there be a monopoly? If this clause be not reinstated, the Bill will be lost. There is in the Collie River plenty of water, apart from the Minningup Pool. It is idle for Mr. Lovekin to try to destroy the Bill. It is all very well for him to say he has always wanted to see an electricity scheme at Collie. His attitude towards the Bill is not to his credit. The basis of the Bill is that the scheme is the nucleus of a big national scheme.

Hon. G. W. MILES: When the vote was taken that deleted the clause, I think the Committee were under the impression that it was to delete only Subclause 2. They do not want to deprive the trust of the rights given in Subclause 1. Mr. Ewing tells us this is to be the nucleus of a big national scheme. If that is so, the Bill ought to have gone out on the second reading. If this is the nucleus of a big national scheme, it is going to give to Collie and Bunbury for all time the right to supply all the power in return for their putting up that £60,000. We are getting at the thing now: It is a monopoly for Collie and Bunbury. Mr. Ewing told us it is going to be a monopoly for all time for Collie and Bunbury.

Hon. E. Rose: No, he did not say that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I say he did; indirectly, at all events. He said this was the nucleus of a big national scheme and that the plans were already drawn out. It means that Collie and Bunbury are going to own half the scheme for all time. The Government are not looking after the interests of the whole of the State if what Mr. Ewing

said is correct, and if they allow this thing to go through.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has not put a correct construction on Mr. Ewing's remarks. Mr. Ewing did say that this is the nucleus of a big national scheme, to demonstrate the possibilities of such a scheme. As for its being a monopoly, under Clause 2 no one but the Commissioner of Railways can have a monopoly, and then if he operates in the district it shall be only for railways or some similar purpose. The Commissioner will be able to transmit current to Perth.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Can he take the water?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under Clause 25 the Commissioner of Railways has unlimited power within the trust's area, except for the supplying of current within that area.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is nothing about water. He must have that water.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He has full power under the Public Works Act of 1914.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Notwithstanding what the Minister says, my interpretation of this is that we are giving the trust power to handle the whole of that water, and are not providing for the Commissioner of Railways to touch it. He must go cap in hand to the trust. Subclause 2 can be deleted, and the Government can have an agreement with the trust, under which the trust will be allowed the use of the water. Then the Government, if they were to come in with a bigger scheme, would have their water rights. But we are asked to give away the whole of the water of the Collie River.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Only a pool.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is the water of the river and the Minningup pool. Where is the other water supply Mr. Ewing spoke of? There is no other. The clause would give the trust a monopoly over the whole of the water.

Hon. J. Ewing: It is only power to take water for this purpose.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The right to use the water should be given under an agreement.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The trust would have power to acquire land and divert the water of the river. The Minister said that a private or Government concern would have all such powers and facilities if it desired to erect a station and transmit the current to Perth. Yet the trust would have a monopoly of the water if they cared to divert it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Ewing has made a statement about water supply. I now remind him of the select committee on the electricity supply, of which committee he was a member. The manager of the electricity supply, Mr. Taylor, gave evidence that laid stress on the water supply and still more stress upon what should be done at Collie. I have not had time to read the whole of the evidence, but I will read a couple of paragraphs for Mr. Ewing's information. In reply to question No. 1870 Mr. Taylor said—

I am not averse to transmission from Collie; indeed I would be in favour of it; but a power station at Collie with a transmission line to Perth would cost over a million and a half of money. We could not have fewer than two turbines at Collie. They must be 15,000 kwf. sets. The scheme I have in mind, which includes two 15,000 kwf. sets, a transmission line to Perth, a new power station at Collie, with a terminal station at Collie, with a terminal station at Perth, involves an expenditure of £1,550,000, including the present capital.

In reply to Question No. 1878 he said—

In putting a power station at Collie it would largely depend on the foundations obtainable for heavy plant and the quantity of water which could be conserved for circulating. It would be necessary to provide for a station with an ultimate capacity of 100,000 kilowatts. If it was anything less than that it would not pay to transmit. It would be necessary to provide for an ultimate circulation of six million gallons per hour.

Hon. J. Ewing: The water is there.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I believe Mr. Taylor also stated that there was not sufficient water otherwise, but a way to provide it would be to pump it back and pass it through aerators so that it would cool before being again used for turbines. Mr. Ewing says there is plenty of water; yet Mr. Taylor said water was one of the troubles. The hon. member should have known it was one of the difficulties of the Collie scheme, but he proposes to give a monopoly of water for all time to this little trust.

