

He paid a tribute to the management of the C.O.D. in the matter of finance. He was treasurer at the time the Government guarantee was sought. Not only had a State Government guarantee of £300,000 been extended, but it had also been approved that £400,000 be guaranteed by the Government for a trading account to cover working expenses of the canner. He stated that the work and the enterprise of the C.O.D. was a fine testimonial to the success of a well-considered enterprise, and an example that could be followed by other sections of primary producers.

There we have an illustration of a Labour Government in Queensland being prepared to support the primary producers to the extent of nearly £750,000 to help the enterprise. Here in Western Australia we have a company of farmers who, without any assistance from anyone, erected a plant that cost nearly £600,000 and has made tremendous savings for the people of the State. This year alone there will be kept in the State one-and-a-quarter millions of money that would have gone out to buy jute but for the operations of the company. Here we have a Labour Party that since the inception of the company has never failed to work against it as a self-helping organisation.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is a lie. Who introduced the Bulk Handling Act?

Mr. ACKLAND: The Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that what I have stated is a fact.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is a lie. You are narrow.

Mr. ACKLAND: In the first instance we were refused sites on which to build our bins.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Where?

Mr. ACKLAND: In various parts of the State.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is not true.

Mr. ACKLAND: I know it is a fact.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Of course, everything you say is a fact!

Mr. ACKLAND: I know that the Leader of the Opposition was partly responsible for keeping us out of the Fremantle hospital silo. We practically forced the Labour Government to appoint a Royal Commission.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are a humbug.

Mr. ACKLAND: There was such an outcry from one end of the wheat-growing districts to the other that the Royal Com-

mission brought in a verdict that forced the Labour administration of the time to introduce the Co-operative Bulk Handling Bill. The Labour Party had no wish to allow us to handle the wheat, but preferred to have a body of bureaucrats—I cannot find a better word—heads of departments, handling the affairs of the farmers rather than permit them to handle their own without a farthing of expense to the country. I say that the statement made by the member for North-East Fremantle had no substance in fact and that the position is as I have presented it to the Committee.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.24 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 10th December, 1947.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Research station, as to purchase of Kojonup property	2588
Education, as to accommodation for teachers	2588
Bills : Iron and Steel Industry, recom., 3r.	2588
Road Closure, 1r., 2r.	2590
Country Areas Water Supply, 1r.	2593
Agricultural Areas, Great Southern Towns and Goldfields Water Supply, 1r., 2r.	2595, 2611
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 4), 1r.	2593
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 3), 2r., remaining stages, passed	2593
Electoral Districts, 2r., remaining stages, passed	2594
Reserves 1r.	2606
War Service Land Settlement Agreement (Land Act Application) Act Amendment, returned	2606
Milk Act Amendment (No. 3), 2r., Com., report	2606
Commonwealth Powers Act, 1945, Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com., report	2608
Superannuation, Sick, Death, Insurance, Guarantee and Endowment (Local Governing Bodies' Employees) Funds, 2r., remaining stages, passed	2609
Superannuation Act Amendment, 2r., remaining stages, passed	2611
Parks and Reserves, all stages, passed	2611
Egg Production Industry (Trust Fund), discharged	2615
Cattle Industry Compensation, discharged	2615
Resolution : State Forests, revocation, passed	2609

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

QUESTIONS.

RESEARCH STATION.

As to Purchase of Kojonup Property.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE (on notice) asked the Honorary Minister:

(1) Is it a fact that the Department of Agriculture and representatives of the C.S. and I.R. have decided in favour of the purchase of a property for the establishment of a research station in the Kojonup district?

(2) Is it a fact that the property which has received favourable consideration in this regard is well improved, adjoins the township and has been offered at approximately £4 per acre?

(3) Is it a fact that the establishment of this research station is being delayed by the Commonwealth Sub-Treasury representative who refuses to agree to the transfer at the price the vendor is asking?

(4) As the establishment of a research station west of the Great Southern is a matter of urgent importance, is there no action the Minister could take to correct the present absurd state of affairs of one Government Department preventing another Department proceeding with a very necessary project at what, today, is a reasonable price?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The property recommended as most suitable is situated close to Kojonup and is sufficiently improved, but yet contains a sufficient area of uncleared land to suit the requirements of a regional research station.

(3) and (4) The regional research station is being purchased and established by the Commonwealth Government and negotiations between the vendor and purchaser are proceeding.

Representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government by the Under Secretary for Agriculture and myself with a view to finalising the deal.

The latest development in the negotiations is that the vendors asked the Commonwealth Government for a firm offer for the property. This was given on the 8th December and is now being considered by the vendors.

EDUCATION.

As to Accommodation for Teachers.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES (on notice) asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the lack of quarters, either departmental or rental, preventing teachers from obtaining promotion for which they are eligible?

(2) How many such teachers declined promotion during the years 1945 and 1946?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, in a limited number of cases.

(2) 1945, 12; 1946, 11.

BILL—IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, Bill recommended for the further consideration of Clause 4.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Powers of Minister:

Hon G. FRASER: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) be struck out.

Yesterday we were not able to debate the matter dealt with in the paragraph because an amendment had been moved to the latter portion of it and we could not go back to deal with the earlier part. I want members to have an opportunity to decide whether the paragraph should remain in the Bill. Personally I think it should be deleted. We have given the Government power to make advances and so forth and have set the limitation upon the shareholding it can take to 48 per cent. I think that is wrong, and it would mean giving the majority vote to the company. State funds should not be invested under such conditions, and we should be careful to safeguard the interests of the country. If, as some members suggested, it was not right to give the Government authority to subscribe up to 52 per cent. of the capital, as private enterprise would in consequence be frightened off, why should they expect the Government to subscribe under the conditions I have indicated? If it is not good enough for one, it certainly is not good enough for the other. The Gov-

ernment could still make advances and could take security for them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. This is the paragraph which gives the Government power to subscribe, pay for and acquire shares. The mere lending of some money to a company would not mean that the Government would have any say in its management; but if the Government had a shareholding of 48 per cent. it would have a big control over the company.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I support the amendment, but not for the reasons given by Mr. Fraser. My theory is that if the paragraph is retained it will mean the start of another State trading concern. It is not the function of Governments to engage in business; that should be left to private enterprise.

Hon. L. CRAIG: This matter was fully discussed yesterday and the Committee arrived at a definite decision. I am rather surprised at Mr. Latham, because yesterday he favoured the Government's acquiring a majority of the shares of the company.

The Honorary Minister: But that was yesterday!

Hon. C. G. Latham: I also expressed the wish that the Government should not be permitted to have that power.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Today Mr. Latham says that the Government should not embark on trading. The Bill will not create a monopoly, as the Government is prevented from securing complete control. Therefore this enterprise cannot become a State trading concern. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I, too, hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. We must remember that a big industry is involved and that much time and money have been expended on trying to attract capital to Western Australia in order to commence industries such as this. I am still hoping that the clause, as originally drawn, will be restored as the result, perhaps, of a conference between the Houses.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I favour the amendment. I think today, as I thought yesterday, that it is better for the State to keep out of trading altogether, but that if it

should enter this industry it should be given control. The Bill, as amended, does not give the Government that control. In my opinion, it would be in the interests of the State if the paragraph were deleted. There is every possibility that large sums of money will be involved in this venture. Under the Bill, the State will have no control. This is a speculative enterprise involving unlimited liability for the State. We are not justified in passing the Bill in its present form. I support the amendment.

Hon. G. FRASER: My only objective is to protect the public funds of the State.

Hon. L. Craig: You moved for 51 per cent.

Hon. G. FRASER: I did, and I would move for 52 per cent. if it would be carried. I cannot see how the public funds can be safeguarded by limiting the shareholding to 48 per cent. There is as much chance of the Government having control there as the eight of us have in this Chamber against the remaining 22.

Hon. L. Craig: Do you not think it would be a good thing if the Government had 48 per cent. of the Broken Hill Proprietary shares?

Hon. G. FRASER: Even then it would not have a say in the management.

Hon. L. Craig: It would not need to.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	19
Majority against				13

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. C. G. Latham	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. G. Fraser
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported without further amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.55]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (East) [4.56]: I would still like to see the Bill defeated rather than leave Clause 4 as it is. To me it is most extraordinary that for an important utility such as the railways we cannot find sufficient money for the necessary repair work and new materials, but we can for this concern which is not even an investment but a pure speculation. For that reason I take this last opportunity of saying that I sincerely hope the Bill will not pass. I am surprised to know that there are members here who will openly condemn State trading concerns outside, but support them within the Chamber.

Hon. L. Craig: In spite of your 51 per cent. yesterday!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I voted for 51 per cent. and for 52 per cent. because I believe that the State at least should have control. Even so, I would at that time have liked to defeat the clause.

Hon. L. Craig: You did not say so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, I did. I hope that any misgivings I have will, in the interests of the State, not be borne out. It is a completely new departure in the life of the politics of Western Australia for the Government to become a shareholder in any sort of scheme put up to it. Already there is a great deal of interest evinced in this matter in the city. The telephones were ringing hot today as a result of people endeavouring to find out how long the Bill was going to be delayed in this Chamber. Some people are waiting to learn how much money the Government is going to put into this concern because they believe the Government will probably be able to boost the dividends by the use of public money. There will come a day of reckoning when it will perhaps be necessary for the Government to foreclose on this concern because of the advances it will have made under the other paragraphs of the clause we have just dis-

cussed. I appeal to members to consider whether it is wise to pass this kind of legislation. We have for a long time protested against State trading concerns, and this is the worst form of State trading that I can think of. I oppose the third reading.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.0]: I support the third reading. I think that when the amendments which have been passed by this Chamber go back to another place the Government will make alterations to the Bill along the lines I have indicated.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But it is a Government Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the right thing will be done. I am always a gambler, and in this case I am gambling that the original Bill will be allowed to prevail before this legislation becomes law.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

First Reading.

