

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 2nd October, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions: Electricity supplies, as to generating cost and charge	1247
Traffic, (a) as to introduction of amending legislation	1247
(b) as to delay in proceeding with charges	1248
Housing, (a) as to special audit of Commission's contracts	1248
(b) as to accommodation for Fremantle family	1248
Building supplies, as to concrete sections, ownership and cost	1249
Water supplies, as to charges to mining companies, Bullfinch and Kalgoorlie	1249
State Saw Mills, as to rumoured consideration of sale	1249
Railways, (a) as to Brookton-Corrigin branch trains	1249
(b) as to increasing freights	1249
Pensioners, as to charge for spectacles	1249
Education, as to extent of accrediting system	1250
Income taxation, as to Government's attitude to Commonwealth proposals	1250
Standing Orders Committee, consideration of report	1251
Bills: Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 3r.	1250
Milk Act Amendment, report	1250
Constitution Acts Amendment, report	1250
Police Act Amendment, 2r.	1250
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com., report	1252
Land Agents Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1252
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1254
Main Roads Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1259
Adjournment, special	1261

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

As to Generating Cost and Charge.

Hon. E. NULSEN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What is the average cost per kilowatt generated?

(2) What is the average price per kilowatt sold?

The MINISTER replied:

For the full year ended the 30th June, 1952, in the metropolitan system:—

(1) The average generating cost was 2.06d. per k.w.h. sold.

(2) The average price received was 2.37d. per k.w.h. sold.

TRAFFIC.

(a) As to Introduction of Amending Legislation.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to bring down legislation this session to amend the traffic laws?

(2) Has the Government given serious consideration to the statement by the committee inquiring into road accidents that "the average motor cycle rider was responsible for 25 per cent. more accidents than the driver of a car or other vehicle"?

(3) If so, what is the Government's reaction to such statement?

(4) What action does the Government contemplate in regard to the recommendation of the committee, particularly in regard to—

(a) drastic revision of the requirements for drivers' licenses;

(b) an adequate and sufficient police patrol force to exercise effective supervision on the roads;

(c) one statutory administration—the Police Traffic Branch—to be responsible for the enforcement of traffic regulations;

(d) all other important recommendations of the committee?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes. The report of the special committee referred to, so far as motor cycle accidents are concerned, was based, in the main, on the burden cast upon the Royal Perth Hospital.

The statement (the average motor cycle rider was responsible for 25 per cent. more accidents than a driver of a car or other vehicle) was based on statistics available for the metropolitan area only. Statistics for country areas not available.

The report stated, "In this State, 627 persons have been killed in the past five years—354 in the metropolitan area and 273 in the country."

(3) The Government has taken action to tighten up certain regulations, and is considering further tightening up.

(4) (a) By "Government Gazette" of the 16th May, 1952, special regulations were promulgated covering the issuing of drivers' licenses. A study of those regulations will reveal an earnest desire to meet the recommendations of the committee.

(b) The first concern is the reduction of accidents and number of deaths in the metropolitan area.

(c) There is no such intention at present.

(d) Since the report of the committee referred to, other reports have been called for and revised and at the present time a special committee is finalising its report into metropolitan traffic problems. All reports will be correlated and appropriate action taken.

(b) As to Delay in Proceeding with Charges.

Mr. STYANTS (without notice) asked the Minister for Police:

In view of the information given to the House on the 18th September last, re delayed charges by the Police Traffic Department against drivers of motor vehicles for alleged breaches of the Traffic Act, such information being, "Some two or three months ago there was a certain delay in presentation of traffic prosecutions but now, with the re-arrangement of staff of the Traffic Branch, which has been necessary through the ever-increasing number of offences, very little delay is likely to occur."—

(1) Does he know that the department is now issuing summonses for alleged offences which occurred as far back as last May and early June?

(2) Because of the inaccurate information given to this House on this matter, will he have the questions asked by me on the 18th September last sent back to the department requesting the true position be outlined for the information of members?

The MINISTER replied:

I ask that this question be postponed, but I suggest that the hon. member talk to me, and I will discuss the whole matter with the Under Secretary and, if necessary, with the Commissioner of Police.

HOUSING.

(a) As to Special Audit of Commission's Contracts.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Premier: Will he request the Auditor General to carry out immediately a special audit of the books and documents at the State Housing Commission, relating to—

- (a) the contracts with Thermoban of Austria for the supply of pre-fabricated houses;
- (b) the contracts with Sandwell & Wood Pty. Ltd. for the erection of those houses;
- (c) the contracts with Sandwell & Wood for the provision and erection of houses produced by that firm, and report generally to Parliament concerning these contracts, and particularly in connection with the following matters:—

(1) Whether the calculated cost of £2,893 per house is reasonably accurate as being the actual cost or whether items of expenditure properly chargeable against these houses have been debited elsewhere, and if so, the particulars of such items of expenditure.

(2) The method in operation in calculating the amounts due to the firm from time to time for progress payments on account of work done, whether a satisfactory plan is used to check these accounts before payment is authorised, and whether the system in use for authorising payments is adequate?

(3) Any instances of authorising officers refusing to sanction payments, the circumstances of such refusals and the amounts involved, and whether made on good grounds, and whether when authority was subsequently given public funds were properly safeguarded?

(4) The stockpile of materials provided by the firm of Sandwell & Wood, with money advanced by the State Housing Commission, and the costing system used when materials from this stockpile are utilised on the firm's contracts?

(5) Any instances of a serious nature wherein it appears there has occurred, or is occurring, a wasteful or careless use of public funds in connection with the contracts under audit?

The PREMIER replied:

I am advised by the Auditor General that the audit of accounts kept under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for the year 1951-52 is proceeding. I shall refer to him the questions raised by the hon. member.

(b) As to Accommodation for Fremantle Family.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is he aware that in the Capel eviction case, the bailiff has been very reasonable and has held his hand, but now informs me that he can hold it no longer?

(2) In view of the statement by the Minister yesterday that he would see what he could do at the Commission, I would like to know what he has done for these people.

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) I discussed this matter with the chairman and the secretary of the Commission this morning, and I understand that Mrs. Capel's sister has a room in her house, and is prepared to take these people in.