Hon. J. EWING: Mr. Lovekin should know that that evidence does not apply.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you think the evidence is not correct?

Hon. J. EWING: It is correct. I cannot understand the opposition of hon. members. It seems to me to have been worked up and it is unjust. I asked several questions of Mr. Taylor and he answered as Mr. Lovekin has mentioned. At that time no survey had been made of the Collie water. The Mitchell Government had surveys made and it was found that what Mr. Taylor had said was incor-

rect. There is enough water in the Minnigup pool, without requiring a dam, to serve the whole of the electrical requirements of the State. The hon. member knows that investigations had not been made at the time Mr. Taylor gave his evidence. I object to being misrepresented by the hon. member. He seems to be determined to defeat the Bill. Two members who voted for the second reading have for some unexplained reason been induced to vote for the deletion of a most necessary clause of the Bill. They will now have an opportunity to rectify their mistake and I hope they will do so. When Mr. Lovekin quotes me he should quote me correctly. He is not going to dominate me.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Mr. Ewing is adopting a wrong attitude when he suggests that we are here to wreck the Bill. We are here to protect the State.

Hon. J. Ewing: I will withdraw that expression as regards you, because you voted for the second reading.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If the Government will not protect the interests of the State it is our duty to do so. I am in favour of the other three subclauses being re-inserted in the Bill, but I desire some modification of Subclause 2. If the subclause were deleted the Government could make an agreement to give the trust all the water required. I want to protect the Government so that when the bigger scheme comes along they will not have to go cap in hand to the trust. No one desires to wreck the Bill, although we do take exception to rushing it through after a sitting of 20 hours. It is the duty of the Minister either to agree to the deletion of Subclause 2, or to postpone the matter so that an amendment may be framed that will properly protect the interests of the State.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I strongly object to the remarks of Mr. Ewing when he says that members are taking up a position which suggests concerted action. I repudiate such a statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hour of the morning is responsible for that.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I agree with Mr. Miles. The Government have no right to give away the river either to the people of Collie or of Bunbury. If the course of the river is diverted, this may have a big influence upon other parts of the district. I shall support the deletion of the subclause. I know the work of the trust would be nullified if the whole clause were struck out. The subclause should be drafted

in a different way, for undoubtedly it gives to the trust a monopoly over the Collie River.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What is the size of the pool?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: It is deep enough in which to drown the hon. member. These powers are too great to give to any trust.

Hon. W. J. MANN: It is delightful to hear Sir William Lathlain talking about taking up the whole of the river. It shows how colossal his ignorance is.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Mr. Taylor does not say so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would cost a million of money to divert the Collie River in the way suggested. It is simply intended to divert small streams.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Then why not say so in the Bill?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would be impossible for the trust to impound the whole of the Collie River.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Collie River furnishes the water supply in the vicinity of the township of Collie where the mines are and where the plant will be erected. All we ask is for some modification of the sub-clause. We want the trust to be allowed to take what water is required, not to impound all the water in the river.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Ewing has overlooked one of the main clauses of the Bill, namely No. 21. He suggests that this would be the nucleus of some large Government scheme.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Not necessarily.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then Mr. Ewing is under a misapprehension in the matter. The two municipalities will be the real parties interested. The whole of the profits arising from the scheme will be divided into two parts, Bunbury receiving six-elevenths and Collie five-elevenths. The Government will not receive one penny of the profits. No doubt members voted on Clause 17 under the impression that they were deleting Sub-clause 2.

[Hon. J. W. Kirwan took the Chair.]

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is only an assumption on your part.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am not hostile to the proposal, but I think members should look closely into the wording of the sub-clause. In going ahead with the scheme

the interests of the Government must be safeguarded, and this clause does not safeguard them.