Bill received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.4] in moving the second reading said: This is one of those Bills that have to be dealt with at this stage of each session. This particular measure is for the purpose of closing certain roads. In order that these roads may be closed it is necessary that the requisite authority be provided by Act of Parliament. Clause 2 deals with portion of Hawthorn-street, Perth, which is a "blind end" and which passed to the Crown in the year 1907 with the other roads in the subdivision. In addition at the "blind end" there is a small strip of land 1½ links in width which ran along the edge of the whole subdivision. It was not unusual in the earlier days for persons subdividing large areas to leave a small strip of a link or so to prevent the adjoining holder from having access to the roads in the new subdivision, but where these odd strips now crop up, as in this case, they can be treated only as reserves since the original owners ceased to be in-

terested when all the blocks in the subdivision were disposed of. This particular dead end path of Hawthorn-street, plus the $1\frac{1}{2}$ links reserve, is only 60.5 links wide—that is about 40 feet—and altogether the area is less than the minimum now allowed for a building lot under the town planning control, and consequently cannot be so-d as an entity for a building for residential purposes. Provision is made in the clause to allow of the direct sale in moieties to each of the adjoining holders thus to increase the size of their properties and allow of the derelict land being put to use.

In connection with industrial development at Victoria Park, the land on either side of Suffolk-street has been acquired by separate companies which desire that Suffolk-street be closed. It is intended that a railway spur line be built on the land at present in Suffolk-street to serve the respective companies. The City Council, the Town Planning Commissioner, and the Surveyor General all concur in the proposal. The land in Suffolk-street is the property of the Crown and a sale price of £150 has been placed on it. Provision is made in the clause for a sale to a purchaser at the discretion of the Governor because at this stage it is not definitely known what arrangements the interested companies intend to make between themselves in regard to the provision and use of railway facilities.

The land on either side of that portion of Vaughan-street, North Fremantle, mentioned in the clause, is owned by J. Gadsden Proprietary Limited, which desires to consolidate its works. The company has undertaken, with the North Fremantle Municipal Council, to pay the cost of removal of electric light wires from the part of Vaughan-street and their erection in Irene-street and will surrender a 25-link strip of its property to widen Irene-street and pay the cost of construction. The neighbouring owner likely to be affected by the closure of part of Vaughan-street (Caltex Limited) has given the necessary consent. Several other similar road closures have been effected in the neighbourhood, which was originally surveyed in rather small sections and the requirements of modern business have outgrown the size of the blocks. The Town Planning Commissioner and Surveyor General have concurred.

A Class "A" Reserve has been declared over certain lands within the Subiaco municipality, at Shenton Park, and on which is situated a "lake." That reserve has been vested in the council. The municipality has purchased adjacent freehold lands for addition to the reserve, and the reversion of these lands and their addition to the reserve are being dealt with under the Reserves Bill. Between the existing reserve and the lands purchased by the municipality are a right-of-way and the adjoining part of Centre-street. It is necessary to close such right-of-way and part of Centre-street so that the contained lands, together with the freeholds purchased by the municipality, may all be added to the Class "A" Reserve, and thus be brought to a common basis.

The Subiaco municipality originally owned Swan Location 2123 as a municipal endowment. In the year 1941, the council surrendered portion to the Crown for the use of the Workers' Homes Board, powers having been granted under the Reserves Act, 1939. Lots and streets were surveyed as part of the townsite of Daglish and the subdivision was "published" on the public plans of the Lands Department. This had the effect of creating the roads according to the plan of subdivision. Later, it was decided that the area was better suited for industrial sites, and it was arranged to hand it back to the Subiaco Municipality. A Crown grant was issued to the municipality in 1945 for the area, excluding the roads which had become established by being shown on the department's plans. The municipality desires to have most of the roads closed for inclusion in a scheme of re-subdivision of the area for industrial purposes. It is necessary to secure parliamentary authority to close such roads and grant the land to the municipality on the same footing as the lands already handed back.

The municipality of Bunbury acquired certain freehold lands for a new showground, including the intervening Port and Bampton-street. As the municipality owns all the lands, including the streets, and desires that such shall be used for the purposes of a showground, closure of the streets in question is necessary. The Town Planning Commissioner and the Surveyor General both concur in the proposal.

The municipality of Busselton has recently acquired a number of lots for a housing scheme. The surveyed section of lots is divided by East-street, which itself has no outlet continuing in its own direction nor is it likely to develop to carry traffic, and it serves no useful purpose. The land in the road would serve a greater purpose as two building lots within the council's scheme. The Town Planning Commissioner and Surveyor General concur.

A site for a high school is being provided at Narrogin, and it is necessary to close portions of Keally and Gray streets and a right-of-way, within the area of the school reserve. The Town Planning Commissioner and Surveyor General and the Narrogin Municipal Council have concurred.

Portion of the Burakin townsite and adjoining country was taken for a water reserve. The boundaries of the townsite have already been amended to exclude the portion in the water reserve, but parliamentary authority is necessary to close the unwanted roads and rights-of-way now of no use.

The Railway Department has re-arranged its section-running and established barracks at Yellowdine. In this connection it was necessary to make some adjustments to provide an area of land deemed sufficient for such barracks, and this involved closing a portion of a road for which parliamentary authority is now sought.

The land along the sea front at Rockingham, situated between Hymas-street and the western end of Class "A" Reserve 21487, is of varying and, in some places, extensive width, but is at present all "road" and is known as part of the Esplanade. For the better control of the area, it is deemed advisable to define a road one chain in width along the surveyed frontages of the abutting lots and close the balance of the "road" and declare such closed portion a Class "A" Reserve for recreation and vest it in the Rockingham Road Board. The portion of the sea front immediately adjoining and continuing to the remaining old jetty, at Railway-street, has already been similarly treated.

The proposals under the present legislation will thereby establish a common basis for all the sea front from Hymas-street to Railway-street. From Railway-street the water front right round past Kwinana to the Commonwealth Naval Base Reserve, is

similarly reserved reaching back to the main road to Rockingham (Marine-terrace)—except in lead-in roads and two areas granted last year for the Crippled Children's Home and the Children's Orthopaedic Hospital. The society has now moved to a new site and it is desired to revert to the original status by re-opening the portion of Brown-street and returning to the society the land it had given for the new road.

Amongst the proposals in a town planning scheme for Narrogin is the provision of a park and swimming pool which will embrace an area which includes several individual reserves, some railway lands, freehold properties acquired by resumption, and also several existing roads. Arrangements have been made with the Railway Department for adjustment of boundaries of railway lands.

It is necessary to close the roads mentioned in the Bill to consolidate the area concerned into two portions separated only by the existing Kipling-street which carries the traffic into and out of the town in the direction of Wickiepin, and which will remain open. The Narrogin municipality's proposals are supported by the Town Planning Commissioner and the Surveyor General.

In the original plan of subdivision of portion of Fremantle, at Beaconsfield, suburban blocks up to seven acres in extent were surveyed and, in some cases, with streets in excess of one chain width. The State Housing Commission has prepared a plan of re-subdivision of land in Yalgoo-avenue, which latter is 150 links wide. For better planning, it is desirable to include in the new lots 50 links of the street, thus leaving it one chain wide, which is deemed sufficient. The Fremantle Council, Town Planning Commissioner and Surveyor General all concur in the proposal. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [5.14]: I am surprised at the Minister saying that it is necessary to introduce legislation of this nature at this particular time of the session. In the past he has always opposed the introduction late in the session of matters of vital importance to various members. To introduce legislation of this type

and ask country members to agree to it without being able to refer the matters contained therein to the responsible bodies in their districts, is to make a farce of the Bill.

The measure contains two proposals in which I am interested. Clause 9 deals with areas of land in the Narrogin municipality. The Minister mentioned the portions in Kealley-street and Gray-street but did not give a reason for the closure of the right-of-way in Butler-street. As to the closures dealt with in Clause 14, I understand they are necessary in order to provide for a swimming pool and a park and that the municipal council and the Town Planning Commissioner have approved of the proposal. There has recently been a municipal council election in Narrogin and I suggest that the views of the council might have altered. I do not know whether they have, but I should like to have the proposal referred to the council to ascertain whether it is still of the same opinion as when the request was forwarded to the Government.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.17]: I also have a complaint, but slightly different from that of Mr. Loton's. I agree with him in protesting against these rush-legislation tactics, an accusation that was hurled at my Party in past years. My complaint is against the local authority. Here we have a measure dealing with various parts of the State and we are asked to say "yea" or "nay" to it. Of the proposals relating to areas other than my own, I know nothing, and the only guidance I can look for is from members representing those provinces.

Hon. A. L. Loton: We are in the same position.

Hon. G. FRASER: No member of a local authority has communicated with me regarding the three proposals for my province. I know of them personally and have no objection to them, but officially I have had no information at all. Until I hear information from other members as to the proposals applicable to their provinces, I do not know whether I can support the second reading. My complaint is against the local authority for not notifying me that it had no objection.

Some years ago a proposal was included in a similar Bill relating to my province

and I knew nothing about it until the measure was introduced. I asked for an adjournment of the debate on that occasion and got into touch with the local authority, and was informed that it was not keen on the proposal for other reasons, and certain guarantees were sought before the Bill was passed. Similar instances might easily occur under this Bill. We look to members of the respective provinces to inform us whether the proposals affecting them are satisfactory. At the moment it is my intention to vote for the second reading of the Bill unless any objection is raised to the proposals applying to other provinces.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Country Areas Water Supply.
- 2, Agricultural Areas, Great Southern Towns and Goldfields Water Supply.
- 3, Parks and Reserves Act Amendment.
- 4, Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 4).
Received from the Assembly.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Central) [5.25]: I obtained the adjournment of the debate in order to check up on the first amendment proposed in the Bill. I was doubtful whether it might refer to contracts made by members of a board, but I find that it does not. It relates only to instances where the board may grant donations to societies, of which members of the board may also be members, and thus might be considered to be the recipients of such grants. As the measure will not affect contractors, I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.28]: This is a very important measure and a case could be put up against its introduction, but on the other hand, it must be admitted that a redistribution of seats may be necessary. Following the influx of population into the metropolitan area during the war, it might be argued that since the cessation of hostilities, people have not had a fair opportunity to settle down again and that a considerable movement of population might affect the goldfields, mining and agricultural districts. This would constitute a case for delay in introducing the measure. However, the Bill has been passed by another place and is presented for our consideration and so we must deal with it.