BUILDING SUPPLIES.*As to Concrete Sections, Ownership and Cost.*

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the explanation concerning several hundreds of large concrete sections which have lain on State Housing Commission land on the south side of Westminster-st., Victoria Park, for many months?

(2) To whom does the material belong?

(3) Has any public money been paid out in connection with the manufacture or delivery of the material? If so, how much?

(4) Against what account has the expense been debited?

(5) Has the project been abandoned? If not, when is it proposed to commence building operations?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The concrete sections were delivered on the site by the Unit Panel Construction Pty. Ltd. on the instructions of a firm of contractors who had entered into a contract to erect War Service homes. The contractors were unable to execute their contract, which has now been irrevocably cancelled.

(2) Unit Panel Construction Pty. Ltd.

(3) No.

(4) Answered by (3).

(5) Yes—as far as the State Housing Commission is concerned.

WATER SUPPLIES.*As to Charges to Mining Companies, Bullfinch and Kalgoorlie.*

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What water charge will be levied for water used for treatment purposes at the Great Western Consolidated Mine at Bullfinch?

(2) What charge is made for water used for similar purposes in Kalgoorlie?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) As the Great Western Consolidated Mine at Bullfinch will be installing modern treatment plant, the charge for water will be 5s. 1d. per thousand gallons.

This is the price now being charged at Kalgoorlie in similar circumstances for the supply of water to members of the Mines Trust which have installed similar plants.

STATE SAW MILLS.*As to Rumoured Consideration of Sale.*

Mr. HOAR asked the Premier:

(1) Is there any truth in the rumour that the Government is contemplating the sale of the State's saw mills?

(2) Has the Government been approached by any person or company in regard to this matter?

(3) Are any negotiations under way that could have the result of the sale of the State's mills?

(4) If not, will he clearly state the Government's policy in regard to this matter?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) Answered by (1), (2) and (3).

RAILWAYS.*(a) As to Brookton-Corrigin Branch Trains.*

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it proposed to discontinue the running of trains on the Brookton to Corrigin branch line?

(2) If the answer to the above is "no," when is it proposed to schedule the next train on this line?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) No.

(2) Subject to availability of locomotives, services will be resumed within a month.

(b) As to Increasing Freights.

Mr. CORNELL (without notice) asked the Premier:

Is it or is it not intended to increase railway freights?

The PREMIER replied:

This is a matter that is at present receiving my consideration, together with other matters, and an announcement will be made when I bring down the Budget.

PENSIONERS.*As to Charge for Spectacles.*

Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it a fact that her department will no longer meet the cost of glasses for old age or invalid pensioners, when prescribed by a doctor, on the grounds that funds are not available?

(2) If this is correct, does she not consider that economies should be effected in other directions before these people should be deprived of such a necessary service?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) No. The Medical Department is concerned only with the medical needs of patients.

In the occasional instances where the health of the patient depends upon the supply of glasses which the patient cannot afford, they will be supplied as hitherto.

The supply of glasses to pensioners for other than medical necessity, appears to be a matter for Commonwealth Social Services.

EDUCATION.

As to Extent of Accrediting System.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Education:

To what extent, if any, is it proposed to substitute the "accrediting" system for the present examinations of the Public Examinations Board of Western Australia with respect to—

- (a) the Junior Certificate;
- (b) the Leaving Certificate?

The MINISTER replied:

The Public Examinations Board is not under the control of the Department of Education but

- (a) At a meeting of the Public Examinations Board on the 27th June, 1952, it was resolved—

- (i) that schools be given the option of accepting a system of accrediting in the subjects of Art, Domestic Science, Woodwork, Metalwork and Technical Drawing at the Junior Certificate Examination as from 1953;

- (ii) that the Public Examinations Board institute a system of inspection in these subjects for schools accepting the scheme.

- (b) No proposals have been made regarding accreditation in the examination for the Leaving Certificate.

INCOME TAXATION.

As to Government's Attitude to Commonwealth Proposals.

Mr. W. HEGNEY (without notice) asked the Premier:

Has the Government decided what attitude it proposes to adopt in connection with the proposal of the Commonwealth Government to hand back to the States the right to levy income tax?

The PREMIER replied:

This matter is still being investigated by Treasury officers from the various States and no offer, terms or conditions have been received from the Commonwealth. At this stage I can only say that, so far as the Government of Western Australia is concerned, we would want to know under what conditions taxation would be returned to the States before we would accept it.

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (2)—REPORTS.

- 1, Milk Act Amendment.
- 2, Constitution Acts Amendment. Adopted.

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR POLICE (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—Mt. Lawley) [2.45] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to consolidate the Police Act and the amending Acts that have been passed in various years, and to enable the legislation to be reprinted. The Police Act of 1892 and the numerous Acts amending it have for many years been out of print, and there has been a constant and increasing demand for the Act and its amendments, especially by the Police Department, legal practitioners, University students and members of the public. Because of its importance and the nature of the Act, it should be readily available to such persons. The only available copies are to be found in the volumes of statutes which are numerous and cumbersome to any person engaged in court work or working on the Police Acts.

There have been 11 Acts amending the principal Act, the Police Act, 1892, but because of the form of several of the amending Acts—notably the Police Act Amendment Act, 1893, and the Police Act Amendment Act, 1902—a reprint under the authority of the Amendments Incorporation Act, 1938, would not be unsatisfactory.

Hon. E. Nulsen: Does this mean that there will be a reprint of the whole of the Police Act?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: It will be consolidated and then reprinted. I have been advised in that direction by the Parliamentary Draftsman. Reference to the Police Act Amendment Act, 1893, and the Police Act Amendment Act, 1902, already referred to, shows that in the former Act no reference is made to the principal Act, although the two Acts are to be read and construed as one, and no particular number is given to a section number, which is intended to be inserted in the principal Act, in either of the Acts. There are many homeless sections that require to be given homes in the principal Act and to be numbered according to their proper places and subject-matter.

