The HONORARY MINISTER: He would make a claim.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: He would claim on the contractor.

The HONORARY MINISTER: He would claim on the owner of the station where he was working.

Hon. L. Craig: But which one?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendments set forth what is recognised as being necessary to perfect existing legislation and to protect the workers. Most of the amendments, I feel sure, will appeal to hon. members, and I believe there will be little trouble in passing this legislation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. L. Craig, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.1 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 14th September, 1937.

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Federal Aid Roads (New Agreement Authorisation) Act Amendment Bill.

BILL—FAIR RENTS.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th September.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [4.37]: I felt very glad when I noticed that the Minister had discarded his 1936 Bill in favour of one containing more of the requirements of the Municipal Councils concerned. I appreciate the difficulty which confronted the Minister. He found that last year's measure was altogether too restricted. It left out many desirable amendments that had been suggested by the Municipal Bodies Association and other bodies formed of Municipal councils in the State. The Bill contains about a dozen new clauses, together with about half-a-dozen very desirable amendments to the Act. The Bill, I am sorry to say, will require very drastic amendment. Even so, I think it can be regarded as a very sound basis on which to build the new Act. The statute under discussion is old enough to warrant an overhaul, and amendment along drastic lines, but not necessarily in the manner desired by the Minister. Although it is old it is not nearly the oldest of our statutes. I make bold to say, however, it is the most obsolete of all. The reason for that is well known to members. I believe it has been out of print for the last 20 years for the reason that this House has not been able to compose its differences in respect to the plural voting issue. The age of the Act is indicated by the names of certain of the municipalities that are enumerated in the Schedule. We find there such names as Bulong, Mt. Morgans, Menzies, Cossack, Newcastle, and others more or less suggestive of the bygone age, so far as our brief history goes. We also find frequent references to cabriolets, hackney coaches, stage coaches, and other old time methods of transport. Next to the Criminal Code this is, I believe the largest of our statutes, containing as it does some 530 sections and extending over nearly 200 pages. In the ordinary way a genuine overhaul of such a statute would be a long and formidable task. In the circumstances, however, it need not be so. During the past 18 months I understand that the Municipal Councils Association and municipalities within the metropolitan area, have had a number of meetings and de-

cided, generally unanimously, on the amendments they consider best suited to their needs. It will be conceded that no one is better qualified than the municipalities themselves for the task of advising on amendments to the statute. They know precisely what they should have, and know exactly what they will not have. They should not have amendments forced upon them by this House for political reasons. I would draw the attention of the Minister and members to a speech delivered by the Minister at Bassendean in June or July of 1936. Speaking then on the Bill that was pending to amend the Municipal Corporations Act the Minister said there would be no strings to the Bill; it would be a genuine attempt to amend the Act. The municipal world understood, and was justified in coming to that understanding, that the Minister, by his reference to strings meant he would not tie up the Bill to the plural voting issue. It is very plain, however, that we are disillusioned on that point, because the many plural voting amendments may almost be said to form one of the main features of the measure. It is possible, however, that the Minister will not insist that an acceptance of the one ratepayer one-vote principle is essential to the success of the Bill. I prefer to think he will keep faith with his Bassendean declaration, which was to the effect that an improvement in the Act was the principal objective. I believe that the plural voting clauses in the Bill were included by the Minister only for the sake of consistency, and it may be as some gesture of regard for a one-time colleague who probably was the only man in the State who permitted the question of plural voting to worry him. Members will understand that no disrespect is intended to our late friend by any reference that may be made to his opinions on this point. I have always had a very high regard for the late Mr. McCallum, and in particular for that insistence at which we were wont frequently to grumble in this House. When the Minister for Works set about to construct this Bill he quite properly got into touch with the Municipal Bodies' Association, and the officers of the Perth City Council and other municipal bodies in the metropolitan area. These municipalities very readily responded with a carefully drawn up list of amendments that were best suited to their needs. Many of these amendments are contained in the Bill, and will be found, perhaps in their entirety, acceptable to the House. I should like to express my pleasure that at long last municipalities are to be given power effectively to control building operations. I believe that when the 1936 Bill was mooted, the Perth City Council set about constructing a new set of by-laws in anticipation of its being passed. Those by-laws, I am informed, have been ready for the printer for nearly a year. Having regard for the pressing need for such by-laws, and for the great amount of building that has been taking place in Perth during the last two years, it is a pity that in December, 1936, when the Government decided to suspend the Bill, they did not then draft a new one from those by-laws. It is too late now to offer that suggestion, but it would have been a very fine thing if municipalities had had power to frame the by-laws during the time that has elapsed, in place of those they are using and are so out-of-date. The parts of the Bill that are likely to excite strong differences of opinion are those dealing with the plural voting issue. It would be correct to say with regard to that issue, that the Minister has found no sound reason at all for including that very contentious question in the Bill. All members know that no one has asked for that particular change and no one wants it. It will be remembered that in 1933 the principle of one ratepayer one vote was dealt with in two Bills submitted to this Chamber. The principle was hotly contested by members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, and I think I would be correct in saying, judging by the attitude of members on the Government side of the House, that, although it was firmly upheld by the Minister in charge of the Bill, the principle was merely luke-warmly supported by other Government members. It was plain to the House then, and must be plain still, that the issue of one ratepayer one vote was just a pet fetish of the then Minister for Works. Parliament repudiated the theory. Whether the present Minister for Works really supports the theory, I cannot say, but I have always regarded him as something of a diplomat who is generally amenable to reason.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Only sometimes.

Mr. DONEY: I am speaking of my experience of the Minister, and it has always been a very pleasing one indeed.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you must keep your eye on him.

Mr. DONEY: Whether the present Minister for Works, with his persuasiveness and even temper, will achieve success to a greater degree than his somewhat insistent predecessor, remains to be seen.

The Minister for Works: The Bill will be passed quite easily this time.

Mr. Patrick: He is an optimist as well.

Mr. DONEY: It rests entirely with the Minister, for if he proves compliable to our requests, the Bill may go through quite easily indeed. Apart from the feature I particularly refer to, I am glad to admit that the Bill is indeed acceptable. Unless the Minister is pliable, I do not think success will be achieved, no matter who may handle the measure.

Mr. Stubbs: And that is not a threat, is it?

Mr. DONEY: Labour Ministers have pleaded on five separate occasions between 1925 and 1933 for the abolition of plural voting. Each time the attempt failed for the reason that the Government had no case, and because no one, saving only the Minister who introduced the Bill, seemed to have any sense of grievance or to take any interest in the matter at all. Indeed, the only occasion when anyone indicated even the remotest interest in the question, was when the Government wasted the time of the House and the money of the Treasury, by bringing down yet another Bill. I would ask the Minister at this point just exactly what injustice he expects to remove from the standpoint of plural voting, if the Bill be passed intact. I would ask him whether, during the investigations he must have made when framing the Bill, he noticed anything objectionable, unreasonable or corrupt arising from the practice of plural voting, or any ills that would be cured by the adoption of the principle of one ratepayer one vote. If the Minister has found anything of the sort, I hope he will pass on the information to the House. In my opinion, the Minister disclosed his personal attitude towards this particular question when, speaking on the introduction of legislation in 1936, he said—

> I have not taken the trouble to secure elaborate information in respect of the contention that plural voting should be abolished.

The Minister indicated that he was altogether too wise to waste his time upon so futile an errand. I believe the Minister has not changed his opinions during the 12 months that have elapsed since then. It has to be admitted that the abolition of plural voting is, nevertheless, one of the planks of the Labour Party's platform, but members will agree that it is a very obscure plank indeed. One might go so far as to say that during the general elections no one Government supporter offered that principle as an important feature of the issues involved. So the Government cannot pretend that they have any mandate from the people to institute this change. If that be so, they certainly have no right to endeavour, per medium of such a Bill as that under discussion, to foist the principle on the people. During his second reading speech on the present Bill, the Minister for Works reminded the House that New South Wales and Queensland had abolished plural voting. I believe that is so, but very many things happen in New South Wales and Queensland that we would not agree to copy in this State. Though that may be the position, we can quite properly retort that, even if those two States have agreed to the change indicated, it has to be borne in mind that Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia are quite content with the existing order of things and refuse to make any change. The gist of the Government's contention, as I see it, is that the possession of property should not give additional voting strength to the ratepayer. I cannot help feeling that that is altogether an illogical view for a Labour Government to hold. They say, in effect, that one ratepayer one vote means that the adult with property shall have a vote, but the adult without property certainly shall not. That is a very pointed discrimination against the man without property and is, therefore, most undemocratic, besides demonstrating that there is no basic difference between plural voting and the view held by the Government. I remember our old friend, the late Mr. Alec McCallum saying that the present method of voting was resulting in damage to and stagnation in municipal life. He was certainly very wide of the mark in that rather astounding statement, and I know the present Minister for Works would not care to voice an expression of opinion of that description. He knows full well it is not in accordance with facts. We can all agree that local government in this State is a very live, healthy and practical thing with an

absolutely tip-top record. Members will agree that, even by comparison with the Public Works Department, local governing bodies throughout the State do their work inexpensively and well. If only they had an up-to-date Act to work under, their output of work would be substantially better both in quantity and quality. Quite plainly it is the function of the House to give them such an Act as they require, and in the meantime it is absolutely futile to talk about stagnation and so forth in municipal life. Some of the objections to plural voting that have been made in this House by members opposite are without doubt stupid in the extreme, particularly the references made with regard to the age of the principle at issue. As applied to those supporting the existing order of voting, terms used during the debate in 1933, when referring to members on the Opposition side, included "antiquated," "antediluvian," "troglodytes," "Tories," and "crusty Conservatives." Our opponents reckoned that nothing that was old could be of any use. I have heard that view expressed not once, but on scores of occasions by members sitting on the Government side of the House. I would remind my very modern friends on the Government side that with regard to principles, age does not weaken them one tiny bit. For instance, our conceptions of right, truth, justice and decency are themselves about as old as the hills, and we should also reflect upon the fact that the principles that are the foundation of most of the statutes we have passed or otherwise dealt with in this House are themselves just about as old as Adam. Nevertheless, I do not say that on that account anything that is good should not be changed. On the contrary, I say that there should be such change, provided only that we can put something better in its place and that we can prove that what we propose to substitute will be an improvement. I regard plural voting as just legal recognition of the individual's right to protect his assets. I see nothing political about the question at all. Members must know that the principle involved is as old as mankind itself. You, Mr. Speaker, know that the value of a man's assets rises and falls in consonance with the rise and fall of the community where his assets are. I say, therefore, that such an individual is certainly the one man who is likely when he casts his one, two, three or four votes, to do so for the advancement of his own particular district and we must remember that when such a man votes to promote his own interests, he hopes to promote those of his neighbours also. So in such a case no one at all suffers. In conclusion, may I say that I hope the one-man-one-vote contentions will once more fail and will continue to fail until such time as the Government are able to show that their proposals are an improvement on our present system. So far as the rest of the Bill goes, I join with other members on this side of the House in wishing the provisions every success. I recall that the Minister suggested a compromise. I feel that it would be wrong to trade away a principle, particularly a principle the application of which has been shown to be fair and very useful, for certain other benefits. As I say—it may perhaps be an exaggeration—the Government are asking the Opposition to haggle over this principle very much like a couple of Jews haggling over a suit of clothes. I remember the Minister asking that the Bill might be treated on its merits. I and those on this side of the House are ready to do that, but the Minister must first of all disclose what those merits are. Then we shall be glad indeed to discuss them. That is all I have to say. There is a great deal more that perhaps might profitably be said, but the matter has been debated in this House so often that it seems futile to repeat the arguments that have already done duty. I have said sufficient to indicate that I shall vote for the second reading, but will join with my friends in contesting those clauses that suggest a change in the method of voting at municipal elections.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [5.3]: Briefly I wish to say that I shall vote for the second reading, but I hope the Minister will accept some amendments when in Committee. I join with the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) in expressing the hope that the Minister will not take up the attitude of having all or nothing. The amending of the Act is long overdue, and even if the Minister is able to effect only some improvements, I think he should be satisfied for the time being. Also I think that a number of the amendments and of the proposed additional powers to be given to municipal councils and road boards are well worthy of consideration. If I may refer to one or two of them briefly, it is proposed to allow the municipal councils to carry on propaganda in regard to tourist resorts. I think that is very desirable, and I feel that municipal councils will be able to do good

work in that connection. Again, I agree that they should have power in regard to aeroplane landing grounds. There is no other body, no one more interested than municipal councils and road boards in this matter. They are enthusiastic, they have first-hand knowledge, they are very keen on the progress of their districts, and they enter into such matters whole-heartedly. The proposal to give municipal councils authority to control street noises and hawkers and building operations should certainly be granted. One thing that is proposed is that municipal councils should not in future have the power to charge interest on outstanding rates. It appears to me that the ratepayer who pays his rates would not then receive much consideration. The Minister would be wise if he encouraged people to pay their rates, and I think those who do not pay should carry some penalty. I know there are cases where it is difficult for ratepayers to meet their obligations, but there are other cases where ratepayers could meet them, but do not do so. I do not think it unfair that they should carry some penalty for not meeting their obligations. However, we can discuss that in Committee. The abolition of plural voting is not nearly so important as the Minister would have us believe.

