ing of ratepayers of the whole of the district, or whether it is to be confined to ratepayers of one ward.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This provision is required by the department to get over existing difficulties. Only in isolated cases will the power be exercised. Some boards are unreasonable, generally because the proposed new road runs through the land held by some member of the board.

[*Mr. Lutey resumed the Chair.*]

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should not say that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But it is a fact. During the last 12 months I have been beseiged by returned soldier settlers asking for this road.

Mr. Mann: Have you not the power already?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, we have not. Only under the clauses here can we deal with roads through private lands. If it is only for the one case under review, this provision is needed. This one case has been going on for the past 12 or 18 months.

Mr. Davy: Should not every ratepayer know what the business of the meeting is to be?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think that altogether necessary Even if the meeting be packed, it will be packed by those who want the road.

Mr. Davy: What about those who would suffer from the road?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would be only one man at most.

Mr. Lindsay: Would not the rest of the ratepayers suffer if they had to pay out £200 or £300 for the fencing of the road?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have nothing to do with that. The road was there long before I took office. The owner of the land is on the road board, and so the board will not agree to declaring a public road through his land to the siding. This is right alongside the railway fences. There have been various instances of people having a kcd for roads and of road boards having refused to approve of them. The Government should have power to declare a public road in case of necessity. It is impossible for the provision to do any harm because the greatest care would be exercised if the road board were opposed to the proposal.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government ought to have power to provide roads to railway sidings, but the points raised by the member for Toodyay should also be considered. The roads should be provided when the railways are being built, and the work of constructing and fencing the roads should be part of the railway cost.

The Minister for Lands: I was referring to a railway that you constructed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is hardly a railway in the State in which I have not had a hand. If the Minister knows that a road is necessary to enable people to market their produce he should have the power to construct it. I suggest that the Minister take the necessary power and not bother about a meeting of ratepayers. I fancy that the Minister already has the power.

Mr. LINDSAY: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that where a road is necessary it should not be a tax on the other ratepayers of the district. I warn the Minister that presently I shall be approaching him for a subsidy.

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

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 13th October, 1926.

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

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT, PROTHERO MINERS' RELIEF SCHEME.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON asked the Chief Secretary: 1. Is it a fact that when the Prothero miners, under the relief scheme,

were put on to make portion of the road between Greenough and Dongarra, none of the road boards was consulted in any way? 2, Why was this ordinary courtesy not extended to them? 3, Why was the section that least required to be made, first put in hand? 4, What was the number of chains of road made in this section? 5, What was the cost per chain? 6, Under which Government department was the work carried out?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, A number of married men were out of employment owing to the mines closing down, and to relieve the position the Government made the money available. It was, therefore, necessary that the work be commenced at the earliest possible moment. Under these circumstances it was not practicable to arrange the usual consultations with the local authorities. 3, According to departmental reports the section dealt with was deserving of the earliest attention. 4, Seventy chains. 5, £40. 6, Public Works Department.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: This amendment is required to continue the present rate of stamp duty on transfers and conveyances. The present rate of duty was fixed by the amendment to the Act of 1917 as a war measure, and it has continued from year to year since. The rate is now 5s. for each £25 value, or £1 for each £100 value. Without this amendmen the charge would, after the 30th June, 1927, become 2s. 6d. on each £25, or 10s. per £100 value. The present rate is not considered an unreasonable one. It has not been seriously objected to, and compares favourably with those of the other States, which are—New South Wales 15s. per £100; Victoria 20s. per £100; Queensland 15s. per £100; South Australia 10s. per £100, and Tasmania 15s. per £100. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.38]: I do not propose to offer any serious objection to the Bill, but when a similar measure came before us a year ago I suggested that probably the Government would take into consideration the question of reverting to the old rates. As the Leader of the House has stated, this was adopted as a war measure. It is a long time since the war ended. One had hoped to see some sort of return to normal conditions. I trust the Leader of the House will consult with his colleagues, and by next year at least, see that we do return to normal conditions with respect to these rates, and thus facilitate as much as possible dealing in land. I think that is all for the good of the State. I realise that probably the Government have certain burdens to carry at this time in connection with the finances, and that probably the renewal of this measure for one year may be justified. I also welcome, as I am sure other members must have welcomed, the announcement of the Treasurer with regard to the appropriation of the moneys received from the Commonwealth, which will enable a certain reduction to be made in income taxation. These matters have to be taken into account in questions such as this one. I am, therefore, giving my support to the measure on this occasion, hoping that the Government will be able by next year to render it unnecessary for a similar measure to be brought up again.