The only satisfactory method of dealing with the position is to obtain Parliamentary sanction of a reprint of the Act as amended from time to time up to date, and this is the main purpose of the Bill. The law, as it exists to date, has not been altered in any way. The only repeals made are consequential on the revision and are simply cutting away dead wood. That is the whole purpose of the Bill. It has at times been suggested that the whole Act should be redrafted, but in my view it would be advisable first to have a con-

solidation and then, at an opportune time, consideration could be given to redrafting the Act and perhaps to separating it into two sections, those provisions dealing with the administration of the Police Force coming within one section and the penal provisions in the other. I am advised that this is the most suitable way of going about the business and I have adopted the recommendation made to me. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. E. Nulsen, debate adjourned.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Consideration of Report.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [2.50]: The report of the Standing Orders Committee is before members and I propose, if it is suitable to the House, to move that each of the amendments be adopted. I will take the amendments separately and in the order in which they appear in the report. The first amendment suggested is to Standing Order No. 80. If members look at that Standing Order they will see that it provides for certain fees which, under that Standing Order, are paid into a fund that comes under control of the House. There is no provision for dealing with the fund if it reaches any considerable proportion. As the Standing Orders Committee has negligible expenses of its own, it seemed desirable to make some provision for dealing with the funds which might accumulate under this Standing Order. Therefore, I move—

That Amendment No. 1, relating to Standing Order No. 80, be adopted.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.
Motion put.

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Speaker, I intended to deal with all of the amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has moved that the debate be adjourned; not the debate on that particular amendment.

Mr. PERKINS: I moved a motion that amendment No. 1, relating to Standing Order No. 80, be adopted. I thought that the Leader of the Opposition had moved that the debate on that particular motion be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will put the motion again.

Motion negatived.

The Premier: Why does not the Leader of the Opposition wait until the hon. member has introduced all of his amendments?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I do not mind that.

Mr. PERKINS: Then I will proceed to discuss all of the amendments suggested by the Committee. I moved the previous motion in order to avoid confusion. There will probably be no discussion on some of the amendments but others may be controversial. For that reason I thought it desirable to take them one by one. If we take them all together, amendments will be moved and it will be difficult to follow them. However, I do not mind how the Chamber deals with it.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Is it not similar to dealing with a Bill that has a number of clauses?

The Premier: That is what I thought.

Mr. PERKINS: Then I will carry on. The next amendment deals with Standing Order No. 109 and I think the explanation set out in the report is perfectly clear. Consequently, I do not think it necessary to give any further reasons. Standing Order No. 218 is the one which provides that a notice of motion cannot be further considered after a period of two hours has elapsed, unless a resolution of the House provides for contrary action. In the opinion of the Committee there seemed to be no reason for retaining that particular provision and it is recommended that that Standing Order be deleted.

The most important amendment recommended by the Committee is the last one in the report and this provides for time limits on speeches. The Committee considered the Standing Orders of other Parliaments in Australia, including the Commonwealth, New Zealand, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania. In all those Parliaments the Standing Orders provide for certain time limits on speeches. I do not propose to go through the provisions of all those Standing Orders but some copies are available if members wish to peruse them. After careful consideration the Committee decided that the Standing Orders in force in Victoria most nearly met the position in this State. Hence the recommendation from the Committee is based on the provisions of the Standing Orders in Victoria.

If members look at the recommendations they will notice that the first is that speeches shall be limited to 45 minutes on any ordinary debate in the House. Then there is a provision dealing with each other type of debate as it takes place in the House. The position in regard to debate in Committee was the most difficult with which the Committee had to deal, and members will note that provision is made for a member's first speech not to exceed 15 minutes, in ordinary circumstances, and all his subsequent speeches are not to exceed ten minutes. However, the Committee does not recommend any limitation on the number of times that a member can speak in Committee.

The Premier: Is that the position in Victoria?

Mr. PERKINS: That is the position in the Victorian Parliament. The Committee gave a good deal of consideration to this particular recommendation and its considered opinion was that some limitation on speeches could be made without unduly affecting the rights of members or cramping them in any way in the presentation of whatever arguments they had to put forward on any particular measure. If the proposal is adopted it could be the means of avoiding a good deal of waste of time which takes place in the Chamber at the moment. The Committee considered that if members knew that there was a time limit on their speeches they would probably present them in such a way as to avoid unnecessary verblage and perhaps make them more attractive for other members to listen to, as well as any members of the public who may be in the galleries. Provision is made for an extension of time in certain circumstances. I think the recommendations are fairly clear and at this stage I do not think it necessary to give any further explanation. I move—

That the Committee's recommendations be adopted.

On motion by Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, debate adjourned.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the previous day of the debate on 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—LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th September.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [3.3]: I support the second reading of the measure as introduced by the Attorney General. I believe it will be welcomed by many hundreds of house-hungry people who are compelled to seek accommodation for themselves and who, under existing circumstances, have no alternative but to place themselves in the hands of certain agents, many of whom are not possessed of the highest and best scruples. When I say that, I am by no means reflecting on long-established land agents who have continued to operate in the metropolitan area and in other parts of the State, because they have established a name and reputation for themselves. It invariably happens, when there is a shortage of any type of goods, commodity or service, that

there is a certain section that will capitalise on the situation, and because of that there are quite a number of land agents in recent years who have set themselves up in business, handling premises available for residential purposes and, to a greater extent, living quarters.

I am aware, as indeed are other members of this Parliament, that all sorts of devices are used against and some extortionate charges are levied upon unfortunate families who are searching for accommodation. In quite a number of cases substantial deposits are required and from time to time a reduction is made in the amount lying to the credit of the applicant, according to a certain formula laid down by the agent. So it could happen that people would have to expend a considerable sum of money because of their dire need of accommodation for themselves and families, the benefit of which is reaped by these recently-established land agents. So because this Bill proposes to broaden the definition of the term "land transaction" to cover houses or parts of houses and other buildings, it will make it possible for some form of control to be exercised over these people who are battering on the unfortunate section of the community that is seeking accommodation.

