

Mr. PLESSE: Some people are very good to them. It is perhaps to be regretted that more has not been done for the aborigines. Except for the Protector of Aborigines, it seems to be nobody's business to look after them. I make no apology whatever for stressing the necessity for doing something for them, because I know from experience what they have suffered. Some of them have had barely sufficient food to keep them alive. After all, if the clause were inserted in the Bill, there would be some direction to the Lotteries Commission that the aborigines are entitled to something. They are human beings. Some people seem to think they have no soul and no feelings. It is scandalous to think that little children, some of them almost as white as our own have to suffer as these children have suffered during recent years.

The Premier: At Wagin the people would not let some of them go to the same school as their step-brothers and step-sisters.

Mr. PLESSE: Perhaps that is so.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we had better discuss that to-night.

Mr. PLESSE: At present there is no instruction to the Lotteries Commission by this House that the aborigines should be provided for.

The Premier: This would not be an instruction to them.

Mr. PLESSE: It would be specified in the Act.

The Premier: It would not be an instruction.

The PLESSE: The Commission would take it as an indication that the aborigines were provided for by the Act.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I desire to make it very clear that I do not oppose the clause, because I consider the object to be a worthy one, but it is unnecessary to include the clause in the Bill. There is ample provision already. Representation can be made to the right quarter for this matter to be dealt with. It is the opinion of members that the commission should have a free hand, that they should not be influenced in any way and that the Minister should have no control over the commission. I am surprised that the hon. member has allowed 12 months to elapse before making representations to the commission on this subject.

Hundreds of matters are referred to that organisation.

Mr. Wise: More unworthy objects than this have perhaps received help.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I will assist the hon. member to place this matter before the commission, but I object to any unnecessary amendment being embodied in the Act. In fact, the proposed new clause is completely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a reflection upon the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I apologise. The object itself is a worthy one, and should receive consideration at the hands of the commission, but it should not be specified in the way suggested, in an Act of Parliament.

New clause put and negatived.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1, Land Tax and Income Tax.

Without amendment.

2, Constitution Acts Amendment.

With amendments.

House adjourned at 11.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 23rd November, 1933.

	PAGE
Loan Estimates, message, Com. of Supply ...	2076
Bills: Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 3R.	2085
Constitution Acts Amendment, Council's amendments ...	2085
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	2086
State Transport Co-ordination, Com.	2091

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

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1933-34.*Message.*

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read, transmitting the Loan Estimates for the year 1933-34 and recommending appropriation.

In Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply to consider the Loan Estimates; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Vote—Departmental, £82,259:

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER

(Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.33]: The total Loan Estimates for this year show a substantial increase on the expenditure of last year. I am aware that there is a considerable volume of thought in the community that in these times the loan expenditure ought to be considerably curtailed. But having regard to the fact that industry has not yet recovered from the depression of the last three years, and that consequently large numbers of men are not being employed in industry as they were formerly, there is need for Government to do something in the way of finding work for those numbers who have been unemployed for so long a period. It is argued, too, that to go in for any considerable amount of loan expenditure only adds to our difficulties in financing, in that it increases expenditure on the Revenue Estimates in order to meet interest charges. But when one examines the situation, it is found that that is not really so. It is much better to borrow money to-day in order to find work for the men who are out of work, to put them into useful employment in the community, if not on entirely reproductive work—because nobody would claim that the whole of the work on which our sustenance men are being engaged is of a directly reproductive character. Yet it is, I think, or most of it will be, indirectly reproductive, in that the State will get the benefit of it in the expenditure in the years to come. But if those men were not employed on works from loan funds, there would be a charge on revenue for sustenance. That, ultimately, is a charge upon loan funds, seeing that the State has a very considerable deficit of about three-quarters of a million which, if that money were not borrowed in order to employ those men and so take them off susten-

ance, would inevitably result in a largely increased deficit. As we know, deficits are always covered by borrowed money. So, if instead of borrowing money now in order to employ men, we had a reduced amount and kept them on sustenance, our sustenance expenditure from revenue would be about double, and consequently our deficit for the year would be increased by £300,000 or £400,000, and so we would have to borrow that money to meet our deficit. Therefore, it is the better policy to do it this way, by which men will be occupied in some useful work, than it would be to keep them on sustenance, under which system no results at all would be obtained, and still we would have to borrow an equal amount at the end of the financial year to make good the deficit incurred by the larger expenditure of money on sustenance.