Over the years the Press has indulged in most unfair propaganda about the non-introduction of such a measure by the Labour Government. If we examine the history of such legislation in this Parliament, we can say with safety that such criticism has been totally unfair and unfounded. Since the original Constitution Act was passed in 1889, six amending redistribution Acts have been passed by Parliament. Two other measures were unsuccessful, one introduced in 1930 by the Mitchell Government and one in 1937 by the Willcock Government. Both of those Bills were defeated in the Lower House. The one introduced by the Labour Premier was defeated in the absence of an absolute majority to vote for it. If members refer to the record in "Hansard," they will find that the Government of the day was one short of the number required to pass the Bill. However, Cabinet did its duty by introducing the measure, even though it failed to pass.

This Bill provides for the appointment of three commissioners the same as was the case in the previous legislation. But there is one important alteration. One of the commissioners is to be the Chief Justice. Everyone will agree with that choice. The second is to be the Under Secretary for Lands and the third the Chief Electoral Officer. I take strong exception to the appointment of the Under Secretary for Lands. It would be a lot better if the Sur-

veyor General was appointed as on the previous occasion. I am not discussing personalities, but the Surveyor General, whoever he might be, has a knowledge of the State which gives him a better opportunity to do the job and he would be of great assistance to his fellow commissioners. Furthermore, he is removed from the influence of the Minister.

Speaking from an actual experience of nine years as an Honorary Minister I would point out that under secretaries of departments are very close to the Ministers controlling those departments. To appoint the Under Secretary for Lands as a commissioner to undertake an important job of this character would be embarrassing both to the Under Secretary and to his Minister. We need to remove this matter from all possibility of unfair influence by anybody. I would like the Minister to consider that. I think it would be a great improvement if he would agree to an amendment substituting the Surveyor General for the Under Secretary for Lands. I think that argument is very sound; and from my experience I would say the alteration would be welcomed by the officers concerned.

The Bill divides the State into three areas: the metropolitan area, the North-West area, and the agricultural, mining and pastoral area. It has always been admitted that owing to the very huge territory which Western Australia covers, we could not agree to a proposition that would provide for every elector having equal voting value; but by dividing the State into three districts it is too widespread and comes too close to the metropolitan area. In the metropolitan area there are 172,691 electors as against 111,378 in 1929, an increase of over 61,000. That increase is very disturbing and should be a matter of grave concern to everyone with the welfare of the State at heart. It is a bad thing for a large proportion of the people to be congregated in the metropolitan area. The total enrolment is nearly 300,000, an increase since 1929 of 81,210 and over 61,000 of those people are living in the metropolitan area. Those figures demonstrate the unsoundness of the balance. There are too many people in the metropolitan area and we should on every possible occasion give encouragement to country people—agriculturists and people in the far North and in the mining districts.

If members will examine the proposition in this Bill they will find that a case can be made out for a buffer area between the mining and agricultural districts and the metropolitan area so that the weighting would taper off gradually. The Bill provides for two votes in the metropolitan area to count as one. There are people who have been fortunate enough—and I am not jealous of them—to be able to retire on a decent living allowance and who reside in Rockingham. The Bill provides that such people will have twice as much voting power as we in the metropolitan area. How can that be justified? People in Rockingham are provided with a good bus service. They can come to Perth or Fremantle every day and take advantage of all the amenities in the metropolitan area. If they have motorcars they can come to the pictures and attend all functions such as races, football matches, etc. They can live in Rockingham and enjoy those amenities and yet have twice the voting power which Jim Brown has in the Fremantle district.

The Minister for Mines: Bring them into the metropolitan area, then.

HON. E. H. GRAY: The same argument applies to people in the Murray-Wellington district or the Swan electorate or the hills.

HON. L. CRAIG: So it does in Kalgoorlie.

HON. E. H. GRAY: No. The people there are up against it. We cannot compare Kalgoorlie with Rockingham or Kalamunda. People at Kalgoorlie deserve consideration. Every mining area of the State is entitled to consideration. Why should the people in Kalgoorlie or Wiluna or Norseman or those up North—

HON. L. CRAIG: Or Bunbury.

HON. E. H. GRAY: Yes. How can we compare conditions and say, "We will put them on the same level but the people who enjoy amenities will have twice the voting power of the people in the metropolitan area"? It is not right or just. It would not be very difficult to form a buffer area that would divide Western Australia into four districts instead of three. We would then taper the weighting of the votes gradually up to the metropolitan area. I think that is a proposition that could be justified and it would be a great encouragement to people living outback. I hope every member

will carefully consider that suggestion. It would not be difficult to submit the necessary amendment, and I would like to see one of the South-West members do so and thus give recognition to the people outback without whose work we in the metropolitan area could not live and who deserve, on every possible occasion, our support and encouragement.

By amending the Bill in the direction I have indicated, we could give a practical demonstration of how much we consider their welfare. The most important amendment in this Bill is that which seeks to eliminate one of the North-West representatives in Parliament. I cannot possibly see how that can be justified. For nearly 25 years, and probably more, we have heard about the difficulties of the North-West from the late Hon. J. J. Holmes and from Hon. G. W. Miles and, in later years, from Hon. F. R. Welsh and Hon. R. M. Forrest. Those members have drummed into us on every possible occasion the necessity of developing the North-West. In the last year or two a vigorous society has been organised, the members of which have given all their spare time to advocating the development of that district. Many station owners have travelled many miles to attend the meetings of the organisation and discuss methods by which that development can be assured.

Members will recall that before the war an eminent representative of the Jewish people came here and tried hard to obtain permission for Jews to form a settlement in the North-West. Sometimes I feel we made a great mistake in setting that proposition on one side. That was some years ago. Consider the remarkable progress these people have made in Palestine. I feel very sorry for them today. I have had first-hand information from young men who have lived in the Middle East. They went away practically anti-Semites and denounced the Jews on every occasion but they changed their minds when they went to Palestine during the war and fought there and saw the wonderful progress the Jewish people had made in the creation of cities and the marvellous production they had obtained from what the Arabs called worthless country.

But what have we done with our North-West? According to experts and to our own members in this House—Messrs. Miles,

Forrest and Welsh—in the Kimberleys there are wonderful opportunities. During the war the population decreased and is 500 less than it used to be. But those who live there are battling hard to develop the place. Yet we propose to reward them by depriving them of one of their representatives in Parliament. That is a very great mistake. North-West members are fully occupied in looking after the requirements of their electors who live many hundreds of miles away—and in some instances many thousands of miles away—and who deserve every possible consideration. I should imagine that the job of a representative of the North-West would be totally different from that of the rest of us. The West province electorate could be lost in one of the station areas of the North, and that factor must be considered when legislation of this kind is being dealt with. The Bill seeks to deprive the North-West of a representative at the most critical time, and I challenge any member to refute the truth of that statement. The North must be populated and every inducement should be given to people to go there. To reduce the representation of that area is to offer an insult to its residents. This House has a reputation of broadmindedness.

The Minister for Mines: I did not think it had, among some of your people.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We have in this Chamber men who know the North well, and I ask them to take action to retain these four electorates. Fortunately the Bill does not propose to interfere with the representation of this Chamber. I would like the Minister to have the debate adjourned—

The Honorary Minister: We are hoping to finish dealing with the Bill some time tonight.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The North-West presents a great problem, as it cannot be left almost entirely empty. We cannot afford again to take the risk of losing that vast area and, if we are to believe the reports of experts, there are tremendous possibilities of development in that part of the State. I think seven representatives are few enough adequately to represent that area. We should have a unanimous vote—with the exception of the two Ministers—turning down the proposal to reduce the num-

ber of representatives for the North-West. Many members of this Chamber know all about the North, and in that regard Mr. Craig could probably lead the rest of us. I leave it to members to do the right thing.

The portions of the Bill dealing with the division of electorates by the Commission seem to be all right. There is a new departure, in that the decision of the Commission will not be referred back to Parliament. I think that is risky and that the Commission's decisions should be referred to Parliament for approval, but probably the Commissioners can be relied upon to do what is right. It is questionable whether the notice provided is sufficiently long, but there is a case for the Bill, and with the one vital amendment I have suggested, I feel that the measure should give satisfaction to all concerned.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.50]: One must agree that from time to time a redistribution of seats Bill is necessary, and almost inevitable, but it seems obvious that the result of this measure will be to deprive the North-West of the State of one representative, and the Goldfields of two representatives. Without analysing the Bill, I make the general statement that a measure with that effect at the present stage of this State's history is retrograde legislation. It has often been brought home to me as I travelled through the vast provinces which you, Mr. President, Mr. Hall and I represent, that our whole system is wrong. In effect, it says to the people on the Goldfields and especially in towns such as Linden and Laverton "You are fools to be out here when everything worth while is down in the city. It costs you more for water and if you wish to take your family for a holiday you must work for weeks, probably in a mine, to earn the wherewithal. It costs you a great deal to travel to the coast. Freight costs you more than it does people in other parts of the State. It costs more to build your house. What do you get out of it? We grudgingly give you the minimum amenities such as schools, hospitals and so on, while in the city there are the best facilities that can be provided. Residents of the metropolitan area have modern theatres, handy beaches and all the amenities that make life worth living and more attractive."

I do not think that is an exaggeration of the conditions that apply to those living and working in the outposts of the State. The result is that the majority of our people drift to the city. Immediately those on the Goldfields make a bit of money they come to Perth. The result of all this is that our State is not progressing as it should. It is an unhealthy state of affairs when half our population lives in the metropolitan area. For many years on the Goldfields—even in the good times before the war—people who wanted to develop industries or build houses had to pay 10 per cent. or even 12½ per cent. interest on the money they needed. The more conservative financial institutions wrote the Goldfields off altogether, and would lend no money there.

