

like to appoint to go through their books and see everything in connection with the operations. The company can prove that if the price of coal is reduced 1s. per ton, a dividend could not be paid on the present rate of wages. The company can also prove that the percentages of cost per ton respectively, of administration and distribution, compare favourably with the figures of the New South Wales collieries, as shown in the report referred to. I see that Mr. Miles suggests the appointment of a judge of the Supreme Court. Good and independent though a judge may be, I do not think he would know much about coal mining. It seems to me that if a Royal Commission is appointed the man chosen for the work should be one who is thoroughly conversant with all the details of it, and has the necessary experience. Such a man should be imported from somewhere so that he would have no personal interest in the local industry. He could then go fully into the question. In the circumstances I am not going to oppose the motion, although as I have shown the appointment of a Royal Commission is unnecessary. With all the information that I have given, with all the great amount of information in the possession of Mr. Miles, and with all that which is found on the files, I do not know what other information could be required.

On the motion by Hon. W. H. Kitson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd October, 1930.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining—1, Gold Stealing Staff; 2, Assistance to prospectors ...	834
Railways, Collie coal, cost of appliances ...	834
Unemployment, Blackboy camp costs ...	835
Pig importations ...	835
Bills: Main Roads, 3R. ...	835
Education Act Amendment, 2R. ...	836
Traffic Act Amendment, Com., recom. ...	839
Annual Estimates: General debate ...	851

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

QUESTIONS (2)—MINING.

Gold Stealing Detection Staff.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Police: 1, Was the police gold stealing detection staff at Kalgoorlie disbanded a few months ago? 2, Have applications been called by the Police Department amongst the police for the purpose of forming a new gold stealing detection staff? 3, If so, what was the reason for disbanding the old staff, and the reason for the appointment of a new one?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, The Chamber of Mines gave notice that it was not prepared to meet the expense of the upkeep of the staff after 30th June last, but has since reconsidered the position.

Assistance to Prospectors.

Hon. M. F. TROY asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that many applications for prospecting assistance and sustenance are held up by the Mines Department because of lack of funds? 2, Will he state when money will be provided to assist this very deserving class of primary producer?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, It is impossible to say at the present juncture what funds will be available for this purpose.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COLLIE COAL.

Cost of Appliances.

Mr. WITHERS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What has been the total cost to the Railway Department for the alteration to, and provision of spark arresting and fire grate appliances, to make it possible to burn Collie coal? 2, What amount, if any, has been contributed by the Collie coal mining industry to assist the Government in this direction?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: replied: 1, In view of the long period over which Collie coal has been used on the railways, viz., 32 years, it is not possible to give the total cost, but many thousands of pounds have been spent in bringing the appliances to their present condition. 2, Nil.

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT.*Blackboy Camp Costs.*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for Mr. Millington) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What are the present contract prices for the following foodstuffs, supplied to Blackboy Camp:—(a) bread; (b) meat; (c) milk? 2, What were the rates paid under the previous contract?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, (a) 2 9/16d. per 2lb. loaf. (b) Corned beef 5d. per lb.; fresh—by the side—4d. per lb.; ox kidneys, 11d. each; mutton—carcase, minimum weight 40 lbs., maximum weight 50 lbs.—3d. lb.; sausages, 4½d. per lb.; tripe, 5d. per lb. (c) 4¾d. per quart. 2, (a) 2 11/16d. per 2lb. loaf. (b) Corned beef, 4½d. per lb.; fresh—by the side—5d. per lb.; ox kidneys, 1s. each; mutton—carcase, minimum weight 40 lbs., maximum weight 50 lbs.—4½d. per lb.; sausages, 6d. per lb.; tripe, 5½d. per lb. (c) 5d. per quart. In each instance delivered at Blackboy Camp.

QUESTION—PIG IMPORTATIONS.

Mr. J. I. MANN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, What was the number of pigs landed from England up to the end of June, 1928; of what breed and sexes were they, and where are they now located? 2, What was the total cost landed at the State farms? 3, What is the number of pigs disposed of up to date, and what is their value—sows and boars? 4, How many pigs are available for distribution during the next six months, and at what price—sows and boars?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: (1) No pigs were imported from England for State farms prior to June, 1928, but in 1929 11 of the 15 pigs purchased there were landed in the State; four died on the voyage. One Berkshire boar, two Berkshire sows, one Tamworth boar, and two Tamworth sows are now at the Muresk College; one Berkshire boar and one Berkshire sow are at Denmark State Farm; two Berkshire sows are at Narrogin School of Agriculture, and one Tamworth sow at Wooroloo Sanatorium. 2, The total cost

of the pigs delivered at the various farms was £940 4s. 2d., but £207 has been received from the insurance company for the four pigs that died on voyage. 3 and 4, This information will take some little time to obtain owing to the number of institutions involved, but it will be supplied to the hon. member at a later date.

BILL—MAIN ROADS.*Third Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [4.39]: I move—That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. MCCALLUM (South Fremantle) [4.40]: At an earlier stage of the consideration of the Bill, an assurance was given to me that the clause dealing with the powers of the Commissioner, to which I moved an amendment and which I withdrew, would be looked into and discussed by the Minister with the Crown Law authorities. I was assured that if it was considered desirable, the Bill would be recommitted so that we could deal with the matter if the clause did not cover everything that was claimed for it. The Attorney General gave me that assurance, and I would like to know whether anything has been done.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [4.41]: Nothing has been done. I am afraid I must plead guilty to not having taken the matter up with the Crown Law authorities; I did not realise how rapidly we would reach the third reading stage of the Bill. I will give the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) a definite assurance that steps will be taken in the matter, and if it is necessary to alter the clause, the alteration will be made in another place. If we recommitted the Bill in this Chamber it would cause considerable delay and necessitate the suspension of the Standing Orders. Perhaps that will satisfy the hon. member. If he chooses, I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with him.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. N. Keenan—Nedlands) [4.42]: The object of the Bill is to confer upon the Minister for Education additional powers in connection with the administration of the Department of Education, relating to the retirement of members of the staff. The present power of the Minister is confined to possible action on his part in two directions. He can transfer a teacher from one school to another under Subsection 2 of Section 7 of the Act, but it is necessary that the transfer shall be of such a kind that the teacher, when transferred, shall receive the same salary. The Minister can also, under the provisions of paragraph (d) of Subsection 1 of Section 28, dismiss a teacher, but he has no power under the Act to exercise such powers as the Public Service Commissioner can exercise under Subsections 6 and 7 of Section 9 of the Public Service Act. Under those subsections, the Public Service Commissioner has power to declare an office an excess office in a department and make other provision for the excess officer. The necessity for the amending legislation arises from the fact that, under the influence of the financial depression, there will be nothing like the same number of vacancies for the teaching staff this year as there have been for some years past. The vacancies that occur in connection with the teaching staff every year average 70 female teachers who retire or get married and 30 teachers who go on long leave, while 64 vacancies are due to various causes. Some are due to retirements of teachers who reach a certain age; some are due to sickness, while others are due to dismissals. In addition, there are new vacancies arising through new schools being established. As was observed by the Leader of the Opposition the other night, this Department has been constantly expanding the number of schools conducted by it. The vacancies total 164 in a normal year and they would be filled in the manner I shall now explain to the House—134 come from the Teachers' College every year—that is the annual output of the Teachers' College—made up of 50 students leaving after a two-year course and 84 leaving after a one-year course. To that total of 134 must be added 30 teachers who return from

long service leave. This year the number of vacancies will be reduced to the extent of 35 fewer female teachers leaving the service to marry. We know that number definitely, because the scholastic year is not the same as the financial year. The scholastic year runs from the 1st January to the 31st December, and before a female teacher can leave the department to marry, in order to preserve her rights to the gratuity, she has to give three months' notice. So we know definitely that the number this year will be 35 fewer. Again, in consequence of the financial depression and the necessity to economise, long service leave has been suspended. This means that 30 teachers who normally would have gone on long service leave will not do so this year. Thus the number of vacancies that will be available next year will be 65 less than the average number of preceding years. It is extremely doubtful also whether the number of 64 vacancies due to retirement from various causes will be reached. I am not taking that into account. It may be reached because the number of deaths is more or less the same, and the number who retire is much the same each year. However, there will probably be fewer vacancies under that heading and under some other headings. To show the necessity for the Bill, I am taking the actual certainty of 65 fewer vacancies next year than has occurred in recent years. In consequence of the diminution in the number of vacancies to 99, it is necessary to reduce the output of the Teachers' College. The position is that the department employs those who come from the Teachers' College after the final examination, and though the department is not legally bound to employ them, it is morally bound to do so, because the persons trained for teachers are not fitted to earn a living in any other way. It would be very cruel indeed to lure young people into the Teachers' College with the idea that they would, when qualified by passing an examination, enter on a career that would enable them to earn a living, and then to tell them that there was no chance of doing so. Besides, it would be absurd to waste the money, so valuable nowadays, in training teachers who were wholly unnecessary. The annual output of the college is 134 teachers a year. It is proposed to reduce the number this year by the following figures:—First of all the Sep-