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—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is necessary to reimpose a land tax and income tax for this year. Except for Clause 3, which provides for a rebate of 33⅓ per cent., there is no change in the tax imposed by last year's Act. The balance of the super tax of 15 per cent. imposed in 1920 ceased as from last year, and the rate of tax remains as that which was in force before the super tax was imposed. These rates commenced at 2d. in the pound and advanced at the rate of .007 pence in the pound to a maximum of 48d. in the pound. It was desired to give some relief in taxation, and it was considered that the best way to do so was to allow a rebate of 33⅓ per cent. on all taxes payable at the present rate, that is last

year's rate after the balance of the super tax of 7½ per cent. had been abolished, in place of altering the rate as it is at present. In order to afford this relief it was necessary to take advantage of the grant given to the State by the Commonwealth as a result of the Disabilities Commission. The Bill authorising this grant has not yet passed through the Federal Parliament, and should it fail to do so it will be necessary again to discontinue this rebate until we get on to a more permanent footing. I therefore think it would be advisable to continue the old rates and to give what concessions may be possible by way of rebates. Prior to the 1st July 1920, the maximum rate of tax was 2s. 6d. in the pound that point being reached at £4.766, and continuing at a flat rate from that sum. From the 1st July, 1920, the maximum rate became 4s. in the pound, commencing at £4.766, and there was in addition a super tax of 15 per cent. The super tax was abolished in two instalments between the years 1924 and 1926, the second moiety lapsing as from the 30th June last. The maximum rate of tax, inclusive of the rebate, will be 2s. 8d. in the pound as against 2s. 6d. in the pound as fixed in 1918. Since the 1st July, 1924, there has been a remission of taxation comprising the super tax of 15 per cent. and the rebate of 33⅓ per cent., or a total reduction in the amount payable of about 42 per cent. The amount received as income tax for the year 1923-24 was £490,059; in 1924-25 the amount was £460,165; and in 1925-26, £566,344. Had the rebate not been provided for, it was anticipated that this year £600,000 would have been received under this heading. The amount it is anticipated we will receive, should the Bill be agreed to, is £400,000. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 7th October.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.48]: This Bill is of great importance, more particularly to the local governing bodies within the metropolitan area. It deals with them in a very direct manner. The outlying local governing bodies collect their own traffic fees and I believe that in many instances they will get as much, or probably more, than many of the authorities within the metropolitan area will receive. We must all realise that the work of maintaining roads in the condition required to-day is very expensive indeed. There are perhaps very few people who realise the enormous cost of making what is termed a good road. For the information of the House, I can inform members that the portion of St. George's-terrace between Milligan-street and Bennett-street was constructed at a cost of nearly £30,000. It will be seen that the financial burden involved in such an undertaking is a big and grave one. As to the Bill itself, I have little to say beyond commenting briefly on [illegible] of the clauses. Clause 8 deals with an amendment of Section 13 of the principal Act and one of the alterations proposed is the inclusion in paragraph (c) of Subsection 2 the words "and if so ordered by the Governor shall be expended on specified roads." I suggest that the city should not be included in that category, because the City Council represents the biggest road-making body within the metropolitan area, and, therefore, within the State. The City Council's engineers are just as competent as those employed by the Government, and are just as capable of determining which roads should be made. The question of deciding such matters should be left in the hands of a body of men who give an enormous amount of time to the affairs of the ratepayers. Perth is making tremendous sacrifices regarding the revenue under the Traffic Act compared with what the municipal authorities were able to collect before that legislation came into force. There is another provision included in Clause 8 that seeks to make the City Council and the whole of the self-governing bodies interested, responsible for certain works of an extensive description. First of all there is our old friend, the Causeway. When the City of Perth took over Leederville, North Perth and Victoria Park, it took over a much greater responsibility than those who fostered the Greater Perth movement had appreciated. Had Perth not taken in Victoria Park, the probability is that a great deal of the responsibility regarding the Causeway would have been thrust upon Victoria Park. It is more than probable that very soon Victoria Park would have been unable to carry out the financial obligations