How many members in this House or in another place have been to Laverton, Leonora or other towns such as those? The outlook here is that those places do not count, and the Bill is in keeping with that attitude towards the more sparsely populated areas of the State. Mr. Gray has pointed out how dangerous it is to leave vast portions of our country unpopulated, yet now we are asked to pass a measure that will have the effect of reducing the representation of huge areas. I ask members to consider the measure carefully, and not just from the point of view of the possible benefit it will give to one political party or another. If the measure will handicap the Goldfields and the North-West by reducing the representation of those areas, it is a bad measure and one that we may regret in years to come. There is a lot more that I could say but I hope that the few arguments which I have expressed, perhaps somewhat inadequately, will induce members to give very careful consideration to the Bill before agreeing to the second reading.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South) [6.1]: I wonder at times when listening to the debates in this House whether members are always sincere in their references to the mining industry and the outback parts of the State, such as the North-West. On many occasions I have heard men say that were it not for the goldmines and those who are producing in the back-blocks, it would be a bad lookout for the metropolitan area, and so it would be. I came down from Kal-

goorlie by train today with a man who had four children with him. He said he had had all he could put up with at Kalgoorlie. I asked him why that was, and he said, "My reason is that I have four children who will have to be brought up. I cannot see any outlook for them on the Goldfields and what am I to do with them when they grow up? There are no trades to which I can put the boys and the only thing for them is to follow me into the mines. I will not let them do that."

Then he referred to the position of the girls and he said, "When they get a little older, we will be worried about keeping them from the environment of various features of Goldfields life. There is nothing for them to do up there. There are no beaches or places where they can enjoy themselves, with the result that there is nothing to encourage them from doing those things which are not in the best interests of young folk." We have just had three very trying days at Kalgoorlie when the temperature on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday ranged from 103 to 106 degrees, and it did not let up during the night at all. People there have to live in dusty, hot conditions and, as Mr. Heenan stressed, they have to suffer hardships due to the high cost of water and food supplies.

HON. A. L. LOTON: You went back there to live.

HON. G. BENNETTS: I went back, and I will continue to live there, and they can bury me there.

HON. W. J. MANN: Then what can be wrong with it?

HON. G. BENNETTS: I am always pleased to back up a place that is a wealth producer for the State. People in the metropolitan area are like fleas living on a dog's back and sucking the animal's blood. I think the speeches of some members of this House are only kidstrokes in their references to the goldmining industry. I do not know how many members of this House have travelled through my province which extends to the borders of South Australia and down to Hopetoun, a distance of about 700 miles. To get over that vast area it is necessary to travel by horse-back, camel or by some other form of transport for which one has to pay dearly. The people who live in those parts have to suffer great hardships, and

surely they are entitled to adequate representation in Parliament, much more so than those who reside in the city. Members representing near-metropolitan constituencies, and particularly those representing the metropolitan area, in this House have hardly any work at all to do for their constituents, whereas we who represent the outer areas are more or less glorified messenger boys.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You should have a few industries to look after like I have.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I have had to work in the back-blocks where they rear big families.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Have you ever been round my province?

Hon. G. BENNETTS: No.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: There you are!

Hon. G. BENNETTS: But the hon. member's province would not compare with mine in size.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You have 700 miles more than Mr. Bolton has!

Hon. G. BENNETTS: We have some members here who represent the North-West. I have been through that part of the State on horse-back. I went as far as Marble Bar, Cue and Day Dawn.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: They are not in the North-West.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I have been inland too. That was in 1911.

The Honorary Minister: What was the furthest you went north?

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I went as far as Marble Bar, and it was 115 degrees in the shade there. Under the Bill those people are to have less representation in Parliament than at present. That sort of thing lends encouragement to the idea of those residing in the hinterland that we are not concerned with people investing capital in that part of the State. If we are to take away some of their parliamentary representation, they will be placed in the same position as that applying to the Goldfields. We have an increased population in the metropolitan area and, of course, that means that it must have extra representation in Parliament. On the other hand, there has been an increase in the population on the Goldfields. I do not know if that applies to the North-West.

With the immigration policy in progress we are sure to get more population on the Goldfields. At present all the industries up there are well understaffed and all the gangs on the Commonwealth and State railways are at half-strength. Under existing circumstances people outback are attracted to the metropolitan area. However, I shall not talk at any greater length. I could stand up all day and get nowhere with this. I have aired my views and I am of the opinion that while there must necessarily be an increase in the representation of the metropolitan area, in all fairness the people who reside in the back country should, if possible, be given extra representation in Parliament or, at any rate, should retain that which they enjoy at present.

HON. W. R. HALL (North-East) [6.8]: I desire to enter my emphatic protest against the Bill, which seeks to reduce the representation of the Goldfields areas in Parliament. I have listened to the speeches delivered so far, and I admit the truth of the statement that there has been an influx of population to the metropolitan area. But there is no guarantee that many of them will not very soon go back to the hinterland of the State. When we appreciate the fact that the Gwalia mine is short of 250 men, there must be some reason for it. I think it is that we have a roving population in this State at the present time, and the men have not settled down since the war.

The metropolitan area cannot carry so many people very much longer and I am convinced that in a short time we will find the population of agricultural and mining townships increasing. That will apply throughout the North-East province and in the South province as well. The people there are at least entitled to the parliamentary representation they possess today. Members representing outback constituencies have a difficult task to perform and are faced with the necessity of doing a lot of travelling, covering many thousands of square miles in order to contact their constituents. For my part, I am afraid I have not been able to visit every part of the North-East province.

Hon. H. L. Roche: You should be ashamed of yourself!

Hon. W. R. HALL: The hon. member represents a small pocket borough over which he could travel by horse and buggy in two days.

The Honorary Minister: He could almost walk around it in that time!

Hon. W. R. HALL: Yes, and I can see by the interjections from some of the hon. member's own Party that they are in agreement with that.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Not at all.

Hon. W. R. HALL: I feel particularly the position regarding the outer areas and some of the rural districts as well, where mining and agriculture are carried out together. I refer to places like Southern Cross and Carabbin. Surely they are entitled to the representation in Parliament that they possess today. When we consider that 250 men are required in a mine over 700 miles away from Perth, it is obvious that something is wrong. I protest against the Bill because it is designed to deprive the Goldfields of some of their parliamentary representation. I shall certainly oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. R. J. BOYLEN (South) [6.13]: Apparently the Bill has been designed to deprive the North-West of one seat and the Goldfields of two seats. I believe that, considering the conditions on the Goldfields—and it must be the same in the North-West—it is practically impossible for the parliamentary representatives of those areas to keep in touch with their electors under existing conditions. It must indeed be extremely hard for them to cover the whole of their districts and visit their electorates during the 12 months. It has to be borne in mind that only in the first part of the year do they have an opportunity to tour their electorates because in the latter half the necessary time is not at their disposal. There are occasions when, in order to attend to an important function in his electorate, a member must neglect his duties in Parliament. If there is reduced representation, it will be less possible to visit the electorates than at present.

Any proposal to reduce their parliamentary representation will create a bad impression upon the residents of the Gold-

fields and the outer areas. There are many requirements and amenities needed in the North-West and the rural districts, as well as in the Goldfields areas, and the people residing in those parts should have an opportunity to confer with their parliamentary representatives in that regard. Now it is proposed to make that more difficult, particularly in the North-West where instead of having four members to represent them in another place, they are to have only three. There is certainly an air of prosperity in the metropolitan area and, in fact, at present it is really prosperous. On the other hand, the rural areas are also showing signs of prosperity. For my part, I think it is really what we might expect in the immediate post-war period.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I was saying I did not consider that either the population or the prosperity of the metropolitan area would increase to any great extent during the next few years, and it is at a time like this that a measure of this nature is introduced which will only tend to increase the representation in the Parliament of Western Australia of the metropolitan area at the expense of the outback districts. Whatever arguments may be adduced in favour of the Bill, I cannot divorce from my mind the fact that the main reason for its introduction is to deplete the representation of the Labour Party in Parliament. The North-West seats are at present represented by Labour members and this remark applies also to the Goldfields.

Hon. A. L. Loton: What about the agricultural areas?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I do not think it will make any difference to the agricultural areas. Year in and year out the Goldfields and the North-West have returned Labour members to Parliament. During the campaigning in March last, one of the promises made by members of the present Government was that the North-West would receive closer attention than it had previously received. How can the electors in the North-West be expected to believe that statement in view of the introduction of this measure? I do not know, and I intend to oppose the Bill.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [7.32]: I rise with a certain amount of disappointment to speak to the measure. I have listened to speeches of members supporting the present Government for a number of years and have also read their opinions as expressed in the Press on many occasions. It has always appeared to me that the arguments which they adduced were in favour of greater representation for the people domiciled in the outback and country districts of the State. It is rather surprising to note that on this occasion the Government has gone back on its own principles by introducing this Bill, which aims at depleting the representation of the North-West and the Goldfields in the Parliament of the State.

I remember coming to this State with my parents as a small boy. We resided at that time in what were then described as the outskirts of the metropolitan area. The land was mostly black sand and bush. I well remember the difficulties with which my parents had to contend, as there was no transport, no lighting facilities, no water. Generally speaking, there was a complete absence of the amenities now existing in the metropolitan area. I can also remember having to go with my parents to a well about a mile from our home to help to carry water for the use of the family. I also recall how at night I trudged through the sand to catch a horse-bus that left the corner of Oxford and Newcastle streets for Perth.

When I think of those days, I am reminded of what people in the outback districts have to put up with today. They suffer to an even greater extent than we did in those early days. Yet we now find the present Government is prepared to take away some of the representation of the people in the North-West and on the Goldfields. I have heard supporters of the Government denouncing centralisation and saying that we should encourage people to leave the towns and settle in the country. I quite agree that that is a wise policy, but we find the younger people of the community reluctant to leave the metropolitan area and one can readily understand the reason. The country has not the amenities which may be enjoyed in the metropolitan districts.

Men and women in country districts—the pioneers and the backbone of the State—

even today have to travel in some cases hundreds of miles to go to hospital. Those people are indeed entitled to greater representation in our Parliament than are the people in the metropolitan districts. I also recall that not so many years ago there was a hue and cry in the State for secession from the Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, we held a referendum and the people of the State voted for secession. Their reason was that Western Australia was not receiving the consideration from Canberra which was shown by it to the more populous States. It seems to me that the present Government is now acting in the same way as Canberra did; that is, it is bringing down a Bill to deny fair representation to the people living in the North-West and the Goldfields districts. It seems to me that those people are as far removed from the seat of government of this State as the State itself is removed from the Government in Canberra. One can journey to Canberra in less time than it takes to go to some of the North-West districts.