Mr. Sleeman: You would not stand for it, would you?

Mr. McLARTY: If the hon. member will listen for a few minutes, he will discover my attitude. I do not think for a minute that the system is at all detrimental to local authorities. Then, if that be so, why should we insist on abolishing it? And I would ask the Minister this: Has he had requests from municipal councils or from electors to abolish the plural voting system? In my district I have never heard the question raised. In that regard the people seem perfectly satisfied to go along under the present Act.

Mr. Doney: You never hear it raised anywhere except in this House.

Mr. McLARTY: Personally I cannot see any reason why a man should not be able to record his vote in a ward in which he has property. It seems to me an injustice to say to a property-holder that he cannot have a voice in regard to a ward in which he has property. Surely the Minister must recognise that it is only a fair thing that a man having property should have some say in regard to it. I know of ratepayers who do hold property in more than one ward, and I think we are perfectly justified in allowing them to have votes in each ward in which they own property. The Minister referred to the Legislative Council and said that even the biggest property-owner has but one vote for that House. That is so in regard to any one province, but there are ten provinces and if a man had property in all ten, he would have a vote in each. Also reference was made by the Minister to the fact that in Brisbane there is no property qualification. That is true, but there is no more heavily taxed city in Australia than is Brisbane, and I have no doubt that it is largely because there is no property qualication there in regard to voting. I do not think it can be denied that those who have property are entitled to some protection; and they can only get that protection through the franchise. We require to encourage people in this country to have their own property. Certainly, when they have property they are entitled to some protection. However, we can argue this in Committee, where I propose to have some more to say. But I do hope the Minister will not adopt the attitude of saying that he is going to have this Bill as it stands, or alternatively he will drop it. Generally speaking, the Bill is a good one, and even if the Minister cannot have it all his own way, I hope he will agree——

Mr. Marshall: You want it all your own way.

Mr. McLARTY: No, certainly not. We will give the Minister every consideration. We want to help the Minister with this Bill, and if he will be reasonable we will assist him to make the measure a very useful one.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [5.10]: I will support the second reading of the Bill, and will also support some amendments when in Committee. So far, the debate seems to be whether we shall or shall not have plural voting.

Mr. Sleeman: To be or not to be!

Mr. BOYLE: Municipal plural voting does not involve any democratic principles at all. Plural voting under the Municipal Corporations Act is to give opportunity for expression of opinion from the man who pays the piper. And the extraordinary part of the position is that, I take it, the object the Government have in bringing down the Bill is to enfranchise the ratepayers generally, that is to say,

the ordinary occupier. In the City of Perth on the municipal roll there are no fewer than 24,500 names, and I venture to say that 70 per cent. of those names represent occupiers, and they have the vote. In very few instances, except those of owner-occupiers of dwellings, do the property-owners have the vote. I know of one instance in the central part of the city where six houses are occupied by tenants and the owner has no vote whatever in the municipal elections. Those votes are all held by the occupiers. I do not quarrel with that, because it is held that the ratepayer, or the rent-payer, in paying his rent also pays the rates. The position under the Municipal Corporations Act is that the tenant has the vote and the owner has no say, or very little say, in the government of the municipality. It is those 24,500 names that return 24 councillors in eight wards. I take the City of Perth because the same circumstances apply practically right through the State. I think this fetish of plural voting is nothing more than a camouflage. It has been suggested that it is of an academic nature. I do not see that, because as a matter of fact the occupier is the man who is exercising the plural vote. The occupier, in many instances, who is not the owner of the property has two votes, and in a few instances he has four. The building powers given under the Bill are long overdue. I am pleased that the Minister has brought down amending clauses to give the municipalities adequate power to deal with the erection of buildings within municipalities. It is apparent that in Perth some of the older buildings in the central portion of the city call for serious attention, and if adequate power be not given to the municipality there can be no improvement shown. Another provision of the Bill I intend to support is that for the abolition of interest on overdue rates. I certainly am not a supporter of unnecessary interest-paying in any particular sphere. I believe there are more economic crimes committed on that score than through any other single factor. Because a person, through circumstances beyond his control, has fallen behind in his payments, it seems thoroughly ridiculous to load him further with interest on the overdue rates.

Mr. Raphael: I am with you there also.

Mr. BOYLE: I am glad to have the hon. member's endorsement; no doubt he will be with me in many other things. Distraint for rates is another question on which I consider the Government have adopted the right attitude. This, of course, has nothing to do with the famous measure that the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) succeeded in getting passed last year. It is a most iniquitous power given to municipalities but not affecting road boards. Where rates are not paid municipalities have the power to put in the bailiff on the tenant who is not responsible for the rates. Although I understand that in Perth, only in two instances have the bailiffs been put in for rates——

Mr. Raphael: But in thousands of instances poor devils of ratepayers have been bluffed by the threat.

Mr. BOYLE: I should say that in many instances——

Mr. Raphael: No, in thousands of instances.

Mr. BOYLE: In many instances such threats have caused a great deal of pain and perturbation to perfectly good tenants who had paid their rent regularly; they have received distraint notices threatening to put the bailiffs in. That is a most iniquitous power to give to any local authority, and I am pleased that the Minister proposes to remove it.

Mr. Doney: At the same time it is a useful weapon in the case of those who can pay and will not pay.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not know that it is. It is only a bluffing power, and I do not think any law can be advanced by giving an authority power to bluff.

The Minister for Agriculture: You will be much safer if you agree with the member for Victoria Park than with the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Mr. BOYLE: So long as I agree with myself I shall be happy.

Mr. Doney: That is a bonny principle.

Mr. BOYLE: I cannot agree with the member for Williams-Narrogin, because I have been to places in the city of Perth where the housewife has been greatly troubled at having received a distraint notice served by the City Council, notwithstanding that her rent book has been a model of rent-paying.

Mr. Doney: I did not say it was generally useful. I said in one instance only.

Mr. BOYLE: While the authorities admit that they have used the power only twice in a number of years, it would be interesting

to know how many distraint notices have actually been sent out. I regret that the Minister did not provide for auditors for municipalities under the same system as applies to road boards, instead of adopting the worn-out system of allowing the ratepayers to vote some dear old chap to the position. For five years I was a councillor and there was one dear old chap against whom nobody had the heart to vote. He was not a very efficient auditor, but he won the election every time. Drastic provision is made for the auditing of road board accounts. All the boards are subject to Government audit by efficient, highly qualified and independent auditors. This benefit is reflected in the 127 road districts. None of those local authorities knows when a Government auditor will descend upon it. Such auditors are armed with full powers. I have met them in the course of their duties and have found them to be most efficient men uninfluenced by any local feeling.

Mr. Raphael: It is not too late for you to rectify that.

Mr. BOYLE: I cannot do it, but I think the Minister would make a first-class job of that clause if he introduced an amendment providing for Government auditors for municipalities.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.22]: I do not propose to say much about the Bill at this stage because, as the Minister mentioned when moving the second reading, it is essentially a Committee Bill. I propose to vote for the second reading because the Bill contains some clauses that will improve local government legislation as applied to municipalities. Particularly do I refer to the clause that proposes to give municipalities increased powers to make by-laws and regulations for the control of buildings. I believe that the City Council has been hampered for a considerable time past through deficient powers in this respect, and has complained that its control of buildings has not been as effective as it should have been. This, I believe, is due to a large extent to a deficiency in the powers conferred on municipalities by existing legislation. Under this Bill a municipality will have power to put into force the new by-laws that were recently compiled with very great care and are at present awaiting an amendment of the Municipal Corporations Act for the necessary power to give effect to them. This will be a very salutary power, particularly for Perth but also for other municipalities. The member for Avon touched on the question of plural voting, which, I agree with him, is a fallacy, though I could not agree with many other things he said. The idea is that the excess voting power is something used by the capitalistic landlord or landowner. Under the Municipal Corporations Act the right to vote in respect of any land is reserved primarily for the occupier. In comparatively few instances in the metropolitan area where, for example, there is vacant land has the owner the sole voting power. If a man owns land in four wards, instead of having eight votes, he might, as the member for Avon said, have no votes at all. The occupier in each ward would have one or two votes, according to whether the rateable value was £50 or over. There are instances that almost show the Act to be most undemocratic, that is, most unfair to people who have invested large sums of money in properties. I could point to one building in Perth—and I am sure there are many others in the same category—worth perhaps £70,000 or £80,000, in respect of which the owner has no vote at all for mayor or councillor. Take a building like that of the A.M.P. Society, worth £100,000 of the money of the policy-holders. That society, by virtue of the suite of offices it occupies, would have two votes for the City Council, and that is the only say it would have in respect of the £100,000 worth of assets in the election of a council. Thus the Act really amounts to this that the voting power is spread amongst the occupiers and does not confer any particular advantage or privilege on the owner or landlord. It means that the man who has property of a rateable value of under £50 has one vote, and a man who pays rent in respect of a property of a rateable value of £100, £200, £500 or £1,000 has but one vote more for the council. To claim that the Act is undemocratic is to lose sight of the manner in which the law operates. I see no reason why the ratepayers who, as one member interjected, do pay the rates, should not have a say, and why there should not be some difference between a man who pays a rent of 5s. a week and a man who pays £50 a week or more. There are some clauses to which amendments will be desirable and in Committee I shall endeavour to persuade members to agree to some variations. I have only one more reflection arising out of the

remarks of the member for Avon. Some local authorities issue their notices in this form, "If these rates are paid before a certain date, you will receive 5 per cent. discount; if they are paid after that date, you will pay the full amount." That has always appeared to me to be a just arrangement under which a man, who pays his rates promptly and saves the municipality some outlay for interest on its borrowed money, receives an advantage as against the man who leaves his rates outstanding, perhaps for years. To charge the same amount at the expiration of a year would be to put the man who struggled to pay his rates promptly on the same footing as a man who lies back, as some landowners, to my personal knowledge, do when they could pay to time. If we abolish the interest on arrears of rates outstanding for one year, thereby giving no advantage to the man who pays his rates promptly, let the Government also abolish the 10 per cent. penalty imposed by the Taxation Department if a taxpayer is a week late in paying.

Mr. Raphael: We are all with you there.

