

a mistake to try to reduce their standard of living.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How are we going to pay them?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Should they have those privileges when other people are unemployed?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We have had bad times before. When I came to Australia 33 years ago, things were bad. People in South Australia were leaving their farms by the hundred and going to Broken Hill and elsewhere. But Australia has wonderful powers of recuperation. Drought, debt, the war, and Federal Governments have reduced the country to its present state. Sir Edward Wittenoom endeavoured to ascribe the whole of the trouble to lack of business experience in Federal Governments. Surely that cannot be borne out by facts! If members of the Bruce Government were not business men, who were? Mr. Bruce was trained in business and was the idol of his Nationalist supporters, and yet he ran the Commonwealth into a deficit of £16,000,000. Now we are told that our present difficulties are due to lack of business experience in various administrators.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The trouble is world-wide.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Watson and Mr. Fisher did show surpluses and put the Government of the Commonwealth on a sound footing. Why blame Labour administrations?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who is trying to do that?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The present depression is world-wide. I am satisfied that Australia will recover as quickly as any other nation, perhaps more quickly. It has made a wonderful recovery after droughts in years gone by, and though perhaps times were not as bad as at present, I feel sure everything will come right again. Experts are generally wrong. May they prove to be wrong on this occasion when they predict for Australia severe suffering and unemployment for three or four years. I believe they will be wrong, and I trust they will be. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Drew, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.9 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th September, 1930.

	PAGE
Standing Orders, report of Committee	519
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1R.	520
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 1R.	520
Egg Marketing, 1R.	520
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R.	520
Anatomy, 2R.	525
Main Roads, 2R.	527
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2R.	
Com. report	531
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 2R.	532

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

STANDING ORDERS.

Report of Committee.

The SPEAKER: I have received the following report from the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Assembly:—

Your Committee, in conference with the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Council have taken into consideration certain difficulties which have arisen in the interpretation of the Standing Orders governing the admissibility of amendments to Bills in Committee. The difficulty was confined to Bills for the purpose of amending existing Acts, and consisted in the doubts sometimes held as to the interpretation of Standing Order 277. The resolution adopted by both Committees was as follows:—

It was agreed that Standing Orders of both Chambers should include the following interpretation:—

“Subject matter of a Bill” means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee.”

It was further agreed that Standing Order 309 of the Legislative Council be struck out, and the following substituted:—

“It is an instruction to all Committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed that they have power to make such amendments therein as they shall think fit; provided they be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, but if any such amendments shall not be within the title of the Bill, they shall amend the title accordingly, and report the same specially to the House.”

Your Committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following Standing Order, to stand as No. 422.

Interpretation.

No. 422. In these Standing Orders the words and phrases following shall have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them, viz.:—

“Subject matter of a Bill” means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee.”

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Agricultural Bank Act Amendment.
Introduced by Mr. Sleeman.
2. Plant Diseases Act Amendment.
Introduced by Mr. Sampson.
3. Egg Marketing.
Introduced by Mr. Hegney (for Hon. W. D. Johnson).

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [440] in moving the second reading said: The Bill represents an attempt to deal with a problem that has arisen as the days have rolled by. With the advent of motor traffic, a problem has been created almost in a night, and various Governments throughout the world are passing legislation to deal with it. The Bill represents our attempt to cope with the problem. Like all measures introduced to deal with new factors, it may be classified as experimental legislation. Unfortunately, we have no experience from the past to guide us, and therefore we must deal with the problem without any such advantage. From what I have been able to note, it has always been the policy of Governments, when introducing legislation, to at least inquire regarding what has been done in other countries, and I have done so in order to inform the House as to the position. During the last four years, because of the advent of motor traffic, we have been forced to spend huge sums of money on road work. During that period the State has spent on main roads, which are particularly dealt with in the Bill, no less than £1,143,197. The people who use those roads in competition with existing means of transport are not asked to pay interest and sinking fund charges, nor yet interest on

the cost of maintenance. If that had been done, it would have meant, taking the interest at 6 per cent. with a charge of 3 per cent. for the sinking fund, a return of £103,000 per annum. As I will explain to the House when dealing with another Bill I will introduce, it is estimated that the cost of maintaining the roads and effecting necessary improvements involves the expenditure of another £100,000 per annum. The motor traffic during the last few years has principally used the roads to which this expenditure is applicable, and has consequently entered into unfair competition with the railways. What I am endeavouring to do by means of the Bill is not to prohibit that traffic, but to see that those who use the roads shall pay a proportion of the cost of maintenance. People may contend that motor vehicles are already taxed in order to pay for that. The actual amount of license fees received throughout the whole State is approximately £230,000 per annum, but of that amount, in accordance with the provisions of the amending Act passed last session, the Main Roads Board receives £55,000 per annum. That will represent merely a small proportion of the cost of maintaining these roads in future. We cannot deal with this question without giving consideration to the existing means of transport such as the railways and tramways. We have invested in our railways £23,615,500, and the Railway Department are charged with the interest on the full amount. To maintain the permanent way and meet the cost of necessary works, costs £800,000 per annum, which the Railway Department has to pay. Last year, the operations of the railways resulted in a loss of £404,488. The Government have decided that vehicles competing with the railways will have to contribute a little more in the future than they are paying at present. Many countries are attempting to deal with this problem, and the two principal methods employed are, (1), absolutely prohibiting the carriage of goods and passengers along routes already provided for by railways or tramways, and, (2), permitting such competition, but at the same time imposing special taxation on those who use the roads. I believe that almost every country in the world is dealing with this problem. Some of the old-established countries are not in the same position as we are, and so I have