The Government has told the people something which it does not believe or, if it did, it is not putting into operation on this occasion. The people of the North-West were nearer to the seat of the war than were the metropolitan people. If Australia had been invaded during the war—and we can consider ourselves extremely fortunate that it was not—the North-West would have been the first to bear the brunt of any attack by the enemy. I feel the Government is wrong in its attempt to take away from the people who are the pioneers and backbone of the State the representation to which they are justly entitled. The House should give serious consideration, even at this late hour, to seeing that full representation is retained for the North-West.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [7.40]: I dwelt for a few moments in order to see whether some of the supporters of the measure would take the floor in an attempt to justify the Bill, but it appeared that none was prepared to avail himself of the opportunity. Most members, if not all, will agree that the time is ripe for a redistribution of seats. The only argument in question is the method of redistribution. It has been said that the present representation is unfair, so we thought that when the

Government was introducing a Bill it would have introduced a measure which would provide for representation on a fair basis. That is where we disagree with the Government. We consider this Bill an unfair measure. We admit freely that there are some districts which possibly could not justify their continuance as districts, on account of the small number of voters living there.

We also contend, however, that some seats have too many electors. But where we really disagree is on the method proposed in the Bill. No-one would object to a fair distribution, but can any member contend that the Bill provides for a fair distribution? Evidently the supporters of the Bill cannot, because not one of them has taken the floor, apart from the Minister who introduced the Bill, in an attempt to justify the proposed distribution. We say, and rightly, that it cannot be justified for a moment. Let me make a comparison. The Bill provides that voting in the mining, pastoral and agricultural areas shall be equal. But can anyone justify the giving of a person at Maddington or Gosnells the same voting power as a person living at Esperance? It is said that there should not be one-vote-one-value throughout the State, as there must be differences. If alterations must be made, let them be made on a fair basis.

The Honorary Minister: Where would you draw the line?

Hon. G. FRASER: I draw the line that the inner areas should have a different quota from the outer country areas.

Hon. L. Craig: What about Kalgoorlie?

Hon. G. FRASER: Kalgoorlie has disabilities that Swan has not.

The Minister for Mines: Electoral ones?

Hon. G. FRASER: A person living at Swan can come to the city, work there and return at night, yet he is given the same voting power as a person living in our far-flung areas. I cannot understand the attitude of members representing country districts. They are, by their silence, agreeing to the proposition contained in the Bill. The Government of the day would naturally introduce a redistribution measure that would favour them. The Bill says in effect, or many members think it does, that one seat will be taken from the North-West and

two from the Goldfields. But if my examination of the position is correct there will be not two taken from the Goldfields but one, and one from the country districts, the members of which are sitting silent and allowing one of their representatives to be given to the metropolitan area.

Hon. L. Craig: They are fair minded.

Hon. G. FRASER: They have had the whip cracked on them as it has never been cracked on us. They do not attempt to justify the Bill. I do not know how they are going to square themselves with their electors. In case they are not aware of the position I am pointing it out to them so that they will not afterwards be able to say they did not understand it.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Thank you!

Hon. G. FRASER: All the districts in the Great Southern are well under their quota, but their members here applaud the Government for taking away one of their representatives.

Hon. E. M. Davies: They think they are sitting pretty.

Hon. G. FRASER: They will not be when their electors get hold of them. If they think the measure is correct, why do they not justify it?

Hon. R. J. Boylen: They cannot.

Hon. H. L. Roche: We find you very interesting.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope I will be interesting enough to show why the hon. member should not allow one of his representatives to be taken away and given to the already overfed metropolitan area.

Hon. H. L. Roche: I hope that Fremantle will not get it.

Hon. G. FRASER: We are well over our quota in the Fremantle area. I suppose country members think they are martyrs in sacrificing one of their members in the interests of—

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Good government.

Hon. G. FRASER: Evidently they think the Liberal Party is all right, because they are giving away a member.

Hon. L. Craig: You will not win a metropolitan seat.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, but they think they are giving a representative away to

their lords and masters. There is no protest from North-West members, although one of their number will be taken away. If an attempt were made to reduce the number of representatives for Fremantle, we would not stay quiet.

Hon. A. L. Loton: If you thought it was fair, you would.

Hon. G. FRASER: We find North-West and country members saying nothing. I am putting these arguments forward so that they may have a death-bed repentance. I cannot see any fairness in the measure. I would support a redistribution of seats on a just basis. The State is too large to have only three quotas. Western Australia comprises nearly half of the Commonwealth, but we are to have only three quotas in allotting the various electoral districts of the State. The move is purely political. None of the North-West seats in this House is to be taken away, because the Government would then lose some of its members. But some of the representatives of the North-West—members directly representing those people—are to lose their seats, but their colleagues here do not protest. It has been said that Labour will lose three seats, but I think Labour will lose only two, one in the Goldfields and one in the North-West. The three seats in the metropolitan area will not be Liberal.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: You ought to be happy about this.

Hon. L. Craig: It shows how fair we are.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You do not sound happy.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am not happy. I do not care who gets the seats in the metropolitan area—I want to see a fair distribution throughout the State, irrespective of who gains. No-one could kick then, but there is certainly a kick against this distribution.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is your opinion.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am here to express my opinion. The hon. member can express his, but he is silent tonight; the whip has been cracked on him and he will not speak.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The exhibition is failing badly.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member is where I never thought to see him; he has kept quiet.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am always like that when I am satisfied.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like the hon. member to tell me why he is satisfied. I might vote for the Bill if he convinced me I was wrong. I think the idea of debate here is to show members where they are right or wrong. It would be pretty hard to induce Mr. Baxter to change his opinion, but at least he is generally prepared to give reasons for what he does.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: He will not bite; go ahead.

The Minister for Mines: The debate was all used up in another place.

Hon. G. FRASER: I do not know what happened in another place.

The Minister for Mines: We do.

Hon. G. FRASER: I want to be satisfied in this Chamber. I make this appeal, that some alteration be made to the Bill.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: What for?

Hon. G. FRASER: In order to give a fairer basis. I ask the hon. member to justify why the outer suburban area should be on the same basis as the outback. That is really the only point contained in the Bill. I agree with Mr. Gray that the Surveyor General ought to be one of the three members of the Commission. If my memory serves me aright, he always has been. I think he has a greater knowledge of the State than the Under Secretary for Lands, and I think a fairer distribution would be brought about from the report of a Commission of which he was a member. I would like the Minister to tell us why he has not been included, because I expect the Minister will reply—I do not suppose he will be as dumb as the rest of the members.

There are other portions of the Bill with which I do not entirely agree, but I realise the dice are loaded against us, and we accept the Bill in a gentlemanly manner. We do not believe in wasting the time of the House unnecessarily. We put our views forward and like to hear a reply to them. We do not profess to be right every time, but we say what we think is right. If we can be convinced that we are wrong we will reverse our vote. In view of the fact that we have not been told in debate that we are right or wrong, we can only assume

that we are right and vote against the second reading of the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [7.55]: I have listened with interest to the opposition to this Bill, but I am afraid I have not heard any real reason advanced against it. Nothing has been said about the provinces, but only about the districts. The only objection to the Bill raised by the Leader of the Opposition was that the inner country districts—those abutting on the suburban areas—were not loaded. I understand that this was the only voice raised on that question. The only other objection he could raise was in connection with the Goldfields, and he suggested there should be an amendment for the central Goldfields districts so that they should have the same ratio as the agricultural districts, which of course they have. But he, presumably, wanted the other Goldfields areas to have a greater loading.

The Bill provides that there shall be 20 seats in the metropolitan area and 27 for the rest of the State. The metropolitan area includes seven-twelfths of the total electors. Objections have been raised about the North-West by members of the Labour Party, but I draw attention to what happened in past years. In 1913, Mr. Collier, the then Labour Premier, brought in a redistribution of seats Bill to provide that the North-West should have only three, and not four seats. He considered that was ample. The population has decreased considerably since then. Again, in 1922, when the National Party was in power, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Collier, endeavoured to get an amendment through so that the North-West should have only three seats. The position has altered considerably since then. The population has decreased and transport conditions have improved out of all knowledge.

One member suggested that Canberra was closer to Perth than was the North-West. Well, the daily papers are now delivered in the North-West ports, but people in Canberra cannot get our daily papers on the day of issue! Things have improved tremendously in the North-West on account of air transport. No doubt the Government would have been justified in deciding to alter the boundaries for the Upper House,

but in view of the great area to be covered and the small population, we consider it is fair that there shall be three members for 3,000 electors in those parts whereas it is estimated that there will be 4,000 to 5,000 in other districts. Mr. Fraser and Mr. Gray were anxious to know why the Under Secretary for Lands is to be on the Commission and not the Surveyor General. The Under Secretary for Lands was selected because he was considered to be far more knowledgeable of the country and the people and came more into touch with the people in the country generally than the Surveyor General does.

Hon. W. R. Hall: What about the boundaries?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No-one knows more about the country boundaries than does the Under Secretary for Lands. Objection was voiced that he was too close to the Minister. It is extraordinary to suggest that the Minister would be likely to be influenced by the Under Secretary for Lands.

Hon. E. H. Gray: I said it would be embarrassing for the Minister.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: To suggest that is wrong. The chairman will be the Chief Justice and with him will be the Chief Electoral Officer and the Under Secretary for Lands. They will be there to give information and assist the Chief Justice or one of the other judges, and obviously the judge would not be in any way biased. It is a great improvement to have the Under Secretary for Lands on the Commission. Without speaking disparagingly of the Surveyor General, I regard him more as a scientific and office man, whereas the Under Secretary for Lands is more practical and gets about more. No-one would suggest that the Tender Board is influenced by the Under Secretary because he is close to the Minister. I consider that the Under Secretary could have attained that position only after having proved himself to be a man of undoubted integrity.