Under the existing Act, a certain procedure must be followed when a person makes an application for a license and it is an exceedingly simple matter for practically any person to become a land agent. All that is required is for him to get several people to supply him with testimonials, attach a £5 note to the application which requires very little in the way of particulars and, provided that such a person has no police record, he is practically assured of being granted a license. I appreciate that it is rather difficult to lay down in an Act of Parliament, or for that matter in regulations, the qualifications that the majority of us consider an applicant for a land agent's license should have. I am pleased that the Attorney General, with whom I had certain consultations about the Bill, was able to go some of the distance by requiring that a person making an application for a license should be suitable for the position. That could be a very broad qualification, but in any event it is left to the discretion of the court.

It is considered by certain land agents, and I think by the Real Estate Institute, that some qualification should be imposed; some sort of test to ensure that an applicant for a license should at least have some knowledge of the work he is to perform if he is granted a license. After all is said and done, it is possible for land agents to handle, in the course of 12 months, many thousands of pounds and also possible for many honest people to be losers to a considerable extent. But equally it would be possible, on account

of ignorance of procedure, for all sorts of untoward things to happen quite innocently on the part of the land agent. I am disappointed that this Bill has not a safeguard such as is contained in the South Australian Act. A great number of regulations are drawn under that Act to provide for a periodic check of the trust funds of land agents. I am informed that in Western Australia it is more of a rarity than the usual practice for land agents to have their books audited.

In South Australia it is laid down very definitely that once in 12 months the trust accounts of a land agent shall be audited by the Government or by an auditor approved by the Government. In conversation with a well established land agent in the city of Perth I was informed that in the course of 12 months he would handle in the vicinity of £20,000. Experience has shown him, in the same way as it did bankers in bygone years, that there is a call upon only a fraction of that money at any one time, and that there is no control or check whatsoever at the present moment. He informed me it would be possible for him to have a trip around the world spending extravagantly as he went, defaulting in certain funds in the process of course, but until such time as his business was wound up, or he departed this life, there would be no check at all.

But if there were a check, and apparently it worked satisfactorily in South Australia, then I feel there would be some appropriate safeguard for trust funds which are handled and in many cases held by land agents. In 1931 when money and property had a totally different value from that obtaining at present Parliament decided that there should be a fidelity bond increased from the then existing figure to £500 to cover any possible defalcations. It is my intention in Committee, as indicated on the notice paper, to seek to amend the Bill we are now considering to increase that amount to £2,000. The premium to be paid would amount only to a few additional pounds per annum. From memory I think for £500 it cost £3 a year to a land agent. I have no idea, but I should think that a bond of £2,000 could be obtained for something in the vicinity of £10 per annum.

If this is to provide some protection for clients, something along these lines should be done. After all, in almost every case where land upon which there is a building changed hands the value would be considerably in excess of £2,000. In any event, if we translated what the pound was worth in 1931 into modern currency I think £2,000 would be roughly an equivalent figure, because at that time the basic wage was in the vicinity of £3 10s.—if we can use the basic wage as a measure of value for money. Apart from the matters to which I have referred, there is a feeling on my

part that the Bill does tighten up and improve the existing legislation and therefore the Government is to be commended for introducing it.

There is another aspect to which I would like to make some reference and that is with regard to the recognition by statute of the Real Estate Institute. This will permit a representative of that organisation which, from my experience, is most anxious to build up and maintain a reputation for fair and equitable dealing on the part of land agents, to appear before the court, object to licenses being granted, and initiate action which the court in its wisdom could take against any land agent who was not playing the game with the public. Of course the Real Estate Institute would like the provisions of the measure to go further to allow for some test or examination, or some minimum qualification before a person could take out a license to become a land agent.

As stated earlier, there are certain exceptions when we have regard to the registration of building operations for master builders before a person can become a master builder. There are other restrictions which those of us who have had any experience of them would not desire to see extended, particularly if they are obnoxious in certain respects. This is a step in the right direction even though perhaps the Bill does not go as far as many of us would like it to. However, I think it should have a speedy passage in both Houses.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Section 4 amended:

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

That a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—

- (d) adding after words, "five hundred pounds" in lines four and five of paragraph (a) of subsection (3) the words, "until the thirty-first day of December next succeeding the coming into operation of the Land Agents Act Amendment Act, 1952, and thereafter in the sum of two thousand pounds."

The effect of this is to increase the amount of the bond from £500 to £2,000. Those bonds that are current, however, will continue to conform to the Act until the end of December following the proclamation of the amendments; that is when they become law.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause refers to the provision of fidelity bonds. The Bill aims at tightening up the re-

quirements and investigations respecting the suitability of applicants for land agents' licences. The institute is being given the right to object to any person securing a licence who is not considered fit and proper to hold one, and the court is bound to take into consideration the character of the applicant. There are many other positions in respect of which fiduciary relations exist where the occupants are not required to enter into fidelity bonds. In view of all the circumstances, I feel that no increase is necessary.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I support the amendment and disagree with the last statement by the Minister regarding the absence of necessity for a fidelity guarantee. I know of three or four sad cases where people placed their trust in men of reputed good character but nevertheless lost the whole of their life savings. Some of the men of reputed good character who were responsible for those actions belong to the same profession as the Minister and were sent to gaol for their actions. Parliament should make reasonable and fair provision for the protection of people who have dealings with land and estate agents through whose hands thousands of pounds pass in the course of a year. While for the most part those agents are honest, should there be a dishonest one amongst them, he could do incalculable harm to ordinary citizens.

Mr. GRAHAM: Frankly, I do not know what has possessed the Attorney General respecting his attitude to this proposition. Land agents are not required to have any qualifications, or University training, but are just ordinary individuals off the street. If Parliament in its wisdom in 1931 thought fit to make provision for a fidelity bond of £500, surely, in view of the present-day value of money, the amount of the bond should be increased to £2,000.

The Attorney General: You have gone a long way with your proposal.

Mr. GRAHAM: The basic wage has increased about 3½ times since 1931!