taken legislation from countries where the conditions are similar to our own, countries such as South Africa, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. In South Australia legislation on similar lines is now being considered. In South Africa a Motor Carrier Transportation Act was passed this year. It creates a road transportation board of three members, none of whom may be an officer or servant of the Administration, who are given power to control motor passenger vehicles and motor goods vehicles operating for reward in proclaimed areas and on proclaimed routes. It provides for certain exemptions such as the carriage of primary and perishable products from the farm to the nearest railway station or town, and specifically provides that a license shall not be granted by the board if other transportation facilities are available. In general effect the Act is designed to prevent competition with the State railways. In New South Wales the Transportation Act was assented to in July last, and is in many respects similar to the South African Act, inasmuch as it specifically provides for the protection of the railways from motor competition. It sets up a trust, and the trust before granting a license for a vehicle to go on to a road to carry for hire or reward shall obtain reports from the Railway Commissioners. If, when this has been done, the board or trust decides to grant a license, it may impose such conditions as to fares or charges as in the opinion of the trust are sufficient to prevent undue competition or overlapping of services. The trust has absolute authority to grant or to refuse any license applied for. It is not our intention to go as far as that. In Victoria there is a measure before Parliament based on lines somewhat similar to the New South Wales Act. Members may recollect that the Victorian Commissioner of Railways went so far as to notify his clients that unless they consigned all their requirements by rail, he would decline to carry any goods for them, or would charge extra freight on the goods that were consigned. He would not consent to carry only the goods bearing the lower rates of freight. Notwithstanding this, Victoria has been forced into the position of introducing legislation to impose further restrictions on motor transportation. Provision is made for the creation of a department of Transport

under a Minister for Transport, and the Minister for Railways is named as being the first Minister for Transport. The Bill further states that the Department of Transport shall comprise (a) a railways branch, (b) a tramways branch, and (c) a road transport branch. It provides that a motor freight vehicle means any motor vehicle used, or intended to be used, for carrying goods for hire or reward or in the course of trade, but it provides for certain exemptions in the matter of primary produce, perishables, etc. The board has absolute power to grant, or not to grant, as it thinks fit, an application made by the owner of a motor freight vehicle for a license. When application is made for such a license, the applicant must name the route or routes upon which he desires to operate. Before a license can be granted by the board, it must be satisfied regarding the condition of the roads, and further it is made clear that only in the event of there not being sufficient other facilities for the transport of goods will the license be granted. When a license is granted, the route or routes over which the vehicle may do business is named in the license, and a penalty is provided if a vehicle is driven on any other route. Power is also given to the Commissioner to operate motor freight vehicles on such routes as the Governor thinks fit. Queensland evidently takes the opposite view of the question. The attitude there adopted is that the roads are designed for the use of the public, and that the public are entitled to use them, provided that payment is made in accordance with the use made of the roads. That is what we propose. The Bill before the House does not prohibit the use of certain roads, but follows the Queensland idea of providing that any vehicle using the prescribed routes shown on the map must have a license. Speaking generally, it will mean that such vehicles will have to pay about four times as much by way of license fee as is being paid to-day. To give some illustrations: An A.E.C. truck, 108 P.L.W., at present pays £13. Under the scale now proposed, it will pay £53 10s., whereas in Queensland the minimum is £60 15s.

Mr. McCallum: Prohibition!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the fees proposed here are prohibitive, those in operation in Queensland are more so. An International truck, 147 P.L.W., pays £22, whereas under the new scale it will pay £77

2s. 6d., compared with Queensland's £82 13s. 9d. A Republic truck, 170 P.L.W., pays £29 10s., whereas under the new scale it will pay £93 5s., compared with Queensland's £95 12s. 6d.

Mr. Angelo: Make those Federal trucks pay.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not intended to deal with other classes of vehicle. Certain exemptions are provided in the Bill. The measure shall not apply to vehicles used (a) for carrying the produce of farms or farming requisites between any farm and the railway station or town nearest to such farm; (b) solely for carrying perishables, agricultural, horticultural, dairy or other perishable products from the place where they are produced to the nearest market place; (c) solely for carrying mining requisites within any prescribed mining district; (d) solely for carrying produce and goods between the station property of any person engaged in the pastoral industry between such property and the railway station or town nearest to such property; (e) by the Crown or a local authority for its own purposes. The existing fees might have been high enough had the Act been properly policed, but it has not been properly policed.

Mr. McCallum: It never will be so long as you leave it to the local authorities.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As regards motor cars, the fees will not be altered. In the United Kingdom a Morris-Cowley pays £10 compared with £4 in Western Australia; a Morris-Oxford £12 compared with £5; a Ford, £17 compared with £6; and an Austin 12, £12 compared with £5.

Mr. Raphael: In the United Kingdom they have roads, not bush tracks.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In order to show the effect of the increase, a Ford of 58 P.L.W. pays £7, whereas under this measure it will pay £28 15s. An International of 77 P.L.W. pays £9, and under this measure it will pay £37 17s. 6d. A Brockway of 93 P.L.W. pays £11, whereas under the Bill it will pay £45 17s. 6d. The Bill provides that the extra license fees shall be paid into a special trust account and used for the maintenance of the roads prescribed in the Bill. This is similar to the Queensland Act.

Mr. McCallum: You are not giving the money to the local authorities.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not. Members may think that the fees are high, but the fees on all motor vehicles are relatively high. Recently Mr. Baxter received a letter from the Meckering Road Board stating that there were two trucks bogged in that district, each laden with seven tons of wool. They had brought the wool from Cue. Just before that I was notified that two trucks were bogged on the eastern side of Merredin. They were carrying eight tons of wool, which had been brought from Wiluna. On the trip to Wiluna they had carried beer. The farmer or pastoralist has to pay the existing fees even if he uses his truck for only one month or two months in the year on developmental roads, which this measure does not touch. Surely, then, the man who wishes to use his motor truck the whole year round, and often during the night as well as during the day, should pay more for his use of the roads. The Bill provides for the exemption of vehicles used in carrying produce, even on prescribed roads, if carting to the nearest siding or market town.

Mr. Sampson: It looks as if the principle of the Bill is to stop the use of trucks.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I mentioned that the existing Act had never been policed. The trucks I mentioned as having been bogged were not licensed to carry seven or eight tons. They were probably licensed to carry 30 cwt. or two tons. Even in the agricultural areas Ford and Chevrolet ton trucks invariably carry 20 bags of wheat, which means a load of 35 cwt. instead of 20 cwt. Some of the local authorities, my own for instance, send an inspector to the sidings, and when he sees a truck with 20 bags of wheat, he says "Another £4 please," and the owner pays and tries to look pleasant. It is intended to police this measure. How can it be done? We propose to appoint officers of the Main Roads Board as inspectors, and users of motor vehicles will have their loads tested by portable weighing machines and will be required to pay according to the power weight of the vehicle. That is the general principle as regards road transport. I realise that the proposed fees are very heavy, but I have shown that they are lower than those in force in Queensland. We could have gone to the other extreme by requiring that if people used motors to transport goods along existing railway routes, they should be placed in pre-