Mr. McDONALD: That penalty may amount to 500 per cent. per annum, and it is imposed quite relentlessly if a taxpayer happens to be a few days late in paying his assessment. If we are going to be consistent, let us abolish that penalty, which is a hundred times more severe than the 5 per cent. interest imposed on the ratepayer who does not pay his rates inside the 12 months.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [5.30]: I intend to support the Bill. The member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) touched on a salient point when he said that the City Council auditors were elected by vote whereas road boards were subject to Government auditors going around from time to time to inspect the books. Before it is too late, the opportunity should be seized to enact a provision that the City Council must go through the same process as road boards in respect of being visited from time to time, and unexpectedly, by a Government auditor. The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) is pleased with the provision giving the City Council powers which at present they do not possess in regard to the erection of buildings. It may repay the Government to investigate various buildings which the City Council have permitted to go up during the past few years. Many of those buildings are absolutely in contravention of the by-laws. London Court is a case in point. That building is not at the specified distance from the boundary, and as regards fire escapes it is a veritable death trap. Parliament should bring the City Council to book for permitting such things to be done. Again, the City Council should be called to account for permitting, by some means or other, the creation of slums in Perth. Certain councillors who have visited the Eastern States have returned here and complained of the state of some of the buildings in Perth. I seized the opportunity to accompany the Town Planning Commissioner in an inspection of some flats. They are an absolute disgrace. One sees two and three gas stoves on the landing stage of a two-storey building. There is absolutely insufficient lighting in those buildings, but the City Council are quite convinced that everything is O.K. If they are not carrying out their job, or if some of the councillors have friends for whom it is O.K. to pass these things, or if an officer is not doing what he should do, Parliament ought to have the right to say to the City Council, as they have said to road boards, "Get out," and put in other people to do the work. Not so long ago we saw a chimney erected in front of Parliament House. It is said that no permit was applied for regarding the erection of the chimney. Further, when it was constructed, it was not constructed in accordance with the by-laws of the City of Perth. Every 20 feet strengthening is supposed to be added in the building of such a chimney. The builder of that chimney, however, put in strengthening only every 25 feet. There was a hullaballoo in the City Council about it. I tried to make the Council stand up to the law and pull the chimney down, which the Council had power to do. However, it had been passed by the Council. The solicitor for the City of Perth happened to be solicitor for the brewery that erected the chimney. The City Council wrote to their solicitor and asked for his opinion, and the brewery people wrote to their solicitor for his opinion. Strange to say, the two opinions coincided, and so the chimney has been allowed to remain.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Should not we hold the Bill up until the Royal Commission you promised has been appointed?

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am prepared to listen to any amendments moved by the hon. member. I do not wish to detain the House, but the Minister would be well advised to investigate many things that are going on. If one attempts to do anything in the City Council,

one is howled down. At all events, I have invariably experienced that pleasure. I am very much in the minority. Plenty of things are going wrong. In the City of Perth and outlying districts many buildings are being erected in violation of the by-laws; but because the parties interested happen to be friends of a councillor, or because a councillor happens to be erecting the building, nothing is said. A certain area is stipulated for a certain building, but that fact does not worry the City Council. That body should have taken action in the past. Not only the present Minister, but previous Ministers, should have known the position and should have forced the City Councillors to carry out the duties imposed upon them by Parliament. I see many things going on that call for the light of investigation. I hope the Minister will at any rate accept the suggestion of the member for Avon with regard to auditing. There will be further opportunities to discuss the Bill in Committee, when I may move some amendments.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [5.36]: As an old mayor of a municipality I desire to offer a few remarks on the Bill. A provision of the measure with which I am particularly pleased is that relating to grass plots. That may seem a small thing, but it can be a fine thing in the metropolitan area. The mayor and councillors of Cottesloe discovered that surveyors in their zeal to correct the mistake of the City of Perth in making roads too narrow, made two-chain roads throughout the municipality. This enormous extent of roads on bare sand becomes difficult to look after in the hot weather. The roads get untidy, and are an absolute eyesore to the town beautiful. The provision enabling people to grow grass along the roads and maintain it is highly necessary. In the past a few people have tried it. Those who go round the city will find here and there a few odd attempts at grass plots, but such attempts are absolutely hopeless unless the whole street co-operates. As soon as that is tried, there is every objection and difficulty in the world. Years ago, when Cottesloe endeavoured to carry out the system, all sorts of vehicles and carts drove over the grass plots night after night. Fences were put up to protect the grass, but got knocked down. There are only a very few streets in the whole of the metropolitan area which are complete in this respect. Just imagine the enormous metropolitan area which, I have been told by land agents, is as large as the City of London in regard to space for homes. I am told that it can house 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 people. If power is taken to have the streets grassed and maintained, it will make a tremendous difference, and may lead to the systematic planting of trees. Up to the present there has been no power to prevent people from driving over grass plots and leaving animals on them. I have seen a cow on a grass patch enjoying herself as if on one of the group settlements. The provision in question is one of the most important and most valuable clauses in the Bill. In an ordinary-sized suburb an enormous area is tied up in the two-chain streets. That width is quite unnecessary to-day. If I had my way I would suggest to this Chamber a clause permitting freehold owners in sparsely settled suburbs, where the streets are too wide, to have some substantial period of time during which they could enclose those idle sand patches and improve them, provided the houses are kept back on the existing alignment. Thus we would achieve streets which could be used. In the suburbs there are enormous idle areas which defeat any attempt at town planning. I do congratulate the Government on having at last brought down this important Bill. I wish it a speedy passage, and I am sure that in the main it will be welcome. I shall not touch the controversial clauses, as they will receive attention in Committee.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [5.42]: I do appreciate that in this Bill the Minister has made provision for repealing the power to municipalities to distrain for rates. In this respect the existing Municipal Corporations Act frequently inflicted injustice, and not always only on the poorer sections of the community. Many city properties are rented by the landlords. It is distinctly unfair that a businessman who is paying a heavy rental and has paid it on the due dates should suffer because the landlord has failed to observe his obligation to the City Council in respect of rates. I observe that the Minister gives what is, in my opinion, a fairer remedy to the City Council in the matter of collecting rates. I hope there will be no attempt to amend that provision. The proposal is to repeal Sections 413, 414 and 415 and the Twenty-first and Twenty-second Schedules of the Act. The clause amending the existing law in regard to absentee votes will, in my opinion, allow of the pos-

sibility of malpractice. Provision is made that the person issuing the ballot paper shall write on it the name and address of the elector. In my opinion, a change is required there. True, it is provided that the elector shall write on the ballot paper the names of the candidates and shall mark them 1, 2, 3 and so on. I consider it would be a greater safeguard if the elector concerned had to sign the counterfoil. That would prevent any possibility of a practice which has taken place, and sometimes on a fairly large scale, in connection with mayoral elections. It has been said—and I think with a certain degree of truth—that in some of the past mayoral elections justices of the peace have been prepared to sign a large number of ballot papers and they have been filled in by some of the parties represented. I recollect on one occasion when I was present at a mayoral election I could not help noticing the very large number of ballot papers that had been filled in by one person. If provision were made that an elector when applying for a ballot paper had to sign a counterfoil kept in the book, it would prevent that practice. The Municipal Corporations Act amendments are long overdue and I support the Bill.

MR. DOUST (Nelson) [5.46]: I do not intend to take up very much time in discussing the Bill, but I wish members to know my feeling with regard to plural voting. There are many ways in which this subject can be viewed. It seems very strange to me that little objection has been made to the provision in the Road Districts Act in which the owner of a property does not have a vote if that property is let to a householder. The householder has prior right to the vote. That is the present law in regard to the Road Districts Act and I think it is proposed to be part of the law in regard to the municipalities. If a man has not the right to have one vote on a property which he has let, how can it be claimed that another has the right to four votes on similar property which is not let? We in this House are elected on an equal franchise. Is that not sufficient to enable municipalities and local governing bodies to create their committees of management to carry out local duties? I think so. I agree with the Government regarding the restriction of the right of each owner to one vote. There may be some justification in allowing a man to have a vote for each ward in which he has property. In the case of a referendum for the raising of a loan in a particular ward, would it not be right for a man to be allowed a vote in the ward in which he lives while he is disfranchised altogether in a ward in which he has other property and in which there is a movement for the raising of a loan? Generally speaking, however, we will get on far better if there is a restriction in the voting power in accordance with the principle of one man one vote. I agree with the new proposal that interest should not be charged on overdue rates. It would be better to allow discount for the prompt payment of rates. If that were done, people would pay rates more promptly and would have a certain advantage over those not paying so promptly. With regard to auditing, I am sorry the Government have not seen fit to incorporate in the Bill the same provision as exists in the Road Districts Act. Ten or 12 years ago I brought this matter up at a conference of local governing bodies in the South-West and I had great difficulty in persuading the local authorities to accept the suggestion that we should have a Government auditor instead of a local ratepayers' auditor. There was a further difficulty later in persuading the Road Board Association of Western Australia to adopt the suggestion, but ultimately it was carried and the department had that placed in the Act and it has been one of the most welcome additions to the Act. It would be of great value to all country municipalities. I should like the Minister when replying to the debate to give reasons for not including some provision for the Governmental auditing of the accounts of municipalities. There will be no difficulty I should imagine, if I judge the feeling of the House aright, in having an amendment drafted to be incorporated in the Bill along these lines. The Minister may have perfectly good reasons for not having adopted the plan and if he has I am quite prepared to bow to his opinion. But from experience I know it is a great advantage to have Government auditors instead of locally elected auditors.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.48]: I intend to support the second reading. On this side of the House we have always supported the second reading of Bills relating

to municipal corporations. It is essential that there shall be a new Act printed as quickly as possible, because the old Act is out of print and in many municipalities it is impossible to get copies for administrative purposes. New members come into municipalities and find great difficulty in obtaining a knowledge of the laws they are expected to administer. I disagree with the member who advocated one man one vote on the ground that that is the practice in this House. The functions of municipalities are so different from the functions of this Parliament inasmuch as the laws of the country affect every individual. If the powers conferred on municipalities under the Act are examined very carefully it will be found that their main duty is to collect money for the purpose of expending it on roads and footpaths in the interests of those who pay the money. The argument has been submitted here frequently that the man who pays hundreds of pounds in the way of rates should have some additional say as to how the money is spent in comparison with the man who pays the minimum amount of 2s. 6d. fixed under the Act. I am sure the member for Nelson (Mr. Doust) would not suggest that the man who pays that small amount should have the same say in the expenditure of the money of the municipality as the man who pays hundreds of pounds. I am disappointed in the Bill. I thought the policy of the Government was to give additional powers to the municipalities. I believe the time is ripe for us to give those additional powers. Continually we have heard from both sides of the Chamber the complaint that in the Eastern States semi-governmental institutions can go on the market and borrow money free of the Loan Council. I had expected that we would make a step in that direction. I am voicing the policy of the Labour Party when I say that I believe in the municipalisation of the utilities provided for people within their particular area. That is the policy of the Labour Party and I believe it is the right policy. The municipalities should control the trams, water supplies and sewerage, and all similar utilities provided for people living within the municipalities. I thought that something of the kind would have been provided in this measure. It would have been a wise step. The Minister might point to the fact that the multiplicity of semi-governmental organisations within the area affected would be difficult to reconcile, but I do not think there would be any great difficulty. If it were made worthwhile we would have a Greater Perth scheme, including the Perth Road Board and other road boards operating within the metropolitan area and we would be able to relieve this State of the responsibility of financing those undertakings which are purely local. Such undertakings in every other State are practically managed by separate boards. In this State, with its small population, the municipalities could similarly control those utilities. In the Old Country is to be found a very sound argument why the principle of one man one vote should operate. There the local authorities control health and education and similar important departments of life, and when such wide scope is given to local authorities, it is only right that the people who are affected by the laws administered by those authorities should have a very liberal franchise. The Minister has not had any applications from local authorities for an alteration of the franchise. If the Minister had said it was proposed to introduce new ideas, whereby local authorities would be given wider powers and whereby the control of water, sewerage, health, education and other things would be transferred to them, he would have had a very good argument, but that is not so. I must qualify the statement that there have been no applications for an alteration of the franchise. I believe Geraldton once carried a resolution along those lines, but when the resolution was carried I understand there was not a full attendance of members of the Council. Generally speaking there have been no demands for an alteration. It is unfair for the Minister to force on the local authorities who give their services in an honorary capacity a law that they do not want.