tember short course has been abandoned, which means a reduction of 28. The February course, a one-year course, will also be abandoned, which means another 28, and one long course involving 30 students will also be abandoned. Thus there will be 36 fewer students in the college next year than there has been in recent years. Instead of having 134 students, as in normal years, there will be only 48. Notwithstanding this reduction, there will be ample teachers available to carry on the work of the department in the years ahead. In 1931 there will be seven teachers available who came out of the college in August last, and for whom no appointment has been found to date. There will also be 28 short-course students coming out in December, 50 long-course students coming out in December, and 28 short-course students coming out in May. That gives a total of 113. Allowing for the reductions, there will be an excess of 14 students next year over the 99 vacancies. If I may go further afield and investigate the position in 1932, there will be 56 short-course students and 50 long-course students. The latter are already in the institution. I should have mentioned that, once they enter the institution, we are under a contract to finish their training. It is a definite contract that must be observed, no matter what the circumstances may be. With the carry-over, therefore, we shall have 120 teachers available in 1932 to fill the possible vacancies numbering 99. On those facts it must be perfectly clear that the present staff at the Teachers' College is largely in excess of present requirements, and certainly in excess of the requirements as from the beginning of next year. That fact is abundantly clear when we bear in mind that from the beginning of next year, instead of having 134 new students entering the college, we shall have only 48. Those who are occupying lectureships and other posts in the Teachers' College have won those positions by merit. They have been promoted from the ranks of teachers to their present positions. Although the needs of the times make it necessary to reduce the staff, it seems to me it would be a very extreme and unjust step to dismiss those men. Instead of that, I propose the scheme contained in the Bill. Roughly put, the scheme is to retire the surplus members of the college staff to the positions whence they came,

and grade down step by step until we reach the bottom of the ladder. Clause 2 of the Bill proposes to insert a new section. The proposed new Subsection 1 gives power on the report of the Director that, for the efficient working of the department, any office of the department other than an office under the control of the Public Service Commissioner is in excess of requirements, the Governor may declare it an excess office, and call upon the holder to retire from the service. That is on much the same lines as the provision in the Public Service Act. The proposed new Subsection 2 provides that the officer so retired from the service shall become an excess officer in consequence of that declaration. The proposed new Subsection 3 provides that on the report of the Director that an excess officer can be advantageously employed in any other office of the department, the Minister may transfer such excess officer to such other office, notwithstanding that it is of a lower grade and bears a lower salary. The proposed new Subsection 4 contains the scheme of this measure. There may be no office vacant to which an excess officer may be transferred, although he may be advantageously employed. Power is therefore given to the Minister to create a vacancy by moving an existing officer out of an office and putting into it the officer who was in the Teachers' College. The proposed new Subsection 5 will enable the Minister to create an office for the second officer who has been disturbed in his position, and so on until all the officers have been transferred and until the lowest rung of the ladder has been reached.

Hon. P. Collier: There will be a surplus when you get to the bottom.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is a chance of these officers being absorbed, but we must pass on the unfortunate position to someone, and we are seeking to do it with every possible care to permit of absorption. The proposed new Subsection 7 may appear to be redundant, because an officer who is retired and subsequently transferred must be deemed to have been in continuous employment. That provision has been inserted at the request of the teachers. It is declaratory of what is absolutely necessary if the scheme proposed is to be carried out. The rest of the Bill consists of mere definition. The measure is

necessary because we shall not want anything like the number of teachers that the Teachers' College at present is capable of turning out. We are going to have less than half the number of students, and it is obvious that we must reduce the staff of the college. We certainly cannot keep the staff if there is no work for them to do.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Could you say that the principle of the Bill is approved by the Teachers' Union?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I could, but I do not intend to say it. Although I take every pride in the fact that the Teachers' Union and I work in harmony, I am not going to say it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I mean the principle of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is absolutely necessary that a measure of this kind should be passed. It is to the credit of the employees that they, being aware of the Bill and of every word it contains, are not only prepared to assent to it but to support it. That, however, is no reason why this House should pass the Bill. The reason is that we have no work for some of the lecturers, because we do not want to produce a number of teachers who we cannot employ. For that reason I hope the House will accept the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [4.58]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Traffic Act Amendment Bill to be recommitted at a later stage of the sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House: there is an absolute majority present.

Question put and passed.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 30th September. Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that Clause 8 be agreed to.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When we have finished the Committee stage of this Bill, I shall be able, owing to the Standing Orders being suspended, to recommit it for the purpose of dealing with clauses that have already been passed.

Mr. McCALLUM: The House has resolved that the Bill should be recommitted. We had already reached Clause 8 before that resolution was carried. Are we going to start now where we left off and finish up the Bill, and then recommit it? What was the idea of submitting at this stage the motion to recommit the Bill.

The Minister for Works: I could not recommit at once without having the Standing Orders suspended.

Mr. McCALLUM: Who said that?

The Minister for Works: The Speaker.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is not usual to recommit a Bill when it is only partially finished. That stage comes when all the clauses have been put through.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution of the House merely gave permission for the recommitment of the Bill. We can now go on where we left off, at Clause 8, and the Minister has authority to recommit the Bill when all the clauses have been dealt with. This is not now the recommitment stage.

Mr. Willcock: We can do that without going out of Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—Amendment of Section 26:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hope this clause will be struck out.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 27:

Mr. McCALLUM: The Act provides that a person who is deemed unfit to be in charge of a drove of animals may be apprehended, but this clause goes further and provides that the drove of animals may be conveyed to a police station. What is behind that amendment?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There may be only one person in charge of a drove of animals. If he is incapable of looking after them, or driving them, he may be arrested. Provision must therefore be made for the animals to be looked after until someone can be found to take them on their way. This, of course, refers to a person

who becomes intoxicated and continues to drive animals along the road.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Minimum penalty:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have discussed this clause with the Minister and he has agreed that it can be left out. Minimum penalties frequently work injustice. A person of good character may have made a mistake in the driving of a car. The magistrate may wish to inflict only a nominal penalty, but may be bound to impose the minimum penalty which, in his opinion, may be altogether too high. Discretionary power should be left with the magistrate in cases of this kind.

Mr. Willcock: That is practically the procedure under the Justices Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think only in the case of the minimum penalty prescribed under the Licensing Act. Whenever minimum penalties are imposed they are liable to lead to hardships being created. We could well allow the court to decide what fine should be inflicted, from 1s. up to the maximum.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 15—Agreed to.

New Clause:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 16:—"Section 5 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition of a subsection, as follows:—(5) Any person who has at any time committed an offence against this section for which he has not been prosecuted shall be liable to pay to the local authority the license fee which he might have been ordered to pay on conviction of such offence, and such fee shall be recoverable in any court of competent jurisdiction."

The phraseology of the new clause may appear peculiar, but I am informed by the Crown Law Department that it makes possible the securing of licence fees for past years. As the Act stands, a traffic fee cannot be collected once the year for which that fee is payable has passed. A few weeks ago in the hills district an accident occurred between a motor truck and a car, and serious damage was done. Later it was discovered that the truck had not been licensed for a period of three years. Under the Act as it stands, not more than the current

year's fee can be collected; fees for the other two years are not collectable, although it can be proved that during those two years the truck used the roads. The difficulty and unfairness of the existing position have often been referred to at road board conferences. The Crown Law Department advise me that the new clause will give local authorities the civil remedy they desire, up to a period of six years. A man who uses a vehicle without a license should be liable to payment of fees when the offence is discovered. I could cite many instances similar to the one I have given. At present the temptation exists to avoid payment; if one can get away with it for 12 months, one need not pay at all. The unpaid license fees would not attach to a subsequent owner, but only to the owner who used the vehicle on the road at the time it was not licensed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At present the local authority cannot recover the license fee without prosecuting. They have to prove that the defendant used on the road a motor which was not licensed. That offence having been proved against the defendant, the magistrate can not only fine him for the offence but can also order him to pay the license fee for the current period. Under the Justices Act one cannot prosecute anybody for an offence committed more than six months before the date of the complaint. So that if the local authority wait six months, they cannot prosecute, and therefore cannot get the license fee although in a position to prove that the vehicle was used. If a man drives a motor car on the 1st June and it is unlicensed, he can be prosecuted in any part of the six months from the 1st June for driving an unlicensed car. Then, if he is convicted, the court can fine him and can also order him to pay the fee for the period in which the offence was committed. Now it is proposed that although the six months are up, nevertheless the local authority shall be able to proceed in a civil court, prove that the man used the car unlicensed, and then make him pay the license fee. That might have some justice in it if it did not go back so far. The new clause will re-open the matter for six years back. A man might have had a car three or four years ago, sold it and forgotten all about it. Then the local authority might be informed that he had used the car on a cer-

tain date unlicensed, and he would be dragged along to the court and be compelled to pay. Perhaps he ought to have paid, but this seems to be opening up the matter a bit too far back. The man might have bought the car and possessed it for a week, and then find himself dragged up to answer a charge several years old.

Mr. McCallum: Meantime he might have lost his proof in exculpation.

Mr. Willcock: Who can swear what he was doing in, say, June of 1925?

Mr. Sampson: The man is only to be called upon to pay fees that he should have paid. Why should the local authority or the metropolitan pool be deprived of what is justly due to them?

Mr. McCallum: Local authorities make mistakes. Have you never been billed twice for your rates?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not asking a great deal of the local authorities to discover within the six months that the man has been driving an unlicensed motor car. Surely there ought to be some finality about the thing. I do not consider the new clause acceptable as it stands.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I cannot see why we should make an exception in this instance. If we would make out a case for the licensee of a vehicle we should amend the Act generally. The limitation is under the Justices Act, and we are now to lift something out of that and make of this a special case to which the Justices Act shall not apply. I refuse to do that.

The Chief Secretary: It is not the Justices Act. This would be a civil action on account of debt.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Attorney General has told us that the existing limitation is under the Justices Act, and that that limitation is not restricted to motor cars or motor licenses, but has a general effect in regard to other liabilities.

The Attorney General: In regard to offences.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Now it is proposed we should make an exception of this one case. We are to say in this measure that the provision in the Justices Act shall not apply.

The Attorney General: Not exactly that.