cisely the same position as the Railway Department, who have to pay interest on capital cost and full maintenance charges. All we are asking is that people who are continually using prescribed roads shall pay a little more than they are doing at present towards the cost of maintaining those roads. There is another phase of the question dealing with passengers, and this is rather more difficult. I am inclined to think the House will agree that my proposals in this respect are mild. The Transport Board of New South Wales has revoked all licenses and, before a new license to carry passengers may be granted, it must be proved to the satisfaction of the board that no other means of transportation exists. We are not doing that, although I might add that similar power is already provided in the existing Act if the Government thought fit to use it. I am asking the motor buses to pay a little more on the seating figures than at present. In effect the fee will be double. In the Eastern States and South Africa commissions or trusts give first consideration to the available means of transport before granting routes. In Victoria the fees for buses running within two miles of the G.P.O. are £4 7s. 6d. per passenger. Here, if pneumatic tyres are used, the fee is £1 10s. The Bill provides for doubling the existing fees on vehicles running on continuous routes. A continuous route would be the Perth-Fremantle road. The fee in that case will be increased from £1 10s. to £3. Routes in the outer suburban areas cannot be classed as continuous routes, because there are not always vehicles running on them. Such routes are used to open up and develop the outer suburbs, and we have no intention of increasing the fees there. Motor vehicles are not in fair competition with the tramways. If they were we would not alter the present position. The capital invested in the tramways is £1,094,157, the interest earned in 1928 was 5.75 per cent., and in 1929 it was only 5.01 per cent. Not only have the tramways to pay interest, but also the full cost of maintenance. They have to pay 3 per cent. to the municipalities for the right to run on the road, and this amounted to £9,500 last year. For the maintenance of tracks and roadways the cost last year was £9,120. The tramways are, therefore, paying £18,620 for the maintenance of the roads and the right to run tramways through the city. The number of car miles run in 1928-29 was 3,188,087, and the

cost per mile-run for maintenance alone was £18,620, equal to 1.4d. per car mile. Figures have been collected with regard to motor bus running. I have ascertained that the buses last year ran 5,804,131 miles, or at least 60 per cent. more than the tramways ran. The seating fees amounted to £3,630 in the year 1929, and the average per bus-mile run was .15 of a penny, compared with 1.4d. for the tramways. The seating accommodation in the Metro buses allows for a capacity of 28 passengers, a power weight of 134, a passenger license of £2, vehicular license £37, and a seating fee of £42, a total of £81. The light Alpine taxi has a seating capacity of six, a power weight of 46, and pays a license fee of £2, a vehicular license of £8, and a seating fee of £9, making a total of £19. The heavy Alpine taxi pays a total of £25 17s. 6d. In the case of the Metro buses, which pay £81, we have ascertained that they run on an average 40,000 miles a year. The fees paid, £81, represent less than one halfpenny per mile for the carriage of passengers. The trip to Fremantle, 12 miles, means a payment of 6d. for the right to use the road. The light Alpine taxi pays at the rate of .11d. per mile per passenger on the Fremantle road, and pays .32d. for the right to run between Perth and Fremantle for each trip. The heavier Alpine taxi pays .13d. per mile, and 1.56d. for the trip between Perth and Fremantle. If this form of competition exists it should be placed on a better footing. These vehicles should pay a little more for the maintenance of the roads than they do at present. That is what the Bill aims at.

Hon. P. Collier: A little more?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. The total amount collected from all of the buses in the metropolitan area last year was £5,319. Even under this Bill the total amount collected will be approximately only £9,000. Not much, therefore, is being added to the running cost. I wish to show what this means on the Perth-Fremantle road. The annual cost of maintaining that road works out on the average at £4,420. The interest and sinking fund on the capital outlay brings the annual charge to £10,702. That is the cost to the State.

Mr. McCallum: The State does not pay that; the metropolitan traffic trust pays.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It comes out of the metropolitan traffic pool. On that road 30 large buses and 110 small ones are now operating, and the total fees collected from this source amount to £2,280. I have taken the worst possible case. In the future a great deal of money will have to be spent on this road to widen it, and to cope with the Fremantle bridge. All that will have to be added to the cost. This is the worst case because the road was built some years ago at a lower cost than it could be built for to-day. At present the whole of the fees paid by all the buses running in the State do not exceed £5,319. It is expected we shall receive under this Bill an increase of less than £4,000.

Mr. McCallum: It is 100 per cent. increase.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think so. The hon. member's arithmetic may be different from mine. I do not make it 100 per cent.

Mr. McCallum: There is not much difference.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Canning-road cost £124,000, or £1,600 per mile. There are five large and 12 small buses running on it, and the total received in license fees is £265 a year. The member for South Fremantle says the metropolitan traffic trust pays for the Perth-Fremantle road. They also pay for the Canning road. The interest and sinking fund charged on the Perth-Fremantle road is £11,160 per annum. Of that amount half is charged to the metropolitan traffic fund, so that in other words the charge is £5,580, and the other half is charged to general revenue. Other vehicles also use these roads.

Mr. McCallum: Practically all the wool that comes into the town by motor comes along that road. Your cockies are using it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot understand the hon. member. When I referred to putting up the fees in one portion of the Bill to stop the wool from going to Fremantle, he raised his voice against it, and now he says that the road is used by the cockies carrying wool to Fremantle.

Mr. McCallum: Yes, and we pay for it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the Bill is passed I do not think much wool will, in future, go to Fremantle by road.

The fees prescribed in the Bill for vehicles using solid rubber and metal tyres have been increased to 40 and 80 per cent. respectively. It is found by engineers in their investigations on the subject—I have seen some of their reports—that certain solid tyres do twice as much damage to a road as pneumatic tyres. Metal tyres should not be allowed on the road, but to keep them off would mean the imposition of a tremendously high charge. These are the general principles of the Bill. There are, however, certain other amendments which tend to improve it. It provides for additional penalties for certain offences, particularly for those who without the consent of owners take control of motor vehicles. Such an amendment is most necessary. Certain sections of the community, chiefly lads who think they are having fun, take motor vehicles from the streets and make use of them. I believe the member for Canning lost his car one night. It is intended to make the penalty for this much heavier than it is now.

Mr. Willcock: What is the penalty?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think it is a fine of £100 or 12 months' imprisonment. We have found that magistrates are apt to be lenient in these cases. The Bill therefore provides that the minimum penalty must not be less than one-tenth of the maximum.