The Minister for Works: You would not expect a request to come from those conservative bodies.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Would the hon. member say that Kalgoorlie and Boulder and those places were conservative bodies; that Kalgoorlie and Bunbury were conservative?

The Minister for Justice: I should say Kalgoorlie was. They always seem to return Labour members.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes; looking at things to-day I see that they are, of course,

conservative bodies. They return a conservative party, not a democratic party. I was wrong. I will agree with the Minister for Justice. They are conservative.

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am very disappointed in the member for Victoria Park. While the hon. member is outside this Chamber carrying out his duties in another capacity, he threatens the Municipal Council with a Royal Commission. But when he comes here and speaks on behalf of the City municipality, he does not say a word about Royal Commissions, not a word! When the opportunity presents itself in this House, we do not hear anything from him, and then he complains that he has not received support from other members of the municipal council, of which body he is one. Here is the opportunity for him. Let us hang up the Bill until he gets his Royal Commission. I challenge him, through you, Mr. Speaker, to come out with his complaints, if he has any. He has certainly made serious charges against the Perth Municipal Council. Why does he not now move to refer the Bill to a select committee, where he will have an opportunity to justify some of the statements he has made away from the House? I have no time for a man who makes threats and lets the matter end there.

The Minister for Works: What about saying something about the Bill now?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am dealing with the Bill. Anyway, it is very unwise for any of us to take any notice of the hon. member, because we know that the principal municipal body is quite capable of carrying out its responsibilities. I hope the House will pass the Bill, and also agree to the amendments we on this side of the House intend to move. A statement appeared in the paper, and it was never contradicted by the Minister, that amendments to the Act would be introduced, and that those amendments would not have a string on them. I contend there is a string on one.

Mr. Cross: No.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course the hon. member is an authority on every subject.

The Minister for Works: You are inciting him.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I always endeavour to pacify him.

The Minister for Lands: You introduced a jarring note.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If anybody introduces a jarring note, it is the Minister himself. All I have done is merely to challenge the member for Victoria Park, who is always threatening what he proposes to do. If members will give the matter calm and cool consideration, they will realise that there is no demand for the abolition of plural voting. We claim that the man who pays the most should have the biggest say. Regarding the employees of the council, they have very little to complain about. There is an award governing their hours of labour, and this Parliament has been very liberal towards them. Not long ago we agreed to a measure for superannuation. It is my intention to support the second reading, but I ask the Minister to be reasonable, in Committee, towards the amendments we propose to move, and which ought to be made. I regret that the Minister has not given additional powers that Parliament would be justified in extending to municipalities to govern their own affairs; for instance, utilities that are purely municipal.

The Minister for Works: I wish you would define those utilities that are purely municipal.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Water supplies.

The Minister for Works: And would you get them all to agree?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister has made no attempt in that direction. Then again, tramways, and we might not have had the spectacle of having to spend over £100,000 on trolley buses.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is advisable for the hon. member to refer to a subject that is not in the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am merely speaking of giving additional powers to municipalities.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member suggested something that is not in the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: He is just sparring.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister himself can always be accused of sparring.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition had better get back to the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, if you, Sir, will check the Minister for Lands. I intend to support the second reading, and I hope the Minister will not sacrifice the Bill by

refusing to agree to the amendments it is proposed to submit.

MR. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [6.7]: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and to those of other members on the opposite side of the House. The kernel of the Bill is plural voting as against single voting. The other evening we had before us a Bill dealing with fair rents, and in that measure provision was made that the landlord was to be able to set off against the rents the payment of rates and taxes. There was a long discussion, and it was contended that he was not able to do that. To-night the argument is advanced that the owner of property pays the rates. But does he pay the rates? If the argument was sound the other evening of fixing the rent with rates and other charges added, to be paid by the tenant, then, under a Bill such as the one now under consideration, is it not right that the tenant should be entitled to vote instead of the landlord? The arguments used to-night and those of the other evening are inconsistent. The member for West Perth mentioned that very few owners of property did exercise the vote and that it was the occupiers who did so. If that be the case, there can be no argument against plural voting, seeing that the occupier exercises the franchise. The Leader of the Opposition regrets that further power is not given to municipalities, and mentioned that in England the municipal councils enjoy powers not granted to local bodies in this State. But there is adult francise in England. If he wants the extended powers to be conferred on municipal authorities here, then he should support the provision for the franchise to be extended to those people living in a particular area. But what he wants is to stick to the old principle that has done service for so many years. We should make progress with the times, and adhere to the Bill as it has been brought down, particularly with respect to the franchise. That appears to me to be the whole Bill. The man who pays the rent pays the rates, and by virtue of that fact should exercise the vote. Moreover, the rentpayer is vastly more interested in the progress of the district than is the landlord. It is the occupier of the house who uses the footpaths and roads, and we know that in many instances owners of property do not live in the locality. I am the owner of a couple of unimproved blocks of land, and at the last road board elections I was informed that I had three votes. I do not consider I am entitled to three votes; certainly I would be satisfied to exercise one. If local authorities are to have extended powers, every person should have a say in electing the individuals who are to represent them. The same people have a right to elect members to the Legislature. Why therefore should they not be capable of electing members to local bodies? Yet we deny to those who have a right to vote for the Legislature a right to vote for a local authority merely because they do not own property. I trust the Minister will not depart from the Bill in the form in which it was introduced to the House.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [6.13]: It had not been my intention to speak to the second reading of the Bill. As has already been said, the Bill, generally speaking, is one that should commend itself to the House because, as the Minister has informed us, most of the subject-matter is the result of deliberations between the various authorities. I find myself, however, somewhat in disagreement with several members who have spoken.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SHEARN: If I thought that the contention in support of the abolition of plural voting was going to make local government more workable, or reflect more representatively on the administration of the affairs of local authorities, I would support the proposal. For some years I have been personally associated with local government. During that time I have noted the very democratic personnel of the various bodies that are operating particularly in the metropolitan area. I can see no great need in the existing circumstances, nor any real necessity, for an alteration in the present system of voting. The point was very aptly put by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald), and I find myself entirely in accord with his sentiments. If, as pointed out by one member, the ramifications of municipalities were eventually to be extended, as we hope they will be, the necessity might exist for broadening the franchise. Unless the Minister can show there is any real necessity for an alteration, I shall be unable to agree that the time is ripe for a change. I was impressed by the

suggestion thrown out concerning the audit system. Whilst I do not believe it was intended to reflect in any way on those who are now filling the positions of auditors, I think, from my experience, that if the municipalities were to inaugurate such a system as the road boards have, a more satisfactory state of affairs in connection with the audit of accounts of municipal bodies would be brought about. As the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) suggested, perhaps the Minister will yet take that proposal into account. I agree with the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) in his remarks about charges for interest. I know from experience the fallacy of debiting ratepayers with interest on amounts owing. A ratepayer may own a large area of ground, but because of the depression and consequent financial reasons he is unable to meet his obligations upon it. It is puerile to continue to increase, by way of interest, the amount owing, and I am delighted to know that some steps are to be taken to remedy that situation. Generally, the Bill appeals to me, though I trust that some of the amendments that have been suggested will be agreed to by the Minister. I am sure the Minister is sincere in his efforts to give the local governing bodies an Act under which they can perform their functions more satisfactorily than has been possible for many years past. As a member of a local governing body, I know the disadvantages under which such bodies are working to-day. I trust the Bill will be carried with certain amendments that I know will be moved in Committee. With some of these amendments I am heartily in accord. I hope we shall then find that the local authorities are provided with an up-to-date Act which will enable them to function along lines that will be in the interests of the State generally, and will be reflected in the various districts over which they hold sway.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [7.35]: The speeches on this Bill have been commendably brief, and I have no intention of spoiling that sequence of brevity. I will, indeed, endeavour to emulate the example of the member for Maylands (Mr. Shearn). Like the Bill of last year, the greatest amount of criticism levelled at this one has been because of the inclusion of a provision to abolish plural voting. I listened with interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who said he was in favour of the municipal policy of the Labour Party. That was welcome news. I have been hoping for several years that he would abandon his conservatism, and adopt the more progressive ideas propounded by the party on this side of the House. The hopes I had in that direction were raised considerably this afternoon when I heard him make the remark to which I have just referred. In his next breath, however, he informed the House that he was opposed to the abolition of plural voting. The basis of the municipal portion of our platform is the abolition of plural voting. I cannot see how he can be consistent in his statement when he expresses himself in favour of that portion of our platform, and at the same time is opposed to the abolition of plural voting. The more we go into the matter, the more necessary does it seem to abolish that system. Stress has been laid on the fact that because a man pays so much a week in rent or so much a year in rates, he should have a greater say in the affairs of municipal government than a man who pays a lesser amount. In the leading Parliament of Australia there is no such thing as a rates qualification, or anything of that kind. The only qualification required of a man or woman to record a vote for that Parliament is that he or she shall be 21, have been resident for six months in Australia, and be in full possession of his or her faculties. Surely a person who has sufficient intelligence to vote for a man to become a member of the Federal Parliament, which handles millions of money contributed by the taxpayers either directly or indirectly, should be qualified to vote for a mayor or municipal councillor. In connection with the State Parliaments of Australia so long as a person is in possession of his faculties and has attained the age of 21, he can vote for a candidate for the lower House. There is another branch of the State Legislature which possesses a property qualification. I fail to see where we are going to improve municipal work by the retention of plural voting, or injure municipal government, or reduce it to a lower grade, by abolishing that system. Surely we have come to the time when we must recognise that it is not bricks and mortar that count, but flesh, blood and intelligence. That is the idea behind the abolition of plural voting. That the parent Act requires amendment is agreed to by all

parties. I should regret it if the inclusion of the provision to abolish plural voting in this Bill stood in the way of the Bill becoming law. I hope members of the Chamber will set a good example, and not only vote for the second reading, but in Committee will see that these particular provisions are put through, as an example to another place. There is only one other feature of the Bill to which I desire to refer, and that is Clause 36, which proposes to amend Section 335 of the principal Act, which deals with by-laws and the powers of municipalities to make by-laws on certain matters. The Bill purports to add to the powers already possessed by these local governing bodies, and in a sense to make such powers absolute. A danger lies therein. The public do not get sufficient notice of by-laws that are about to be made, and after they are gazetted no notification is given to the people concerned. The result is that as people are ignorant of these by-laws being framed, an injustice is sometimes done. In certain areas particular building by-laws may apply. Take an area where only a certain class of house may be erected. A by-law is put through by the council, and the inhabitants of the area concerned know nothing of it. When they try to put up another kind of building, they find themselves unable to do so and suffer certain penalties. In Committee I will endeavour to secure the passing of an amendment to provide that 14 days' notice shall be given by the municipal council of its intention to make a certain by-law, so that the public may know where they stand. I also intend to move that, when a by-law has been made and notice has been given thereof, it shall not become effective until it has been laid on the Table of the House for another 14 days. When the State Government frame regulations under any Act of Parliament, those regulations must be laid on the Tables of both Houses, and should either branch of the Legislature desire to disallow any of them, power is provided to that end. Municipal government is a very important part of our everyday life. It comes nearer to the hearth and the homes of the people than the State Government, because the municipal authorities handle health and other matters vital to our individual and collective existence. Every action of municipal government enters into close touch with our everyday activities, and if it is imperative for the Government to lay regulations on the Table of the House so as to give an opportunity for revision and consideration, it should be equally mandatory on municipal councils to observe the same conditions. I hope in Committee to secure approval for an amendment to bring about that desirable state of affairs. In every other particular I support the Bill, and I hope that even the Leader of the Opposition will recognise the necessity for abolishing plural voting.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

BILL—NURSES' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 26th August.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [7.47]: The Minister, in moving the second reading of the Bill, said that it contained nothing controversial, and I agree that it does not. At the same time, I cannot follow his reasoning when he said the measure gave additional powers to the Australian Trained Nurses' Association. On perusing the principal Act, I came to the conclusion that all the powers that organisation had, if they had any, were taken away by that Act, under which a board was established for the purpose of setting examinations for nurses who were being trained and for their subsequent registration. Since that time, the A.T.N.A. has existed mainly for the benefit of nurses outside the scope of the Act. The Bill introduces two new matters only. It provides for the registration of infant health nurses who are trained at the King Edward Hospital, and for the registration of those who have trained at the Children's Hospital. In addition, it is set out that if such nurses desire to deal with adult patients they have to undergo a further training of six months. The other main provision in the Bill is that registered nurses shall wear a certain type of cap. There is not much in any one of those provisions. In my opinion, the Act as a whole requires a complete review. When the measure was before us in 1921 we considered it was quite a good piece of legislation, and it did provide that nurses who were trained for the prescribed period should sit for an examination and be registered, but no penalty for non-registration

was included. It has been ascertained that some nurses who have completed their training, have not sat for their qualifying examination, nor have they registered.