Mr. Willcock: But that is what it means.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Why should we make of this a special case? If the local authorities are not active enough to see that all vehicles are licensed—and they have six

months in which to take action—why should we say to the local authorities, "You are too slow to catch them within the specified time, so we will give you a longer time in which to do it." If we are to make any alteration in the law, let us do it in the Justices Act. Let us amend that Act, but do not let us limit that Act by putting something into this Bill. I have opposed this sort of thing in this House before. It is quite wrong. I am not prepared to say the local authorities shall have opportunity to penalise offenders after the expiry of six months, which should be long enough. After six months a man might be called upon to produce evidence which he is no longer in a position to produce, but which he would have produced had the action been taken within six months.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is some confusion in the hon. member's mind. The Justices Act comes in only for one reason. When a prosecution is brought against a defendant for having driven a car without a license, the section provides that in addition to the penalty for the offence the magistrate may also order that the proper fee shall be paid. It is recoverable, the same as a civil debt. The unfortunate thing is that Section 5 of the principal Act puts the two together. What the member for Swan wants is to give the local authorities the right to recover the fee as a civil debt, not under the Justices Act at all. Within certain limits, everyone I think will agree with him. But unfortunately he puts no limit whatever to the period during which a prosecution may be brought. The Statute of Limitations, which provides for six years, is not suitable to the purpose, for the period is too long; so if the hon. member were to fix a limitation of, say, two years, why should we refuse it? It is true, as the member for Guildford-Midland suggests, these local authorities should be more alert; but I do not know that other bodies besides local authorities have not been found at times to be anything but alert.

Mr. Willcock: But there are all sorts of suggestions that members of local authorities do not pay their license fees under a certain mayor, and that when another mayor is elected they are prosecuted.

Mr. SAMPSON: I agree with a good deal said by the member for Guildford-Midland. But those people who refuse to pay their license fees are very elusive indeed, and local authorities in many instances are understaffed, so it becomes a very difficult matter

to collect those license fees. But why should we endeavour to protect those who are trying to dodge their liabilities to local authorities?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: There is a better way of doing it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I propose to accept the suggestion of the Chief Secretary by amending my amendment to provide for a period of two years.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may not amend his own motion. Probably some other member will do it for him. If the hon. member will withdraw his motion, I can then take a further motion.

Mr. SAMPSON: May I not amend it, even with the consent of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest it would come better from some other member.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move—

That the following new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 16: "Section 5 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition of a subsection as follows:—(5) Any person who has at any time after the coming into operation of this Act and within two years committed an offence against this section for which he has not been prosecuted shall be liable to pay to the local authority the license fee which he might have been ordered to pay on conviction of such offence, and such fee shall be recoverable in any court of competent jurisdiction."

Still I am in doubt. I am inclined to ask that consideration of the proposed new clause be deferred until a later stage.

The Minister for Railways: Why not do it on recommittal?

Mr. SAMPSON: I think I will go back to the original suggestion of the Minister. I am advised by the Crown Law Department that the proposed clause is all right as it stands, and if the House approves of it it will be of service. The House should approve of it.

Mr. Willecock: Having been given leave to withdraw it, you cannot now move it again.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has withdrawn the new clause he first proposed.

Mr. SAMPSON: So that my proposal will not be lost, at least without a vote being taken, I shall submit it in this form—

That the following new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 16: Section 5 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the

addition of a subsection as follows:—(5.) Any person who has at any time, after the coming into operation of this Act, committed an offence against this section for which he has not been prosecuted, shall be liable to pay to the local authority the license fee which he might have been ordered to pay on conviction for such offence, and such fees shall be recoverable in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot accept the clause, even in its latest form. I am aware that the Road Boards Conference asked for it, and I told the conference I did not think it was practicable. The local governing bodies have not collected all the traffic fees, and to assist in that direction it is my intention to ask the House to agree to certain regulations which, from the 1st January, will provide that every motor vehicle must display on its windscreen, the motor license. I believe that by that means—the posting of the license in a conspicuous place on the car—we shall be able to secure full registration of motor vehicles. It will mean that even the local authorities will be able to see whether a vehicle is licensed or not. Therefore the amendment is not necessary. After the hon. member's many efforts to straighten it out, I still think it is wrong.

Mr. MARSHALL: I intend to support the amendment because it is one that in my opinion cannot be taken lightly. Members generally have emphasised the fact that extra fees are necessary, with a view to paying for the maintenance of the roads. This has been a heavy cost to the taxpayers. There is a large section of the community that can afford to pay for the pleasures they get out of motoring. We also have the spectacle of the heavier motor vehicle owners securing a license for, say, a 35-cwt. truck and packing on it perhaps three tons. In this way the State is losing thousands of pounds annually. The better the road the heavier the load that is put on the trucks. Members may take this lightly, but I contend that the hon. member's new clause is of value. The very people the Minister desires to tax have evaded payment for years past. It would be far better if the whole business were given over to the control of the Police Department as is done in the other States. I am assured by those who know that there are many who overload their trucks and exceed the speed limit. The proposed new clause will offer the Minister some opportunity to prevent over-

loading. I am certain he will never get over the difficulty of speeding by causing the licenses to be displayed on the wind-screen. Anyone might stick a counter receipt on a windscreen and that could be done as easily as false number plates are used now.

The Minister for Works: The licenses will be of a different colour each year.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have seen many of the receipts given by road boards.

The Minister for Railways: The motor licenses will be nothing like that type.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course if it is a special type it will be all right. What is required is something that cannot easily be copied.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommitted.

On motion by Minister for Works, Bill recommitted; Mr. Richardson in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—New Section:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In connection with Subclause 1, the member for South Fremantle the other evening dealt with the question of a person using a vehicle for the carriage of goods, and he wished to add the words "except for his own use." I cannot agree to the suggestion he made. There is an impression in the minds of members that this deals with motor cars. It does not. Part II. of the Fifth Schedule deals with motors or steam wagons used together with trailers, and does not apply to motor cars at all. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 10a, after the word "vehicle" in line 2, there be inserted "mentioned in Part II. of the Fifth Schedule."

Another point is that the 7s. 6d. per P.L.W. does not apply to motor cars. Therefore there can be no doubt that this particular provision does not apply to cars. As regards an owner carrying goods for his own use, I have studied the question without discovering a way in which to make the matter clear. I have here five Transport Acts passed by various countries in 1930,

and each of them appoints a transport board, as we may find it necessary to do next year. Those boards have power to do almost anything. No inspector would interfere with a man who was travelling to the beach in a motor with his tent and so forth. Moreover, it is provided that the Minister may grant exemption. A man carrying rams, as mentioned by the member for Katanning, would certainly not be called upon to pay four times the fee. Neither would a man who had had a breakdown in his tractor and had come to Perth for a spare part. Nor is it intended that a man going on a picnic shall pay four times the fee.

Mr. McCallum: But that is what the Bill says now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: "Goods" does not mean a tent and a pair of blankets and some tucker. The Bill is an honest attempt to deal fairly with carriers who compete with the Railway Department. The insertion of the words "for his own use," as suggested by the member for South Fremantle, would mean that the man could carry benzine and stores generally. I am prepared to accept any other amendment that will put the matter more clearly. However, I am not prepared to allow a wheat grower to cart back oil in his motor.

Mr. McCallum: He should be allowed to, in the case of his own requirements.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot agree to go as far as the member for South Fremantle wants to go. Still, I would not object to a man carrying back from Perth groceries for his own personal use.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister's amendment does not meet the points which have been raised. It merely sets out that an ordinary motor car carrying goods will not be subject to the Fifth Schedule. The clause, however, says that every person, without exception, using any vehicle, no matter of what kind, for the carriage of goods, any goods whatever, upon any road mentioned in the Fifth Schedule shall be liable.

The Minister for Railways: But you are not reading the relative section of the principal Act.

Mr. McCALLUM: The amendment does not apply to Section 10 of the principal Act, but only to the Fifth Schedule under this Bill. The Minister's suggestion is that

trucks only being mentioned, cars would be exempt. But we know that many cars are put to all the uses to which trucks are put. Cars are so converted as to become suitable for all descriptions of work done with trucks. The Ministers amendment merely makes it clearer that the clause refers to motor or steam wagons, and that these will be judged on P.L.W. All trucks are now licensed on that basis, while motor cars are not. If a farmer has equipped his farm and a motor truck forms part of that equipment, he should be allowed to use it as has been suggested, particularly in these times when economy is urged on the farmer day after day. The Minister, however, refuses to let the farmer use his own truck to cart his own requirements to his own farm. According to the Minister, the farmer should run his truck back empty and pay as outsider to do the transporting much more than it would cost the farmer himself. The Minister must not dictate to the producers of this country what they shall or shall not do in using their own plant.

The Minister for Works: Not on roads that are not prescribed.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister will see to it that all roads likely to be used by the farmers will be prescribed. The farmer may have a train service running only once or twice a week, and he is to be prevented from using his motor truck to slip into the country town in the event of his tractor, for instance, breaking down. A hundred and one such things may occur, meaning all the difference between success and failure in farming. The idea is not to allow the farmer to enter into commercial carrying, or even into carrying for his neighbours. He is to carry only for himself. The Minister will not permit even that. The hon. gentleman says he is here especially to look after the interests of the producers, and this is the way he proposes to do it.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not think any exception can be taken to the Minister's amendment. The only point I am doubtful about is the effect of the amendment in the event of a motor car being converted into a truck.

The Minister for Works: If it is a truck, it will come under Part II.

Mr. McCALLUM: It may be a motor car one day and a motor truck the next.

The Minister for Railways: At any rate, it is a vehicle, and there is a definition covering it in the Act.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the additional fees are to apply only to trucks. The Minister's amendment does not affect the point we were discussing when he recommitted the Bill, and my amendment can be inserted later on.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That after "goods" in line 2, of the proposed new subsection, the words "except for his own use" be inserted.

I cannot see why a man who owns his motor truck cannot put it to its full use in connection with his own business. I do not intend the amendment to cover persons who engage in carrying. To limit a man in the use of his own property in connection with his own business is not right.

The Attorney General: That is not what the law says.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have already pointed out that this Bill will require the payment of four times the present tax, and that is not limitation, but prohibition. No farmer will be able to pay the increased tax.

The Minister for Works: But the Bill refers to "any person," not to farmers.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not care what the man may be; he should be entitled to make full use of his truck in connection with his own business.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Is there not a danger in your amendment? Would it not permit, for instance, the Merredin Brewery to send beer to Perth in its own trucks?