Hon. J. Ewing: Will not the Government representation safeguard them?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Not a little bit. Subclause 2 of Clause 17 states that the trust, not the Government, may within the district impound and take the water of the Collie River and the Minningup Pool. That is a permanent and exclusive right to the whole of the water within the district as defined by the Bill, covering a radius of 40 miles from the Collie town hall. The ordinary meaning of "impound" is to dam up. The trust will have power to dam up the Collie River, and there is no safeguard for the interests of the people whose properties may be damaged by the process of damming. Properties along the river bank may be seriously injured, and the Bill contains no provision for compensation in such cases. If an action for damages were taken, the trust could claim that they had dammed the river under legal authority. They have also the power to divert the water. The clause is most serious, and has been introduced without due thought; and we are not now in a position to give it that consideration which it deserves. Notwithstanding what the Chief Secretary indicated with regard to the rights of the Commissioner of Railways under the Government Electric Works Act, the Commissioner would not be safeguarded when carrying out a scheme of supplying electric power and current for railway and tramway purposes, but would have to make terms with the trust for the right to use the water in the Collie River and the Minningup Pool. The Commissioner could not carry on the production of electricity unless he also had this water power. The Government Electric Works Act, though conferring practically the same powers as are contained in Subclauses 1, 3 and 4 of this clause, does not empower the Commissioner to impound water.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I propose to add an amendment at the commencement of Sub-clause 2 to provide that the trust may, within the district, enter into an agreement with the Government to deal with the waters of the Minningup Pool.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that already there is an amendment before the Chair.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have moved an amendment, but in order to facilitate the



business of the Committee I will ask leave to withdraw it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I understood that the Chief Secretary had moved to restore the clause, and I do not think it has been restored. As a matter of fact, it has been taken out of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment suggested by Mr. Miles will be an addition to the motion by the Chief Secretary, and if the amendment be agreed to it will form part of the clause.

Amendment (to strike out Subclause 2), by leave, withdrawn.

Question (to reinsert clause) put and passed.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That before "impound" in line 1 of Subclause 2, the words "enter into an agreement with the Government to" be inserted.

The effect of the amendment will be that the Government will have the right to protect the interests of the State in connection with the impounding of the waters of the Collie River.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have no objection to offer to the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I want to see that a plentiful supply of water is available as the scheme develops. Mr. Ewing, in his speeches on the Bill, has relied upon Mr. Taylor. I have already quoted what Mr. Taylor said, in answer to Mr. Ewing's own questions, when he was examined before the select committee that dealt with electricity supply. I have looked up the report again, and I find that in answer to Question 1872 Mr. Taylor said—

I have reported to Mr. Stead—

Mr. Stead was Acting Commissioner of Railways at the time—

—that if the Government will electrify the suburban railways and the main line to Northam and carry out an extensive policy of electrification, I will recommend the necessary power station.

If we are not careful, the trust to be established under the Bill will prevent the electrification of the suburban railways and the Government will be cutting their own throats. We should see that we are not giving away rights that will be necessary in future. The Government are divesting themselves of the chance to electrify the railways, without which they must always be run at a loss.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I think it is about time that this discussion closed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot reflect upon the House. He must withdraw the remark.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I will withdraw. We are keeping another place waiting while we haggle here about nothing. Mr. Lovekin says if we do so and so, and so and so, there will be disaster. Mr. Nicholson says we must be careful of this and that. Mr. Miles says the position will be so and so. The whole thing is a farce. We are discussing a little bit of water at Collie and the water will still be there when the people who are discussing it are dead. This business would not keep the House for five minutes, if common sense were used.

Amendment put and passed.

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

That in line 1 of Subclause 2, after "take" the word "the" be struck out and "sufficient" inserted in lieu.

That will mean that with the earlier amendment the trust, by agreement with the Government, will be able to impound, divert and take sufficient water from the Collie River for their purposes.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that instead of the amendment being moved in that form, Mr. Miles should alter it so that it would read that by agreement with the Government the trust may impound, divert and take such water as may be agreed to, or words to that effect. As time goes on there may be big works constructed, and the Government should retain their rights and not give the trust the absolute right to take sufficient water or anything else. It should all be subject to an agreement, and so long as everything is satisfactory the Government will not deal unfairly with the trust.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is the difference? They are to enter into an agreement with the Government to take sufficient water, or to take such water as may be agreed upon, which is the same thing.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Well, I will leave it to the Minister. I think my amendment is sufficient.

The Chief Secretary: It is sufficient. The Government will be very careful about the drafting of the agreement.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will become a question of what is "sufficient water." The trust may say "sufficient water" is so much,

and we cannot do with less." "Such water as may be agreed to" is much better than "sufficient water."