The Minister for Employment: And the effect on the men would be detrimental.

The PREMIER: Yes, that is so. No one will question that even the sturdiest men deteriorate when unemployed, lose their character and individuality when they have been on sustenance for two or three years. That is inevitable in even the best of men. So it is much better that we should obtain money by these means to get them employed, more particularly as the financial results will be just the same; for had we not obtained this increased amount of loan money this year, our expenditure on sustenance would be just about double what we expect it to be, and that would add to our deficit, and the money would have to be borrowed at the end of the year. So the larger amount of loan money does not in fact increase our indebtedness for the year. The amount asked for this year is £2,686,311. The expenditure last year was £2,217,982, or an increase of £468,329. As I say, if we had obtained only the amount of last year, that £468,329 would have shown as expenditure in the Revenue Estimates, and would have to be borrowed to make good the difference. The expenditure last year was as follows—

	£
Departmental	72,705
Railways and Tramways ..	178,889
Harbours	235,722
Water Supply	737,241
Development of Goldfields ..	29,558
Development of Agriculture ..	735,156
Miscellaneous	228,681

The increased expenditure this year is rendered possible by the provision of

the additional loan money which we have been able to obtain through the Loan Council. Last year the total available was £2,100,000, including the Commonwealth Grant for relief of unemployment, £145,000, which was not a loan at all but was a grant from the Commonwealth for the relief of unemployment, and was not shown in the Loan Estimates. This year we anticipate that the sum which will be available to the Government is £2,750,000. Its distribution will be as follows:—

	£
Departmental	82,259
Railways and Tramways ..	404,500
Harbours	269,000
Water Supply	785,500
Development of Goldfields ..	110,000
Development of Agriculture ..	798,052
Miscellaneous	237,000

Hon. W. D. Johnson: How will that money be secured? There is no grant.

The PREMIER: No. Harbours will earn their own cost, and water supply will cover its own cost, but I am not sure about agriculture covering its own interest charges. The greater proportion of the increased expenditure for this year relates to railways. Provision is made for two new lines, Yuna-Dartmoor £10,000, and Southern Cross-southward £10,000. But most of the railway expenditure will be on additions and improvements to open railways, for which £300,000 is provided as against an expenditure last year of £76,697. This is a very great increase, from £76,697 spent last year additions and improvements to open railways, as against £300,000 provided this year. The increase, of course, is due to curtailment of expenditure in past years, which necessitates increased allocations on additions and improvements this year. A fairly large part of that sum is for what are known as belated repairs. In ordinary circumstances this money would be found from general revenue, but it is not possible to do it now; in fact it has not been done at all for many years past; so it is paid from loan and will be recouped by allocating the amount from working expenses over a number of years; instead of charging the whole of the expenditure this year to working expenses, it will be paid out of loan and will be recouped out of working expenses over a number of years.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That will be a new trust fund, which we have not had in the past.

The PREMIER: Yes, that has been the practice for a number of years; it has been paid out of suspense and recouped over a number of years to the fund. All relaying is done on that principle.

Mr Stubbs: It does not include new rolling stock?

The PREMIER: No. There is on the Estimates provision for additional rolling stock, which is urgently needed. The sum of £300,000 is for additions and improvements to railways and £20,000 has been provided for additional stock. The principal work will be the super-heating of locomotives and the construction of 50 sheep trucks. The principal works at present in hand are the Spencer's Brook-Northam duplication, estimated to cost £30,000, and the duplication east of the tunnel, estimated to cost £47,000. Other works which were in hand at the end of the last financial year, and which will be completed this year, are the Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway, the Lake Grace-Karlgarin railway, and the Meekatharra-Wiluna railway. Expenditure will also be incurred in the deviation of the Eastern Goldfields line between Kellerberrin and Bungulla; the regrading at Hines Hill, estimated to cost £45,000; the completion of the Mullewa-Narngulu regrading, estimated to cost £36,000; and sundry minor works estimated to cost £62,000. The regrading of railways is very valuable work. As a matter of fact, I cannot understand why Governments in past years have not proceeded with it, because we have long stretches of railway, about four-fifths of which is of a good even grade. It might be one in 80. Then we have a few miles where the grade is one in 40 and, of course, the load that an engine can draw is governed by the steepest grade on the line. I am very sorry that Parliament did not embark on this regrading work many years ago. If one travels on some of the south-western railways, particularly on the lines to Bridgetown and from Brunswick to Collie, one can get out and walk alongside the train nearly all the way. That, of course, greatly increases running costs and involves loss of time, whilst limiting the weight of the load to be pulled, and so on. Regrading is really reproductive work, because it will lower the operating cost of the railways and so benefit the whole system. In trying to map out a programme of employment