Mr. McCALLUM: Does the hon. member think the brewery would pay four times the tax in order to do that?

Mr. H. W. Mann: No.

The Minister for Railways: And in any case the railway passes the brewery's doors.

The Minister for Lands: But would it not enable the brewery to do what is suggested?

Hon. P. Collier: There is one hotel only that sells Merredin beer; the rest are tied houses.

Mr. McCALLUM: Is it suggested that the proprietor of the brewery will consume the whole of his beer?

The Minister for Lands: No, but the brewery may own hotels, and cart the beer supplies in trucks.

The Minister for Railways: And they could use trucks to bring goods to market for sale.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not say that the people should be exempt if they bring goods in for sale.

The Minister for Railways: But that is what your amendment says.

Mr. McCALLUM: How do you know what is in my amendment? It is not on the Notice Paper.

The Minister for Railways: I know what your amendment is.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have not given it out.

Hon. P. Collier: Trying to be smart and misleading!

The Attorney General: Why, you told us what your amendment was long ago!

Hon. P. Collier: The Minister for Railways is trying to assist all the other Ministers.

The Minister for Railways: And so I can if I like.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members must keep order.

Mr. McCALLUM: All I ask is that anyone who owns a truck shall be able to cart goods for his own use, not for the purposes of sale. Surely no exception can be taken to that.

Mr. MARSHALL: I appreciate the desire of the member for South Fremantle, but his amendment will open up a long argument. In its application, the amendment will lend itself to dishonesty. If a man were taking a truckload of perishable goods to market and had not a full load, is it possible to imagine that he would refuse to cart some of his neighbour's goods in addition to his own? How does the member for South Fremantle suggest that that position could be controlled? If a man had 200 caulifloweres on his truck, how would it be possible for anyone to say how many belonged to him and how many to his neighbour? If the hon. member can tell me how those positions can be safeguarded, I will support him. We will assume the amendment is carried. What will happen? The ordinary carrier, from whom we expect to

secure the increased taxation, will disappear from the roads, and the producers will purchase motor cars and do their own carrying without any additional taxation payments on their part. All that will be achieved will be the encouragement of the sale of American motor cars, petrol and oil, and the upkeep of the roads will still have to be paid for by the people of the State. If we are rendering those services we have to see to it that the people benefiting by the legislation pay in proportion with the benefit they receive. The hon. member by his amendment will allow dishonest men to come in and displace a section from whom we desire to get further revenue in order to maintain the roads. As far as I can understand the measure, the Minister already has power under it to exempt certain vehicles from the increased fee. If any owner of a motor car or motor truck carrying commodities can advance a sufficiently good argument to the Minister, the Minister will have power to exempt him. I suggest to the member for South Fremantle that his amendment can be covered by the discretion the Minister has under the Bill.

Mr. McCallum: No, it cannot.

Mr. MARSHALL: No owner of a private truck exempted under the proposed amendment would pass by his neighbours with a partially loaded truck when he could receive a reward for adding to his load, and that without any chance of detection. The amendment will lend itself to dishonesty, and unless the hon. member can advance stronger arguments I will vote against it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I doubt if any member would not be in agreement with the member for South Fremantle in his desire to allow the owner of a truck used in legitimate business of the nature described in the following subclause to use that truck for his own benefit in his own business. But the amendment if agreed to will destroy the whole purpose of the Bill; for a man owning a truck for profit or gain is constantly using it for his own use—the words of the amendment.

Mr. McCallum: But the amendment prescribes that the goods, not the truck, shall be for his own use.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Knowing that the hon. member is opposed to the principle of the Bill, I can easily understand that if he can get into it anything that will destroy its purpose he will

do it. At the moment, apparently, it is his desire to assist the dairyman, the farmer and the orchardist. Has he forgotten the number of railwaymen that have had to be dismissed because of the competition of the motor traffic? Has he forgotten that we have dismissed men from the railway workshops because they cannot be kept going in view of the reduced business of the railways, the result of the road competition? The cost of maintaining our roads should be met by those gaining benefit from them, not by the general taxpayer. It is all right to say the farmer, the horticulturist, the dairyman, or even the pastoralist, who occasionally brings his products to the nearest market town or railway station should be permitted to use the roads to take back his own requisites to his holding. That is all very well, but we can specify it better in that subclause which exempts him when bringing his produce to market; there we can make the same exemption for the carrying of his requisites back to his holding. But if, as the member for Murchison suggested, we are going to permit the farmer or the orchardist to take back goods that are only ostensibly for his own use, we are going to allow him to use the roads for his own gain and without paying the increased fee. To-day quite a number of people owning motor cars are occasionally converting them into passenger vehicles, making no charge for the carriage of the passengers, but charging the passengers a special rate for the carriage of their parcels. All that is being done in competition with our railways.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Why not give us a better railway service?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We shall be able to give a better railway service when we can recover some of the traffic taken from us by motor competition running over roads maintained by the general taxpayer. The member for North Perth must know that quite a number of his constituents are looking for work because the railways have not the traffic they had previously.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: That is the fault of the railway management.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course it is always the fault of the railway management. But I do ask the member for South Fremantle if he does not wish to destroy the Bill to move his amendment in that portion of the clause which will permit of its being carried out without our

having to maintain squads of policemen all over our main roads. For if the amendment were to be placed where the hon. member desires it, we should never be able to police our main roads. To-day we are holding up quite a number of people who we know are infringing the law, but we cannot bring them to book because of the loopholes in our law. This amendment, if agreed to, would create another loophole. We have to do something in order to save the taxpayer from the unfair charge of maintaining those roads; and we have to save our railway system, in which an immense amount of public money has been invested on which interest and sinking fund must be provided. I know the hon. member is anxious to do justice to the farmers and orchardists. So am I, and so are we all. But we do not want to do an injustice to the rest of the community in trying to do justice to the few. I am afraid the amendment will have just that effect, and I ask the hon. member to submit it in another subclause. I know a man who is operating for a distance of 52 miles on one of our roads. He has a very small farm and he brings in a very small quantity of his own produce, perhaps once a week. Apparently in addition he is carting for his neighbours and charging them for his service. If the amendment were to be agreed to he could keep on doing that without paying any of the additional fee.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: Why could not the Railway Department carry those things?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member, surely, cannot be thinking out the subject very seriously. The Railway Department could show an all round improvement if given the custom, but without that support it cannot be done. Some of our country settlers complain of the time occupied in getting their deliveries over spur lines. That is due to the fact that the traffic is not there in sufficient volume. If it were, the result would be very different. The Committee can understand that unless we grip this question pretty effectively we shall have to lose even more of the men employed in our railway service.

Mr. McALLUM: The Minister would never have made that speech had he been in the House during the last six years. It is only because he is a stranger amongst us that he made it. During the six years we were in office we repeatedly tried to protect

the railways and tramways against unfair competition. The people the Minister is now associated with on that side of the House told us the reason we could not carry on the railways successfully in face of the motor competition was only our bad management. I put that back to him. We shall see what he can do with his management. Before the motor traffic reached its present dimensions every effort we made to protect the railways and tramways was challenged in this Chamber.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. McCALLUM: Even the adjournment of the House was moved on account of a few taxis running between here and Fremantle. Regulation after regulation as to routes and stopping places was disallowed. I do not want to be told of the necessity for protecting our railways and keeping the railwaymen employed, because if we had got our way the railways and tramways would have been in a very different position to-day.

The Minister for Railways: You are flattering yourself.

Mr. McCALLUM: It was only owing to the opposition we got from members now on the Government side that the vested interests on the roads grew to their present dimensions. And when the Minister talks of the money invested in the railways and tramways, he should remember that the railways and tramways are not the only concerns in which money has been invested. What about all those people with money invested in motor vehicles; are they not to be considered? Now the Minister would tell them that even in their own districts they are not to be allowed to make full use of their vehicles for the carriage of their own goods. This is the right place in the Bill for my amendment, and this is the place where it is to go. As for leaving a loophole for those who try to get behind the law, can the Minister name any law where that is not possible? Is there any Act that cannot be evaded in some way? I do not suggest that anyone in the carrying business should be allowed to compete unfairly with the railways, but men who have spent their money in purchasing plant should be able to use it to carry goods for their own requirements. To prevent them from doing so would impose restriction and hardship.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	21

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Munro	Mr. Withers
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Parker
Mr. Davy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Thorn
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. Marshall	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Angelo
Mr. Millington	Mr. Ferguson
Miss Holman	Mr. Teesdale

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. McCALLUM: The amendment moved by the Minister for Works to the early part of the clause does not meet the point I made the other night about picnic parties going out in trucks carrying camp equipment, groceries and blankets. They would have to pay four times the license fee unless granted exemption by the Minister. That would put the Minister in the position of taxing master—a very undesirable power to give anybody. Hundreds of people travel from the wheat belt to Nornalup, Bunbury, and Busselton for a few weeks' camping, and they would be debarred from travelling on specified routes unless they obtained exemption or paid four times the tax. I move an amendment—

That after "goods" in line 2 of Subclause 1 the words "which term does not include personal effects or domestic requirements" be inserted.

The Chief Secretary: Make it read "goods other than personal effects."

Mr. McCALLUM: In view of the experience of the member for Swan, I think I had better adhere to my own plain terms. If I submit to legal advice, I may not get anything at all.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That after "farms" in paragraph (a) the words "or timber mills" be inserted.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Omit the word "mills." I want this to apply to sleeper hewers.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: To meet what is desired, several amendments will be required so that the paragraph will read "(a) for carrying the produce of farms or timber mills or farming or timber mill requisites between any farm or timber mill and the railway station or town nearest to such farm or timber mill."