Hon. G. W. Miles: Very well. I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

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

That at the beginning of Subclause 2 "the" be inserted; and after "pool" in line 2 the words "as may be agreed to" be inserted.

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

Clause 20—Supply of current to mines:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The trust may contract with the mining companies. Can the Minister tell us why the Bill specifies the Amalgamated Collieries of W.A., Ltd.? And why should it be limited to coal mines? I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 "Amalgamated Collieries of W.A. Ltd. and other coal" be struck out and "any" inserted in lieu.

Also it will be necessary to strike out the word "companies" and insert "company" in lieu.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that the hon. member retain the plural. And, why limit it to "companies"? Why not add "persons"? I do not know whether it is the intention of the trust to confine their dealings to companies, or whether they propose to extend them to persons. It should be an obligation on the trust to supply electric current to all that want it.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Look at Clause 19.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That only provides that the trust shall erect substations at Collic and Bunbury to meet the requirements of those municipalities. I take it the municipalities themselves will be the distributors. I think Mr. Harris's amendment a good one.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Unless some arrangement is made with these companies, the whole thing falls to the ground.

Hon. E. H. Harris: But why limit it to the Amalgamated Collieries of W.A.?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think there is any special reason for that. I see no objection to the amendment.

Hon. J. EWING: The Amalgamated Collieries of W.A. are mentioned because they have five pits, and will have to scrap a considerable quantity of machinery. They are scrapping their machinery to assist the

project, and the trust will have to make arrangements to supply current to that company. I wish to make it clear that I have no interest in the Amalgamated Collieries, and I hope Mr. Lovekin was not alluding to me.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Do not the Amalgamated Collieries supply Collic at present?

Hon. J. EWING: Yes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is why they are mentioned?

Hon. J. EWING: Yes. Consequently, arrangements will have to be made for the trust to supply the Amalgamated Collieries under this scheme.

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

Bill again reported with further amendments and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

## BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

*Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.

*Sitting suspended from 7.56 to 9.10 a.m.*

## BILL—SOUTH-WEST ELECTRIC POWER.

*Assembly's Message.*

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

## ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

*Complimentary Remarks.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.11 a.m.]: The session has come to an end, and I wish to say a few words on behalf of myself and my colleague and other members of the House. We have met continuously on the ordinary sitting days, and we have sat long hours, almost right through the session. There have been changes in the highest offices in the gift of the House. After a term of honourable service, Sir Edward Wittenoom resigned as President in August last, and the distine-

tion of filling the office was conferred upon you, Sir. I am only echoing the sentiments of every member when I say those fine qualities that marked your occupancy of the office of Chairman of Committees have accompanied you in the exercise of the more responsible functions with which you have since been entrusted. Your ability has long been recognised, but what we most esteem are your kindly manner, your strict impartiality and your supreme desire to be helpful and considerate to members, whilst at the same time upholding the dignity of the House. Mr. Cornell, as Chairman of Committees, has realised all my expectations. His long experience in this Chamber has been reflected in his work. Mr. Cornell has invariably given great assistance to members, and he has contributed to the despatch of business by his mastery of intricate duties. Like you, Sir, he is noted for his fairness. The Clerk of the Council and the Clerk Assistant, in their respective capacities, have been ready at all time to co-operate with me and my colleagues: and our "Hansard" staff, who are a credit to Western Australia, deserve an expression of our appreciation of the services they have cheerfully and efficiently rendered. The other officers and attendants also have been responsive to the call of duty. In all these assurances I am certain I am voicing the opinions of every member of the Council. I have also to thank members for the kindly consideration and generous forbearance they have extended to me during this and previous sessions. I shall always have a delightful remembrance of my experience in the Council. I tender to you all the compliments of the season. I trust you will have a joyful Christmas and a very happy New Year. I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 20th January.

**HON. J. EWING** (South-West) [9.14]: I should like to join the Leader of the House in his congratulations to you, Sir, to the Chairman of Committees, and to the officers of the House and to "Hansard." I can only re-echo his words, wishing you a very happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year. At this juncture we should say something of the leadership of the Minister. He has been wonderfully kind and generous to us, and we all appreciate his good feeling. I want to join with him in the expressions he has voiced.