Mr. Willcock: That is already in the Justices Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill alters slightly the definition of certain roads mentioned by the Main Roads Board in connection with the traffic trust account. These have been wrongly described, and the Bill puts that right. Another amendment is in regard to licensing dates. At present if a man wants to license his vehicle on the 20th December he pays the whole fee. The Bill provides that a new vehicle may be licensed for three, six or nine months according to when it was purchased. This refers only to vehicles that have not previously been licensed.

Mr. Sampson: And, I suppose, to an old one not previously used.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Commissioner of Police may refuse to grant a license to drive in certain cases. We think that a person, whose license has been taken away and who is refused another by the Commissioner, should have the right of appeal to a magistrate. The Bill gives a person that

right. It also tightens up existing legislation in respect of drunken or drugged drivers. In England, the Continent and South Australia it is necessary for the driver-owner of a vehicle to affix his license on some conspicuous place on the wind-screen. On many English cars we see a little round disc which holds the license. The license is only a bit of paper, and the colour is changed each year. This would give the traffic inspectors and the police an opportunity at a glance to see whether a vehicle was licensed or not. I am perfectly satisfied that numerous vehicles, though perhaps not many in the metropolitan area, are unlicensed.

Mr. Sampson: Are you adopting the South Australian method?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. However, that can be done by regulation. New Zealand has a different method. The Dominion has a Minister for Transport, but has not passed an Act.

Mr. Raphael: There are thousands of pounds' worth of buses lying idle.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In New Zealand the colour of the license plate is changed each year, in order to allow of unlicensed drivers being caught. From investigations I find that Western Australia is the only Australian State which does not collect the whole of the license fees and pay them into a central fund. It is not my intention to alter that system at present. New Zealand is in a very different position from Western Australia, inasmuch as the Dominion controls the post office, where licenses are issued, instead of being obtained at police stations. Under our existing Act, the Government may prescribe rules for motor buses. It may be necessary to alter the Act, since the whole of this legislation must be described as experimental. For that reason we are going about the business in a most moderate way. New legislation should proceed step by step, instead of going the whole hog. By taking everything at a jump, we may do injustice to some people.

Mr. McCallum: This Bill does not go the whole hog!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is the most moderate measure of its kind known to me. It does not forbid motor competition, but gives motors the right to compete so long as they pay a moderate amount for the use of the road. In many ways it is necessary that the Bill should be enacted. The financial difficulties of all the

States are due largely to losses on their railway systems. It is those losses which have forced every Australian Government to take action. Under the Bill motor vehicles will have the right to compete, but only if their owners pay a little for the use of the road which they damage.

Mr. Sampson: Will the users of the road be able to stand up to this measure?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. I do not believe in monopoly. The Bill represents a reasonable attempt to put railways, tramways and motors on an equitable footing. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McCallum, debate adjourned.

BILL—ANATOMY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [5.18] in moving the second reading said: Before I deal with the Bill, may I take the opportunity, this being my first speech in the House during the present session, to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the Chair, and also to congratulate the member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) on his election as Chairman of Committees. Further, may I offer my congratulations to the new members and express my regrets for old members who have fallen by the wayside on the road of politics. I sincerely hope that the new members will have the same pleasure in the company of other members that I have experienced. Then, I am sure, there will be no regrets so far as the new members are concerned. This is a Bill to render assistance to students who are studying dentistry in Western Australia. It is also for the benefit of future students of medicine and surgery. At present a diploma in dentistry obtained in Western Australia is not recognised outside the State. In order to complete their education, it is necessary for our students to proceed to dental colleges outside Western Australia or outside the Commonwealth. Only in this way can they secure a diploma which permits them to practise in other parts of the world. The object of the measure is to permit the practice of anatomy. To the average person the thought of anatomy and dissection offers gruesome possibilities. Nevertheless, to provide proper training for medical and dental

students dissection is absolutely essential. 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. To students of dentistry, dissection is as essential as it is to students of surgery. By practising anatomy on the dead subject, the dentist becomes more competent to relieve the sufferings of the living. A century ago all sorts of improper practices were carried on to enable the necessary training in dissection to be pursued, but in about 1870 Great Britain led the way by introducing an Act to regulate the methods by which the necessary subjects might be secured, under proper conditions, for medical and dental schools, thus providing absolute safeguards against irregularities. At present such Acts are in operation in most countries. Western Australia is one of the very few in which there is no such provision. It may be many years—though I hope it will not be—before a medical school is established in Western Australia; but dental training has been pursued for some time, and it has been the aim of the Dental Board steadily to raise the standard of training to a point where reciprocity with the other Australian States, and also with other countries of the world, may be secured. The opening of the dental hospital in 1927 marked a decided step forward, and the custom has now been established of all dental students receiving their practical tuition at the hospital. Efficient study of the head and the neck, an accurate knowledge of which is essential to the properly-trained dentist, cannot be obtained without actual dissection. At present the lack of an Anatomy Act makes dissections impossible, and unless dental students can carry out a course of actual dissection it is not possible to raise the standard of the 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 the hospital's standard of training is equal to that of similar institutions in other States. The ultimate desire for reciprocity, not only with other Australian States but with other parts of the world, will never be attained until the aims set forth in the Bill have been achieved. Therefore an Anatomy Act, giving students the right to undertake a proper course of dissection, is one of the first

essentials in the advancement of dental education in this State. The time will come when a medical school will be added to the University. I hope the time is not far distant. In anticipation of that, the British Medical Association have joined with the dental profession in asking for this measure. It has been framed in consultation with members of both professions, and it follows the lines of the Victorian statute, which has given great satisfaction in that State. No charge on the people of Western Australia is involved in the carrying of the Bill. The University has agreed to make available a room for the purpose of carrying out the study of anatomy. The measure will be policed by an inspector, who will be the Principal Medical Officer of this State. The measure is not a new conception. It has been desired for a long time. In going through the file I noticed that the subject received the consideration of the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) when he was Minister for Health. Had time permitted, no doubt the Bill would have been introduced last session. It provides all necessary safeguards to prevent abuse.