entailed. Then there is the proposal to debit costs in connection with the North Fremantle bridge against the local authorities. That is a rather large item to debit against the City of Perth, because I know of no other place in Australia where a city is responsible for the upkeep of roads outside its own area. In this instance, it has been done under the provisions of the Traffic Act and, as hon. members are aware, the whole of the money collected is pooled. There is another important factor regarding the manner in which proposals dealing with the City of Perth itself have been dealt with. Under the Bill the obligations upon Perth start at the extreme boundaries of the city area. The Perth-Fremantle-road is one instance; another is the Canning-road, while there is also the Perth-Albany-road and the roads going out from the northern end through Guildford. I contend it would have been more equitable to take the Fremantle-road to as far as Mill-street, and join all the local governing bodies affected in the responsibility for the maintenance of the upkeep of Mount's-Bay-road. If it is fair to debit the City of Perth with the upkeep of roads outside the Perth boundaries, it is surely equally fair to debit other bodies with those roads within the city area that should be classed as main roads. The same would apply to the Victoria Park end, where the Causeway would be a more fair starting point. Instead of starting the responsibility of the city authorities there the Bill provides that it shall start from the extreme boundary of Victoria Park. A protest has been received from Subiaco regarding Nicholson-road and Thomas-street, along which the whole of the bus traffic travels. Those roads have not been classified as main roads in regard to the traffic fees. Special consideration should be given to such bodies as are compelled to bear the financial burden involved in the maintenance of those roads. The Subiaco Council is in that position regarding Thomas street, along which the whole of the buses travel in their run to Fremantle. The Subiaco local authorities also complain that a part of the Nedlands-road within the Subiaco boundary has not been declared a main road under the Act. In fairness to the present Minister, I must admit that the fees that have been collected and paid into the metropolitan traffic trust, have been distributed on a more fair and equitable basis than on previous occasions.. I have had considerable experience regarding the distribution of traffic fees and I have had a great deal to say about it elsewhere. I am credibly informed by people competent to judge that, in their opinion, the fees have been fairly and honestly distributed. I say "honestly" inasmuch as the local governing authorities concerned each receive a fair share of the fees in proportion to the responsibility each local authority is carrying. I am well aware of the difficulty facing the board regarding the distribution of fees. It is indeed a difficult proposition and experience only will determine eventually the best way in which the fees can be distributed. The City of Perth has to maintain 170 miles of main roads and the probability is that, had the city been able to retain the traffic fees as was possible before the Traffic Act became law, a much larger income from that source would have been derived that it is possible to get at present. The City Council, however, are extremely fair regarding their demands, and they desire that justice shall be done to the whole of the self-governing bodies interested. The time may come when those controlling the traffic may have established some set method of distribution. It is very important that the City Council and the other local governing bodies shall know what amount they are likely to receive from traffic fees, when they are preparing their works programme. There has also been placed in my hands a request relating to one or two of the other clauses of the Bill. Paragraph (u) of Subclause 2 of Clause 21 relates to vehicles and the overlapping of materials. It reads--

> Prohibiting the driving on any road of a vehicle laden with material projecting beyond the side of the vehicle.