**HON. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [9.15]: I wish to make a few remarks endorsing what has been said by Mr. Ewing. I feel we should be a very poor crowd indeed did we not realise the splendid lead we have from the Chief Secretary in control of the business of the House. He has met us all in a kindly spirit whenever any of us could not, perhaps, be ready to continue a debate, and has always been willing, even at great inconvenience to himself, to meet our desires in bringing forward the business of the House. You, Sir, we all acknowledge to have been a tower of strength, and you have helped in carrying through the business of the House in a manner very gratifying to us all. We recognise also we have had the support of officers of the House, and a very good measure from the "Hansard" staff. To the Chairman of Committees also we owe a very deep debt. Many times when we on the floor of the House have been somewhat in a tangle he has been ready to put us on the right track and to keep us up to the business, yet giving everybody an opportunity for full discussion. At the same time I should like to welcome our new members and say how heartily we have appreciated their ready grasp of the work of the House. Also I wish to mention our pleasure in having back with us after their visits abroad, Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Kitson. I hope they will for long have opportunity to help us in our debates. I heartily join with others in felicitating you, Sir, and I hope that your visit to the Old Country will be in the highest sense successful and enjoyable. I wish you all the compliments of the season.

**HON. J. NICHOLSON** (Metropolitan) [9.18]: I should like to join with other speakers in the greetings so ably extended by the Minister to you, Sir. It is, I think, a coincidence, or almost a coincidence, that we are terminating the session only a few hours short of the time at which we terminated on the same day last year. It causes one to feel there must be something in the atmosphere of this Chamber that is distinctly inspiring, something that induces us to cling to the place: otherwise, I am sure, we would make an effort to terminate our sessions more speedily. It indicates, too, the spirit of harmony and goodwill by which every member is actuated towards you, Sir, and towards the Chairman of Committees, the Chief Secretary and the Honorary Minister. It shows also that confidence and feel-

ing of respect with which every member regards this House. It is a place where we can all give expression to our views freely, without arousing bitter feeling in any member. It is a great thing that one can give free expression to his thoughts and ideas on matters that come before us. Long may that spirit endure. The goodwill that has actuated every member throughout the session, I trust, will be appreciated by you, Mr. President, during this Christmas season. The Chairman of Committees has had more than an arduous task. He has been confronted with duties of almost unparalleled difficulty, has surmounted them successfully and shown by his gifts and ability that he is able to perform the duties of his office with the utmost satisfaction to the Chamber. The Leader of the House and the Honorary Minister have likewise had difficult tasks to perform. Those tasks they have performed with the greatest possible credit to themselves. Notwithstanding the little incident of yesterday, the Leader of the House can rest assured that he holds the supreme respect of every member of this House. I join in all that has been said, not only as regards yourself, Mr. President, but as regards the officers, who have always shown a readiness and willingness to assist every member to overcome any difficulty that confronted him. The officers of the "Hansard" staff have likewise had a difficult task and our good wishes certainly go forth to them. These greetings come spontaneously from every member.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [9.22]: Before the motion is put, may I be permitted to add a few words of appreciation and of thanks. I desire to thank you, Mr. President, both as a colleague and as President, for the many courtesies and great consideration you have extended to me as Chairman of Committees, and as a member on the floor of the House. I desire to extend to the Leader of the House, to the Honorary Minister and members generally my thanks for their forbearance during my term as Chairman of Committees. If I have served reasonably satisfactorily, I shall be perfectly satisfied and thankful. I desire also to thank the clerks and all the officers of the House down to the humblest messenger boy for the consideration, courtesy and attention they have displayed towards me at all times. I also

desire to join, in the thanks I have uttered, those of my colleague Mr. Dodd, who has expressly asked me to return thanks for him. Last, but not least, I desire specially to thank that wonderful body of men, the "Hansard" staff. I had a due appreciation of the "Hansard" staff when I was a member on the floor of the House, but I desire to say that since I have had the honour of occupying the position of Chairman of Committees, my appreciation of the "Hansard" men has increased a hundredfold. I wish you, Mr. President, the season's greetings and the same to all the officers of the House. May you, Sir, have a pleasant voyage to the Old Country and a safe return.