Hon. P. Collier: Why not insert a separate paragraph to cover timber mills, just as you have a separate paragraph to cover mining requisites.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That would meet the position, but the Minister for Works has adopted this method.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I wish to assist the sleeper hewers—men carting sleepers or telegraph poles—and the amendment will not achieve what I desire. Perhaps the better words to use would be "forest products." Sleepers have to be carted over prescribed roads, not necessarily along them. If my suggestion is not adopted, people may not be allowed to cart their sleepers across a road.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We all know what we want. We might pass the clause and have the necessary amendment made in another place.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (d) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"Solely for the carrying of any produce of any garden, orchard or dairy farm from the place where the same is produced to the nearest railway station, town or market place and for the carrying to such garden or dairy farm of any requisites not intended for sale."

This amendment is to meet the desires of the member for Swan.

Mr. PIESSE: I hope the Minister will make some provision to protect producers who may wish to convey stud sheep to market or some other place. Sheep of this character may often lose some of their value if they are not properly handled, and the owners may desire to send them to some place by road. Some means should be provided whereby they can do this.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I quite agree that the man who wishes to take stud sheep to some other place should be exempt from the Act. The engineers of the Main Roads Board will be appointed inspectors under the Act, and will be instructed what to do and what not to do. I quite agree that these sheep owners should not be called upon to pay.

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

Clauses 5, 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Amendment of Section 13:

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That paragraphs (a) and (b) be struck out.

I suggested previously that paragraphs (a) and (b) should be struck out. They are superfluous in view of the decision that the additional tax should not apply to the metropolis. The Minister undertook to look into the matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I understood that the hon. member had been advised in this matter by the Crown Solicitor. That officer now says the paragraphs must remain in the Bill. The Commissioner of Police is the collecting authority under this schedule. The 7s. 6d. on the power, load, weight is collected on vehicles used on the prescribed routes, and has to be paid into the trust fund. The Commissioner collects no fees for licenses for vehicles which travel over outside roads. In order to make it clear that the 7s. 6d. does not go into the metropolitan pool, one of the paragraphs says that the fees so collected must be paid into another fund and used for a special purpose.

Mr. McCALLUM: The point raised by the Minister has nothing to do with the case. Section 13 of the Act deals exclusively with the metropolitan pool. It says that the Commissioner is the licensing authority and that he collects the fees, etc. The other

night we added to the clause a proviso that, for the purpose of this schedule, no portion of any of the roads named in that part, that were situated within the metropolitan area as described under the Act, should be included. That applies to all roads in the Fifth Schedule outside the metropolis. Nothing outside the metropolis can be dealt with under Section 13. The fees referred to in Section 10a cannot be levied in the metropolis and the roads cannot be declared to be within the metropolis.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is purely a technical matter.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have been behind the scenes. I do not want a conflict of interpretation, nor do I want it to be said that it is possible to declare these roads within the metropolis, and that additional fees may be imposed.

The Minister for Works: The hon. member's amendment the other night would permit of any of the roads being declared within the metropolitan area.

Mr. McCALLUM: That shows how much more careful we ought to be.

Hon. P. Collier. This Bill has given the officials of the Crown Law Department a headache.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is a crudely and badly drafted Bill. If there is no question of bringing these roads and these fees within the metropolitan area, why make Section 13 subject to Section 10a? It may easily be said that the latter section overrides the former. If the fees were imposed within the metropolitan area, chaos would immediately result. I know what officers will put up to Ministers when they want to get in money and build up their positions. The Commissioner is definitely set out as the collecting authority for roads outside, and the fees are set out here. Why mix this matter up with the metropolitan business at all? When I spoke to the Crown Solicitor on the subject over the telephone to-day, he agreed with me. On the most favourable interpretation there is still a doubt, and what we all agree ought not to happen will still be possible.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The member for South Fremantle seems in a suspicious mood to-night, and I do not know whether he will believe me, but I assure the Committee that without the slightest pressure from either the Minister for Works or myself, the Crown Solicitor—

Mr. McCallum: I do not want to complain, but I understood I was to be present at the discussion with the Crown Solicitor. That is what you agreed to.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When?

Mr. McCallum: When I agreed to the matter being deferred.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is what I said to-night.

Mr. McCallum: You have not carried out what you promised. I was not present at the discussion with the Crown Law Department.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: My recollection is that the only time I ever said anything about the hon. member being present at a discussion with the Crown Law Department was to-night.

Mr. McCallum: No. You said it the other night, when I agreed to withdraw my amendment and let the clause go.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am very sorry. I must confess I do not recollect it. In any case, the whole question is purely academic. If the words remain, they will remain simply out of abundant caution. They cannot do any harm to anybody. The point is that these fees are to be payable to the Commissioner of Police. The Crown Solicitor's point of view was that if the words were left as they were, it might be suggested that the fees should go into the metropolitan traffic trust, which is not intended. Therefore the words "Subject to Clause 10a" were inserted. The whole matter seems to me purely an academic question of draftsmanship, but there does not seem to me to be any reason for disregarding the Crown Solicitor's advice by striking out these words.

Mr. McCallum: Then you endanger Clause 13 by making it subject to Clause 10a.

The Minister for Works: Clause 10a refers to increased fees.

Mr. McCallum: That is what I say.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Suppose Clause 13 is subject to Clause 10a, how does that affect Clause 13?

Mr. McCallum: By rendering it possible that the additional fees will apply in the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: They apply only to prescribed routes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I fail to see the fear of the member for South Fremantle. Is not a declaration that the roads

within the metropolitan area shall be exempt put into Clause 10a?

Mr. McCallum: No; into Clause 13.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand that the hon. member moved an amendment to Clause 10a making it quite clear that Part I. of the Fifth Schedule could not come within the metropolitan area. Is not that so?

Mr. McCallum: No. I moved that amendment to the schedule itself.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Clause 10a creates the Fifth Schedule.

Mr. McCallum: The Fifth Schedule is under Clause 5.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Clause 4 creates the Fifth Schedule. Clause 5 sets forth the Fifth Schedule. The member for South Fremantle has secured the insertion of a proviso to the Fifth Schedule, which was brought into existence by Clause 10a.

Mr. McCallum: You lawyers are hopeless.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know that we get much further by calling lawyers hopeless. The member for South Fremantle apparently does not want the argument pursued further.

Mr. McCallum: You are hitting all round. You are not touching the point.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is the hon. member's opinion. As a general rule, the hon. member has an utter contempt for all opinions except his own.

Mr. McCallum: You have not played the game. You gave an undertaking that I should be present at the interview with the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor now tells me that my point was never put forward.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will let the member for South Fremantle exhibit all the spleen. The hon. member specialises in spleen. If I made such a promise as he states—and I do not recollect making it—I take it that "Hansard" will record the fact. Further, I will see that the hon. member has an opportunity of discussing the matter with the Crown Solicitor and members of the Government. However, I give the Committee my word that without any suggestion from myself or the Minister for Works the Crown Solicitor, when this particular point was put to him to-day, said he had been rather taken on the jump, and had expressed an opinion somewhat hastily to the member for South Fremantle over the telephone, and

that after further consideration he was of opinion that the amendments we are now discussing were necessary. Irrespective of whether "Hansard" says I made the promise, I want the member for South Fremantle to have the fullest opportunity of discussing the matter. If the Minister for Works wants this Bill dealt with to-night, the matter will be discussed with the member for South Fremantle at the earliest possible opportunity, and if an amendment is necessary it will be made.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the member for South Fremantle was discussing this matter the other evening, the Attorney General gave him an assurance that he would consult with me.

The Attorney General: And I did consult with you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Attorney General also said that if the position was as stated by the member for South Fremantle, an amendment would be made. I did not hear the Attorney General say he would discuss the matter with the member for South Fremantle. This afternoon the Crown Solicitor said to me, "Mr. McCallum rang me up on the telephone, and I did agree with him then; but the words must remain." I say they must remain; the measure will be useless without them. Under Clause 13 the Commissioner of Police is the licensing authority for the metropolitan area. The new clause sets out that the additional fee shall be collected by the Commissioner of Police or the Minister. That refers to the 7s. 6d. fee on all prescribed roads. That fee is not to be collected by the local governing bodies, but by the police; and instead of being paid into the metropolitan trust account, it is to be handed over to the Minister, who will pay it into the Main Roads Board account. I assure the member for South Fremantle that the understanding arrived at by the Attorney General, the Crown Solicitor and me this afternoon is quite clear. Those two sections do not deal with the metropolitan area, and the method suggested is the only way by which the money can be devoted to the desired purpose. I hope the committee will agree to the clause as it stands.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am sorry the Attorney General has shown any heat regarding this matter.

The Attorney General. You accused me of not playing the game.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not want to continue that phase, but the Minister will find that what I said was correct. As a matter of fact, I had been waiting for a ring on the telephone inviting me to confer with him. When the Attorney General argues now that the clause merely provides for the Commissioner of Police to be the collecting authority, I would remind him that that provision is already laid down in Subclause (3) of Clause 4. If that is the intention, then the collecting authority is already fixed elsewhere in the Bill. I admit candidly that I am suspicious concerning the effect this will have on the metropolitan area. I know what the view of some people will be; if they can get money, they will get it. All I want is to have the position made perfectly clear. If the Crown Solicitor, after his conversation with me, reconsidered the matter and changed his opinion, I should have been advised.

The Minister for Works: You have been advised.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have not been advised.

The Attorney General: Heavens! Surely you would not expect the Crown Solicitor to write you a letter to advise you.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, but I thought he would act in the same way as I did.

The Attorney General: The Crown Solicitor advised me and I advised you! Perhaps you do not take my word for it.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not dispute the Minister's word, nor the truth of what he says took place between the Crown Solicitor and himself. On the other hand, I can read English. If it is ruled subsequently that the clause will apply to the metropolitan area, then those representing the metropolitan area will have been grossly deceived and that will apply also to those who carry on business in that part of the State and to the local governing bodies concerned. I have placed my protest before the Committee and if anything happens along those lines, it will not be my fault. If the legal view is correct, what I suggest will not happen, but from an ordinary commonsense reading of the clause, I am afraid the effect will be as I suggest.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Just to finalise the matter, I wish to inform the

member for South Fremantle that I have received an intimation from an impartial person who was present on Tuesday night, and he says he understood me to promise the hon. member that I would consult with him and the Crown Solicitor on this particular technical point. That being so, I am prepared to meet the hon. member and discuss the matter with him and the Crown Solicitor to-morrow morning or on Saturday.