upon which to spend the loan money that will be available this year, we have sought as far as possible to proceed with this regrading work, and we have been assisted in our efforts by the engineers of the department. The whole of the money will be expended upon labour, as no new material will be required. The grade will simply be lowered and the rails put down again. The Government consider that regrading is economical, useful and reproductive and, as I say, it will result in a reduction of the working costs of the railways in the years to come.

Mr. Latham: Regrading can hardly be called belated repairs.

The PREMIER: I am not dealing with belated repairs.

Mr. Latham: Of course, the cost will come out of the £300,000.

The PREMIER: I did not say that £300,000 was for belated repairs only. That sum covers all additions and improvements, including regrading. If I conveyed that impression, I did not intend to do so.

Mr. Latham: Really, a big portion of the £300,000 is for deviation and regrading.

The PREMIER: Yes. In round figures, the belated repairs will cost £100,000. The other works I have enumerated, regrading, deviation—

Mr. Latham: They will run into about £150,000.

The PREMIER: Yes. In the Estimates the sum of £10,000 is provided to complete the installation of the trolley buses.

Mr. Latham: That is already spent.

The PREMIER: Yes, but it comes into this year's Estimates. The sum of £10,000 is provided for proposed extensions of the tramlines at Victoria Park and Wembley. I know many members will question the wisdom of further tramway construction at this stage, when everything is uncertain with respect to transport in the future; but these are not new lines, they are merely short extensions of existing lines designed to serve increasing population beyond the termini of the existing lines. Buses would not be prepared to cater for that service.

Mr. Thorn: Have you got the rails?

The PREMIER: Yes, and they are paid for; so we may as well proceed with the work. We could not organise a bus service for a short section of half a mile beyond an existing tramway. Then there is the additional unit at the East Perth power house to which reference was made on the

Budget. That work is not being provided for in this year's Loan Estimates. The method of financing it was discussed at the recent meeting of the Loan Council and it is hoped that the whole of the expenditure can be incurred without placing an undue strain on loan resources. Hon. members are no doubt familiar with what is proposed to be done in this connection as a result of statements that appeared in the Press, particularly the statement made by the Minister for Works on his return from the meeting of the Loan Council. In brief, it is proposed to purchase the material required, by the issue of debentures, which will be repayable over a period of 15 years. One debenture will be redeemed out of the General Loan Fund each year. The cost is estimated at £460,000 and, instead of having to find the whole of that amount this year, one-fifteenth of the total amount will appear in each year's Loan Estimates. The amount will be raised in Great Britain.

Mr. Stubbs: At what rate of interest, 5 per cent.?

The PREMIER: No, not more than 4 per cent. The rate has not yet been settled, but I am quite certain the money can be obtained at 4 per cent.

Mr. Latham: Four per cent. in England represents 5 per cent. here.

The PREMIER: Yes, with exchange added.

Mr. Latham: You have not yet really completed your arrangements?

The PREMIER: No. The consent of the Loan Council must be obtained and that is being sought now. Immediately the consent is given—it is being obtained by telegram from the members of the Loan Council—I hope to introduce a Bill giving us the necessary authority to proceed on those lines. Negotiations with manufacturers who will be tendering for the supply of material disclose that the method of finance I have suggested will be satisfactory to them. There are several firms and companies in Great Britain who are willing to tender, so that it will not be a question of letting the contract to one particular firm or company. There will be competition, because, as I say, several companies are willing to finance on the basis I have mentioned. I think the proposed arrangement a very good one. We shall be able to raise the money at about the same rate of interest as we would have

to pay if we borrowed it direct from London.