Mr. Munsie: Does the dental hospital come within the Bill under the term "person"?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

Mr. Munsie: The hospital is not mentioned at all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: "Person" includes any society howsoever established. The Victorian Act contains a similar provision. Under it medical practitioners have power to issue certificates for the practice of anatomy. That power will not be needed in this State, because the only person authorised to issue certificates will be the principal medical officer. The measure will not operate outside the metropolitan area. If hon. members examine the Bill, they will see that ample safeguards are provided. I do not know whether hon. members desire to study the Bill. It is purely a piece of scientific legislation. However, if hon. members desire to go into the provisions of the measure, there is no objection to the adjournment of the debate. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Munsie, debate adjourned.

BILL—MAIN ROADS.*Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [5.29] in moving the second reading said: This Bill has two principal objects. One is the abolition of the Main Roads Board, and the appointment of a commissioner in the board's place. The other is the waiving of contributions by local governing bodies for the years 1927-8 and 1928-9. The abolition of the board is proposed on the score of economy. We have now, and shall have, much less money to spend than we had in the past; and it is our duty to ensure that the money is spent as far as possible on the actual building of roads, and not more of it than may be unavoidable on payment of staff salaries. In other words, the Bill proposes to reduce overhead costs. I think it desirable to inform hon. members of the past expenditure on roads. Gross expenditure for 1926-7 was £734,377; for 1927-8, £642,430; for 1928-9, £725,985; and for 1929-30, £1,029,895; a total for four years of £3,132,687. It is a lot of money, and I am inclined to think it will be many long years before the State will again spend so great an amount on roads in any one year. Of that money spent, £2,081,284 was from Federal aid road funds, a fund contributed by the Federal Government; but, as members will recall, for every pound it so contributed, the State has had to find 15s. From other sources there was spent £1,051,402. Of the expenditure of the Federal aid roads, as I have mentioned previously to-night, £1,143,000 odd was spent on main trunk roads and main arterial roads, and £938,087 on developmental roads. Those "other sources" from which £1,051,402 came are rather interesting, because we are not likely to get such an amount from those sources for another few years. Of the various accounts that have been drawn on to meet the cost of making these roads, the principal one is the general loan fund, which contributed £733,551. That includes also £72,915 taken from the metropolitan traffic trust fund and Treasury suspense account and £58,363 from the main roads trust account for maintenance. These amounts have aggregated on the average £798,000 per annum for the last four years. In order to spend that money, a very large

staff was built up. I believe it was quite necessary under the conditions that existed in the past, but certainly it is not necessary under present conditions, nor is it likely to be necessary under the conditions which will prevail in future. Here is the cost of the staff and incidental expenditure during the past four years—

COST OF STAFF AND INCIDENTAL PER CENT.

—	Cost of Staff.	Per cent.	Incidental Expenditure.	Total.	Per cent.
1927 ...	£ 16,058	2.186	£ 12,985	£ 29,043	1.768
1928 ...	26,133	4.068	28,217	54,350	4.392
1929 ...	41,728	5.747	27,141	68,869	8.738
1930 ...	43,289	4.203	22,566	65,855	2.191

Mr. Sampson: What are the incidentals?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Principally motor cars. Members will see from those figures that the expenditure of over £1,000,000 has cost us £65,855. That brings me to the financial position of the main roads fund on the 30th June last. Members will remember that there was a grant from the Federal Government, termed the unemployment grant. That unemployment grant was not an unemployment grant at all. It was a grant taken out of the Main Roads Board's chest, our own fund. Even when I took control of the department I, like everybody else, was under the impression that it was money provided apart from the Federal aid road fund. In fact, I have received several letters from the Premiers of the Eastern States. Of course, those letters went first to our own Premier and were then sent on to me. I have replied to them. Premiers of the Eastern States protested that this money was not Federal aid roads money for an unemployed account.

Mr. McCallum: That was made perfectly clear at the time.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was made perfectly clear to no one but the hon. member. On many occasions I have received copies of letters sent to the Prime Minister by the Premiers of New South Wales and of Victoria, and copies of letters sent also by the Premier of Western Australia. Eventually it was decided that the money was out of the Main Roads Board chest, and the Prime Minister agreed to extend the Federal aid roads agreement for six months in order

to allow us to get back £192,000 through the agreement.

Mr. McCallum: You will find that in the original arrangement: the agreement was to run for an additional year, and the money was to come out of that fund.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The agreement is to run for an additional six months, not an additional year. There is no reason why it should run for an additional year, because the amount passed to the States from the Federal aid fund is £2,000,000, whereas this amount is £1,000,000. So there is no suggestion of the agreement being extended for a year; it is to be extended for only six months in order to allow us to get back at the end of that term the £192,000 mentioned. But the position was this—If the hon. member knew, at all events none of his officers knew, and they have spent that money—on the 30th June last the position was that a good deal of the money for this year had been already spent. But this is the point: This £192,000 was given to us, and the State was not asked to contribute its 15s. for every pound of that amount. So from the 21st February the agreement has been altered to the effect that we shall receive our money out of the Federal aid road fund and the State will not be asked to contribute at all. But up to that date there was a debit balance of the State's 15s. amounting to £111,003. That was already spent, and I find that I have also a debit balance of £72,000 which, added to the £111,003, leave me, after deducting the £22,000 sinking fund, with £179,000 to spend for this financial year on Federal aid roads out of Federal money. In addition to that, we have an accumulated fund under the petrol tax, which was imposed a few years ago, of £20,000 and the collections under traffic fees last year and what we are expecting to collect this year, namely, £100,000, which leaves £299,000 to be spent on Federal aid roads this financial year. Of course, that is for this year. In future I hope—provided no amendment is made to the Bill—that we shall have the £384,000 and the estimated amount of £55,000 in traffic fees, together with the £22,000 sinking fund. I might mention what the sinking fund means: On the whole of the loan money of the State under the agreement we had to pay a sinking fund of 3 per cent., and that is now fixed at £22,000 which, since we shall not be borrowing any money in the future, will not in-

crease. That leaves for next year £417,000. I might also inform the House that the Prime Minister and the Premier of this State have signed a fresh agreement to take the place of the existing Federal agreement. That will leave us this money to spend without restrictions other than the restrictions laid down in our own Act. At the Premiers' Conference in February of this year the Prime Minister said—

One important aspect of the Federal aid roads agreement from the point of view of the State Governments is the stipulation that the maintenance of roads constructed or reconstructed under that agreement is the responsibility of the State Governments who in this way are called upon to provide money for maintenance in addition to their contributions in respect of the construction or reconstruction of roads.