The Minister for Health: They could not be registered unless they were qualified.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I propose to provide a penalty to be imposed if nurses after completing their training do not sit for the qualifying examination and if successful fail to register as qualified nurses. In their own interests they should do that, because it will be beneficial to them as practising nurses. It will give them additional standing. I cannot readily agree to infant health nurses being registered under the parent Act. In my opinion they should be registered under the Health Act. When we consider the position we must realise that the Health Act, and particularly Part XII. of that measure which deals with health matters including midwifery, covers ante-natal nursing, and so on. Those are health matters, and there is a clear line of demarcation between the position of a person trained to keep people healthy and that of those who are trained to look after persons when they are sick. We provide for the registration of midwives under the Health Act, and we should also make that provision for the registration of those engaged in ante-natal nursing, as well as in infant health work. Those are purely and simply health considerations. I hope the Minister will amend the Health Act so as to include some such provision. I agree with him that the nurses I refer to should be registered, and we should carry out the provisions of Section 13 of the Act and not permit unregistered nurses to practise their profession in our hospitals. Section 13 definitely states that only registered nurses shall be employed in Government Hospitals or in the Claremont Hospital for the Insane after the passing of that Act. I know it is sometimes impossible to secure the services of registered nurses, and we have had to depend on those that were available. In suggesting that the Minister should agree to amend the Health Act in the direction I have indicated, he will surely agree that it is wrong in principle to amend one Act by means of a Bill to amend another Act. In this instance the Minister proposes to amend the Health Act in a Bill to amend the Nurses' Registration Act. It is difficult in such circumstances to ascertain just exactly what amendments have been made to an Act. No reference will be made to the matter in the index to the volume of statutes. Although the proposed amendment is not a very important one, the principle of amending one Act by means of a Bill that amends another Act is wrong. That class of legislation should not be permitted. There is no association between the Nurses' Registration Act and the Health Act, and, in the circumstances, it is not in the interests of decent legislation to proceed along such lines. As the Minister pointed out, there is not much in the Bill, and I wondered why it had been introduced apart from the fact that nurses trained in infant health work and at the Children's Hospital are not at present registered. The former have to undertake a course extending over three years at the King Edward Hospital, and have to qualify in midwifery as well. Then they have to secure other qualifications that have been referred to. The possession of the three classes of qualification is of great advantage. While the Minister has very little control over the Infant Health Association, which is an incorporated organisation, I hope he will insist as far as he can on that body securing the services of fully qualified nurses. I know he is just as keen as I am to see that that work is carried out effectively, and I hope he will adopt that suggestion.

The Minister for Health: Give the Government a chance to secure their registration.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think they should be registered, but not under the Nurses' Registration Act. They should be registered under the Health Act. The Minister agrees that it is not a matter of the nurses attending to babies that are sick. That is not their function. Rather is it to advise the mothers to seek medical attention for their sick children. Most of the information I have on the subject has been obtained from the Minister himself, so I am on sound ground in agreeing with him there. There is a feeling amongst nurses at present that those who come from the Eastern States after five months' training should not be regarded as qualified for infant health work. I am doubtful whether under the amended legislation those girls can be regarded as qualified for infant health work.

The Minister for Health: They cannot.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think they can, and, at any rate, we should retain such openings in employment for our own nurses rather than import girls from the Eastern States and provide them with those opportunities. I have placed a few amendments on the Notice Paper, and I hope the Minister will give consideration to them, even if he cannot accept them. I have given much thought to the matters dealt with, and I hope to make the Act as effective as possible. At present there is nothing embodied in the Act to compel nurses to register. I do not know what the Minister's idea was when he referred to re-registration. I believe he meant that every girl who had undergone her ordinary training period should be qualified by passing an examination and then should be registered.

The Minister for Health: They cannot be qualified until they pass the examination.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the Act refers to registration and then to passing the examination; the process should be the other way about. All girls who are trained should pass the necessary examination. I agree with the Minister that that course would give the nurses greater security, and it would enable any sick person to know that he was being attended to by a qualified male or female nurse. I shall not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but I hope the Minister will give consideration to the amendments I have placed on the Notice Paper.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [7.58]: I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition wondered what the Bill was about and the need for its introduction. I admit that the annual registration of nurses is desirable, because under present conditions it is very difficult indeed, if not quite impossible, to ascertain what nurses are registered. As Australian nurses have achieved worldwide fame and are in great demand overseas, the need to know what nurses are available locally is pressing. So far as that clause of the Bill is concerned, there is justification for it. I would say there is very good reason for the encouragement of young women taking up this work. It is a very noble work, a very difficult work, a work that calls for skill, industry and personality. A young woman who becomes a nurse certainly becomes a noble young woman and a most welcome young woman in any community. So I say again that the registration of nurses is greatly to be desired. I hope the Minister will do what he can in order to encourage young women to become trained as nurses. But there are other features in the Bill that seem to me to be trivial and of comparatively small moment. The question of nurses' caps is one which will not, I think, cause any great commotion generally. From the days of Florence Nightingale nurses have worn caps, and from the days of Florence Nightingale the same class of caps has persisted, caps with tails, affording a ready home for germs. Those germs are carried about through the hospitals. I won't say the caps are unattractive. As a matter of fact, a nurse is very attractive with or without a cap. I should say it would be doubtful to point to any class or section of women workers that are as attractive and beautiful as the nurses. The Minister for Employment is able to speak authoritatively on this because, in common with most people, he has spent periods in hospital, and I am sure he will support me; and you, too, Mr. Speaker because you have had very great experience in this matter, when I say that so very attractive are nurses that a single convalescent male patient seldom leaves the hospital without making a definite matrimonial proposal to one or more nurses.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member will have some difficulty in connecting all that up with the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, Sir, it is easily connected up with the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: That is all sub rosa, and you should not give it away.

Mr. SAMPSON: I did not intend to bring the ex-Premier into it, but I could not leave him out.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course I have been in hospital.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is nothing to be ashamed of, is it, Mr. Speaker? But these flapping tails of the nurses' caps; the Minister, in this century of medical enlightenment, brings down a Bill to encourage the use of flapping tails on nurses' caps. I must admit I had thought it was not possible for the Minister for Health to astonish me, but he has now done so, and I think that when he looks further into it he will find that he has astonished himself.

The Minister for Health: I would be astonished if I found that the nurses' caps had flapping tails on them.

Mr. SAMPSON: The remarks of the Minister were applicable to nurses' caps.

The Minister for Health: Which have no tails.

Mr. SAMPSON: The tail certainly hangs down over the nurse's shoulders.

The Minister for Health: That is portion of the material; but there are no flapping tails.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is where the material is specially folded over to provide a cap, and is, I acknowledge, a very attractive cap, but from the medical standpoint, a very unsuitable cap. As I have said, in the time of Florence Nightingale no one raised any question about it, but to-day the position is altered, and I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that in certain circumstances infection may be spread by those flapping tails.

Hon. P. Collier: Would you prefer the permanent wave to be seen without any covering at all?

Mr. SAMPSON: No, I agree with the ex-Premier that there should be a cap, but the Minister for Health, in his great anxiety for the senior members of the profession, has entirely overlooked the juniors in the matter of caps.

The Minister for Health: No, I have not.

Mr. SAMPSON: Since the juniors are not permitted to wear caps, what does the Minister propose to provide for them? This is evidently a world-moving subject, a subject that has called for consideration on the part of the Minister. What about the probationers? Are they not to be permitted to wear some approved cap?

The Minister for Health: Yes, they wear it now.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand from the Bill and from the speech of the Minister that there is a feeling abroad in the ranks of the nurses that the juniors should not be permitted to wear the same caps as are used by the seniors.

The Minister for Health: It is not a question of senior and junior, but the unqualified should not wear the same cap as the qualified.

Mr. SAMPSON: As the Minister has now put it, the question takes on a new aspect. Let us give consideration to this matter of the juniors. I say we should do everything we can to encourage nursing. Nurses are greatly needed. There is a shortage of nurses. And now the Minister is going to discourage the probationers by not permitting them to wear the nurses' cap.

The Minister for Health: They do not wear it in any training school in Australia.

Mr. Raphael: You are wrong there, they do.

The Minister for Health: I am not wrong.

Mr. SAMPSON: I should like the Minister, or even the sartorial expert from Victoria Park, to give his consideration to the designing of a cap which could properly be worn by junior nurses.

Mr. Raphael: I will support you in that, anyhow.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think that could be done, and very properly done.

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Mr. SAMPSON: I did not hear what the hon. member said, but I am equally enlightened. If a nurse who is not registered as qualified should wear a cap the use of which is restricted to the qualified nurse, she may be fined anything up to £20.

The Minister for Health: Quite right, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not think it is right because consideration could be given to the provision of a suitable cap.

Hon. C. G. Latham: So it could be. So long as it is not this special cap it is all right.

Mr. SAMPSON: I want to see an approved cap that has been thought out and is attractive.

Hon. P. Collier: Why not appoint a select committee to approve of a cap?

The Minister for Health: And have the hon. member for Swan Chairman of it?

Mr. SAMPSON: If the Minister is seriously inclined along those lines and is prepared to accept the suggestion of the member for Boulder, I am with him and we will have an attractive cap for the probationers.

The Minister for Health: They have a nice one now.

Mr. SAMPSON: I like the enthusiastic way in which the Minister says that, but the Bill is silent in respect to it, and from inquiries I have made there appears to be no definite approved cap for probationers. It might be said that it is of small moment, but if the Minister would focus his mind upon this subject it might have the effect of greatly increasing the number of probationer nurses who, in the course of a few months, would become qualified. The position at present is that the Health De-

partment are continually advertising for nurses. That would no longer prevail. There are many young women anxious to become typistes and to work in offices, but there is a shortage of young women who desire to become nurses. There needs to be more encouragement given them to undertake the work. If one nurse a little more precocious than the rest does wear a cap the use of which is limited to registered qualified nurses, she is likely to find herself in grave trouble. She is liable to a fine of up to £20. I hope the Minister will appreciate this suggestion and do what he can to alter the outlook and encourage young women to take up this profession.

Mr. Cross: Can you tell us what caps they wore when you were on your travels in the South Sea Islands?

Mr. SAMPSON: One is not in hospital when he is travelling in the South Sea Islands.