**THE PRESIDENT** [9.25]: In a few words I have to say before the session closes I desire to express my appreciation of the more than kind remarks that have been made regarding myself personally. To me it is an interesting fact that my first session as President should be marked by the passage of an extraordinarily large number of Bills. I understand it is a record number of Bills for any session of the Western Australian Parliament. We have passed no fewer than 62 Bills, and the highest previous record was established in 1912 when 59 Bills were passed. I mention this as an indication of how heavy the work of the session has been. To members who view the proceedings from the floor of the House, it may appear that the duties of President are very simple and very easy. Since I have had experience, however, I know differently. It is when mistakes are made and consequent complications arise that the difficulties of the position are realised. I have been three years Chairman of Committees and one session President, and the result of that experience has convinced me that smoothness and easy running of the business of the House can be attained only by close attention and constant vigilance on the part of those who have charge of it. The goodwill of the members is also necessary, and I have been strengthened by the feeling that I have had that goodwill. I hope that in this important first session of mine, I have got through the work without error. I am not conscious of having made any error, and I feel deeply grateful for the consideration and assistance I have received from all the members without exception. The general public have little idea of the heavy work that the average member of Parliament does when he discharges his duty con-

scientifically. Members' duties in attending to the requirements of their constituents are never easy, more especially in the case of some members of this House who represent wide and scattered areas; and members thoroughly deserve a holiday respite from their labours in this Chamber. I would like to join in the tribute that has been paid to the hon. Mr. Drew for the ability, the tact, the industry, and the fairness he has invariably shown in his leadership of this House. (Members: Hear, hear!) From him, and from the Honorary Minister, Mr. Hickey, I have received nothing but courtesy and kindness. I wish to thank all the members for the consideration they have shown to me in my office as President, and also to thank them for the help they have given me. I have received special help from my old friend and colleague the Chairman of Committees, the hon. Mr. Cornell. The Clerk of Parliaments and the Clerk Assistant have also rendered me valuable assistance, and I fully agree with what has been said regarding the "Hansard" staff. To that staff the House is indebted, and our thanks are due to them. In wishing hon. members a happy Christmas may I express the hope that they, and also this great State in which we are all so deeply interested, may enjoy a very prosperous new year.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.33 a.m. (Friday).*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Thursday, 16th December, 1926.*

	PAGE
Papers: Railway project, Kondinin Eastward .....	3167
Ministerial Statement: Migration, domestic servants .....	3168
Questions: Traffic fees, King's Park .....	3168
Strikes, wages and payments .....	3169
Agricultural land East of Pingrup .....	3169
Railway loop, Newdegate .....	3169
Locomotive staff, hours .....	3169
Government Departments, overtime .....	3169
Railway gauge unification .....	3169
Road Districts Act Amendment Bill .....	3172
Assent to Bills .....	3169-70
Bills: Adoption of Children Act Amendment, returned .....	3170
Kojonup and Dowerin Road Board Loans Validation, returned .....	3170
Government Railways Act Amendment, Council's Message .....	3170
Government Railways Act Amendment, Conference report .....	3171
Government Railways Act Amendment, Council's further message .....	3172
Appropriation Bill, returned .....	3171
State Insurance, request for Conference .....	3171
State Insurance, Conference report .....	3172
Timber Industry Regulation, Council's further message, etc. ....	3172
Timber Industry Regulation, Conference report, etc. ....	3172-3
Public Works Act Amendment, Council's amendments .....	3173
South-West Electric Power, Council's Amendments .....	3174
Resolutions: Railway gauge unification, Council's Message .....	3170
Metropolitan Water Supply, etc., to create Board of Control .....	3170
Close of Session, Complimentary remarks .....	3176
Adjournment .....	3178

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 a.m., and read prayers.

### PAPERS PRESENTED—RAILWAY PROJECT, KONDININ EASTWARD.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [11.3]: The Premier recently laid on the Table certain papers relating to the district which would be served by the projected Kondinin Eastward railway. The Engineer-in-Chief has since proposed a different route going out from Kondinin and ultimately right through to Salmon Gums, linking up with Corrigin, then coming on to Brookton and so to Armadale and Fremantle. It would then be a trunk line with Fremantle at one end and Esperance at the other. A second line would come in at Southern Cross and link up with Pingrup. This proposal of the Engineer-in-Chief was referred to the Railway Advisory Board. They have just held a hurried meeting, and there is a division of opinion amongst them on the matter.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Can we all speak on this?