Mr. Latham: It would be cheaper to borrow the money here, if that were possible.

The PREMIER: It cannot be done. I do not know that it would be much cheaper, either. Take the recent loan of £10,000,000; that is not cheaper money than can be obtained in London.

Mr. Latham: That was at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. You will not get the money you require under 4 per cent.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You have to pay exchange.

The PREMIER: If we borrow the money here we shall have to pay exchange just the same. The bank rate of interest to-day in London is about 1 per cent.; in fact, according to this morning's paper, it is a fraction under 1 per cent.

Mr. Latham: I hope you get it for 1 per cent.

The PREMIER: Seeing that the bank rate in London is 1 per cent., I do not think there will be any difficulty whatever in obtaining debentures at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., because that rate in Great Britain is considered very good, particularly if the security offered is gilt-edged, as Australian stocks are considered to be to-day. With regard to harbours and rivers, the only new expenditure is on the Esperance jetty. Complaints have been received for some years past respecting the safety of that jetty. It is stated that it can only be used in calm weather, and the fear has been expressed that vessels might refuse to load wheat there unless the jetty is repaired. As a matter of fact, an intimation was given by the agents of the ship-owners that they would refuse to allow vessels to proceed to Esperance to lift wheat, on account of the danger to shipping. Having regard to the large amount of public funds invested in the Esperance district, per medium of the Agricultural Bank, and the expenditure there on railways and water supplies, it is considered advisable to proceed with this work, because unless shipping facilities are provided it is possible that all the money spent in the district will be lost. Although the amount involved is considerable, there is no escaping the expenditure unless, as I say, we are prepared to abandon the Esperance district and write off all the public money invested there. The estimated

expenditure on the jetty for this year is £40,000. The piles are already being cut and the work will be commenced in January and proceeded with as rapidly as possible, so that the jetty will be completed for the next harvest. The total estimated cost of the work is £120,000. At the close of the last financial year, work was in progress at Fremantle, Geraldton and Bunbury. Work is, and has been, proceeding at those ports, with the exception of Bunbury, each year. The expenditure is an annual one and has not varied to any great extent. A large sum of money has been expended on harbour works at Geraldton during the past six or eight years and it is necessary to push on with it in order to get it completed, so that full use may be made of the harbour. The expenditure on the Bunbury harbour is heavier; in fact, the work there only commenced during the last financial year, so the expenditure this year will be considerably in excess of that of last year. I do not feel too confident about the success of the Bunbury harbour operations. There has always been trouble there with silting and other things. This, however, is a serious attempt to remedy the difficulties, and will involve the State, not only in an expenditure of £40,000 for this year, but somewhere about the same amount for several years to come. I hope, as a result of this expenditure, that our good friends at the port of Bunbury will be satisfied, and cease to have the grievance in regard to their harbour that they have nursed in their bosoms for some years.

Mr. Withers: This is only a portion of the Government scheme.

The PREMIER: There is always a Government scheme. It is like the expenditure of loan money in many other directions. Although it is not immediately reproductive, it will be reproductive at some time. In years gone by we have justified the expenditure of considerable sums of money on the ground that it will ultimately prove reproductive.

Mr. Doney: Do you mean that by the expenditure of the larger sum this year you are likely to overcome the silting difficulty?

The PREMIER: I am looking forward to further considerable expenditure next year. What I am concerned about is that, even when the job is supposed to be completed, we may not have overcome the silting difficulty.

Mr. Doney: That is the doubt that is troubling me.

Mr. Ferguson: It is a Kathleen Mavourneen expenditure.

The PREMIER: That may be so. With regard to water supplies, the only new work on hand is the commencement of the dam at Canning. This has been under consideration for many years. It is evident that with the growth of the population in the metropolitan area, and the consequent increase in the amount of water required, the provision of an adequate water supply can no longer be delayed. The alternative would be to increase the number of bores. That is not considered desirable. The total cost of the dam is estimated at £1,260,000. Its construction will be spread over eight years. It should be possible to draw upon the dam in the summer of 1935-36, and from then on an increased supply will be available each year. This is not included in the general amount set down for water supply, but a sum of £80,000 is provided for this year. The sewerage and drainage works in the metropolitan area were continued last year at a cost of £116,085. The area where the operations are being continued is comprised in portions of Nedlands, Hollywood and Wembley. Drainage works were provided in the Maylands-Inglewood district, and a commencement has been made with drainage at Shenton Park. It is proposed to continue these works throughout the year. A sum of £120,000 has been provided.