Later on he said—

Frankly I do not think the Commonwealth should have ever had any connection with road construction, and the Commonwealth Government is prepared to discuss freely with you the question whether we ought not now to come to an arrangement to review the Federal aid roads agreement, which imposes on the States obligations they are finding irksome.

I am not too sure of what is likely to happen in the near future, and the result is I find it is not easy to lay down any definite policy as to what is likely to occur; but the point I wish to make is that it naturally follows that I, as Minister, have to reconstruct the Main Roads Board. It is impossible to keep the staff we have at present, because there is only about half the amount of money to expend. Also, the very fact that the agreement is now amended and that under it we can do what we consider best, means that I have now to arrange a new policy in regard to the Main Roads Board. When I was sitting in Opposition I frequently spoke on this subject, declaring that there was too much overhead expense, too many plans and specifications, and that there were perfectly good roads in the wheat belt being ploughed up. I considered there was a considerable waste of money. I am not blaming anybody for what occurred then, because the fact that the plans had to be sent to Melbourne made it almost impossible to get efficiency. But that is all over now. About two years ago a conference was held here in Perth, in fact, there were two of them. One of them moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission, but the Road Board

Conference, like sensible men, did not do that. One of the reasons was this. The then chairman of the Main Roads Board made an able speech at that conference, and I repeated that speech to the House. He told the conference the policy the Main Roads Board would carry out. However, he could not carry it out, but that portion is to be carried out now. Regarding developmental roads in the dry areas, I have frequently declared that there was no necessity for surveyors and engineers and plans and specifications; that there should be more co-operation between the local governing bodies. That is going to be done in future. When money is provided for a developmental road, the engineer will go out and meet the local governing body, and together they will decide whether the natural surface is fit for a road or whether it requires gravel, and whether drains or culverts will be required. So instead of those huge costly plans and specifications there will be an adequate little plan on which contractors can tender. I not only hope to co-operate with the local authorities in that respect, but I hope the local authorities, seeing that the development roads are their roads, will give a reasonable price for the job. It has been suggested that we give this money to the local authorities. I am not prepared to agree to that, because there are some local authorities who might use the money in order to reduce their rates. And, after all, this money is only supplementary to what they are already collecting. We are also altering the policy of maintenance. In the past it has not been possible to go on with proper maintenance because the Act lays it down that before any road is declared we must take into consideration the money in the fund. And in the past there never was sufficient money in the fund to take over and declare the whole of the main roads in the State. To-day we have a policy by which we are declaring 2,800 miles of main roads, and we are taking them over and maintaining them with gangs of men, who will be in charge of sections and who will be held responsible for the good condition of the roads. In the future, the roads that will be constructed will be lighter than those that were made in the past, and road maintenance gangs will be appointed to take charge of them. While maintenance may not be necessary,

it will be the duty of the gangs to carry out such improvements as making drains and perhaps widening the roads, and so improve them gradually. It will be remembered that my predecessor stated that each local body would receive £2,000 per annum. It follows that that cannot now be continued. I did tell the conference, and I also told the House, that provided we received Federal aid roads money the local bodies would get £1,000 per annum, and I trust there will be a surplus to use in opening up and developing the country. It is hoped it will be possible to give more assistance to the boards that urgently require it, on account of the new settlements in their areas. I have already mentioned the fact that salaries and incidentals last year accounted for £85,855. Under the re-organisation—the full effect will not be felt this year—the salaries will be £16,000 and the incidentals £10,000, a total of £26,000. And I am inclined to think that even with that greatly reduced expenditure we shall have greater efficiency than we have had in the past. That is to say, we shall get more mileage of roads made for the same expenditure. I am not blaming anyone for what happened in the past because the Federal aid roads scheme provided that roads had to be built in a certain way, that certain plans and specifications had to be approved, etc. Now that that is cut out, it will be possible to make the roads at a reasonable cost, roads that will be suitable to the conditions that exist in Western Australia. I have already mentioned the fact that the Bill also provides for the removal of the assessments to local governing bodies in the years 1927-28 and 1928-29. I sat on a select committee with my predecessor in office and that committee unanimously agreed to leave the assessments in the Act. But the position is that the local governing bodies that collected that money a considerable time ago have spent it, and it seems almost impossible now to get it from them. Therefore I am asking the House to agree to waive those assessments. The amounts in the year 1927-28 were—Permanent works £3,109, and maintenance £4,338, a total of £7,448. The total for the two years came to £32,673, and for 1928-29—permanent works £2,917 and maintenance £14,859 a total of £17,776. It was also provided in the amending Act of last year that the local governing bodies should pay 22½ per cent.

down to as low as 10 per cent. for the year 1929-30. It is not my intention to waive the amounts in those cases. The Act was passed in November but the notices were not sent out to the boards. When I became Minister for Works I instructed that the notices should be sent out. Again, the boards were in the unfortunate position that they had collected the money and had spent it. But because we allowed the metropolitan fees to be paid into the trust, all we had to do was to help ourselves by taking the money out of the pool. I am not prepared to agree that the local bodies outside the metropolitan area shall be exempt from those payments. Realising now that they have to pay into the trust, they are remitting the money to Perth. I will give them time to pay the 1929-30 allocations provided they make application. I am prepared to say it is not fair to ask them to pay two years' fees in one year, but I am hoping they will pay a portion of their arrears this year, and in that way be able to carry on.

Mr. Marshall: What is this for?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: For the maintenance of roads. If the hon. member had been in his place, he would have heard what I said. Someone has to maintain the roads and it should be the user and not the general taxpayer. We expect to receive £55,000 per annum from traffic fees to maintain existing roads. Therefore, I say that the local bodies must understand that they have to pay not only this year's traffic fees, but also last year's.

Mr. Marshall: You will not get a bob from out my way.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It makes one wonder whether it is not necessary to amend the Traffic Act so that the central body can collect the whole of the fees. It seems to me that I may have to ask the House to do that if the local bodies are not prepared to stand up to their obligations.

Mr. Kenneally: The policy was apparently ineffective in regard to outstanding fees.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As far as the local bodies were concerned, the Act provided that they were to be asked to pay for the maintenance of main roads for the years 1927-28 and 1928-29 as the roads were not declared and maintained by the Main Roads Board owing to there not being sufficient money in the fund. How is it possible

now to ask the local bodies to find this money two or three years after it has been spent?

Mr. Sampson: What was the amount in 1929-30?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The allocations I have been referring to apply to 1927-28 and to 1928-29. The Act passed in November of last year set out that the local bodies should pay a maximum of 22½ per cent. down to 10 per cent. of the traffic fees for that year.