Mr. Raphael: His eyes were lower than the head in the South Sea Islands.

Mr. SAMPSON: Encouragement is needed for young women to take up this profession. The Act sets out a precautionary clause "that nothing herein shall be construed to interfere with the probationer nurses." That is in the parent Act. The Minister would appear to be guilty of an infringement of the Act which he controls more or less.

The Minister for Health: No, I am not.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think I have shown that the effect of the Bill will be to discourage probationers. No wonder the back benches are concerned; I am concerned myself. The probationer nurses have no sinecure. Their job is a hard one. They have much unpleasant work to do. They are engaged in the army of disease fighters and they do their work wonderfully well. The question whether untrained nurses should be permitted to wear the customary nursing cap or whether this mark of prestige be restricted to seniors of the profession gives rise to a far more important question, namely, should the present style of cap be worn at all. I suggest to those concerned, through the Minister, that consideration should be given to the matter. If the Minister is of the opinion that the cap has no tail, does not flap and is denfinitely a non-carrier of germs, he need not take any notice of what has been said, but I assure him that such is the case, and right down through the ages from the time when nursing became a profession the wearing of these caps has been questionably wise. I admit, and probably this is where the Minister has been led astray, that the wearing of the cap does give additional grace to the wearer, but apart from this feature the cap has little claim to popular use. There are vital reasons why it should be abolished. It is a germ carrier of the first order. It is a survival of the practice of the pre-germ era. By pre-germ era I mean the time before there was a knowledge of germs. The cap has come down from a time anterior——

Mr. Raphael: What category of germ would you come under?

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not going to answer that either. The present-day cap originated in the dawn of medical science and whereas colossal progress has been made in the elimination of germ-disseminating equipment, the cap remains as in the earliest days. I ask the Minister if he considers this matter of any importance; whether he regards it seriously and is he—since he failed to do so in the second reading stage—prepared in the Committee stage to take the House into his confidence and say what is to be done in regard to this matter.

Hon. P. Collier: Is the cap not an attraction to the nurses?

Hon. C. G. Latham: To the nurses and the patients I suppose.

Mr. SAMPSON: It gives the final embellishment of attraction just as one might say a coat gives protection and embellishment to a man. From the medical standpoint it is of no value; in fact quite the reverse. I am looking to others who know more of this subject than perhaps the Minister——

The Minister for Health: I believe there are a lot who know more about it than you do, anyway.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not going to delude myself into the belief that the Minister has disclosed any knowledge.

The Minister for Health: The Bill discloses all the knowledge required.

Mr. SAMPSON: We are continually losing our nurses; they are going overseas where they are greatly appreciated and where they enjoy a great name and fame. There are nurses leaving their homes every day for Singapore and other parts. The Minister may be able to dispute that. I hope he can.

The Minister for Health: I am not attempting to dispute it and I am glad to see

Australian-trained nurses are very much appreciated irrespective of where they go.

Mr. SAMPSON: They are appreciated. That is quite corrrect, but I want the Minister to go further and encourage young women to take up this profession because we are losing the nurses we have and we have insufficient nurses. I keep on saying it. If I say it often enough perhaps the Minister will begin to believe it. We have not sufficient nurses.

The Minister for Health: I know that better than you do.

Mr. SAMPSON: Here is a department spending money to insert advertisements in the "West Australian" calling for approved nurses that cannot be got. This cap business will have to be considered.

Mr. Cross: Do not you think that if we increased the rate of pay, more girls would train as nurses?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, if we increased the pay and reduced the hours. Some years since I was successful in reducing their hours from 56 to 48 per week. That was not a bad start and could be interpreted as meaning that their wages had been increased, because they received the same pay for the lesser hours. I think I have said all that is necessary regarding the caps worn by nurses. I am much concerned about it. I am a great admirer of the profession because, without qualified nurses, the longevity of the human race would suffer severely. We cannot depend upon the registered and qualified nurses alone because we are losing them continually. We must make the profession sufficiently attractive, and there should be no discrimination against the younger women engaged in the profession or, if there is, there should be equal consideration in respect to the class of cap they wear. I hope the Minister will give consideration to the matter. I realise that the cap worn by nurses is a symbol, that it is easy to put on and that it is easily laundered, but in the interests of hygiene, a smaller cap should be worn. It could still be very attractive. In various professions caps are worn. The leaders of religious organisations wear caps. Leaders in defence matters wear caps.

Hon. P. Collier: Waitresses wear caps, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: I admit that, but I do not know whether there is the same danger from tails in that instance, though they are apt to settle in the soup. I propose to leave the matter more or less in the hands of the Minister. I am not satisfied with his Bill. A far better job might have been made of it. I am hopeful that the debate will be adjourned, and that additional amendments will be put on the Notice Paper. The last thing I wish to do is to interfere in this matter, because it is a question for the Minister. I hope he will accept the suggestions made in the spirit in which they have been offered, namely, to assist the profession by the securing of additional probationers.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [8.24]: The time of the House might be saved if I state I have been in touch with the Trained Nurses' Association and that they are anxious to see the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition adopted. I am sure the Minister has the greatest sympathy with the ideals of the nursing profession, and it must hurt him to have all this joking and unnecessary wasting of time about amendments to which, I believe, he will agree. Regarding the cap, I should like to have the word "white" deleted. I have not obtained the opinion of the nurses on this matter, but I know that in some parts of the world trained nurses wear caps of a similar kind, but in colours. Here we would be rather limiting it if we stipulated "white" caps. I think it would be very difficult to protect the cap, because if two inches were added to the length, it would evade what the Minister is trying to protect, or if the size were decreased by two inches it would not meet the position. I have a photograph of the V.A.D. caps which are very similar, except that they have a little string to pass across the back of the head. I trust that the Minister will accept the amendments, because I feel sure a majority of the trained nurses in this State would also approve of them. I support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans—in reply) [8.26]: The debate has produced little that calls for reply. The only real objection by the Leader of the Opposition was to infant health nurses being registered under the trained nurses Act. He wants them registered under the Health Act. To do that, they would have to come under the registration board provided for midwives. If

there is one section of the Trained Nurses' Association that has deserved to come under the fullest qualification of Australian trained nurses, it is the section embodying those employed as infant health nurses. There is still one nurse engaged in infant health work who does not hold the three certificates, but she is the only one and no other will be employed in future. To get such a position, nurses must hold the three qualifying certificates. Under existing conditions, a medically trained nurse who passes her examination can become registered as such. A woman who passes her examinations and becomes qualified as a midwifery nurse, without any medical training, can become registered as a midwifery nurse, but I hope there will be few such cases in future. Personally I do not like giving approval—and there have to be exceptional circumstances before I give it—for the training of a woman to become qualified as a midwifery nurse unless she has had medical training. I do not think it is right. Some nurses with ordinary training become very capable, but I care not how capable they become, they would have been more capable had they first received medical training. When a nurse has to get both medical and midwifery certificates, and in addition a mothercraft certificate, before becoming an infant health nurse, I am not going to place her in the same category. I hope that in the next ten years—it may not be quite that time—the Midwives' Registration Board will be abolished. It was created when the Act was passed to enable midwives to be registered, but at the time at least 80 per cent. who were registered had had no training and held no qualifications whatever. They had never had a day's training. They were registered because they were practising midwifery at the time the Act became law. At that period not quite 20 per cent. of the midwives had had any training. I am pleased to say that the position to-day is reversed. There are over 80 per cent. of these on the midwifery register to-day who have had the training. I hope that within 10 years all of them will have had the training. When that time comes the registration board will go out of existence, and we shall have one registration board to register all sections of qualified nurses. The only other objection taken by the Leader of the Opposition was that the Bill is intended to amend the Health Act. I admit that is so, but I think that is necessary. I do not desire to have one set of conditions applying to one set of nurses, and another applying to another set of registered nurses. All the amendment does is to strike out one line in the Health Act which says no re-registration fee shall be charged for midwifery nurses. If there is one register that we should keep up-to-date it is that register. I want them to re-register every year, and I think they should do so. If this Bill passes every other nurse will have to register every year. If a nurse misses for two or three separate years she can still come back and be registered by paying the ordinary fee of 5s. The amendment of the Health Act in this direction is justified. I hardly know what the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) wants.

Mr. Raphael: He does not know himself.

Mr. Sampson: I have told you.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: He says that caps have been worn since the days of Florence Nightingale. I agree. They have, however, been worn by trained and untrained nurses alike, and that is what I want to stop.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the point.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: This Bill will prevent untrained nurses from wearing the cap of the trained nurse.

Mr. Sampson: What about probationers?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: When they become trained they will wear the trained nurse's cap. Until they become qualified they should not be allowed to wear the trained nurse's cap.

Hon. P. Collier: They are doing so.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) said they were doing it in the Wakefield Hospital in South Australia. I have never been a patient there, but I understand it is a training school for nurses in that State. I am credibly informed that no probationer in the Wakefield Hospital wears the trained nurse's cap.

Mr. Raphael: They waited on me for a month, so I should have a fair idea of what they wear. They do wear the nurse's cap. I have eyes just as the Minister has.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have made inquiries from every State of the Commonwealth, and I had the information direct from that hospital itself. I have it in black and white from the matron, and the doctor in charge.

Mr. Raphael: You are telling an untruth there.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not attribute that to the Minister.

Mr. Raphael: It is a private hospital, and there is no doctor in charge.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: If it is a private hospital it cannot be a recognised training school.

Mr. Raphael: But you say you had a letter from the doctor, and there is no doctor there.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Then it is a very peculiar hospital.

Mr. McLarty: Is there any trained nurse's badge?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: There is. A badge is issued to every trainee who goes into the Perth Public Hospital. She receives a badge from the Hospital, which is a training school. If she passes her examination and registers she gets another badge. The two badges are very similar. The Children's Hospital issues two different kinds of badge.

Hon. C. G. Latham: One is a trainee's badge.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, but badges are not in question. They can wear what badges they like. The Trained Nurses' Association and the trained nurses generally have agitated for these changes for some time. They have been before me by deputation on three or four occasions, urging the necessity for the trained nurse's cap being recognised. Their object was to enlighten the public after a year or two, so that a man or woman who becomes sick and enters a private hospital will know that the case is in the care of a trained nurse. I have seen a maid in a hospital who was called in to assist the nursing staff, and who was put into the uniform of a fully qualified nurse, cap and all. That was not right from the point of view of the public, and is not fair to the girl or the patient.

Mr. Sampson: Why not have an approved cap for the probationer?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: We will get the hon. member to design one. The Trained Nurses' Association are quite satisfied with the cap they have, but they want it to be recognised.

Mr. Sampson: I am speaking of probationers.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The hon. member said this Bill would discourage probationers. I do not agree with him. What would encourage a few more probationers might be to reduce the age at which they can embark in the profession. At one period in this State the trained nurses themselves, the representatives of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association, agreed that trainees should be accepted at the age of 18. I do not come into that as Minister, nor does the Public Health Act nor the Nurses' Registration Act come into it. All that the last mentioned Act says is that the girl must be 21 when she is fully qualified. If she is 21 and is qualified she can be registered. It was agreed to accept trainees at the age of 18. So many applications were received that the local training schools had to put up the age to 21. It was impossible to cope with the number of candidates who were forthcoming. There is now a scarcity of trainees. That can be overcome by reducing the age by one year. That would give us all the trainees we require. If we want sufficient nurses we should have more training schools. I am most surprised at the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) saying that the trained nurses want the amendments put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. They have been to me since the Bill was drafted, and again since the amendments appeared on the Notice Paper. They came first by way of deputation to endeavour to induce me to introduce a Bill to protect the nurse's cap. I agreed to do so. Immediately the amendments of the Leader of the Opposition appeared on the Notice Paper they came to me to protest against them. They declared the amendments would debar infant health nurses from becoming registered under the Health Act.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Here it is in their own writing.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I will not agree to that. The nurses who need the most recognition are the infant health nurses. With one exception all who are doing infant health work are the most highly qualified nurses in the State, and possess three certificates. I am not going to agree to any amendment that will cut them out. I wish them to be registered, just as ordinary qualified nurses are registered, and I am making provision for

that. There is nothing else for me to reply to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3 of principal Act:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I wish to show that under the Bill the Minister will lose control instead of gaining it. The nurses referred to in paragraph (a) do not do all classes of nursing, and therefore I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) the words "all classes of" be struck out and "general" inserted in lieu.