Mr. Stubbs: They are all payable, are they not?

The PREMIER: I am afraid some are not payable. I do not know that the Maylands-Inglewood drainage scheme will pay.

Mr. Stubbs: A good rate has been struck.

The PREMIER: Yes. The cost is heavy. It is a large drain of about 6 feet in diameter. It goes through a part of Maylands which is not closely populated, although the land itself will be rated. The department charges a rate whether a person gets any service or not. I have been paying rates on my place for 20 years, but there is no drainage there. The drains are lower down. I suppose the water from my hill goes into those drains, and that this is why I have to carry my share of the rates. One pays water rates, also, whether the water is used or not. A survey is being made of Claremont and the surrounding districts, and it is proposed

to provide sewerage connections as soon as the plans are prepared.

Mr. Raphael: Did you say Victoria Park?

The PREMIER: That will come into another scheme south of the river. The Claremont scheme will link up with that of Subiaco, and the sewerage will be carried off through the same outfall. The sum of £120,000 is provided this year for renovations and extensions to water supply mains. The expenditure on this work last year was £102,565. It is hoped that by relining the water mains their life will be considerably extended and the quality of the water improved, a very desirable object. This will please the member for North Perth. In connection with water supplies for towns, it is proposed to construct a new reservoir at Collie, whilst at Geraldton extensive improvements to the reservoir and mains will be carried out.

Mr. Latham: Is the work not finished there yet?

The PREMIER: It is like the Bunbury harbour. When one scheme is completed, it is found necessary to start another. I think this is the third scheme that has been gone on with at Geraldton; it is certainly the second one.

The Minister for Railways: It is only a question of replacing the mains.

The PREMIER: It appears that extreme difficulty has been experienced at Geraldton in obtaining a satisfactory catchment area. The existing dam was roofed over in order to prevent the evaporation of water. A satisfactory water supply is of vital importance to Geraldton, owing to the requirements of shipping as well as to the growth of the town. Something must be done there. For a number of years the people of Geraldton have suffered from the worst water supply of any town of its size in Australia. I went there on several occasions intending to stay a week, but left the next day. Other country towns have made requests for improvements to their water supplies, and each of these is being investigated. The drainage and irrigation works of last year will be carried on during the present year. These were for the most part started by the previous Government. The principal works are—the Wellington dam and Collie River irrigation scheme, the Harvey River diversion, the Waroona irrigation, and the snagging of rivers. It is anticipated that the Wellington

ton dam will be completed before the end of the year. Most of the works are well on the way to completion. The expenditure provided for this year shows a decrease on that of last year of something like £200,000. This is due to the fact that the works are nearing completion. The sum of £160,000 is provided for the goldfields-water supply. Last year the amount was £54,000.

Mr. Stubbs: The pipe line has been down for 33 years.

The PREMIER: This money is required for reconditioning and renewing the main pipe line in order to prevent losses from leakages. The renovations, which are only to the main pipe line, and the cement lining, will absorb £48,000, and new wood pipes will cost £64,000. The wood pipes are being made locally from our own timber. It is considered by the engineers that these pipes, which have only been introduced during the last year or two, are equal to steel pipes.

Mr. Stubbs: Has their life been proved?

The PREMIER: Very exhaustive tests have been made, and it was not until careful consideration had been given to the matter that the engineers decided there was no risk in using them.

Mr. Latham: They have been used in Victoria to my knowledge for 20 years.

The PREMIER: For steel pipes the sum of £51,000 has been provided. The main has been laid for so many years that there is considerable leakage all the way along the track. The pipes are old, and considerable expense has to be incurred in patrol work. For some years past the Railway Department have been obliged constantly to patrol the railway line. The pipe line runs inside the railway fence, and, if there was a serious burst, it might cause a wash-away of the line and bring about a serious accident. This patrol work costs between £5,000 and £6,000 a year. The mistake was made in the first place in running the pipe line alongside the railway. In every case where a new section is renewed, it is laid away from the railway, and that is why occasionally we see a section of the pipe line a quarter of a mile from the train. This is done in order to minimise the risk from burst pipes and the possibility of a railway accident occurring.