Mr. McCallum: It was only a substitute for other payments.

Mr. Kenneally: The Minister knows that in giving evidence before the select committee the local bodies deliberately said that in some cases they were not going to pay.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Even to-day there are one or two boards who have refused to pay. Of course, the Government cannot prosecute local authorities, and that is why I have mentioned that unless they pay it may be necessary to amend the Act so as to take the money that the law says we are entitled to.

Mr. Sampson: What is the amount involved?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: £32,673.

Mr. McCallum: That is the amount you are writing off?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have collected over £3,000 and some of that from the metropolitan area. The Perth Road Board and the Perth municipality have paid some amounts, but outside the metropolitan area the local bodies will be credited with whatever they pay, and we shall have to refund out of the traffic fees the money paid by the public bodies in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Sampson: What is the amount you hope to collect?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have already mentioned that we hope to collect in traffic fees £55,000 this year, and the amount of the allocations we are wiping off is £32,000. I think we can start on fresh lines if the local bodies will live up to their obligations. As I have already explained, the object of the Bill is to effect economies and cut out unnecessary overhead expenses. There are three members of the board and if the Bill is passed, there will be a saving of at least £2,000 per annum in that respect. I think that by carrying out the purpose of the Bill as it has been outlined, there will be greater effi-

ciency as well as economy, and it will be in the interests of the State as a whole. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McCallum, debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.56] in moving the second reading said: This is the usual Bill that is brought down every year and which is necessary for the protection of the securities of the Agricultural Bank. No new accounts have been opened for some time. There are soldier settlers who are under the Act and there is outstanding £1,731,731. That is why year after year we have to pass this continuance Bill. I do not know that there is any need to give the House any further information. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [6.0]: The Bill is the usual one introduced every session, and I admit its necessity while there are clients on the board respecting whom security must be provided. I am glad it is not the intention of the Government to accept any new clients for the board.

The Premier: There have been no new advances for some time.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I know that, except in regard to returned soldiers. There is an urgent necessity for removing a number of the clients who are on the board at present. I tell the Government that, because it is most necessary that they should pursue the policy I adopted myself. There are a number of people on the board who should have been off it years ago. They are men who have never given the country a fair deal.

The Premier: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Members of the Country Party would be well advised not to interfere regarding these matters. When I was Minister for Lands and as such controlled the Industries Assistance Board, I

gave Mr. McLarty carte blanche. I told him to go ahead and not to close the door on any man who was giving the country a fair deal. I told him not to extend any consideration to those who were not doing that. It is utterly wrong and contrary to all decent standards of morality, to extend further assistance to those who will not do the fair thing. I know perfectly well that there have been members of Parliament here who have taken up the grievances of some of these people, but I tell them that there are many people in that category who should not be considered at all. My policy as Minister was to stick to the good man who was honestly trying to make good, even though he was a muddler. I was prepared to give no consideration to dishonest men. I hope the Government will continue that policy in the interests of the community as a whole. I am sure the Premier will admit the soundness of that policy. I believe he will realise that it is incumbent upon the State to stick to the man who is a trier.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam—in reply) [6.3]: I entirely agree with what the hon. member has said. It is customary to lend every assistance to men who are honestly trying to succeed and the man who will not do that should not be further assisted. The policy being pursued by the Government is just as the hon. member left it when he vacated Ministerial office. We have made no further new advances for the simple reason that we have not the necessary funds to do so. Any amounts that are advanced now are from repayments. There has been no increase in the capital of the board for some time because it could not be done. I heartily agree that men who are triers, willing workers giving a fair deal to the State, should be assisted. I am sorry that we have not the funds to enable us to do something for farmers who are in difficulties owing to the present financial position. The fact is we have no control over the money enabling us to do it. The board is administered by trustees who operate under an Act of Parliament, and we do not interfere with their business to any great extent.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Lindsay—Mt. Marshall) [6.8] in moving the second reading said: The principal reason for introducing the Bill is the reduction of taxation fees. It is perhaps remarkable that in these times legislation should be introduced for that purpose, and I have no doubt the House will welcome it.

Mr. Wilson: There must be a catch in it somewhere!

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: Hon. members will remember that last session they dealt with a Bill to amend the Inspection of Scaffolding Act, but the measure was defeated in another place. It is not my intention to include in the Bill those clauses that caused the defeat of the Bill last session. At the present time, the scaffolding fees in connection with new works are 5s. for every £100, or part thereof, of the cost, or estimated cost, of the work. Even though the cost of the job may be £10 only, a fee of 5s. has to be paid. There is no minimum fee provided. In the Bill we provide that the fee shall be 4s. for every £100, or part thereof, of the cost, or estimated cost, of the work, where it does not exceed £10,000; 2s. for every additional £100, or part thereof, where the cost, or estimated cost, exceeds £10,000 but does not exceed £50,000; and 1s. for every additional £100 where the cost, or estimated cost, exceeds £50,000. There is a provision that the maximum fee in any instance shall not exceed £100. Provision has now been made that jobbing repairers, such as painters and so forth, will pay 4s. per £100 and not 5s. for each job as in the past. The erection of lifts and such works, where previously the charge was made on material and labour, will now be charged on the labour only. Scaffolding that consists only of trestles and planks or swinging stages and gear used by painters, signwriters, paperhangers, plumbers and electricians, will carry a fee payable at the rate of 4s. for every £100 or portion thereof on the aggregate cost of all

work of which the owner has given notice covering the period of one year. When lifts are installed, it is customary to use planks that rest on permanent fixtures and this will cover that type of work. In the past those undertaking such work had to pay a fee of 5s. for each job, but now they will have to pay a fee of 4s. for every £100 in respect of labour only engaged in connection with the actual works for the purpose whereof that type of scaffolding is to be used, and not on the total cost of the works. The Bill also deals with gantries. A reduction of approximately 50 per cent. in the amount of fees received is expected. That will mean a great loss of revenue to the department. There has been considerable profit in the past from this legislation, and the reduction contemplated in the Bill will practically do away with that profit. We intend to make clear the meaning of the term "gear." A definition clause is included in the Bill as follows:—

"Gear" includes any ladder or plank forming part of or used in connection with scaffolding and any chain, rope, fastening, hoist, crane, conveyor, stay, block, pulley, hanger, sling, brace, or other movable contrivance of a like kind used or intended to be used by workmen or for the support or protection of workmen employed on works, and not being gear which is subject to inspection under the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921.