Mr. Brady: And £2,000 would not represent the cost of one house today.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. If it were a cash transaction, only one deal would be covered by the guarantee, and there would be no recompense for the unfortunate citizen at all. The bond in that event would afford no protection whatever. Just for the sake of a few extra pounds, the Government should not refuse to afford the extra protection to the public. There should be a minimum guarantee adequate to cover the position. Even if the amendment were agreed to, it must be remembered that half-a-dozen clients might be left lamenting, and the £2,000 would have to be shared between them. Therefore, even the provision I suggest is

inadequate. I trust the Attorney General will reconsider his attitude and withdraw his opposition to the amendment. This is a non-party Bill that has been considered by representative members of all parties from both Houses, and I think members opposite can support the amendment as being quite logical.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	19
A tie		0

Ayes.	
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Needham
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Kelly
Mr. McCulloch	

(Teller.)

Noes.	
Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Doney	Mr. North
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Cornell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: The numbers being equal, I give my vote with the noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 14, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 16th September.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [3.36]: I cannot say that I am enamoured of the Bill and, judging by the manner in which the Minister introduced it, I cannot believe that he was very enthusiastic about it. Seemingly the measure was drafted and sent to the Minister, who introduced it as a matter of course and let it go at that. He did say that the proposals were fairly wide. I agree with him; in fact it is difficult to tell just what the Trust desires. The Minister said he had been advised that, if regulations were made under the existing Act, they might be declared invalid. I should like to know what the Minister thinks of that advice. He did not state it as his own opinion and I do not know whether he agrees with his advisers on that point.

The Minister for Education: I think the wording of the present section is insufficient to guarantee their validity. That is my personal opinion.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: There should be no need to grant such wide powers as are proposed in the Bill. We should be informed exactly what the Trust desires. If the Commissioners wished to prevent the taking of large quantities of alcoholic liquor on to the wharves, there should be no difficulty in framing a regulation to that effect, though I doubt whether any regulation could prevent a person from taking along a bottle or couple of bottles of beer. In my opinion there would be no difficulty on that score and there is no need for the Bill on that account.

Under this proposal, the Trust could do anything. It could prevent the holding of election meetings or meetings in connection with the eviction of people from their homes. A little while ago there was a largely attended meeting on the question of evictions. The amendment will not do any good.

The Minister for Education: Such meetings could be held somewhere else.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Why insist upon their being held somewhere else? Then what about stop-work meetings and other meetings of that sort? Must they be held somewhere else?

The Minister for Education: I did not say we could prevent them, but such meetings could be held somewhere else.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It is more convenient to hold them on the spot.

The Minister for Education: There is no way of stopping that so far as I know.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Some people contend that stop-work meetings are of no use, but we have had eminent lawyers as well as the Arbitration Court stating that the proper meeting is a stop-work meeting because there the real sense of the members can be obtained. It is far better to have properly constituted meetings than meetings held sporadically. Suppose that at the pick-up tomorrow morning the waterside workers decided to discuss some question, should they be told that they must not discuss it there? I cannot see any need for the amendment. Why look for trouble when we have a contented and reasonable body of men? We should not make them discontented by saying they shall not do this and they shall not do that. The world will not be fit to live in presently if things go the way they are.

Collections could be stopped on the waterfront. Money is collected for all sorts of purposes by religious and charitable organisations, and I pay the waterside workers the tribute of saying that they are good givers. It is not necessary to take my word for that. Members can go to any of the collectors—and there are collections nearly every Friday—and they

will be told that the men contribute freely. But under this measure that could be stopped. The Trust could close the gates and say, "There will be no more collections on Fridays." It could stop the sale of papers. There is a waterside workers' paper and there are other papers; and there is the "Tribune." The sale of the "Tribune" could be stopped.

The Minister for Education: That would be a good idea. That is the first good idea you have thought of.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: While I am not very anxious to read the "Tribune," I contend that anyone is entitled to do so if he wishes to. Mr. Speaker has missed quite a lot of what has gone on in this Chamber. Once or twice I have seen the "Tribune" being read on the front bench, and there is no more harm in workers buying the "Tribune" and reading it on the waterfront than there is in Ministers reading it in this House. I do not know that there is any need to prevent even the "Tribune" from being sold. This is a free country and, if a man wants to buy that paper and read it, he should be allowed to do so. I do not object, so long as he does not try to press it on me.

The Minister for Education: That is what would be done on the wharves.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Observe how the Deputy Premier sparked up when I referred to the "Tribune!"

The Minister for Education: I said it was the first bright idea you had thought of.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: People seem to have a "Red" complex these days. Anyone who has a bit of fight in him is classed as a commo. I do not think there is any need to go to all this trouble. If it is the "Tribune" that the Trust is after, I would point out that that paper can be sold a foot outside the gate. So why should its sale be prevented inside? If people want to buy it, let them do so.

Mr. McCulloch: What about the "War Cry?"

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: That is circulated there, and the Seventh Day Adventists' paper as well. I have seen them sold, and quite a number of others.

Mr. Styants: The "Farmer's Weekly?"

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I have not noticed that there yet, but I observe that they are giving that away now. It is sent to me every week.

Mr. Hearman: They might be able to improve you, Joe!

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I do not think there is any need for the Bill. The best thing for the Minister to do is to have it redrafted. He has admitted that it is wide. I do not think he knows what the Trust wants to do. The Bill was sent to him and he introduced it. Let it

be redrafted and let the Harbour Trust tell us what is actually wanted and have that put in the Bill. When I read it, it made me smile because it looked as though it was copied from the arbitration Bill that was before us recently. It contained a provision for regulating, controlling and prohibiting

(a) the entering, or remaining, within the boundaries of the Harbour or any specified part or parts of the Harbour by any person or class of persons, or any thing or class of thing;

(b) the doing or omission of anything or class of thing within the boundaries of the Harbour or any specified part or parts of the Harbour.

Members will recall that the arbitration Bill had much the same provisions.

Mr. Styants: It is a real dragnet.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It seems as though the draughtsmen have an obsession for including all-embracing provisions of this sort. The Minister should have the Bill redrafted and present something that we can understand. I hope it is not intended to try to close the wharves and send soldiers down there. That was tried once before and you, Mr. Speaker, will remember what happened on that occasion. We do not want to have the wharves closed so that nobody can visit them on Sunday afternoons. Thousands of people parade along the wharves at week-ends. I think that you have been there, Mr. Speaker, to inspect the ships and the harbour, and I know you would be very disappointed if you went there one Sunday afternoon and then found the gates locked.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 p.m. to 4.5 p.m.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Before afternoon tea I was saying that I thought the Bill would make the wharves at Fremantle too close a reserve. The Minister is endeavouring to enclose the wharves in a half-inch mesh net instead of giving free access to it. As the fisherman would say, he is trying to catch all the small fish instead of being satisfied with those of decent size. Is there any harm in the Deputy Premier holding a meeting there at any time, if he wishes to do so? I do not think there is. But it might be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that would be prevented from explaining to the waterside workers the housing problems of this State, though there would be no harm in his doing that. The Bill would prevent political meetings and the selling of papers, including religious publications, in that area.