Mr. McCallum: But the Bill is to be passed to-night.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That does not matter. If the Crown Solicitor advises that the clause should go out, it will go out. The Legislative Council will not raise any objection because this is a purely technical matter. I suggest that the member for South Fremantle accept my offer, and we confer on the matter any time before next Tuesday.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for South Fremantle desire to proceed with his amendment?

Mr. McCallum: Yes.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Amendment of Section 42:

Mr. McCALLUM: Will the Minister explain what he means by "continuous routes"? Does it mean that if there is a break of five minutes during the day, it will not be a continuous route?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have explained this matter several times. Take the Perth-Fremantle Road. There are upwards of 24 buses running on that route. They are running at all times of the day, and therefore that is a continuous route. Take the road on the other side via Applecross. There are a few buses only running on that route, and therefore it will not be a continuous route. The buses plying there will have to pay half fees only. There must be a continuous service on a road. Application must be made to the Routes Advisory Board and the board will decide what time table shall be run. The time table itself will show whether a particular route is a continuous route.

Mr. Wansbrough: What if there are a number of companies running buses on the one route?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Companies have nothing to do with it; it is a matter of buses only. If there is a spell of half an hour during which no bus is on the route, it will not be a continuous route.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 12, 13, and 15—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill again reported with amendments.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1930-31.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 30th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

MR. WILSON (Collie) [8.58]: At the outset of my remarks, may I compliment you, Mr. Chairman, on your accession to the office of Chairman of Committees and wish you success in your new sphere. May I say at this juncture that I would not have taken part in the debate because I know how hard up the Government and the people are, had I not been compelled to do so, because of statements and innuendoes made in the Legislative Council that I regard seriously, and which made me ask myself whether there was not a charge made against me as member for Collie. I hope hon. members will bear with me to-night just as if I were in the dock, seeing that in another place the President saw fit to allow two of the members to traduce the district I come from, and incidentally to bolster up some rotten concern of their own.

The Minister for Railways: That is not Scotch; that is plain English!

Mr. WILSON: Sometimes it takes a plain Scotchman to understand English. There are such things as "pure Scotch" and "pigeon English," and I intend to give the Committee some dinkum Scotch to-night.

The Attorney General: That is dinkum Aussie.

Mr. WILSON: The newspapers during the past two or three weeks have been full of the Collie coal scandal, organised profiteering, unholy alliances and other similar terms. I want, in my own way, to give the Committee an outline of the history of the increased prices for coal and an indication

as to how those increases were arrived at. I happened to be the prime mover in connection with all increases gained since 1915, and for practically ten years before that I was general secretary of the Collie Miners' Union. The first increase was given by Mr. J. D. Connolly when he was Minister. He gave the miners of Collie 6d. per day increase on the score that Newcastle had got 1s. The other three increases were all granted by the Arbitration Court. I was the advocate for the Collie miners at each of those tribunals. I refer to the Clarkson tribunal, the Edmunds tribunal, and to the Hibble tribunal. The miners of Collie followed in the van of New South Wales. The whole of the Federated Coal Miners of Australia, with the exception of those of Collie, got an advance in wages five months before the Collie miners. What kind of a man would I have been to allow that to go on without trying to help the men I was representing? For Mr. Miles and Mr. Holmes to speak of organised profiteering is to show that they do not know what they are talking about. I want to deal with those two gentlemen and some of the statements that are alleged to have been made in another place. They said it was a question of the miners of Collie getting introduced a Bill asking for a 35-hour week. Mr. Holmes said that, and Mr. Miles echoed it. They said a Bill was brought down a couple of sessions ago prescribing that the coal miners of Collie were to work only 35 hours per week. I have that Bill here, as it left this House and was sent to them. Those two members of another place are living under false pretences, because they have never read the Bill; they are getting £600 a year for doing nothing but telling lies. Here is the Bill itself. It is a Bill for a seven-hour day, which makes up 42 hours per week. When I introduced that Bill in 1926 the coal miners had for a long time been working a seven-hour day underground. They are still working seven hours per day. I can tell members that there was in the Old Country an Act of Parliament for a seven-hour day for underground workers for many years, and that the hours per day there for those workers is now only 7½ hours. Will members be surprised to learn that 6½ hours was the working day for men in the north of England 80 years ago? Let me repeat it: eighty years ago 6½ hours was the recognised standard day in the north of England.

So much for our seven-hour day Bill. Then those two members of another place said that if the Collie miners worked longer they would produce more coal. I have here a statement from the Mines Department, and also a statement from the inspector of mines at Collie. I am going to show what was the rate in the production per head for an eight-hour day, and the production per head for a seven-hour day. It is not generally understood that the Collie miners are always on piece-work. The more coal they get the more they earn. It is not a question of working in the mines for eight hours and getting your pay. You must produce the article. I am going to show that while no increase was given in the tonnage in those later years, the tonnage produced in the seven-hour day was more than that produced in the eight-hour day. Some may smile and say that could not be done. I say advisedly that miners producing coal on tonnage-rate would be all out in less than seven hours. When I tell you that those miners on piece-work practically take no crib time, you will understand the pitch at which they work. These figures are from the Mines Department. In 1915 there were 286,666 tons produced; or every man produced 764 tons of coal, working on an average 220 days per annum; or 3 tons 9 cwt. per man per day of eight hours. In each of the years from 1915 to 1920 inclusive eight hours per day were worked and the average was less than 3 tons 10 cwt. per day; in 1921 with a seven-hour day it was only 3 tons 3 cwt.; in 1922 it was 3 tons 10 cwt.; in 1923 it was 3 tons 10 cwt.; in 1924 it was 3 tons 14 cwt.; in 1925 it was 3 tons 16 cwt.; in 1926 it was 4 tons 1 cwt.; in 1927, 4 tons; in 1928, 4 tons; and last year it was 3 tons 16 cwt. I say there are no other workmen in the world that can claim that tonnage per day, from 3 tons 16 cwt. to 4 tons 1 cwt. per man per day. And then these buccaneers from the Upper House talk about producing more when 4 tons 1 cwt. per man is the highest tonnage in the world! And those two members of another place ventured to jibe at the supposed inferiority of their own native fuel. I understand they are both locally-bred men, and it seems certain that they decried the local fuel. They said that it takes 155 tons of Collie coal to equal 100 tons of Newcastle coal. That is not true. I do not know the authority for their statement, but I will

give the authority for what I say when I declare it is not true. Dr. Jack, who was a Royal Commissioner in 1904, said that Collie coal was 1.432 tons as against Newcastle's 100 tons. Professor Woolhough said it was 1.380; Mr. Humm, ex-Chief Mechanical Engineer at the Railways, and Mr. Evans, now the Railways Commissioner, said it was 1.414, and the then Minister for Railways (Mr. Gregory) said it was 1.342; that is to say, it took 1.342 tons of Collie coal to equal 100 tons of Newcastle coal. But these members of another place make it 155 tons. It may not sound much, but it means a good deal in values, when we are spending hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum. Mr. Miles went on to say that the Collie miners are making too much in wages. I am going to admit that the Collie miners make good wages, but I say also they work every minute of the day they toil in the mines. The men are put on to the very hardest and most laborious work in the district, and he quotes certain men as high as £3.5. I wish it were true. I have seen their returns sent to the Taxation Department, and there are not two of them above £600 in the whole of those 800 men. Of the other 800 there must be some men who are trying to make big wages, like the champion shearer. But this member of another place makes the man who stands out as the average for the district. I know men who are making big money. I know of some men in Collie at the present time who are practically the "ringers" of the shed, so to speak, or the champion coal-getters. The tunnel goes down steeply, and these men are at the mercy of a broken chain or one of the skips breaking off at any moment of the day. They are working in most hazardous conditions. And this member in his cu by job in the Upper House knows not what they are doing. Now I will recount the wages the Arbitration Court gave to the Collie miners. Of the day wages for miners on seven hours per day, the man in charge of the coal cutting machine—nowadays there are very few men who lie down with a pick and cut the coal; in this country all the coal is broken by machinery—the man in charge of this £1,000 machine, cutting coal, is paid 21s. 3d., while his two helpers get 20s. 11d. and 19s. 11d. respectively. Then the set-rider, the man whom some of you have seen on top, who rides on the skip and

goes down into the bowels of the earth—Mr. Justice Burnside on one occasion said that if he had his way he would cut out the job altogether gets 20s. 1d. So we come to the miners; we have the shiftman at 19s. 11d., the labourer on top 16s. 6d., and unclassified workers 18s. 2d. That is with this exception, that there is a 2s. allowance on the day's work. Those are the wages, about 21s. or 22s. for the best worker there. Let me tell you the price per ton that we get, and I am finished. In one mine, the Co-operative, they bore a hole in the coal, they shoot it down, load it into the skips, and put up the timber to make the place safe and right for themselves and the machine man. The amount they get for that is 3s. 8d. per ton. At the Proprietary Mine they are paid 3s. 6d. per ton for shooting the coal down, and so on. At the Cardiff mine they are paid 3s. 8d. per ton, and at the Westralia the men get 3s. 11d. Out of this they have to buy their own tools and explosives and oil; so you can quite understand that anything they get out of what is left they well deserve. Sometimes the wheelers get a certain pay of about 18s. 3d. a day. On piece-work they perhaps earn up to 25s. a day, and the companies get a better deal from piece-work than they do from day work. Yet one of those members of the Upper House complained that the men should do piece-work instead of day work. Little he knew of the subject! And these are the prices. I published a statement in the Press two or three months ago with regard to Newcastle coal. I showed that the Newcastle miners should not have their daily wage reduced. I showed that the Newcastle companies were receiving 23s. per ton for the coal, and that the miners were getting 3s. 2d. per ton for hewing it. I also showed that the Collie mines were getting only 19s. per ton for their coal, and were paying more than was being paid in New South Wales for the hewing. Mr Miles complains of that. I cannot see the force of his argument. If the men in Newcastle received only 3s. 2d. with coal at 23s. per ton, it was surely good enough business for our men to get 3s. 10d., or 8d. more, when the coal was 4s. per ton less. The hon. member drew a comparison to suit his argument, but where the comparison comes in, I am at a loss to understand. A good deal has been said about conferences be-

tween the several parties—the unions, the Commissioner, and the Trades Hall. It is true that conferences have been held. They were inaugurated for a specific purpose. At one time the loco. drivers did not care to use Collie coal, and they demanded a mixture consisting of 50 per cent. of Newcastle coal and 50 per cent. of Collie coal. The conferences were brought about to get the loco. drivers to use 100 per cent. of local fuel. Those conferences have been held for 12 years, and at none of them have the companies' representatives been allowed to attend. The price to be paid for the coal has never been a subject of discussion. I remember a time when a conference was called and the present Minister for Railways attended it. The companies asked to be allowed to send a representative and the Minister replied, "No, you cannot attend here." Was not that so?