Mr. Rodoreda: Why use any steel pipes at all if wood pipes are satisfactory?

The PREMIER: In some parts of the line the pressure is low on the gravitation side, and wood pipes can be put in there, but where the pressure is high, steel pipes are used. Under the heading of development of mining, the amount provided this year is £110,000, compared with £29,588 last year. The excess expenditure is due to the desire of the Government to encourage men who were previously on sustenance to take up prospecting. It is estimated that the prospecting scheme will cost about £80,000 this year. About 2,000 men are engaged in it, and it is gratifying to note the number who have obtained satisfactory results. It is also necessary to provide additional money for extensions to State batteries owing to the increase in the tonnage of ore sent in for treatment. An idea of the increase may be gathered from the following figures:—

1st January to 31st October, 1932—64,739 tons milled; 50,679 tons cyanided.

1st January to 31st October, 1933—75,608 tons milled; 68,880 cyanided.

It is estimated that the quantities for this year will be 93,000 tons milled and 92,000 cyanided, a total of 185,000 tons, at the State batteries. Gold production for the first ten months of 1933 shows a gratifying increase over the production for the same period in 1932; 523,923 fine ounces have been produced this year, as against 499,551 fine ounces last year. That is a bright spot in the industries of the State, as regards the number of men employed and the increased tonnage treated not only at State batteries but at all other batteries as well. We are reverting to something like the yield we had 12 years ago. It is to be borne in mind, too, that the price of gold is now over £6 per ounce. I feel that many people do not realise the part the industry has played in saving Western Australia from a much worse position than otherwise it would have been in during the past two or three years. Under the heading of "Agriculture" there is an amount this year of £788,000, compared with last year's expenditure of £735,000. Included in this year's amount is a sum of £325,000 for the Agricultural Bank; and £85,000 is provided for assistance to settlers under the Industries Assistance Board. The requirements of the Group Settlement Scheme call for a sum of £47,000. The work covered by this

sum does not include certain special settlements established by the previous Government, which are of necessity being continued. I refer to Nornalup, Nannup, and Napier River. The numbers of settlers at those three places are 79, 57, and 19 respectively. In addition, work on the Frankland River land clearing is being continued. As regards the Forests Department, provision is made for £130,000 for the current year's work, and to clear last year's Loan Suspense Account of £10,052; a total of £140,052. The whole of the £130,000 will be spent on relief work, and 90 per cent. of the expenditure will be in the form of wages. The works to be carried out are:—

	£
Jarrah reforestation	90,200
Pine planting afforestation	24,500
Mallet reforestation	5,800
Karri reforestation	2,000
Forests settlements	7,500

It is proposed to continue the work of establishing new crops of young timber on areas heavily cut over by both sawmillers and hewers. The following particulars will indicate the nature of the work being undertaken:— Firstly, the opening up of old timber tram-lines and tracks as lines of access; and the clearing of additional scraper tracks to form a basis for controlled burning operations, thus eliminating the danger of serious fire damage. Secondly, the thinning and improvement of existing re-growth which is capable of developing into marketable timber. Thirdly, re-stocking, by means of natural regeneration, those areas which are at present carrying only useless trees and malformed re-growth. Next, as to pine planting. The results of the work carried out during the past year have been most encouraging. This year additional areas attached to existing plantations will be cleared and prepared for planting, during the next season, in localities where past results justify the anticipation of successful growth. The object of this work is to provide for a large proportion of the softwood requirements of the State, for which in normal years approximately £200,000 is sent overseas. The money is not even spent in Australia. The whole of that annual expenditure of £200,000 would have been saved to the State had we embarked upon pine planting on proper lines long ago. It was done in a small way some 30 years ago near Busselton, but the enter-

prise proved a failure because of the lack of trained foresters in the department at the time. Latterly the work has extended every year; and I offer an invitation to hon. members who would care to do so, and can make the necessary arrangements to visit the pine plantations behind the Mundaring Weir, on the catchment of the Helena River. I am sure very few members, and very few of the public know the extent of those pine plantations, and the magnificent growth taking place there.