A further result would be that the secretary of the union might not be allowed to address a meeting there. It is a pity that the member for South Fremantle is not present as he knows every inch of the

wharves and everything that happens there. He could have made a worth-while contribution to the debate had he been in this House instead of being laid aside in hospital. About 12 months ago Dr. Evatt came over here and addressed the waterside workers on the wharves but, had this measure then been law, he would first have had to get permission. I do not think it should be necessary for permission to be obtained in such a case.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago people were not allowed to speak on the Fremantle Esplanade unless they first secured a permit to do so. You will recall that the then member for Fremantle spoke there without a permit and, when the authorities tried to summons him, stayed in Parliament House for several days before he found out that they could not serve the summons on him while the House was sitting. The result was, however, that the Fremantle Esplanade was again made free to all and anyone can now address the people there on any subject, which is as it should be.

The Minister is endeavouring to tighten up too much the position at the wharves. If it is only "The Tribune" that the measure is aimed against, why not say so? I do not think the whole place should be tied up. The rights of the people should be protected but, if this Bill is allowed to become law, we may have the spectacle that instead of thousands of people going to the wharves over the week-end to look at ships, the place will be as silent as the morgue. I trust that even now the Minister will decide to lay the legislation aside until it is re-drafted and then tell us exactly what the Harbour Trust Commissioners want. That would be much better than the present wide attack on the liberties of the people. I trust that the Minister will do as I have suggested, and have the Bill re-drafted.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION

(Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling—in reply)
[4.9]: The member for Fremantle has grossly exaggerated the position that could exist if the Bill became law and regulations were made under it. Let me point out that the measure does not do any of the things that I made reference to as being desirable in the opinion of the Harbour Trust Commissioners, or the things that the hon. member has referred to in his flight of imagination. All it does is to empower the Commissioners to make regulations. Therefore the Bill, in itself, does none of the things that have been mentioned but, as I have said, simply gives power to make regulations.

As everyone knows, if regulations of an unreasonable character are made, they have to run the gauntlet of this House, and in consequence, if this House considers them unreasonable, doubtless they would

suffer the fate of other unreasonable regulations which at odd times have been rejected by Parliament. Some weeks ago, when this Bill was first before the House, the Leader of the Opposition raised the question of its phraseology and asked whether it would not be possible to define the type of regulations a little more clearly than they were. On that occasion, the debate was adjourned and the matter has been delayed purposely so that it might be looked into by the Crown Law Department.

The advice is that if we start endeavouring to identify things that we want to do and then something else crops up which we might find necessary or desirable to do, and it is not within the power we have, we have to introduce another amendment to make sure that it can be done. Therefore the officers of the Crown Law Department do not recommend that the wide phraseology of the measure should be altered but that we should rely upon the good sense of the Harbour Trust Commissioners, who hitherto have not displayed any absence of good sense. In the unlikely event of these gentlemen being unreasonable or showing an improper sense of responsibility—a most unlikely occurrence—the regulation would be laid upon the Table of the House and would have to run the gauntlet of Parliament. I am informed that the Bill was deliberately drafted in this way so that the Commissioners might have authority from time to time to do any desirable thing.

So I do not propose to accept the suggestion of the hon. member, having given the same suggestion, along other lines, consideration in the way I have mentioned over the past four or five weeks. I submit that the Harbour Trust Commissioners have shown themselves, in all times past, to be responsible persons, and they have expressed the opinion that they want power to do certain things. They may wish, in the future, because of other circumstances arising, to do certain things, and this paragraph, when it is inserted in the Act, will give them authority to make regulations which will then be tabled in Parliament. The hon. member appeared to think that the premises of the Fremantle harbour, wharves and so on could be used as a sort of bazaar. He indicated that half-a-dozen newspapers are sold there now and that two or three bottles of beer could be taken there now, but that that will not be allowed in future.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I did not say how many bottles of beer could be taken there.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I thought the hon. member did.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I said it would be against the regulations to take down any quantity.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member referred to the several newspapers that are sold there and the political meetings likely to be held. He even suggested that I might like to have a political meeting there. It seems to me that the premises of a place such as the Fremantle harbour should be reserved substantially for the purposes of the harbour, for the loading and unloading of vessels, the handling of cargo, the transport of passengers, and so on, and if anybody wants to purchase those types of goods, or do those things, he is not obliged to do it on the wharves or the premises of the Fremantle harbour. They can be done outside in the normal shops and other places that are suitable for the particular job in mind.

I cannot, therefore, subscribe to the views of the hon. member, even if the Bill purported to do the things which he claims. As I have indicated, it does not do that; it seeks only to give the Harbour Trust Commissioners power to make regulations which may be desirable. If those regulations are unreasonable or improper, they can be disallowed by Parliament. But I am sure members will agree with me that the Harbour Trust Commissioners have never displayed an improper sense of responsibility, or a lack of responsibility, and they are not likely to display it in the future.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Did you say "never"?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I would say "never."