The Minister proposes to deal later with nurses trained at the Children's Hospital and with nurses trained for infant health work. If here he deals with all classes of nursing, there is no need to deal with nursing anywhere else. The Minister said the Australian Trained Nurses' Association had interviewed him after the amendments appeared. However, those who saw him did not speak with the authority of the association's executive. In point of fact, the amendment I have moved was requested by the association.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. The writing on the paper I hold in my hand is that of the secretary of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association, and it states—

To delete "all classes of" and put in lieu thereof "general." The reason for correction is: we ask that the words "all classes of" be deleted and the word "general" be included as "all classes of nurses" may be interpreted to include midwifery, which is governed by a separate Act and register.

I feel that in supporting the Leader of the Opposition I am also supporting the Australian Trained Nurses' Association.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I wish to make an explanation. Originally I thought the effect of this amendment would be to make the clause clearer, but when I submitted the matter to the draftsman of the Bill he said, "Do not agree to that amendment." Thereupon I got another opinion, which differed from my own and that of the draftsman. Thus I am in somewhat of a quandary. I have no objection to the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition provided it will not nullify the Bill. From one source I am informed that such will be the case. I will say now that I certainly intend to adhere to the registration of infant health nurses.

Progress reported.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 26th August.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.48]: This is merely a small machinery Bill intended to facilitate the work of empanelling juries in criminal trials. I have read the Bill, and agree with the suggestion that it will facilitate the work of the Criminal Court. I do not think I need say more, except that I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—AIR NAVIGATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th August.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [9.51]: I feel in a quandary regarding the Bill because it was only a few months ago that I agreed to support the handing over of these powers to the Commonwealth Government. Among those who opposed that proposal was the Minister who moved the second reading of the Bill now before the House.

Hon. P. Collier: They were asking for more power.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is perfectly right. Now I ask myself whether we are right in seeking to over-ride the decision of the people. At the referendum, by a majority of over 10,000 the people of Western Australia refused to hand over these powers to the Commonwealth.

Hon. P. Collier: Not these particular powers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. While I will not pit my knowledge against that of other members, I desire to express my

view on the matter. I contend we are asked to hand over powers to the Commonwealth Government that we will never be able to take back.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Cannot we repeal this legislation?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think that would make any difference because immediately the Commonwealth Government secure the powers we are asked to hand over, under the Commonwealth Constitution our legislation, should we hand over these powers, will cease to have effect. Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act commences—

> The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to . . . . .

And paragraph 37 of that section reads—

> Matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law.

I contend we are handing these powers over under paragraph 37 of the Constitution Act. I have read that Act very carefully and I have not noticed any provision for the taking away of any power once it is handed over to the Commonwealth authorities. Immediately the Commonwealth have control of anything, they are reluctant to hand back that privilege to the States. Looking back over the period since Federation was inaugurated, I cannot help thinking that the operations of the State have been well defined inasmuch as in the early stages the States handed over such powers to the Commonwealth as they themselves determined. The States rightly determined that matter and gave the Commonwealth limited powers. From time to time the Commonwealth have asked for additional powers and the States have either approved or rejected the proposals of the Commonwealth. Now, if I sum up the position correctly—in my own mind I do—the Commonwealth desire to grab these additional powers from the State. It is for the State to give, and not for the Commonwealth to grab or take. I consider the Commonwealth are now seeking to take powers from Western Australia without the State's approval. Right from the inception, the Commonwealth have always sought to take greater powers than the framers of the Constitution intended they should have. I wish to refer to remarks made by the Federal Attorney General, Mr. Menzies, at the conference that was attended by the Minister for Works. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Menzies said—

> Where power is referred by the State Parliament to the Commonwealth, it may very well be that the power once referred cannot be taken away. I know there are differences of opinion among lawyers on that, but one view fairly widely held is that once the power is referred, it is referred permanently.

Hon. P. Collier: That is the general interpretation.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think it is, too. We should remember that Western Australia, at the time other States decided to federate, stood out of the arrangement. Subsequently Western Australia joined the Federation and when later it was decided that a mistake had been made, we found we could not withdraw from the Commonwealth. Even an appeal to the House of Commons and the House of Lords did not give us the result we desired. I am very concerned about handing over these powers. As I pointed out previously, I went on the hustings and advocated the extension of these powers to the Commonwealth. I was more reluctant even then to hand over powers regarding aviation than I was to hand over those relating to marketing, because I believe that at no distant date there will be much competition between transport through the air and that by road. It is useless disguising the fact that in various parts of the world at present aviation, while still expensive, is becoming cheaper. To-day there are two men travelling around Australia in a plane at an estimated cost of 1d. per mile. If it is widely known that such a cheap form of transport is possible, we must appreciate what that will mean. Then again with respect to heavier transport, it must be remembered that everything necessary was conveyed by air from Australia to the gold mines in New Guinea, even to racehorses, cows, pianos and heavy machinery. In aviation to-day they can transport almost anything. So one does not know what really is ahead of us. What we are really concerned about is that we should not have to scrap at great expense our transport system in this State. I want to see the State maintaining sufficient control over aviation. In the Bill before us it is stated that the Act shall come into opera-

tion on a date to be proclaimed, and that, subject to the context, "the Commonwealth Act" means the Air Navigation Act, 1920-36 of the Commonwealth of Australia and, if that Act is amended, includes that Act as amended from time to time. So if we read the Commonwealth Air Navigation Act, which is a very short Act of only two or three clauses and contains even less than the Bill now before us, we find we are binding ourselves to all their amendments in the future. We do not know what those amendments are going to be. And we are also to bind ourselves to any future regulations they may make. The point has been raised that air navigation includes only the control of planes in the air.

The Premier: That is the point.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, that is the point. But examine the Act controlling navigation of shipping. It controls not merely the navigation of ships, but many other things also. After all, in Acts of Parliament we find words used which have a common meaning but are otherwise interpreted when set into an Act of Parliament. It is on account of that I have hesitation over this question. We are binding ourselves to the Commonwealth Act and to all subsequent amendments to that Act.

The Premier: Yes, all amendments.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is so.

The Minister for Works: You must not become confused over this.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: When I look at the marine navigation Act I am convinced that we do not know what the result may be.

The Minister for Works: That is nonsense.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It will be seen that the Act covers much more than navigation, for it controls the carriage of goods along our coast. That itself gives us some reason for concern. The Air Navigation Act of 1920 consists of only four clauses. The first is the short Title, the second is the commencement, in the third is a definition of "territory," meaning Commonwealth territory, and the definition of "convention," meaning the Aerial Navigation Convention that sat in Paris in 1919, while the fourth clause enables the Government to make regulations for carrying out the findings of that convention, and for the purpose of providing for the control of air navigation in the Commonwealth and its territories. That is all there is in the Air Navigation Act.

The Minister for Railways: That is pretty far-reaching.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: How far-reaching?

The Minister for Railways: As far-reaching as the Paris Convention.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is not what is written in the Act, but what is left out. It is on account of that I have some doubt as to what we really ought to do. I turn up the Act dealing with navigation at sea, and I find it deals with all classes of navigation and all classes of shipping. Under its old interpretation the word "navigation" does not apply to the air; even in the newer dictionaries the interpretation of "navigation" as we know it applies only to the sea. I really think there is some necessity for handing over to the Commonwealth some powers over air navigation. For instance, there is the question of airworthiness of planes.

The Minister for Works: It means safety regulations.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. There must be some single power. I do not know whether it was discussed at the conference.

The Minister for Works: It is all there.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: What I should have liked to see would be a board with a Minister of the Crown on that board in order to watch the interests of the State; then a member of the Commonwealth Air Force, to look at it from the purely air navigation side, and probably a representative from civil aviation.

The Minister for Works: That will be done.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Well, if they do that, probably we shall then have some knowledge. After all, such a board to a certain extent could only be advisory, because there would not be uniformity, and that is what we want, namely uniformity in air navigation. That is what the State desires.

The Minister for Works: They want that, to refer new regulations to all the States.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But that would not give us the right to say yea or nay to them. After all, the Attorney-General or the Minister for Defence, whichever has charge of this, will not be there all the time. The difficulty is this clutching hand of the Commonwealth Government stretching out for more power and more control.

The Minister for Works: It will not be the Minister for Defence.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have investigated what control there is over civil aviation now, and I find that wireless on aeroplanes is controlled by the Postmaster-General, that certain other works are controlled by the Minister for the Interior, while still other sections are controlled by the Minister for Defence. So there are three controls in civil aviation. There ought to be more unity there. Surely it would not be very difficult to set up some kind of control that would co-ordinate these factors better than they are co-ordinated to-day. In view of the decision of the people, I believe we have to be very careful with this class of legislation, because we have no rights, and I do not think any member of this House desires it either. I am not speaking against the Bill or of the Government's action in respect of it. I am sounding a note of warning as to what might happen if this Bill is passed as it is. It has been suggested on this side of the House that there be a time limit and that this clause remain in operation so long as Parliament desires it, but that does not overcome the difficulty. Suppose we said that this Act shall remain until Parliament otherwise orders. That is provided for, because we can amend a law. But the question is whether we can touch it if we hand the matter over to the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Works: If we repeal the Act.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: All this is doing is to hand the power to the Commonwealth.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Mr. Menzies says that we cannot get the power back.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I hope I did not leave that impression. Mr. Menzies said it was the general opinion. He did not say what his private opinion was.

The Minister for Works: It was also said that we are able to withdraw the power we give; that we can repeal the Act.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I would like to know whether that is so. I am doubtful about it. I do not think that we have any more authority to withdraw the power from the Commonwealth than Western Australia has to withdraw from the Federation.

The Premier: One is a constitutional matter, and the other concerns an Act of Parliament.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We can hand power over, but there is nothing in the Constitution Act to say that we can take power away again. In paragraph 37 of Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution it is stated that "Parliament may make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to all matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliament the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopts the law." We adopt the law and I can find no provision at all whereby, having once handed over this power, we can take it away. I think we should know how we can. A time limit has been suggested for the operation of the Act of from five to ten years, but once we have handed the power over our law ceases to exist. Section 109 states that "when the law of a State is inconsistent with the law of the Commonwealth the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid." Once having made a law relating to something of which we have handed over the control to the Commonwealth, how can we make a law inconsistent with theirs? It would not be valid.

The Minister for Works: We have not handed over complete power to the Commonwealth, but power to operate this law. We adopt the Commonwealth regulations. You will see the section there. We say the Commonwealth shall police the law.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What has the State got left?

The Minister for Works: It has transport left.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot agree with that. We say in Clause 3 of the Bill—

In this Act subject to the context—"the Commonwealth Act" means the Air Navigation Act, 1920 to 1936, of the Commonwealth of Australia, and, if that Act is amended, includes that Act as amended from time to time; "the Regulations" means the Air Navigation Regulations made and as in force from time to time under the Commonwealth Act; "the Territories" means territories under the authority of the Commonwealth, and includes territories governed by the Commonwealth under a mandate.

Clause 4 states—

The regulations from time to time in force applicable to and in relation to air navigation within the territories shall (except so far as

those regulations are by virtue of the Commonwealth Act and the regulations applicable to and in relation to air navigation within the State of Western Australia) apply, mutatis mutandis, to, and in relation to air navigation within the State.