Mr. Stubbs: Are our pine plantations similar in quality to the pine we import?

The PREMIER: Yes; high quality pine. The development in the catchment of the Mundaring Weir is wonderful. I hope hon. members will avail themselves of an opportunity to visit it some day, so that they may learn what is being done. Pine takes only about 30 years to come to maturity. If we keep on planting year after year, within 30 years we shall have a rotation of crops in pine just as in harvests. As a year's requirements are cut, fresh planting is continued, and the same ground is gone over again and again. Thus we shall be enabled to supply our own requirements. The pine plantations of France are worth about £5,000,000 a year to that country. The French just cut and plant each year for their requirements, and there is no risk of any shortage. The same thing could easily be done with the greater areas in Western Australia suitable for pine planting. The undertaking has now been placed on a scientific basis. Although we shall not get much benefit from it for a few years, the next generation will reap the advantage of the work now being done in this direction. Taking in all costs, including interest on the money expended, the crop will be profitable to the State.

This year the Forests Department have also launched out in the direction of mallet reforestation. The poorer classes of country in the Narrogin district, hitherto unproductive, are being utilised for the propagation of mallet, the bark of which, as is known to hon. members, is remarkably rich in tannin. During last year 1,579 acres were sown, making the total area treated in this manner 3,978 acres. It is proposed to sow a further area during the current year, in conjunction with the thinning of existing groups of naturally regenerated forest, and further fire-lines will be extended. The fact that the

Wagin Municipality and Road Board have handed over certain areas to the control of the Forests Department is indicative of the public interest in reforestation of waste lands with mallet. The local people have undertaken to look after the plantation, to keep a watch for fires, and generally to superintend the undertaking. As regards karri reforestation, settlement has taken place over the bulk of the cut-over karri forests, but a substantial area has been dedicated as a State karri forest. In the Manjimup district considerable progress has also been made with regeneration of karri, and smaller areas at Boranup and Yanmah have received attention. At the close of the last financial year a total of 8,700 acres of cut-over karri land had received silvicultural treatment. In the Public Works Department £80,000 is provided for roads and bridges, this sum being irrespective of expenditure by the Main Roads Board on Federal aid roads. For the latter, this year's estimate is £345,000, as against last year's expenditure of £374,000. Last year's expenditure on roads and bridges was £83,000, made up as follows:—

	£
Boyup Brook-Cranbrook-road ..	34,250
Armadae-Brookton-road ..	9,869
Nannup-Pemberton-road ..	8,175
Frankland-Nornalup-road ..	10,074
Manjimup-Nornalup-road ..	17,636

If the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) were present, he would be glad to hear that the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook-road is a road which can be turned into a railway. Rails are very high in price, and the money for them is sent overseas; but when the State is in a position to purchase the necessary rails, they can be laid upon the road which is being constructed. Work on the other roads is still being carried on, and all of them should be concluded this year. In addition, reconstruction of the Merredin-Kalgoorlie, Geraldton-Northampton, and Lake Grace-Ravensthorpe roads has been put in hand. Public buildings are in a state of extreme dilapidation, and have been so during the last few years. It is necessary, therefore, to provide a large amount of money for renovations. In a number of cases the roofs are completely gone, gutters are allowing rainwater to run down the walls, and external painting has not been done for years. It is impossible to allow this state of affairs to continue any longer. At the

Claremont Hospital for Insane the overcrowding is so great that the construction of an additional ward for female patients has become imperative. The work has commenced, and £21,000 for it has been placed on these Loan Estimates. The work is very badly needed, and it could not be delayed any longer. Extensions, long overdue, of the Midland abattoirs have also been forced on the Government, and will cost an additional £50,000 this year. The state of affairs existing there at present does not allow the work to be carried on in a proper manner, and would ultimately lead to trouble and possibly to loss. As a matter of fact, the Government make a profit on the running of the abattoirs. There is a good demand for assistance under the Workers' Homes Act. At present 131 applications are being held. These, at an average expenditure of a little over £600, represent approximately £80,000. From their own funds, representing repayment, the Workers' Homes Board have approximately £30,000 available for investment during this financial year. All such funds available up to the 31st December next have already been absorbed. For some time applications have not been received, owing to the board's inability to advise applicants definitely when these matters will be finalised. It is considered that if funds were available, numerous applications would be lodged. In addition to the £30,000 of the board's funds, an amount of £35,000 is provided on these Loan Estimates, making a total of £65,000 for the financial year.