The inclusion of such a provision has caused consternation amongst drivers and carters. When the Bill is in Committee, I will offer a suggestion that we should stipulate the allowance of a certain amount of overlapping. The Bill is very definite, and everyone knows what difficulty would be experienced if such a drastic provision were enforced. It would certainly place drivers in an awkward position, and some leniency should be allowed. I should say that the overlapping to be permitted should be 12 inches or 9 inches. At any rate, some latitude should be allowed.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Would this apply to wagons on a sheep station?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: This would apply to everyone. I do not deny that some such provision is quite necessary

in some instances. Clause 22 gives the Government power to prescribe routes, and also maximum and minimum fares. The local self-governing association desire that the word "minimum" should be struck out. They say it is quite reasonable that "maximum" should be left in. Every hon. member realises that under the Traffic Act very big powers are sought, but at the same time I feel that we must take into consideration the effect on the railways and tramways, because those are assets which are owned by the people, and if the people do not use them we must still pay interest and sinking fund on the capital outlay. Personally I feel that we shall have the traffic difficulty with us until such time as we electrify the metropolitan and suburban system. That will overcome many of the existing difficulties because an electrified railway service would quickly run the buses off the track. The self-governing bodies are desirous of altering the personnel of the board. Their wish is that the board should consist of three members, one to represent the Minister, one to represent the local authorities within the metropolitan area, and the third to represent the local authorities outside the metropolitan area. I am not committing myself to that proposal because I feel that it requires serious consideration. At the same time I deem it my duty to put the suggestion forward so that the House might know what is in the minds of the local governing bodies. It is easy to say what should be done with other people's property, but a big field of discussion is opened up when we remember the responsibility that we have by way of paying interest and sinking fund. Another clause in the Bill refers to damage done to a roadway and casts the responsibility upon the person doing the damage. It actually provides that the individual responsible should be debited with the cost of the repairs. In this respect the Government themselves are very often perpetrators of damage to roads and if private individuals are to be made responsible, a like responsibility should be cast upon the Government. I have in mind the time when the Como tramway was being constructed. The Government were then carting rails over various roads, and having badly cut up one road and made it impassable for traffic, they used another road and damaged that just as much. The City Council were not able to obtain any redress for the cutting up of the roads. These are the only matters I wish to touch upon at this stage of the Bill. We all realise how important it is that complete control over traffic should be given to the board, and how necessary it is that the regulations should be much more stringent than has been the case in the past. A protest has been made with regard to giving the Commissioner of Police authority to collect and distribute traffic revenue. I take it, however, that whilst the Commissioner will collect that revenue, he must pay it to the credit of the Metropolitan Traffic Trust in the Treasury, and the Minister will then assume control over it. I support the second reading and in Committee will offer suggestions in the direction I have indicated.

On motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 3) £1,363,500.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING. ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The clause deals with the horizonal base, and an interpretation is given of "horizontal base." In the principal Act there is an interpretation of "scaffolding" I should like to know whether anyone placing a ladder against a structure of any sort, be it a haystack or anything else, would come within the scope of the Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Recently it was found necessary to paint the upper portion of the Government Printing Office and the person who took the contract was advised not to erect scaffolding, but to erect suitable gear in the form of a bo'sun's chair. Any ladder longer than 25 feet is subject to inspection by the inspector of scaffolding if it is used in the metropolitan area. Buildings in the country are exempt from inspection unless the scaffolding required will be more than 15 feet from the ground.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What about a haystack?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Scaffolding is not required for the erection of a haystack.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: My principal objection to the clause is that it seeks to substitute "any person" for "workman." I will go as far as anybody else to protect workmen; but when the responsibility is shifted to the individual and he is brought under the same category, that is going too far. If I have a workman doing work in a dangerous position, I shall be only too pleased to have an inspector come along and see that everything is right; but if I choose to do some risky work myself on a Sunday, I should not be subject to the directions of the inspector.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I can give an instance showing that supervision is necessary. The contractor for a building at Muliewa went on the scaffolding, when a piece of timber broke and he fell on a heap of bricks, with the result that he was laid up for about 12 months.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You want to penalise everybody for the sake of one person.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: If a hay shed or a haystack is being built, would an inspector have to make a visit of inspection under this clause. And if the inspector is not notified, will the person responsible for the erection of the shed or stack be liable to a fine? The clause represents a useless obstacle.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On the second reading I gave several instances showing the necessity for the clause. When high silos are being erected, the workmen engaged on them should be protected. I repeat that haystacks do not come under the clause. In the metropolitan area scaffolding, in order to be subject to the clause, must be 8 feet above the horizontal base fixed. Churches in the country are built from 40 feet to 60 feet high, and surely men working in the country are as much entitled to protection as men working in the city. The administration of the parent Act has not been drastic. I am informed that there has not been a single prosecution to date for faulty scaffolding. The instructions of the inspectors have been carried out readily.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What has been the revenue of the department from the Act?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: About £1,000. I have not the exact figures at the moment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I fail to see any danger of hardship to country residents in this clause. The proviso to Clause 2 makes the matter plain. Not many haystacks are more than 15 feet high. I agree with the Chief Secretary that men engaged on buildings in the country must be protected equally with men engaged on buildings in the city. I also agree with our Leader's remarks as to silos. Falling from a high silo, a man might be crippled for life, if not killed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We are only starting on this legislation, and presently we shall find that a department has been built up. Information as to the cost for last year is no safe indication of future cost. Hitherto the Act has been limited to certain areas, and the officers engaged have been able to do the work of inspection about Perth in conjunction with other work. Under Clause 5 anyone desiring to erect a building which needs inspection must first advise the municipal council or road board of what he is going to do. Then the council or board must advise the central authority. Thereupon an inspector goes to Kalgoorlie or Albany or Wyndham to inspect. The cost up to date is a mere bagatelle; but with the extended authority asked for by this Bill, we do not know where the matter will end. I shall vote against the clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The person who proposes to erect a building will not be required to notify a municipal council or a road board except in so far as the by-laws of the local authority prescribe notification. In nine cases out of ten a person proposing to build must apply for permission, and then he will notify the Chief Inspector of Scaffolding. There is not much difficulty about that. I now have the figures as to fees collected under the principal Act. They are as follows: Up to 30th September, 1925, £25 5s.; up to 31st December, 1925, £173 15s.; up to 31st March, 1926, £402 10s.; up to 30th June, 1926, £296 10s.; from 1st July up to a few weeks ago, when the figures were made up, £167 15s.; or a total of £1,065 15s. The work employs two full-time inspectors under Section 4, and also eight Public Works inspectors under Section 5, the cost of the latter's services not being included. No one is sent up to Kalgoorlie to inspect. There are officers of the Public Works Department throughout the State to perform the work of the Scaffolding Branch when necessary.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Clause 3 amends Section 1 of the Act, and that section limits the scope of the Act to the metropolitan area, which is to say the Metropolitan Province, the Metropolitan-Suburban Province,

and the West Province. Clause 2 of this Bill, a clause which we have passed, inserts a provision that—

> This Act shall be in force and have effect throughout the State whenever scaffolding exceeding 15ft. in height from the horizontal base is used.

So now it will apply to every country district and to every structure exceeding 8ft. from the horizontal base.

Members: No, 15 feet.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I say 8ft. advisedly, for under the definition in the Act "scaffolding" means any structure exceeding 8ft. from the horizontal base. I do not see any amendment of that, despite the mention of 15ft. in the proviso to Clause 2.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The extension to country districts was made in the parent Act. As a matter of fact, the Act does not apply to any single storey building in the metropolitan area, unless the scaffolding reaches more than 8ft. from the ground. From an 8ft. scaffolding a man can work on a 13ft. building. The proviso to Clause 2, prescribing a scaffolding of 15ft., is an improvement, for buildings up to 20ft. can be erected from a 15ft. scaffolding. Up to 15ft. the building is exempt.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Hitherto we have protected workmen, but under this it is proposed to protect everybody. It is an interference with the liberty of the subject, for a man should be allowed to do his work in his own way. I am disposed to move that Subclause 2 be struck out.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Will it not be sufficient to delete the specific words? I move an amendment—

> That in lines 4 and 5 of Subclause 2 the words "By substituting for the word 'workmen' in line 3 the word 'any person'" be struck out.