Exception was taken by Mr. Heenan to the fact that provision is not made for one-man-one-vote as in the Commonwealth sphere, but I have not heard any complaint by Mr. Heenan that the Goldfields people are badly represented. Two voters in the metropolitan area count as the equivalent of

one on the Goldfields, so I cannot see where the hon. member can possibly have any objection. Two voters in the metropolitan area are regarded as equal to one in Kalgoorlie or Boulder City. Is there anything unfair about that? Is it unfair that the people at Gosnells should have equal voting power to the people of the Goldfields? Mr. Bennetts said that people are leaving the Goldfields; that he had met a man and his four children today who were leaving the Goldfields because their votes at present counted only as three compared with one in Perth. Does he suggest that if we gave greater voting power to Kalgoorlie, people would stay there? Maybe they are leaving because, in the last 20 years, their representation has not been as good as it might have been. By the alteration, we might be doing the Goldfields a good turn, if the effect is to change the representation. They might then join with the supporters of an enlightened Government and receive better treatment than they have had in the past.

Hon. G. Fraser: I know something else that your Government is called.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am not prepared to relate all the praise we receive. Mr. Bennetts told us that he had been on the Goldfields for 52 years and intended to stay there, even if he did not get a vote. The enlightened Commonwealth Government does not give the people of Darwin a vote at all.

Hon. G. Fraser: Yes, they have a vote.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They have a representative in the Federal House who is not permitted to vote.

Hon. G. Fraser: But the people have a vote.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Mr. Boylen said it was impossible for members to keep in touch with electors because of the extent of the areas they represent. The areas on the Goldfields are no greater than those in the agricultural districts.

Hon. G. Fraser: What about Kanowna and Murchison?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Admittedly they extend right across the State, but it is easier to get into touch with electors on the Goldfields than with those in many

agricultural districts. Kalgoorlie is served by railways and aeroplanes; it has fast services to the east and the west.

Hon. G. Bennetts: A fast service on the express train!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is a good service in the east.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Not on the State railways.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: With altered boundaries we might be able to change even that.

Hon. W. R. Hall: This week's funny story!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is suggested that the Government desires to change the representation of the Goldfields.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Not suggested; said straight out.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That might be because the people in Victoria recently changed their representation very considerably. The trend seems to be in favour of a change.

Hon. G. Fraser: There will be a change in Western Australia, too.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Mr. Davies appeared to be very concerned about the North-West. I have explained that as far back as 1913, it was the policy of the Labour Party to grant only three seats to that part of the State and now that conditions have altered somewhat, the Liberal and Country Parties have adopted that view. We are very anxious indeed to encourage people to go outback and we do encourage them in every possible way, but I cannot see how the fact of the representation being more in keeping with present-day conditions will in any way influence the young people who it is suggested should go outback. They do not care whether they have a vote or not. All said and done, representation is not a matter of the number of votes; it is a matter of the individual who represents the voters. In many instances the Goldfields have been extremely well represented, and it is not a question of the proportion of votes. I have referred to the suggestion that we should do what the Commonwealth does, but we are far from adopting the Commonwealth system. We are giving the equivalent of two to one in the agricultural and mining areas whereas the Commonwealth gives one

to one throughout. Mr. Fraser agreed that there should be a redistribution of seats, and, now that a Bill has been introduced, he has been generous enough to say that, generally speaking, the measure is fairly right.

Hon. G. Fraser: Up to a point.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If it is not, why did not the Government he supported bring in a Bill?

Hon. G. Fraser: It did, but the measure was defeated.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Yes, in 1937.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have asked how we can justify Gosnells and Esperance, the North-West and Perth, and provinces such as the Metropolitan-Suburban province, with 31,000 electors, while Mr. Bennetts represents 3,500 electors. This means that nine electors in the Metropolitan-Suburban province equal one in Mr. Bennetts's province. No wonder people are leaving the Goldfields!

Hon. G. Bennetts: You can get around your province on a bike in one day.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The same disparity is found in comparing other seats. Take the North-West: Thirty-five electors in the Metropolitan province equal an elector in the North-West. However, it seems perfectly clear that every member is satisfied with the Bill and I shall not occupy more time in replying to the debate.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: This Bill requires an absolute majority to pass it, and so I shall divide the House.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	19
Noes	7
Majority for	12

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. C. G. Latham	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Matters to be considered in dividing State into districts:

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I move an amendment—

That in lines 2 to 4 of Subclause (2) the words "with such alterations and modifications of internal boundaries and designation as the Commissioners may think fit, be divided into three electoral districts" be struck out with a view to inserting other words in lieu.

This is the vital amendment and is designed to retain the four existing North-West seats instead of reducing the number to three. I anticipated that one of the North-West members would have moved the amendment and I apologise for having to do it myself. I feel sure that they will regard it as a just amendment.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	16

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. G. Fraser	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. C. G. Latham	Hon. H. Tuckey
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 15, First Schedule, Second Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.26]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: As this requires the concurrence of an absolute majority of members, it is necessary that the House should divide.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	19
Noes	7
Majority for	12

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. A. C. Daffin	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. C. G. Latham	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. G. Fraser	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—RESERVES.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (LAND ACT APPLICATION) ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Assembly without amendment.

BILL—MILK ACT AMENDMENT
(No. 3).

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. G. P. Wood—East) [8.32] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend Section 26 of the Milk Act, 1926-47. It is a most important measure and I hope it will be given due consideration and a

speedy passage through this House. Representations have been made by producers, retailers and the Milk Board, to have the Act amended on the lines set out in the Bill. At the present time the Milk Board has power only to fix the minimum price to be paid to dairymen and the maximum price or prices at which milk may be sold retail.

There is no provision for intermediate prices. It is most desirable that the board be given power to fix the maximum price that milk vendors may charge other milk vendors, particularly in view of the fact that a large proportion of the metropolitan milk supply is now purchased by milk vendors from other vendors who hold treatment licenses. It is also desirable that the rates to be charged for milk treatment should be fixed. Under the Act "treatment" covers a variety of functions, and it would be as well to enable the board to fix, where necessary, the rates in respect of any services connected with treatment.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Have you any idea of the approximate rates for treatment at present?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The difference for what would be called the middleman is something like 1s. 1d. per gallon. There is a wide spread between the producer and the consumer. In Sydney, the difference between the producer and the consumer is only 9½d. I will have more to say later with regard to the Royal Commission that is now sitting. Before long, in the metropolitan area the bulk of the milk will be pasteurised. There is provision in the Act that the board may require milk either to be pasteurised or bottled or supplied from T.T. accredited herds, or to comply with other conditions. Such conditions almost certainly would include bottling and brine cooling, which are functions described in the definition of "treatment." In many of the country districts treatment may not extend to pasteurisation for some time to come. It will involve cooling and possibly bottling and refrigeration, and therefore the rate to be allowed for treatment should be variable and not uniform. We cannot get pasteurisation plant installed immediately everywhere, although—as I said the other evening—efforts are being made to have all treatment depots in the metropolitan area

equipped with up-to-date pasteurisation plant.

In view of the probability of having only T.T. accredited milk or pasteurised milk, as provided in Section 27, it may be desirable to enable the board to fix varying prices for differences in grade, quality and so on. In the other States the boards fix variable maximum rates to be charged to consumers for different quantities. There is a rate fixed for one pint, and a different rate for two pints, and so on. It is cheaper, by comparison, to have two pints of milk in one bottle than two pints in separate bottles. There is already power in the Act to fix rates for transport. The Bill provides for fixing the minimum price or prices per gallon to dairymen for milk supplied in any dairy area, provided that a different price or prices may be fixed in respect of milk produced in different dairy areas or parts thereof, whether sold to or purchased by a milk vendor in a district in the dairy area in which the milk was produced or in a district in a different dairy area.

It also provides for fixing the maximum price or prices which may be charged by milk vendors for milk sold to other vendors, provided that a different maximum price or prices may be fixed in respect of milk sold in different dairy areas or parts thereof, provided also that a different maximum price or prices may be fixed according to differences in grade, quality, description or quantity or place of delivery. It provides for fixing the maximum rate or rates which may be charged by any person for any particular service connected with the treatment of milk, provided that a different rate or rates may be fixed for milk treated in different dairy areas or parts thereof.

The Bill further provides for fixing the maximum price or prices at which milk may be sold by retail in any dairy area, provided that a different maximum price or prices may be fixed in respect of milk delivered or sold in different dairy areas or parts thereof; provided also that a different maximum price or prices may be fixed according to differences in grade, quality, description or quantity. That refers to the consumer. It may be desirable for milk to be 4½d. a pint in Perth and 4d. somewhere else, according to the circumstances. Powers similar to these are contained in the

Victorian and New South Wales Acts. In New South Wales the Milk Board has wide powers; those of a Royal Commission. At present there is a Royal Commission sitting inquiring into the milk industry in this State. Its terms of reference are as follows:—

To inquire into and report upon the following matters and things in relation to milk as defined in the Milk Act, 1946, namely:—

1. The cost of production, transport, treatment and distribution of milk.
2. The prices to be paid by dairymen for milk.
3. The prices to be charged—(a) by milk vendors to other milk vendors, and (b) by milk vendors to consumers.
4. The charges to be made in respect of the transport and the treatment of milk.
5. Any other matter incidental to or connected with the foregoing which the Honorary Minister for Agriculture shall approve as being within the scope of this Commission.

If this amending Bill is not passed, much of the work of the Royal Commission may be wasted. The Commissioner may recommend that certain things be done by the Milk Board, for which power does not at present exist. I do not wish to anticipate the findings of the Royal Commissioner, or to influence them in any way. Today the producers receive 1s. 6½d. per gallon for milk at their farms, including 4d. per gallon Commonwealth subsidy. That subsidy is to cease at the end of January, and if the Royal Commissioner says the producers should still receive 6s. 6½d. we will have to find 4d. from somewhere else. Where is it to come from?

Hon. A. L. Loton: From the consumer.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I agree that it has either to come from the consumer or out of the 1s. 1d. at present received by the retailer. Perhaps half of it will have to come from each. I do not think the producer can be cut down to any lower figure than he is receiving today. I know what I am talking about when I say that. I have been among the producers. Some of them talk about going in for beef or butter, and I am with them when they say they cannot produce whole milk at under 1s. 6½d. per gallon. Assuming that the Royal Commission will bring in a recommendation to that effect, we will have to get the extra 4d. from someone. Unless

the amending Bill be agreed to, it will not be within the power of the Milk Board to deduct that amount from the retailers. The Bill has been asked for by the Retailers' Association, by the producers and also by the Milk Board.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Where do you think the 4d. will come from?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know what the Royal Commission will recommend. Part might come from the consumers and part from the retailers.