The Minister for Railways: Yes.

Mr. WILSON: The first man who asked to be permitted to attend the conferences was the Commissioner of Railways himself. I have a letter from the then Commissioner, Colonel Pope, in which he asked permission to be represented at the conference. He sent Mr. Backshall to plead to be allowed to attend in order that all concerned might co-operate with a view to determining the coal most suitable for the department's requirements, considering also the views of the loco. drivers. The Commissioner was then allowed to attend. Ever since then the conferences have been held. The three-months' term, was inserted in the first agreement of all at the request of the Minister for Railways, and it has been included ever since. Let me repeat that the price has never been a subject considered at the conference. Mr. Miles spoke about an unholy alliance to boost the price of coal. He does not know what he is talking about. He is trying to do injury to an industry that has been working peacefully for the last 10 or 12 years. He talks about an advance in price and an unholy alliance. In the course of his statement he mentioned the names of a number of shareholders, but it is a remarkable fact that out of practically 500 shareholders, he named only about a dozen. Why he should single them out and name them, I do not know, but I consider it was undignified to publish the names of men whose shoes he was not fit to black. He

mentioned the name of a judge of the Supreme Court who holds shares. Yet the hon. member, two nights ago, said he would be pleased to have a judge of the Supreme Court as a Royal Commissioner to conduct the inquiry. He mentioned the Rev. Mr. Henn as the holder of shares.

Hon. P. Collier: One of your own, is he not?

Mr. WILSON: He is not a "Scotch-bbyterian." We are not in it this time, though we are generally there when there are any bawbees about. The hon. member also mentioned the Rev. J. W. Grove and Archbishop Chune as shareholders. I consider it was infra dig to mention those names. Worst of all, he forgot to say why Amalgamated Collieries shares are held in those names.

Hon. P. Collier: Another unholy alliance with the church?

Mr. WILSON: The late Mr. Lynn gave a donation to found a scholarship at Fremantle. The present manager, Mr. Johnson, has given a scholarship of £500 per year for five years to assist boys of Collie workmen. A certain number of shares, or their equivalent, was given to the church schools, so that scholarships would be available there. Those shares are held in trust by some of the gentlemen mentioned for the purposes of the scholarships. The shares had to be put into somebody's name. Yet this blunderer from the North-West butts into an affair like that. Does he not know that we want more men and more companies to exhibit the same spirit and help to educate our boys and girls? Instead of holding them up to contumely, he should have been the first man to commend them for their action. Regarding the arrangement of prices, the first advance was given in August, 1915, by Mr. J. D. Connolly, then Minister for Railways. In December, 1915, all the Eastern coal miners got an increase in wages and prices from the Federal Coal Tribunal. Collie coalfield was ignored. Five months afterwards I asked Mr. Hughes why Collie had been left out of the arrangement for increased wages. He created a special tribunal and the Collie miners sent me as their leading advocate to get their just dues. We got less than did the Newcastle miners, but still we got something. Almost the first thing

I did on my return from the war was to see Judge Edmunds. The Newcastle miners had received another increase. I was sent East, and although we received less than did the Newcastle men, still we got something. In 1920 I was again sent East, and again we got an increase. From the four increases obtained since 1914, the Newcastle mines have received 14s. per ton, as against the Collie miners 8s. per ton. Some years ago I asked a question of the present Minister for Railways regarding the date of the last increase granted to the Collie miners. It was in 1920 and it was the last increase they received. Since that time—10 years ago—the Newcastle miners have received increase amounting to 3s. 9d. per ton, whereas the Collie miners have asked for nothing. Mr. Miles commented on the fact that when the Government called for tenders for coal, no tenders were submitted. I was instrumental in blocking the submission of tenders. There was good reason for it. If tenders had been submitted, they would have carried a higher figure, because the Collie miners had received less by way of increases than had the Newcastle miners. Our men had received no advance in 10 years. That was one of the reasons. If there is any unholy alliance, I am not in it with the companies or with any of the shareholders I mentioned. We have always tried to get our dues, and at the same time have given our best to the Government. To show that I do not make statements without first verifying them, let me read figures taken from the Government file showing the increases granted to the Newcastle miners as against the Collie miners:—

	Newcastle.	Collie.
1916	1s. 0d.	0s. 6d.
1917	3s. 0d.	1s. 11d.
1919	2s. 9d.	2s. 7d.
1920	4s. 0d.	3s. 0d.
	<hr/> 10s. 9d.	<hr/> 8s. 0d.

And since then the Newcastle miners have received increases amounting to 3s. 9d. Here is the question I asked of the Minister for Railways—

When did the Railway Department pay the latest increases ordered by the Federal Coal Tribunal in the price of coal to the Collie companies for fuel supplied?

The Minister replied—

On the 27th September, 1920.

Increases received by the Newcastle miners since that date have been 1s. 6d., 1s. 6d., 9d., and 6d., a total of 4s. 3d. and then sixpence was taken away. Meanwhile the Collie miners have not asked for anything. That is the position regarding the so called unholy alliance. Mr. Helm, who controls the Railway Stores has had a good deal to say, but before I go on to that, let me remark that the Collie miners would have been quite justified in endeavouring to get increases based on those granted to the Newcastle miners since 1920. On the 9th November, 1925, Mr. Hibble, of the Coal Tribunal, awarded every worker in the industry in Australasia from 1s. to 1s. 6d. per day. Especially did the labourer on top benefit, for he received 1s. 6d. per day. The labourer on top in the Collie district did not get that 1s. 6d., and did not approach the Government to have it paid. Mr. Miles quoted the price paid by the Government of New South Wales for Newcastle coal, but he did not mention the prices paid in other States nearer to us. I sent a telegram to Victoria asking what price was paid for coal from the State coal mine and also for coal from the private mines in the same district. I know that district from A to Z because I was there for 15 years. Mr. Lemmon, the Minister for Education, replied as follows:—

The price of Wonthaggi coal on trucks pit's head 19s. 8d. No purchases from the other mines. The other mines would not supply at 19s. 8d.

That 19s. 8d. coal is of the same quality as Collie coal. Yet Mr. Miles did not tell us that. The Wonthaggi mine is a State mine. Many years ago the Government of Victoria reduced the capitalisation of the colliery by nearly £200,000. Notwithstanding that the Government have lost £200,000 on the mine, they are still paying 19s. 8d. per ton to keep it going. Mr. Miles, in moving his motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission, set out the terms of reference under 12 heads. Any person who reads the report of the Coal Commission in New South Wales in 1930 must be struck by the similarity of the references. Every item that Mr. Miles suggests is something that appears in that volume.

Hon. P. Collier: Well, you would hardly expect otherwise.

Mr. WILSON: He has not one idea of his own. He got his typist to copy out these

things, but he only copied those that helped his own case, and that he thought were to the detriment of Collie. He forgot to say that there were some interesting articles in this volume. He talked about the price of coal. Let me tell the Committee that we really are to be congratulated upon having a coalfield like Collie. The hon. member also referred to South Australia. The report in question says—

According to figures supplied by the Commonwealth Statistician, the comparatively small quantity of coal utilised by the railway system of South Australia—namely 244,000 tons—cost approximately £547,000. . . . As compared with Western Australia, South Australia uses 70,000 tons less and pays approximately £240,000 more for its requirements.

The Commission pointed out that South Australia used 70,000 tons of coal less than Western Australia and that it had paid £240,000 more for it than did Western Australia. Mr. Miles forgot to point that out. Why did he omit that statement? He also said that the bunkering trade had gone. He remarked that we had not bunkered coal for a long time, and that the ships which used to bunker Collie coal were not now doing so but were giving preference to the Newcastle commodity because of the high price charged for the Western Australian article. Let me quote again from the Royal Commission under the heading of transport—

The extent to which oil-burning ships are increasing gives a general indication of the fact that coal is, in point of economic value, seriously feeling the competition of oil as fuel. Oil supplied for bunkers in Australia expressed in terms of tons of coal, illustrates the extent to which coal has been displaced.

There are some figures which indicate the extent to which coal has been displaced by oil. In 1922 we in Australia supplied oil to the tune of 29,000 tons; in 1923, 81,000 tons; in 1924, 148,000; in 1925, 201,000 tons; in 1926, 238,000 tons; in 1927, 268,000; in 1928, 290,000, and for the nine months of the current year 251,000 tons. This is the extent to which oil ships are displacing coal. To revert to the bunkering trade, I would point out that Collie has increased its bunkering since 1924. In that year the quantity bunkered was 38,000 tons, in 1925 it was 41,000 tons, in 1926 45,000 tons, in 1927 41,000 tons, and in 1929 46,000 tons. I do not know where Mr. Miles got his figures, but it is evident he has been misled. Someone has evidently invited him

is costing. I am going to support any Commission that comes along.