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

Clauses 4 to 6—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 10:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

> That in line 3 the words "or president of a district council" be struck out.

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

Clauses 4 to 8—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.43] in moving the second reading said: This Bill, or one practically identical, was submitted to the House last year. But it came down in the last days of the session, and so it was difficult to give it consideration. I did not ask members to do so, for I realised that in the circumstances it would be unfair to make such a request. The necessity for an effective Weights and Measures Act should require no emphasising. Although the majority of traders are honest, it stands to reason there must be some who are unscrupulous and quite prepared to defraud their customers if opportunity be given them to do so. That opportunity has existed for some years past, in consequence of the state of the law. In 1915 the Labour Government passed an amending Act, but owing to difficulty in obtaining housing accommodation for the standards, which were imported from England, the Act has never been proclaimed. Arrangements have now been made for the transfer of the metropolitan water supply staff to the Public Works offices, and the vacated premises will be used by the weights and measures branch. Police Inspector O'Halloran, who is to be closely connected with the administration of the Weights and Measures Act, was recently sent to Sydney to collect information and study the subject generally so that he might be able to organise the new department on right and proper lines. He was sent to Sydney because our Act of 1915 was copied from the New South Wales Act. It was deemed advisable that he should ascertain how the legislation had been operating in New South Wales and what defects had been discovered. It was equally important also to gain practical experience of the admin-

istration. Inspector O'Halloran gave close study to the question. He had a long interview with the head of the department; he attended the chief office almost daily for several weeks, and endeavoured to acquire as much knowledge as possible of the methods of administration and the technical side of the work. He accompanied different outdoor inspectors and watched their method of inspection. In his report to the Commissioner of Police he said—

> There is no doubt that the Weights and Measures Department in Sydney is right up to date, and from various sources I heard nothing but commendation of it.

It is expected that everything will be in readiness to proclaim the Act within the course of a few weeks, but before the proclamation it is desired to amend the Act and bring it up to date. Our Act having been based on the New South Wales Act, the amendments proposed are those which the experience of New South Wales has shown to be necessary. It is not anticipated that the cost of administration will be a heavy item. In New South Wales, with its population of over two millions, the expenditure is surprisingly low. In 1924 it was £7,691 and in 1925 £10,361, the increase of £2,670 being due to the appointment of a number of junior assistants for training purposes and increases of salaries. The revenue was £7,681 in 1924 and £7,557 in 1925. We hope to make the revenue balance the expenditure. In the 1915 Act the fees were embodied in a schedule. When the Bill was before another place last session, at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition and a prominent member of his party, the schedule was deleted and provision was made for fixing the fees by regulation. It was considered that the fees in the schedule were stiff. Yet, in the absence of experience, there is no means of knowing whether they were really so or not. The Bill now before the House will enable the fees to be fixed by regulation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: For what are the fees?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member will find a variety of fees set out in the schedule to the Act of 1915. Clause 2 of the Bill will bring the Chief Inspector under the definition of an inspector. Clause 3 is consequential. Clause 4 gives the Governor power to appoint a chief inspector and inspectors. Clause 6 recasts Section 20 of the Act. The original Act provides that every person delivering goods to a purchaser, except at the premises of the seller, must send an invoice or a delivery note with the goods, showing the net weight or measure. By the amendment in the proposed new Subsection 2 the seller, if the case should require, must, instead of giving the weight or measurement, state the number of articles. Right through the Bill weight, measure or number is dealt with as custom demands. Bread is exempted as it is already provided for in the Bread Act. Articles weighed, measured or counted when delivered at the premises of the purchaser, or any package on which the net weight, measure or number is marked as prescribed, are also exempted from the operation of the new Subsection 2. The new Subsection 3 contained in Clause 6 covers much of the same ground as does Section 20 of the original Act. It insists that either weight, measure or number shall be legibly written or printed on packages offered for sale. Wholesalers were not included in the original Act, but they are brought in by this amendment, and rightly so. The wholesalers may be the source of all the trouble. It is possible that if Clause 6 were rigidly enforced in every instance difficulties might arise, and so power is given under the proposed new Subsection 5 to exempt by regulation any article from the requirements of the provision, either wholly or in part. By Clause 7, Section 21 of the principal Act is also repealed though the new section proposed in substitution has not been amended to any great extent. It deals with cases in which the net weight or measure or number of articles is not correctly stated. In the original Act, as in this clause, it was a sufficient defence to produce from the person from whom the goods were purchased a written guarantee that the weight or measure was correct, and to prove that the retailer sold the articles in the same state as he had received them from the wholesaler. The person giving the guarantee would have to be a resident of Western Australia, or a company with a registered office in the State. That is repealed, but the only material difference is that the wholesaler is brought in, and also that words are added stipulating that if any article of which it is necessary to give the correct weight, measure or number is found in the possession of any person manufacturing or trading in such article, that person shall be deemed to be in the possession of the article for sale until the contrary is proved. For instance, if a person is trading in jam and jam is found in his factory or business premises, the onus