Hon. F. R. Welsh: When will the sittings of the Royal Commission end?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I hope in the near future. It must do so because the subsidy runs out at the end of January. It is desirable that the powers sought should be vested in the Milk Board, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [8.47]: I desire to support the second reading of this measure as it is a very important one, and in some respects long overdue. I cannot see anything wrong with the proposed fixation of prices because that principle has been in operation since we adopted it years ago. By the means suggested, the industry will be controlled to that extent. One part of the Bill to which the Minister did not make reference concerns surplus milk. That has been a serious problem for a long time and has caused a lot of dissatisfaction in the industry. In making provision for fixing a price for butterfat content, the Bill will afford a lot of satisfaction to the industry.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

The CHAIRMAN: There is an omission in Clause 1 in that the number of a Bill is not inserted and a blank remains in the clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the word "and" be struck out.

As the Bill to which reference was to be made is still before the Legislative Assembly, it is impossible to insert the number of that measure and so the amendment becomes necessary in order that only one measure shall be referred to.

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

Clauses 2 and 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—COMMONWEALTH POWERS ACT, 1945, AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [8.57] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill complementary to the one just passed. In 1945 powers were referred to the Commonwealth with regard to the fixation of prices. We had to pass a similar measure in regard to the wheat Bill. We agreed to give the powers to the Commonwealth Government, which fixed prices under the National Security Regulations. Recently Mr. Chifley has referred those powers back to the State and it becomes necessary to pass the legislation as it applies to the Milk Board. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: As the Bill requires an absolute majority to pass the second reading, it will be necessary to divide the House.

Division taken.

The PRESIDENT: I have satisfied myself that there is an absolute majority in favour of the Bill and that there is no dissentient vote. I declare the division off and the second reading carried.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. A. L. Loton in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

The CHAIRMAN: It will be necessary to insert a number in line 4 where the blank appears.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 after the word "No" the figures "31" be inserted.

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

Clauses 2 and 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

RESOLUTION—STATE FORESTS.

To Revoke Dedication.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the motion of the Minister for Mines to concur in the Assembly's resolution as follows:—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 4, 12, 20, 21, 22, 23, 28 and 37, laid upon the Table of the Legislative Council by command of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on 4th December, 1947, be carried out.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [8.59]: I have perused the resolution with some interest, as a number of the revocations are situated in the province I represent. I find that they have been requested by the people in the various areas and therefore have much pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Question put and passed, the resolution agreed to and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—SUPERANNUATION, SICK, DEATH, INSURANCE, GUARANTEE AND ENDOWMENT (LOCAL GOVERNING BODIES' EMPLOYEES) FUNDS.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.0] in moving the second reading said: This short Bill merely proposes to empower local governing bodies to provide superannuation schemes for their employees. Representations were made on behalf of the Fremantle municipality which was extremely anxious to inaugurate a superannuation scheme for its employees and it was found that the bylaws under the Municipal Corporations Act did not give the municipi-

ality the necessary power. This view was confirmed by legal advice. Municipalities and road boards are extremely anxious to provide superannuation schemes for their employees and in consequence it was decided to bring down this legislation, which will give the necessary authority not only to municipal councils but also to road boards. If members will examine the Bill they will find that the word "corporation" means a municipality and a board of a road district.

If the Bill is passed, then such local governing bodies, or a collection of road boards or municipalities, or both, may enter into an arrangement to formulate a scheme for superannuation, sickness, death, insurance, guarantee and endowment funds for their employees. The fund may be established and maintained by the ordinary revenue of the corporation or out of deductions from the remuneration of employees who voluntarily elect to enter the scheme. Any such scheme entered into before this Bill becomes an Act, provided it is approved by the Governor, will be declared to be as valid and effectual as though it had been established under this measure. Provision is made for the proper auditing of the accounts of the scheme, which will be formulated by the corporations.

Hon. H. Tuckey: There is nothing of a compulsory nature about the scheme?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No. The Bill also provides that it shall be in addition to, and not in reduction of, any powers that municipalities or road boards already have. I understand there is no opposition to the Bill; in fact, that it has been requested by the local authorities. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [9.4]: I support the measure. This matter has had the attention of the Road Board Association for many years. Local bodies have tried to introduce some form of compulsory scheme, but nothing came of those proposals. I am pleased now that under this Bill boards, or a collection of boards, may formulate a superannuation scheme. The measure, I am sure, has the approval of the local governing bodies throughout the State and of their employees. They will be pleased to know the Bill has been passed by Parliament.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [9.5]: I support the measure. It is necessary on account of an omission in amendments which were made to the Municipal Corporations Act and the Road Districts Act and which were introduced in this Chamber by myself. Power was purported to be given to local authorities under those Acts to formulate superannuation and benefit funds for their employees and it was confidently thought that the power so given was sufficient for the purpose. It was subsequently discovered, however, that there were flaws in the Acts. It was really an oversight by the Crown Law Department and probably the Local Government officials missed the point, too. Representations were subsequently made to the Minister for Local Government and I was able to assure him that this was so.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The scheme has been held up for years.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: This Bill will rectify the omission.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [9.7]: I have but little to say about the Bill. It is a good idea to allow boards to establish superannuation funds, but these may become dangerous in the case of small boards whose revenue is not great.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It is not compulsory.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Such boards should be very careful to ascertain whether they can afford such a scheme. I suggest that the Government obtain the advice of a competent actuary on the establishment of a standard scheme that would be applicable to all local authorities. Many superannuation schemes have failed because their funds have become low.

Hon. H. Tuckey: We had the advice of an expert from Melbourne.

Hon. L. CRAIG: There is only one actuary in Western Australia.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Is there one?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: No.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The A.M.P. Society has a qualified actuary. Although I do not wish this to be made public, he could be made available to the Government at no cost to help to formulate a standard scheme. It

would be a tremendous help to have a scheme of that type which could be adjusted to the revenues of the local authorities. It is most important that the scheme should be considered and approved by a chartered actuary. We know what happened to the Government scheme. A few years ago the Government had to put into the scheme over £500,000 owing to some actuarial miscalculation. I make this suggestion to the Government which I hope it will adopt, and I now offer the services of a chartered actuary to help the Government in whatever it likes to do about the matter.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [9.9]: I also support the Bill. I am a member of a local authority that sought legal advice on the question of introducing a superannuation scheme for its employees. As a matter of fact, a scheme had already been inaugurated by the local authority of which I am a member, but we found we had not sufficient power to proceed with it. Therefore, it is necessary that this Bill should be passed. I point out that it is in no way obligatory upon a local authority to introduce a superannuation scheme. The Municipal Corporations Act provides that a local authority may, when its employees retire, grant them up to a maximum of 12 months' salary or wages. A number of employees, owing to their age, will be retiring in the near future and it has been found that the practice to which I have referred will be a burden upon the local authorities. The scheme adopted by my local authority is underwritten by an insurance company. The scheme was considered from an actuarial point of view and the contributions from the employees and the subsidies of the local authority have been actuarially based. The scheme is recognised as being actuarially sound. Any other local authority that desires to introduce such a scheme should have power to do so. It will be able to get the advice of any representative insurance company in Western Australia.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Provision for validating of existing schemes:

Hon. E. H. GRAY: For the information of Mr. Craig, I may say that when I was Minister in charge of local government, I convened—at the request of the Road Board Association, the Country Road Board Association, the metropolitan body, the Municipal and Road Board Employees' Union and the Local Government Officers' Association—a conference at the same time as our superannuation scheme was being considered by the Eastern States actuary. He was good enough to come to our conference, and Mr. Bromfield, the chairman of the State Superannuation Fund, undertook to draft a scheme. A committee representative of all these organisations was formed, and Mr. Bromfield was in charge of it. A scheme was evolved, and okayed by the actuary from the Eastern States, and presented to the organisations concerned. Unfortunately we could not get agreement with the Local Governing Bodies' Officers' Association, but if the local authorities at any time wish to organise a united scheme they have only to get the file where they will find the particulars already set out.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 7, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT.

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, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—PARKS AND RESERVES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.20] in moving the second said: This Bill is to amend the Parks and Reserves Act of 1935. As members know many parks and reserves are controlled under that old Act, but strangely enough the powers for making regulations have been found to be deficient. Recently a motorist drove on the lawns of King's Park, and it was discovered that he had committed no offence under the bylaws, and furthermore, that bylaws could not be made. The Bill, therefore, is to give greater powers for the making of bylaws, to prescribe rules to be observed in respect of any vehicle being driven or used on roads, and the use of footpaths and bridle tracks on park lands and reserves. It is also to regulate, prohibit or restrict the driving of any specified kinds of vehicles, and to prescribe the places where vehicles of any class may, or may not, be parked on park lands and reserves. The measure is more or less a formal one, but it is nevertheless essential in order that the authorities controlling parks and reserves shall be able to make the necessary regulations. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL AREAS, GREAT SOUTHERN TOWNS AND GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [9.25] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to make provision for a comprehensive water supply in various districts in Western Australia. The Act may be cited as the Agricultural Areas, Great Southern Towns and Goldfields

Water Supply Act, 1947, and it will come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation, provided that such proclamation shall not issue until such time as satisfactory financial arrangements have been made by the State and Commonwealth Governments.

There are two Bills that will come before the House, and this measure is to be read in conjunction with the Country Areas Water Supply Bill. It is not my intention to have both Bills before the House simultaneously. I know from past experience that a considerable amount of confusion can ensue when we have two such Bills as these to consider at the same time. I propose, therefore, to have this Bill carried, if members agree to pass it, and then deal with the other. This measure is one to approve of certain work being done. The other Bill is merely the machinery one. It is long and will be subject to amendment, if the various machinery clauses are not acceptable. I take it for granted, however, that if this measure is agreed to the other will be, subject to amendment if desirable.

Similar Bills were before Parliament last year with this exception, that the proposition then was indeed a costly one and was subjected to considerable criticism from certain areas—particularly the Great Southern. The cost of the project under this measure will be about 50 per cent. less than last year's proposition when we were then asked to spend about £9,500,000. The present proposal is estimated to cost £4,500,000. Even at the reduced cost, the present scheme will be of tremendous importance to the State. In view of the general unanimity and lack of criticism of this Bill, it is far better than the one which was before Parliament last year. The Bill is substantially the same as that recommended by Mr. Loder, chairman of the Commonwealth Department of Works Committee, who made inquiries into the matter.