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You are wrong there.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is the hon. member's opinion. The Commissioners of the Harbour Trust come from all sections of the community, and if, as a body, they came to the conclusion that a regulation ought to be made under this section, they would pass it, and if Parliament did not disagree with it, it would be the law of the land. But I am sure that it would not be an unreasonable regulation and it would not improperly restrict the rights of anybody. Consequently, I think the House should pass the second reading of the Bill and complete its passage as quickly as possible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 65 amended:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: As the Minister is not prepared to have the Bill redrafted, I think we should attempt to redraft it here. The Minister said that what I

said is not happening down there, but it could happen. Also, the Minister made the wild statement that the Harbour Trust Commissioners had never done anything unreasonable. I do not know whether he has a bad memory, or was not in the country at the time, but during the first World War the waterside workers refused to load flour that was destined for Germany. Consequently they were debarred from entering the wharves, which were closed and locked. Dog licences were issued for the men working there, and scabs on the wharf took the place of the men who had worked there. Why do not the Commissioners tell us what they want, instead of leaving it open like this? Consequently I move an amendment—

That a proviso be added, as follows:—

Provided, however, that no regulation made under this paragraph shall debar any candidate nominated for a Federal or State Parliamentary election from addressing meetings and/or distributing literature, or any paid official of a trade union from performing the duties of his office, but so as not to interfere with the ordinary performance of the Commission or their servants.

I have been very moderate. The amendment is clear-cut, and I think the Committee should agree to it to prevent the Commissioners from being unreasonable. It is known that trade union officials in their official capacity sometimes become very unpopular with the representatives of the Commissioners because they are trying to do their job in the interests of the employees for whom they are working. I was a trade union official myself at one time and one of the harbour officials said to me, "If the management saw you here you would be thrown out" and I said, "You do your own dirty work; do not let the management do it for you." So I hope the Minister will be reasonable and will agree to the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think it is necessary for us to accept the amendment. In referring to the statement made by the member for Fremantle as to what happened about 35 years ago, I would point out that those actions were obviously taken under Section 65 of the Act, if they were taken as the hon. member suggests, but I have no knowledge of the matter. Paragraph 17 of that section provides for the regulation of the duties and conduct of all persons as well as the servants of the Commissioners who are employed in the harbour. As that paragraph now empowers the Commissioners to make regulations in regard to employees it would not be necessary for them to exercise their authority under this new proposal.

I cannot imagine anybody declining to allow officials of a trade union to perform their duties. However, I am not going to be one who will say to the Commissioners that they have got to allow political meetings at election time and a distribution of political literature on their wharves. As far as I am concerned if they feel it is desirable they can give such permission as they think fit. I do not doubt they have given it in the past, because I do not suppose anybody has held a meeting there without at least notifying the Commissioners and seeking their views. I am not suggesting that the people who hold meetings there are unreasonable, nor am I suggesting that the workers themselves would be unreasonable enough to neglect to inform the representatives of the Commissioners of their intentions in order that there might be a reasonable measure of co-operation. Nor do I intend to impute that any such discourtesy would be shown by the representatives of the Waterside Workers' Union. However, I am not going to say that the Commissioners cannot make regulations if they consider it desirable so to do and that is what the hon. member wants. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: We want to be sure that they cannot do such things. The present-day Commissioners might be all right, but next year we may have Commissioners that are not all right. If there is no chance of their using such wide authority what is the harm in including a provision to prevent them doing so? The Commissioners at present are now empowered to make regulations governing their servants who are working on the wharves and they comprise the majority of those employed at the Fremantle harbour. Some, of course, work for the company, but the biggest percentage are employed by the Fremantle Harbour Trust. As the Commissioners now have the power to make all these regulations I think it is only reasonable to assume that they might not do what they say they will, but if the Minister says they are not likely to do such things there is no harm in the Minister's agreeing to my amendment to ensure that they do not.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	20
Majority against					4

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Needham
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Moir	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Naider
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Doney	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Manning	Mr. Cornell

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Seeing that the Minister has been so unreasonable in not agreeing to make provision regarding political meetings and the activities of union representatives, will he give the Committee an assurance that the collections that are now taken up on the trust's property from time to time will not be interfered with? Representatives of various charitable organisations visit the wharves from time to time to make collections, and should they be prevented from doing so the workers may have a few extra shillings in their pockets but the organisations concerned will feel the loss of the money. The collections are taken up on pay-days, which are usually Fridays, and I would like an assurance from the Minister that there will be no interference with that practice.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am, of course, very sympathetic with the point of view expressed by the hon. member. However, I do not desire the Bill to be amended expressly to deal with that phase, but I will take the matter up with the Commissioners and inform them that it is the desire of members that there shall be no interference with this very legitimate practice.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th September.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [4.35]: I have looked through the Bill and have no objection to its provisions. The only question I would raise is that these could be made to apply to existing highways. The Bill could be made to apply to the Stirling, Albany or Great Eastern Highways. I am not saying that, if that were attempted at some future date, I would raise any objection to it. The highways to which I have referred would probably be made very much safer if the numerous roads leading into them were to be reduced in number. Those who have driven motor vehicles along Stirling High-

way, especially from Broadway in Nedlands to, say, Fremantle, will know that roads intersect that highway every few hundred yards.

There can be no doubt that traffic which comes from the side roads on to the highway constitutes a considerable danger and is probably responsible for many of the accidents which take place at the intersection. It might be possible, in connection with highways such as Stirling Highway, to reduce the number of roads intersecting them by 50 per cent. without putting drivers of motor vehicles to much inconvenience. In many instances they would possibly have to travel a few hundred yards further to get on to the highway, but if the reduced number of points at which traffic might enter the highway were to be efficiently controlled or policed, I think it would make a great contribution to road safety in the future.

The only danger I can foresee to traffic on the controlled access road would arise from the matter of speed. Take the position regarding Stirling Highway, for instance. If the number of cross-roads from which motor vehicles would be permitted to enter the highway were reduced by 50 per cent., it would mean that some motorists would take advantage of the lessened number of intersections to increase their speed down or up Stirling Highway.

Mr. Rodoreda: Some could not travel much faster than they do now.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am inclined to agree with the hon. member. To some extent, it is because of that reason I raise this very point. I have seen motorists travelling along Stirling Highway at very great speeds, even with all the cross-roads that connect up with the highway at present. If the number of roads connecting up with the highway were to be reduced by 50 per cent. then there would, I think, be very grave danger of motor vehicles, that use the highway speeding up, on the average, considerably above what is done at present I think therefore, when the Commissioner of Main Roads and the Government are working out plans in connection with the first highway which would be declared a controlled access road under this legislation, that they would be very well advised to ensure that there would be control in regard to the entry of traffic to such a road, and also much stricter supervision in regard to the speeds at which motor vehicles would use the controlled access road.