is thrown upon him to prove that the jam, although on the premises, was not for sale. Clause 8 allows some latitude in respect of goods that diminish in weight owing to climatic influences. It is sufficient in such instances that the words "net weight when packed" should appear on the label, followed by a correct statement of the weight. Regulations may provide for a permissible diminution of weight in such circumstances. Subclause 2 is a safeguard for the seller. It provides that weights and measures and numbers approximating those stated on an invoice will be regarded as complying with the regulations. Clause 9 seeks to strike out of Section 23 the words "with intent to mislead." Under the original Act it was impossible to secure a conviction in a prosecution for misrepresentation as to weight and measure or failure to comply with the different requirements of the Act, unless it could be proved that there was intent to mislead. That, of course, could not be proved in nine cases out of ten, unless a successful thought-reader could be brought into requisition. Clause 10 has reference to such goods as produce that are generally weighed by the purchaser. A farmer sends to a dealer a truck of chaff. The farmer has to rely on the dealer to give him a correct return of the weight, and if he fails to do so he commits an offence under the Act. That is only one of many instances in which the purchaser must be depended upon to give the correct weight. This measure will place him under a legal obligation to do so. Section 24 of the principal Act makes mandatory the seizure of any weight or measure through which a person has committed a fraud. No discretion at all is permitted to be exercised by the magistrate; he must in all circumstances order it to be seized. Clause 11 proposes to give the magistrate discretionary power. There may be cases in which no useful object could be served by seizing the weights and measures. At any rate it might be an extreme penalty very much heavier than the fine, and that for a first offence. Clause 12 refers to petrol pumps, penny-in-the-slot machines and similar instruments. They come under the measure, but are not referred to in the principal Act as they were not in use at the time that measure was submitted to Parliament. Instead of specifying in the Act all the weighing and measuring instruments required to be stamped with a mark of verification, Clauses 13 and 14 will enable the Government to deal with those matters by regulation; otherwise it would be necessary to amend the Act every time a new device for weighing or measuring was introduced. Under Section 30 of the Act all coal and firewood in excess of 5 cwt. had to be sold by weight unless the written consent of the purchaser was obtained to its being sold otherwise. Clause 15 stipulates that all coal and firewood shall be sold by weight, no matter what the quantity, but there is a proviso that makes it lawful to sell those fuels by measurement elsewhere than in a municipal district, a townsite or other place where a weighing machine is not provided. Clause 16 will repeal Section 31 of the Act. That section refers to the driver of any vehicle carrying coal or firewood in excess of 5 cwt. in cases where the written consent of the purchaser was alleged to have been given to its being sold otherwise than by weight. In such circumstances the driver was required to produce, on the demand of an inspector, the purchaser's written consent to the sale. As, under the Bill, coal and firewood may be sold only by weight in towns where there is a weighing instrument, and elsewhere at will, Section 31 of the Act must necessarily be deleted. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [6.0]: I have compared this Bill with the parent Act. There appear to be two omissions of matters that were dealt with in the Act. Section 20, which Clause 6 of the Bill repeals, provides that the Act shall not come into force until the expiration of one year after the commencement of the Act. The Act was passed in 1915 but has never been proclaimed or put into operation. In the course of his reply the Minister might inform the House the reason for this omission. I take it that the position has not altered from what it was in 1915. The matter would have assumed a different complexion if the Act had been proclaimed, but it has never yet been put into operation. There is another omission from the same clause of something that was provided in the Act. The section reads—