One big difference between the two schemes is that under the present proposal, the pipeline to run from Wellington Dam to Narrogin, will be considerably bigger in size than was suggested by Mr. Loder. It is desirable to have the larger pipeline in view of the anticipated increase in population and production in the years to come. Of course the written consent of the Commonwealth

Government is necessary before the scheme can be proceeded with. The scheme as set out in the Bill is based on the recommendations of the Commonwealth, the only difference being the size of the pipeline as I have already mentioned. Under the scheme of last year large areas, particularly to the east of the Great Southern, were to be brought under the proposed scheme, but, on this occasion, those areas are not included. I consider that this will have the approval of at least 90 per cent. of the people.

Hon. E. M. Davies: For what reason are they not included?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Those people do not want the water supply.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Have they water supplies of their own?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, and they do not want to have to pay the cost of another supply. That is only reasonable. I should not like to have to pay rates for water on my farm because I have a particularly good supply. My property is not very large, and yet it has probably one of the best water supplies in the eastern districts. Many people in the Great Southern are similarly situated. They have spent much money on the sinking of dams, which is cheaper than putting in a comprehensive scheme.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But not so safe.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It used to be said that if a dam were put on the top of a hill in the Great Southern, in the wet years it would fill. If a dam is placed on a selected site by people having a knowledge of the country and of the rainfall, it is safe, particularly if the dam is covered. I do not think enough has been done in the way of covering dams.

I do not want to deny any information I can give as to the reasons for the scheme. Owing to certain objections, the scheme of last year was dropped. I believe that this modified scheme will meet with the approval of at least 95 per cent. of the people. Negotiations with the Commonwealth are not quite complete, but I have every reason to believe that it will support these proposals. While the State Government is spending a considerable amount on the scheme, most of the money will have to be found by the

Commonwealth. The cost of raising the Mundaring Weir will be borne by the State Government, as well as the cost of the work at the Wellington Dam. We hope a decision will be reached shortly and that the work will be proceeded with. It is desirable that the work should be put in hand in areas such as the North-Eastern wheat belt and parts of the Great Southern where there are no adequate schemes at present.

I want members to understand that dams are satisfactory only in districts of certain rainfall, not everywhere. Probably in the North-Eastern wheat belt, dams would not be very safe; in fact, I think they would be very unsafe, and that is where it is most desirable this scheme should be put into operation as soon as possible. In many areas, probably even in the Great Southern where the rainfall is good, lack of water has retarded development of the country as well as the development of the towns. I have been in towns on the Great Southern where it has been very hard to get a bath owing to the very inadequate water supplies. This scheme will be of immense benefit to the Great Southern towns as well as to the farm lands.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Will the scheme reach Katanning?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. We cannot afford to delay this work.

Hon. H. Tuckey: How far down will it go?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Katanning is the most southerly town, unless an extension further south is made later. The scheme will supply Pingelly, and the main pipeline will be carried to Narrogin and then down the Great Southern.

Hon. G. Bennetts: How will the Goldfields benefit?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know whether the Goldfields will get any more benefit because I believe the present supply is adequate. If the Goldfields are short of water, they can easily be catered for by the increased supply that will be available from Mundaring.

Hon. G. Bennetts: No. 7 pump is in action for the first time for many years.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I shall give figures showing the present and the proposed supplies from Mundaring, and I think the hon. member will be happy when he hears them.

Hon. G. Bennetts: We are more concerned about getting water at a cheaper rate.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Government has given much consideration to that matter and to the question whether it would pay to increase the charge very slightly to the great body of consumers in order to make water available to the Goldfields at a lower rate. That would even up the charges and I think it would be desirable to do so. I have always subscribed to the idea that the man who is far away should not have to pay much more for his requirements than the man who is less distant. I have noticed great anomalies in the water charges in the Great Southern, one man paying 5s. and a man on the other side of the road 7s. 6d. or comparable figures, because the scheme on one side happened to cost a little more. Such a disparity is not right.

The happiest relations exist between the Commonwealth and the State regarding the modified scheme. This really confirms the attitude adopted by this House last year, which had much to do with the defeat of the other Bill after a conference. Things are going much better for everybody concerned than they were last year. One thing I and the engineers are a little concerned about is that the installation of the scheme may be retarded through a shortage of pipes. I do not know how we shall overcome that, but we shall, of course. Still, it is causing concern at present.

Certain priorities are provided under the scheme, the first priority being the North-eastern wheat belt. I think it only right that those districts should receive first consideration. They will be supplied from the Mundaring catchment and later on areas in the Great Southern will be supplied from the Wellington dam. Members representing the Great Southern should look forward with considerable pleasure to this scheme. Imagine having plenty of water in country towns and on the farms of the men that want it! It has always seemed extraordinary to me that in country towns like Katanning and Narrogin, there should not be an abundance of water because there the rainfall is fairly copious. As to the figures I spoke of, by raising the Mundaring Weir, the capacity of the catchment will be increased from 4,600 million gallons to 15,000 million gallons. That is a considerable increase. At the Wellington Dam, the pre-

sent capacity of 7,500 million gallons will be increased to 38,000 million gallons.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Is there any work proceeding on the Wellington Dam at this stage?

The HONORARY MINISTER: So far as I know, there is not, but I believe the preliminary work will soon be put in hand at both places.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Is not the cost of raising those weirs to be a State responsibility.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Are those figures the same as were given last year?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I assume they are; they have been put up by the same engineers. The rapid industrialisation anticipated in the South-West and the Great Southern towns will soon absorb the whole of the present capacity of the Wellington Dam and, even if the farmers do not want the water, the scheme nevertheless should be proceeded with. The two Bills now before the House are very similar to those that were fully debated last year. Unquestionably we need water at Northam, York and such like places. In my home town of York, the production of vegetables has been retarded through lack of water. I do not know what the capacity of the Avon Valley for vegetable growing would be if the water were available. Orchardists, people wishing to grow lucerne and engage in dairying and pig raising cannot get water at the cheap rate because the supply is insufficient. Some people are on the cheap rate and get water at 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons. They have been on the cheap rate for many years and will not be interfered with, but many others wish to go on that rate and when this scheme has been completed, they will be permitted to do so.

Hon. G. Bennetts: It is lack of water that hangs everything up. I guarantee that the Goldfields could produce anything if only adequate water were available.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I wish to quote from the report of the committee that toured most of the southern portions of the State and reported on the Great Southern towns. The report stated—

The committee, during its visit to the area found a universal demand for additional water

in practically all towns included in the itinerary, and this need has been verified by the field investigators. It appears that the towns on the Great Southern railway line, between Beverley and Katanning, are particularly in need of supplemented water supplies, while Narrogin, Wagin and Katanning in particular have a strong case in favour of the development of local industries.

Another important point is that the railways need better water supplies. The Railway Department has had to spend some thousands of pounds in the southern portion of the State for the carting of water for locomotives. I believe that in some of the areas water carting will have to be undertaken shortly on account of the dry season. I do not intend to say any more at this stage. I do not want to withhold information members require. I have a lot of facts here and anything members desire to know I shall be only too glad to tell them when replying to the debate. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [9.46]: It is with far different feelings that I rise to speak to this Bill, from those which I experienced last session. On that occasion, with my two colleagues from the South-East province, I opposed the measure submitted because it was an imposition on one section of the community. The farming community would have had to carry the whole burden and the towns would have derived the whole of the benefit. Now, through the change of Government and through our having a Minister from down that way in control of the Bill, we have a measure which contains most of the amendments which we suggested in this House last year and which we fought for throughout.

I take this opportunity to thank those members who so loyally stayed with us during the whole of the debates on that occasion, and I think that we can say now that we were on the right side and that the propositions we submitted were along the correct lines; because when Mr. Loder and his officers from the Commonwealth Government came over and made their investigations, they more or less substantiated the suggestions we had submitted. The Great Southern members have had several talks with the Minister and Mr. Dumas concerning this legislation, and I am pleased to

say that the ideas placed before both those gentlemen have been more or less embodied in the two Bills we have to consider. There are a couple of minor clauses which we shall debate in Committee.

At this stage I would like to ask the Minister if he will ascertain from the Minister for Works whether the assurance he gave to a deputation will be given effect to: namely, that when the work commences from Wellington towards Narrogin in connection with this scheme work would also commence from Narrogin towards Brookton and Pingelly. The Minister made that statement to a deputation and Mr. Dumas was present. But there is no mention, either in the brochure, which has been provided or in the Bill, of the fact that the work will be proceeded with on that basis. This Bill provides for an adequate water supply for towns on the Great Southern. I do not think that the northern towns of Brookton, Pingelly and Narrogin have ever had an adequate water supply.

During the last 24 years, Brookton and Pingelly have had to pay rates for a substance that on some occasions came through the pipes totally unfit for domestic use, and not even fit to be used on lawns or gardens. It does not seem possible that within four years after the Bill has been proclaimed water will be provided for the people of those centres. I make particular reference to the words "after the Bill has been proclaimed" because therein lies the one drawback. It has not been finally agreed as to what financial aid will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. The Minister has said that the raising of the wall at Mundaring has proceeded to a considerable degree, and I think that only two more years will elapse before it will be completed. I would like to make a guess and say that when the team employed at Mundaring have finished their job they will be transferred to Wellington.

Hon. L. Craig: Wellington is the first job.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: They have been working for two years at Mundaring raising the wall.

The Honorary Minister: Not in the proper manner. They have not had the material.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Mr. Dumas said that in two years the wall would be completed. He told us that himself. I know what I am saying on this matter, because we consulted Mr. Dumas on more than one occasion. As we are going to obtain an adequate supply of water for towns in the Great Southern area on the same charge basis as at present—that is to say, at no increased cost—I am wholeheartedly in favour of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

The following Orders of the Day were discharged:—

1, Egg Production Industry (Trust Fund) Bill.

2, Cattle Industry Compensation Bill.

On motion by the Honorary Minister.

House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.