That means that it will apply within the State as it does interstate.

The Minister for Works: It means that we have that power at present.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The High Court rules that we have. We have power over transport.

The Minister for Works: We have a Transport Act that is not repealed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We do not need to repeal it. We do not need to repeal any law. When we hand power over to the Commonwealth they repeal our laws automatically. We hand over powers by regulation. Clause 5 states—

Where by or under the regulations any power or function is vested in or exercisable by any person or authority for the purpose of the regulations, or any part thereof, the like power or function under the regulations in their application by virtue of this Act shall be vested in or exercisable by that person or authority for the purposes of the regulations in such application.

Clause 6 states—

Any certificate, license, or registration granted, issued, recognised or effected—(a) by or under the regulations in their application under the Commonwealth Act; or (b) by or under the regulations in their application by virtue of the law of any other State of the Commonwealth, and any cancellation or suspension of any such certificate, license, or registration shall in this State have the same force and effect as if it had been granted, issued, recognised, or effected in pursuance of the regulations in their application by virtue of this Act.

There is no reservation at all within our Act. I went on the platform and advocated that people should hand this power over to the Commonwealth, but I raised the point that there was a danger in doing so and that I should like to see a time limit. All we are doing is to enable the Commonwealth to co-ordinate the whole of the regulations dealing with air navigation within the restricted meaning of the word "navigation," and that only; so that when the aeroplanes take passengers or goods or anything else interstate they should be seaworthy and fitted with wireless or whatever else is necessary.

The Minister for Works: We discussed these points, and the Bill is the result.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have read of rulings given by the Attorney-General and of decisions given by the High Court. I know rulings have been upheld sometimes by the High Court, but the regrettable thing is that if rulings are disputed 19 out of 20 of the decisions are in favour of the Federal Government and not of the State.

Hon. P. Collier interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of course they have to let them stand.

Hon. P. Collier: That is why they took the James case to the Privy Council.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They had to take that to the Privy Council. I doubt whether the State could apply to the Privy Council. Our legal friends might be able to advise the House on that matter, or the Solicitor-General might be able to advise the Minister.

Mr. Patrick: The State cannot go without the consent of the High Court.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I doubt whether the State can go to the Council on a constitutional question.

The Minister for Justice: Did not Queensland go a couple of times?

Mr. Patrick: They cannot go without the consent of the High Court.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I hope members will realise just why I got up. I do not desire to prevent the passage of this legislation, but I do want to be careful. I am not prepared to hand over one ounce more power to the Commonwealth Government than they are justified in taking, particularly in view of the fact that the recent decision of the people was against it. The State will never get the power back.

The Premier: We have not given the power to them.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I want the Premier to be perfectly satisfied. We cannot take the power back. I know the Minister is anxious to clear up the point. He has offered to allow me to discuss the matter with the Assistant Crown Solicitor but I have not been able to see him because he has been so busy. No doubt the Premier has discussed this with him. We should not rush this legislation through. It will do no harm if we allow it to rest for a while. We should be very clear about it and obtain the best legal advice possible. When we come to getting legal advice, there will be difficulties.

Hon. P. Collier: No finality there.

The Premier: It all depends who has the last guess.

The Minister for Works: There is no hurry about it; a Bill has not yet been passed by the other States.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister has certainly given me plenty of time to consider the measure, and I have given much consideration to it.

The Minister for Works: We have to exercise care.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We ought to provide that a board shall be set up and that the Minister of the Crown for the time being shall be a member of the board to watch the interests of the State. There should be no frittering away of any of our powers. I know that the Minister was very careful. He could not very well attend such a conference without feeling that members here would be guided by his advice. I feel sure that his position would have been different from mine. He went definitely to oppose the granting of such power, and I was reluctant to hand it over. We never know what is ahead of us.

The Premier interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: On the platform I said that the danger likely to arise from legislation of this kind was that there might be competition with our forms of transport, and we could not afford to scrap them. The people evidently took the Minister's advice and refused to give the Commonwealth the power sought. The only time when the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) and the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) stood side by side on the same platform advocating the one thing with the one voice was the occasion of the memorable meeting in the Town Hall.

Hon. P. Collier: And what a win we had!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Undoubtedly.

Hon. P. Collier: Irresistible power!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I hesitate to think what might happen to the State if there was a coalition between those two members, especially if they obtained a majority of 10,000 over the whole State as they did on the referendum. I shall support the second reading. I cannot do otherwise, but I hope that before the Bill goes into Committee, the Minister will obtain the best possible advice.

Hon. P. Collier: I think your point is well worth raising.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We should ascertain to what extent we can revoke that power, and whether the Commonwealth, under its Act, can interfere with our jurisdiction. Under this Bill we are committing ourselves to all future amendments of the Air Navigation Act and regulations.

The Minister for Works: Safety measures.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Bill does not say so. The Minister does not know how wicked are some of those fellows in the Eastern States. The policy of some people in Australia is unification. I certainly am not a unificationist. I would not give any power to the Commonwealth——

The Minister for Works: You were very rash a few months ago.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, I was not. The referendum had nothing to do with secession. If we ever do secede, we shall take all the powers away from the Commonwealth, so it will not matter what powers we give to the Commonwealth temporarily. If I thought there was any chance of getting out of Federation I would say, "Give the Commonwealth Government this power."

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing Federation.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is closely allied to the subject matter of the Bill. I want to know if in the event of our giving the Commonwealth this power we can take it away again. Had you been in the Chair at the time, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure you would have agreed with me that there is one way of taking the power away.

The Premier: By repealing the Act.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But that would not repeal the Federal legislation or any amendments of it. I reluctantly support the second reading, but we must satisfy ourselves to what extent we shall be able to revoke the power that we hand over.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [9.25]: I consider that practically the whole substance of the Bill is contained in the preamble, which I will read and then voice my protest against the introduction of legislation of this kind, whether by the present or any other Government. The preamble states—

> Whereas at a conference of representatives of the Governments of the Commonwealth and of the States held in April, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven, it was resolved that there should be uniform rules throughout the Commonwealth applying to air navigation and air craft, the licensing and competence of pilots, air traffic rules, and the regulation of aerodromes, and it was agreed that legislation

should be introduced in the Parliament of each State to make provision for the application of the Commonwealth Air Navigation Regulations, as in force from time to time, to air navigation and air craft within the jurisdiction of the State:

If all the States and the Commonwealth are in common agreement regarding legislation of this kind, that legislation should set out clearly what has been determined between the Commonwealth and the States, and the agreement should find a place in a schedule to the Bill. Then we would have an opportunity to ascertain precisely what had been agreed to at the conference and there would be no misgivings as to the actual purport of the legislation introduced.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: And it would be capable of termination.

Mr. LAMBERT: I will deal with that aspect presently. When one peruses this innocent little Bill of such a far-reaching nature, it is interesting to recall Section 98 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act, which reads—

> The power of Parliament to make laws with respect to trade and commerce extends to navigation and shipping, and to railways the property of any State.

To what extent we in our blind innocence are delegating further powers to the Commonwealth is hard to understand. I feel that the wisdom of the people of Australia, expressed by way of referendum only recently, reflected the very great fear of the growing Commonwealth octopus that has been stretching out its tentacles in every direction since the day we embraced Federation, and that it will continue to do so until, as the Leader of the Opposition said, we are reduced to the plight of unification. The people of Western Australia have clearly shown on any and every occasion that they do not desire a further delegation of authority to a central form of government. It is dangerous. One cannot be regarded as a little Australian for saying that the form of government which finds its genesis in Canberra cannot be conducive to the development of this State. The authorities there know little or nothing about it. When we were embraced in the Federal Constitution we were given certain powers. We could deal with our own Customs. After many years the Federal authorities appointed a Commission to inquire into the disabilities from which this State was suffering under Federation. By a majority vote the Commissioners pointed to the remedy, which was to revert to the provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution and regain control of our Customs for the first 25 years on a sliding scale. It must be increasingly apparent to members that every time State Ministers go to the Eastern States some further power is filched from us. It was not long ago when a Premier of Western Australia went to Canberra, and as a result of his visit one of the most important of our institutions, the State Savings Bank, was almost forcibly filched from us. That is a regrettable blot in the history of the Commonwealth. Recently another State Minister went to the Eastern States. So far as we can learn from the preamble of the Bill a common agreement has been arrived at between the Commonwealth and the States. We have a right to know in express words what that agreement is. Merely to ask us to swallow holus bolus something that has been agreed to is not sufficient to warrant us in voting upon it. Everything should be set out definitely for our perusal. We might never get out of this tangle, out of this fence that is being erected around us. When Ministers were called together to deal with the situation known as the financial emergency, the late Mr. Davy visited the Eastern States. He came back armed, not only with an agreement, but with copies of legislation which it was suggested should be passed into law by all the States, and was passed by this House. I shall never be one to give the Commonwealth any more power than they already possess, until we have a clear and proper adjustment, not only of our constitutional relations with the Commonwealth, but until we see where we as a State Parliament are drifting. We do not want to sacrifice any more of our autonomous rights nor delegate any further powers to the Commonwealth Government. The time has arrived when we should say we are not inclined to pass any more legislation of this kind until the Federal Government remedy some of the wrongs from which this State is suffering. Although I have no desire to see the Commonwealth Parliament set aside I do think we should respect our own position. Either we have powers as a State Parliament, powers that we have no right to abrogate, or we have not such powers. Only the other day by an over-

whelming majority the people of this State decided on two big issues by way of a referendum. It cannot be said that the judgment of the people was warped by party divisions or party distinctions. We have it from the Leader of the Opposition that he, the member for Boulder, and the member for Nedlands were on the same platform.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, no!

Mr. LAMBERT: Were on the same platform.

Members: No, no.

Mr. LAMBERT: They were there in a political embrace that has possibly never been known before. Fancy those three hon. members embracing each other.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I was not there.

Hon. P. Collier: He paired with us that night.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the Leader of the Opposition was not there, and he says he was not, to a large extent he was in sympathy with the other two hon. members. The people of the State definitely, and every time on which they have been consulted by a referendum, decided that they were reasonably competent to manage their own affairs. In voting on these questions they were more or less removed from the squabbles and inconsistencies of party politics, and were actuated by commonsense and a knowledge of their own convictions. We know that the evolution of aircraft is ever widening in scope. It is essential, in view of the position of the world's affairs, that there should be some uniform control by regulation or by enactment. By the evolution of aircraft it is possible to challenge all our forms of transport. We have seen far-reaching changes in one decade, and may see many more in the next decade. We should tighten up our legislation in such a way that there can be no doubt in the minds of this legislature. There should be no abrogation of our powers to the Commonwealth authorities. I hope that if hon. members feel more or less inclined to pass legislation stated in the nebulous fashion of the Preamble to the Bill, they will at least see that precautions are taken that we shall never say the Federation shall have unlimited power. Let me recall to hon. members what was done with regard to our State Savings Bank and our power to borrow. We should have some thought for the people who will in time to come occupy Western Australia and will never be able to wrench away from a central form of government. Let us look at the wars waged for freedom. Even within the British Isles wars have been fought for political freedom. Many instances could be quoted to show that where power is delegated to a central Government, wars are needed, and sometimes very bloody wars, to wrench that authority away again. In delegating this power, particularly as the Bill is worded and as it relates to Section 98 of the Federal Constitution Act, we should clearly and definitely, in language that can never be misinterpreted, lay down that the legislation shall operate only from year to year, or from triennium to triennium. As long as this measure is terminable at the will and commonsense of the people of Australia and of the Parliament of this State, I shall be quite satisfied.

On motion by Mr. McDonald, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th September, 1937.

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

QUESTION—POLICE, COMPENSATION.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What are the conditions of compensation applying to the members of the Police Force who are injured in the course