In the case of any liquor paying excise or customs duties, the measures set forth in any Act dealing with such liquors shall be held to satisfy the requirements of this section in regard to measure.

In the Act that was intended to mean that the standard of measure under which liquors were supposed to conform to the Customs

and Excise Act was prima facie the standard under this Act. In this respect the clause I refer to supersedes Section 20 of the Weights and Measures Act. We shall thus have this position in connection with any liquor or other liquid that comes under the Customs and Excise Act, that one Act will provide for one thing and another Act for something different. It is an important point and one that should be cleared up. We should not have State and Federal laws working against each other. It is possible that a brewer of beer may be using an 18-gallon keg which, owing to reconditioning and use, might hold a quantity different from that which it held originally. That might conform to the standard laid down in the Federal Act, but under the State Act might still be required to contain exactly 18 gallons. This will lead to conflict of opinion in that the manufacturer may not know with which Act to conform. I have no objection to any other part of the Bill except to the portion of Clause 17 which provides—

> For the examination and licensing of scale repairers, and generally for their supervision and control, including prohibition of the use of the designation "scale adjuster," or any like designation by persons other than those licensed under the regulations.

I take it that these regulations will operate in much the same way as those which governed the goldfields water supply reticulation in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. No man could lay pipes there unless he was licensed to do so, or held a certificate of competency. An employer could not employ a man unless he was certified as competent to carry out the work. It would be worth while looking into this question and informing the House as to whether it is intended that the employer shall be licensed as well as the employee, or whether the parties jointly and severally must hold a certificate of competency to do the work It is essential that a workman who is required to perform these adjustments of weights and measures shall be a qualified person, and that the man who employs him shall be similarly qualified. If this is not insisted upon, we may have a quack in charge of an expert, a most undesirable state of affairs. I support the second reading of the Bill.

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

BILL—RESERVES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.10]: I was glad to hear Mr. Stewart state that he knew of the conditions appertaining to four or five of these reserves. The particular reserve to which I desire to draw attention is that at South Perth, referred to in Clause 13. I have no objection to the Bill being passed if certain conditions are imposed upon the trustees of this reserve. A number of people at South Perth have bought land and built nice houses because of this reserve. Within the boundaries of the reserve is a very fine lot of foliage, native trees and flowers, which it would be a sin to destroy. It is a fairly large area. In Committee I propose to move that a strip of land a chain wide be in turn reserved around this area, and that the onus be thrown on the local authority to maintain that width of a chain in its natural state, as far as it is possible to do so. I think that will meet with the wishes of the residents. If this be done I shall support the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: Can you reimpose a reservation in a case of this sort?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I understand that last session a somewhat similar suggestion was made in the House. I think there would be no difficulty about the Bill being passed if this suggestion were carried out.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M Drew—Central) [7.30]: I was not in a position before tea to move the adjournment of the House until to-morrow. I find it is necessary to adjourn. I am not prepared to go further than we have gone to-night. We have made good progress. There are other Bills that might have been taken, but a similar state of affairs exists in connection with them. In the circumstances, I find it necessary to move—

> That the House do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 7.33 p.m.