The Minister for Railways: That is not the total advantage derived. The money is kept here in circulation instead of going to the other States.

Hon. P. Collier: And employing our own men.

Mr. WILSON: And more than that. Although we could not get Newcastle coal years ago, our coal was the means of taking our wheat and timber to the ports for export during the war period.

Mr. Willecock: And without delay.

Mr. WILSON: Yes. There has never been a strike at Collie that has interfered with the simple working of the railways over the last 20 years. Everything has been going along smoothly. I am no champion of the coal companies, but I have yet to learn that they have made extravagant profits or declared extraordinary dividends. I could name a dozen companies which started in Collie, and every one went to the wall. At the present time I am not too sure that another is not going to the wall, and going there quickly. I should, of course, be sorry to see it. What I cannot understand is this. In another place four directors sat and listened to the tirade against their company, and up to now did not say a word in answer, although I believe this afternoon one of them had something to say. Does anyone think I would sit in company with these men in a holy or unholy alliance to raise the price of Collie coal? They are not worth it. They took their gruel without a fight. I say advisedly that three or four of those directors know that there is no hope of paying dividends for years to come.

The Minister for Railways: A kind of Kathleen Mavourneen dividend.

Mr. WILSON: I would like to live as long as that. I shall welcome any commission that is appointed, and the Collie miners would welcome it, too. We want first of all to find out what it is going to do. Three or four commissions have been appointed in this State to inquire into the coal industry. There was also a select committee in 1902, and John Ewing was chairman. Then Dr. Jack came here from the other States, and we had the Woolnough commission as well. I was a member of the Woolnough commission. It cost a good deal, and I got some of it. What do they want now? Mr.

Miles talks about the Commissioner being a judge of the Supreme Court. What would a judge know about the coal industry? We want an engineer who knows the ins and outs of the industry, and understands it from A to Z. A judge could only go upon the evidence that was tendered. If an official expression is wanted, everyone concerned should be allowed to give evidence in the matter. The man who makes money by coal has no more right to get his books investigated than the ordinary trader has. I welcome the appointment of any Royal Commission. A good deal has been said about the departmental officers not giving a fair deal to certain companies. Mr. Commissioner Evans has been a very hard man to bargain with, but he is honest; his integrity has never been doubted. He has always given the local fuel a fair deal. For my part, if he says that one coal is worth so much, I am prepared to believe him. But on this subject I do not believe people who have never been on a locomotive, and who denounce the Commissioner simply because he did not give a deal which suited their special requirements. I happened to be on the engine during the trials made by the Woolnough Commission, and I can certify that everything was carried out fairly and in a scrupulously clean way. Each company got a fair deal from the men. The result was to give the local coal a fair go. If people are told that the coal is soft, they only delude themselves by insisting that it is hard, for they cannot get past the engine and laboratory tests. The departmental officers have always acted above board in the matter, though they have been anxious to squeeze the companies in order to get revenue for the department. At no time have they ever given the miners anything to which they were not entitled. As to the holding of conferences between the companies and the miners, at no time has there been any understanding as to prices. All that the Collie miners have received has been given to them by a legitimate tribunal or Arbitration Court. They are now working under an arbitration award. Do the people who say that the miners are earning too much money by the system of piecework wish them to revert to day work? I do not think it would pay. A boss would be needed for every miner working. Piecework is an attribute of coalmining,

and the coalminers always give a fair go. In passing let me mention that the Comptroller of Stores placed on the file a minute which is not right. After drawing attention to the last reduction in the price of Newcastle coal, he says that even admitting the cost of Newcastle next year will be 40s. 4d., on the equivalent values Collie is entitled to 22s. 10d. That is to say, even now Collie is getting 4s. under the price on equivalent value. Let me quote from the file what the Comptroller of Railway Stores says:—

The last advice received from the Coal Viewer at Newcastle shows the present selling price for large coal at 22s. 10d. f.o.b. to which must be added 17s. 6d. freight, making the selling rate 40s. 4d., which would give an equivalent price for Collie coal of 21s. 10d., whereas the highest rate being paid under the present agreement is 19s. 0d.

Does Mr. Miles want Collie to go for that difference? If he does, I can promise him some help and fun. If the Government do not think they are getting a fair deal and consider that they can fight Collie by paying 4s. per ton more for Newcastle, let them do it.

The Minister for Lands: Our policy is to support the local industry.

Mr. WILSON: My object is to curtail the activities of Western Australian born so-called politicians. They are not boasting Western Australia in attacking a district whose men have always acted fairly. Perhaps I have been a little heated in some of my remarks; but, after all is said and done, when there is talk about unholy alliances and other things of that kind, the man who has been instrumental in getting increased pay and reduced hours must take a stand. I have done nothing that I would not do again if another chance came along to do it. I would lead the van in doing the same thing again. I see no reason why the Government of this State should pay the Newcastle people more for coal than they are prepared to give the men at Collie. If the Government want to appoint a Commission, I shall not oppose its appointment.

Mr. Willcock: Neither will I.

The Minister for Railways: But what will the taxpayers say about the cost of a Royal Commission?

Hon. P. Collier: That is my view also. But no one has anything to hide.

Mr. WILSON: Why does the Press publish the silly vapourings—if I may borrow a word from the member for Canning (Mr. Wells)—of those men? Even "Truth" publishes them with big headlines. If the people in question went through the file and saw what was there, they would be astounded by the omissions of Mr. Miles. I have been waiting too long to-day to deliver my speech, and I may have made it in a spasmodic manner; but the fact is that the men at Collie have done their best to help the Government. I acknowledge also that the Government have done good to Collie, as the fact is that no Western Australian coal company could live without some support from the Government, the bunkering trade being so small. If the Railway Department's aim is to get the very best coal, they must not forget that there are three parties to the contract—the companies, the drivers who use the coal, and the miners who get the coal for a certain price. The miners have just as much right to get into conference to decide what they shall work for, as the coal companies have to get into conference to decide what the coal shall be sold for. Prices have never been discussed between the companies and the miners. The object of the conference which took place was to create an atmosphere of patriotism among the locomotive drivers and the coalminers. The drivers said to the miners, "Give us your very best and cleanest coal, and we will burn it." The miners replied, "We will promise to clean all debris out of the coal, and keep the coal clean, so that you can burn one hundred per cent. of it." I have previously told in this Chamber an incident connected with a big strike at Newcastle years ago. No Newcastle coal was to be got, and a coal mining company instructed the miners to cut down the black roof, and this was sent out and burnt as coal. I promised Mr. Gregory that I would take him to see the place where the roof was brought down. There was a certain percentage of firing property in it, but it was pure stone. Anything black was taken for coal at that time. At the present time the Collie miners are under strict supervision to supply clean coal. That is the result of a conference between the Commissioner of Railways, the Miners' Union, the locomotive drivers and the A.L.P. executive, who act as a sort of un-

pire between the fighting colliers and the challenging locomotive drivers. The three-months provision was inserted at the instigation of the then Commissioner of Railways, and that provision has continued ever since. I hope it will continue to remain in force. I hope that the affinity established between the Commissioner of Railways, the locomotive drivers, and the coal miners will continue for all time. I do not say that there should be an attempt to raise the price. There never has been. The locomotive drivers would refuse to discuss the matter if the question of price were ever introduced. They say to the miners, "You have the same court to go to as we. You have the Federal tribunal to go to. Having that tribunal, you can apply to it. We wash our hands of any idea of trying to put on pressure." Finally, as regards a Royal Commission you can let Miles have one and you can put Miles on as chairman of it so far as I am concerned.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 7th October, 1930.

	PAGE
Bills: Anatomy, 2n.	859
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 2n.	861
Com. report	870
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 2n.	871
Yarnall Act Amendment, 2n.	873
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2n.	884
Main Roads, 2n.	888
Bees, 2n.	888
Adjournment, Royal Show	888

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

BILL—ANATOMY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: To the average person the thought

of anatomy and dissection suggests gruesome possibilities. Nevertheless, to provide proper training for medical and dental students, dissection is absolutely essential, and, in consequence, it is necessary to submit this Bill to authorise the practice of anatomy. When it is remembered that a qualified professional person must, in the course of his profession, dissect the live individual, it is obvious that, to enable him to do this safely and properly, he must have experience in dissection on the dead subject. A century ago all sorts of improper practices were carried on to enable this necessary training in dissection to be pursued, but in about 1870, Great Britain led the way by passing an Act to regulate the methods by which the necessary subjects might be secured, under proper conditions, for medical and dental schools, providing absolute safeguards against irregularities. At the present time, such Acts are in operation in most countries, and Western Australia is one of the very few places where such legislation does not exist.

It may be many years before a medical school is established in this State, but dental training has been pursued here for some time, and it has been the aim of the Dental Board to steadily raise the standard of training to a pitch where reciprocity with other States of Australia and with other countries of the world, may be secured. The opening of the Dental Hospital in 1927 marked a decided step forward, and the practice has now been established of all dental students receiving their practical tuition at the hospital. Efficient study of the head and neck, an accurate knowledge of which is essential to properly trained dentists, cannot be obtained without actual dissection. At the present time, the lack of an Anatomy Act makes dissection impossible, and unless the students can carry out a course of actual dissection, it is impossible to raise the standard of our course of training here. One of the first aims of the Dental Hospital is affiliation with the University of Western Australia, and this cannot be claimed until our standard of training is equal to that of similar institutions in the other States, and the ultimate desire for reciprocity, not only with the other States, but with other parts of the world, will never be granted until the foregoing aims have been achieved. Therefore, an Anatomy Act, giving dental students the right to undertake a proper course