Reading this Bill, I think that the suggested system could, in operation, have a lot of merit. I believe it could obviate many of the risks which exist at present because of the fact that our major highways, especially in the metropolitan area, have so many lines of traffic entering them from cross-roads. As a matter of fact,

we have one or two suburbs where the roadways were laid out many years ago—and I have Leederville particularly in mind—and where the road system makes a far greater contribution to road safety so far as vehicular traffic is concerned than do any of the road systems in the more modern suburbs.

In the Leederville district, most of the cross-roads, on reaching Oxford-st., end there. No roadway runs right across Oxford-st., and if one wants to get to the opposite side, one has to turn into Oxford-st. and travel 100 or 200 yards and then turn into another road. That system has always impressed me greatly, because it makes a major contribution to road safety, in my judgment. It might be a good thing if the Minister for Works were to make certain, in consultation with the local authorities, where they are involved, that all new suburbs to be established should be compelled to develop a road system of that kind.

The Minister for Works: This Bill will give us that authority.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Bill will give the Commissioner of Main Roads and the Government authority to develop the road systems that are thought best, and I recommend to the Minister that he keep the Leederville roadway system well in mind, especially where it is connected to Oxford-st., which is a very busy thoroughfare. I have nothing further to say except to indicate again that I support the second reading.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.44]: It seems to me that the Bill should make the traffic position easier, especially in the metropolitan area. I was astounded to hear the figures given by the Minister in reply to a question concerning the number of accidents in Shepperton-rd. From the end of December, 1949, to the present, a period of a little over 2½ years, there were 288 accidents in that locality. I think that is the worst road in the metropolitan area. It does not seem to me that it should be a major highway at all, because there are so many cross-streets. Vehicles travel along Shepperton-rd. at a very great pace. It is only a few yards from the Albany Highway, so vehicles cross over one main thoroughfare and, after travelling a few yards, are on to another. We do not want another 288 accidents in Shepperton-rd. in the next 2½ years, and I hope the Minister will keep that matter in mind.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. D. Brand—Greenough—in reply) [4.45]: I very much appreciate the reception this Bill has had. I think it was readily recognised that it is one that aims at providing a solution of the traffic difficulties that face us today and which, as the member

for Fremantle has indicated, have grown like Topsy, so that the present generation has a very real problem to solve.

Referring directly to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition about the danger of speed on controlled roads, it would naturally follow that the establishment of a controlled access road would imply that speed regulations would be enforced. At certain intervals there would be entry on to the road at a major intersection where a circus, similar to that on the Causeway, would be established. That would have the effect of slowing down the traffic but at the same time would permit a continued flow. I understand it is anticipated that such intersections will be included in some of the roads envisaged.

I will certainly take cognisance of the hon. member's suggestion regarding Oxford-st. as an example of a thoroughfare over which traffic is not permitted to cross. That provides greater security to an extent, because drivers are inclined to pull up before turning into the highway. On the other hand, it could easily mean that, on a very busy highway with a number of rather busy side-streets entering it, greater congestion would be created than would be the case if there were through traffic.

However, these are problems for future planners. It is admitted on all sides that down through the years, because of lack of planning, problems such as that in connection with Shepperton-rd. have had to be faced. There have not been sufficient byway routes to permit of traffic travelling around the busy built-up areas. It is hoped that when a Town Planning Commissioner is appointed in the near future, some of these problems will be faced. This Bill, by virtue of the new provisions it will add to the Act, will enable us to provide greater security on the roads.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Section 6 amended:

Mr. RODOREDA: This clause gives the Commissioner for Main Roads power to declare any road he thinks fit to be a controlled access road. Is Parliament to have the right to disallow such a proclamation, as it has in the case of regulations, or is the Commissioner to be given complete power in this regard?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The power of the Commissioner is subject to the Minister only and—in this my opinion is reinforced by that of the Attorney General—he will make recommendations to the Governor.

Mr. RODOREDA: This is an important step that we are taking and I do not think we should agree to such power being given to the Commissioner. I would like to see included in the provision a safeguard, giving Parliament the right to disallow any proclamation made by the Commissioner. In almost every instance the Minister would agree with the Commissioner, because Ministers get into the habit of agreeing with their technical advisers. I would like an assurance from the Minister that he will examine the clause further with a view to having inserted some safeguard such as I have mentioned.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) : I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 7.30 p.m. on Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 7th October, 1952.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Margarine, as to nutritional values	1261
Housing, (a) as to asbestos quality, building costs and rents	1262
(b) as to requesting answers by Auditor General	1262
(c) as to building costs, Roebourne Superphosphate, (a) as to importation and Italian sulphur supplies	1262
(b) as to cost, etc., of U.S.A. and pyrites sulphur	1263
Hospital Benefits Scheme, as to societies' applications and membership	1263
Traffic, (a) as to delay in proceeding with charges	1263
(b) as to third party insurance premiums, North-West	1264
Native Administration Act, as to introduction of amending legislation	1264
Transport, as to bus and train services, eastern suburbs	1264
Local authorities, as to Loan funds and works	1264
Health, as to handling of foodstuffs	1265
Standing Orders Committee, consideration of report	1265
Bills : Milk Act Amendment, 3r.	1265
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), 3r.	1265
Land Agents Act Amendment, 3r.	1265
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 3r.	1265
Main Roads Act Amendment, 3r.	1265
Constitution Acts Amendment, 3r.	1265
Wheat Industry Stabilisation Act Amendment, Message, 2r.	1265
Fremantle Electricity Undertaking Agreement, Message, 2r.	1266
Fremantle Electricity Undertaking (Purchase Moneys) Agreements, 2r.	1267
Police Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	1268
Coogee-Kwinana Railway, Message, 2r.	1274
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment and Continuance, Message, 2r.	1275
Education Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1277
Adjournment, special	1282

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

MARGARINE.

As to Nutritional Values.

Mr. STYANTS asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has he read in the issue of "The West Australian" of the 23rd September, 1952, the statement from an official of C.S.I.R.O., that the nutritional value of margarine, as usually sold in Australia, is below that of butter?