Up to the present there has been no inspection of hoists such as are used for conveying concrete to various floors during building construction. The ropes used in connection with the hoists may be dangerous, but the inspectors under the Act I have mentioned, have no power to supervise them, because hoists are not included under the Inspection of Machinery Act. It is intended to allow inspectors of the scaffolding department to examine that type of gear. The Bill will also make it clear that a person engaged in painting his roof or cleaning out guttering will not be brought within the provisions of the Act, should he be assisted by his family or a friend, who may help without any remuneration.

Mr. Panton: Hear, hear!

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: I have no doubt that that provision will affect some hon. members here. Under existing conditions should they secure any such help at a height of over 8 feet from the ground, they would be liable for the payment of scaffolding fees. The clause

in the Bill will make it clear that if a man desires to do a little job for himself about the house, he will not be brought within the scope of this legislation. Owing to the reduction in charges to be levied and also in the curtailment of building operations generally, which has in itself caused a reduction in revenue, it was decided to re-organise the department. It naturally follows that owing to the restricted building operations, particularly in the metropolitan area, the fees receivable will be considerably less than in former years and as I am reducing the fees chargeable by 50 per cent., the effect is that, compared with the past, there will be no work for the department, which has been re-organised in order to reduce costs.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.50 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was dealing with the cost of administration of the scaffolding department. Had I known there was so little business before us, I might have contrived to finish my remarks before tea. I had mentioned that owing to the reduction of 50 per cent. in the fees, and to the fact that the building trade had fallen off, it was necessary to deal with the administrative costs. In the five years the scaffolding department has been in existence, the total revenue was £17,098, and the cost of administration £8,685 12s. 6d. In other words the scaffolding fees collected were twice the cost of the administration. Reducing the fees by 50 per cent. would mean that the revenue in normal times would about equal the cost of administration, but as the building trade has fallen off considerably, it becomes necessary to reduce the cost of administration. In the past there have been three full-time inspectors in the metropolitan area whose salaries and incidentals amounted to £1,813 6s. 3d. per annum. At present only one full-time inspector is employed and, adding administration, the department is expected to cost £831 per annum. I am giving these figures because the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) on the Address-in-reply dealt with the matter. It has always been the practice in the scaffolding department for certain officers, paid as scaffolding inspectors, to make the inspections in the metropolitan area. Outside the metropoli-

tan area inspection has been made by district architects and supervisors of the architectural division of the Works Department. The administration of the Act has now been transferred to the architectural division. Previously it was administered by a sub-department, which also controlled the Shops and Factories Act, timber inspections, industrial arbitration and shearers' accommodation. The staff exclusively engaged on scaffolding work consisted of three inspectors and one typist. In addition nine other officers of the sub-department attended to scaffolding matters as well as to their duties under the various other Acts. The inspectors referred to have operated from Midland Junction to Fremantle only. All other inspections required under the Act in other portions of the State have been performed by the district architect attached to the Works Department, no charge being made for such services. On the administration being transferred, it was found that by utilising our own organisation, both field and office, the whole of the necessary work could be carried out by taking over one inspector and one typist. Thus the services of two inspectors have been dispensed with, and owing to the reduced amount of administrative work which the sub-department will now have to perform, some clerical officers should be available for transfer. The Bill is unique insofar that its object is to reduce charges. Anything the Government can do in that direction should be done.

Mr. McCallum: I brought in a Bill last year. What is unique about this one?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member did introduce a Bill last year, but it was not similar to this one.

Mr. McCallum: It provided for a reduction of fees.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It provided for a reduction of fees to 4s. per £100, but it did not give the small man the relief proposed under this measure. What is more, the hon. member included a provision to delete the 8ft. limitation, and another place threw out the Bill because of that provision. The hon. member could have brought in a Bill to reduce the fees, without tacking on to it a question that had been rejected by another place on a previous occasion. This measure contains no

camouflage. It is an honest attempt to reduce the charges to building contractors. In the past they have paid too much. In future they will pay a fair thing. If the Bill be passed, the Government will be able to claim that they have done something, even though little, to reduce building costs.

Mr. McCallum: It was the fault of your friends that it was not done last year.

Mr. Millington: I thought we brought in a Bill to reduce the income tax.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was several years ago; I was referring to recent years. I cannot see any hope of introducing legislation to reduce taxation at present. When Parliament passed the original Act, it was never intended to make a profit out of it. Yet considerably over £8,000 profit has been made in the last five years.

The Premier: If you say that, someone will be applying for a refund.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would be useless to do so, because there is not sufficient money in the Treasury. The Bill will afford relief to small men particularly, who will be asked to pay 4s. per £100 where previously they paid 5s. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. McCallum, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.37 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 17th September, 1930.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	534
Address-in-reply, thirteenth day	534
Bill: Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 1r.	563

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. J. J. Holmes (North) on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Thirteenth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [4.34]: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. I am very pleased to note that during the debate very little criticism has been levelled against the previous Government. As a member of that Administration, it was my privilege to be associated with the activities of government in their various forms. Whilst it was not possible for that Government to do all that some people would have liked, particularly all the supporters of the Government outside Parliament would have liked, we can claim in equity that we were fair and impartial in our dealings with all sections of the community. On the hustings during election time the supporters of the Mitchell Government were not able to point to anything of a major character in condemnation of our administration, with the exception of the unemployed problem. The record of the Collier Government, therefore, is something of which they might be proud. During the campaign, the issue of unemployment was the one most featured by all interested parties. The supporters of the present Government, in their anxiety to make out that the previous Government were not capable of dealing with the situation, gave utterance to statements and promises which they now admit they cannot live up to. When Sir James Mitchell stated during the campaign that, if returned to power, he would be able to secure all the money necessary to provide employment for everyone in the State, I think I am right in saying that he made a statement he now admits was not possible of fulfilment.

Hon. J. Nicholson: For what reason?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: For the same reason that the late Government on the hustings told the people it was not possible for them to do all that certain parties imagined should be done. The finances of the State were the main subject of discussion. As I have said, Sir James Mitchell indicated that he could get all the money he wanted to cope with the unemployment situation.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Did he not believe he would get £4,000,000?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not know what he believed, only what he said. The policy of the Collier Government, as ad-