Mr. Latham: A considerable number of workers' homes are on the board's hands, are they not?

The PREMIER: I do not think so.

Mr. Latham: It is so, according to advertisements on the trams.

The PREMIER: It may be that the Workers' Homes Board advertise that they have homes available, but these will probably be soldiers' homes, the property of the Repatriation Department, although advertised as workers' homes. Reverting to the total of £65,000 available for the current year, I should mention that applications already on hand are more than sufficient to absorb the amount.

Mr. Stubbs: Many of them are overcapitalised.

The PREMIER: Possibly, but they were over-capitalised when the homes were under the control of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Latham: Civilians can buy those homes.

The PREMIER: I suppose they can.

Mr. Doney: I know quite a number of homes, not soldiers' homes, that are available and unoccupied.

The PREMIER: I have not heard of that.

Mr. Doney: It is so.

The PREMIER: There are many localities where these houses could be constructed, but we are not receiving any applications now through the Workers' Homes Board, because no money is available and there is already a long list of applicants awaiting consideration.

Mr. Rodoreda: The board require too much for the old homes.

The PREMIER: A suggestion was made that the board should erect skeleton houses on the outskirts of the metropolitan area. Those homes would be at a lower cost than the ordinary workers' homes, but the board do not favour the idea as they would represent bad securities and would inevitably result in a loss. Moreover, it is considered that such an action would bring the board in conflict with local authorities in regard to permits. On the other hand, I have no doubt that there are areas in the outer suburbs where such homes could be erected, and would be permitted by the local authorities, but, as I have indicated, the Workers' Homes Board do not favour the proposal.

Mr. Hegney: I presume they would be homes built after the style of those erected under the McNess Fund, which cost about £250 each.

The PREMIER: They would be something along the same lines. The homes built under the provisions of the Housing Trust Act, are unlined, and have no bathrooms. They were built very cheaply.

Mr. Latham: I think that is the sort of house that was contemplated when the suggestion for skeleton houses was made.

The PREMIER: Yes. Regarding the erection of homes similar to those under the Housing Trust Act, the board would consider applications of that description for the erection of homes in suitable areas. Those homes cost approximately £260, but are constructed of timber and could only be erected in limited areas, where permitted by the local authorities.

Mr. Hegney: There are a number of such areas around Bayswater.

The PREMIER: And also, I presume, in parts of Victoria Park.

Mr. Hegney: And in Melville and in Queen's Park.

The PREMIER: I have already pointed out that the Housing Trust cottages are unlined and are not fitted with bathrooms. The board would not consider erecting houses unless those features were included and the extra cost would represent between £70 and £80. Generally speaking, the board experience a full demand upon any funds made available. Regarding the Housing Trust, all the money at its disposal has been expended. It will be remembered that £7,000 was provided by Sir Charles McNess and £15,000 was provided by the State from the Commonwealth grant for the relief of unemployment, which amounted to £145,000.

Mr. Latham: The money was taken out of the grant before the one you mention.

The PREMIER: At any rate, practically £22,000 has been spent by the Trust in erecting houses, and there is no money in the fund now. No new cottages have been built for over 12 months. Small repayments that are received by the Trust are being utilised to complete the lining of houses already erected. Very small repayments are asked and if the tenant is not in a position to pay anything, no demand is made upon him. Where they can pay 5s. or so a week those payments are utilised in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. Hegney: They are very comfortable homes for old age pensioners and for others who could not have a home otherwise.

The PREMIER: They represent the class of home that, if money were available, could well be provided for many people who cannot afford to avail themselves of more expensive dwellings. They might be able to finance the occupancy of such homes, which contain two or three comfortable little rooms.

Mr. Marshall: They would be quite comfortable for invalids and for persons who are not in a position owing to their health to engage in work.

The PREMIER: And if they could afford 2s. 6d. or 5s. a week, they could provide themselves with a fairly comfortable home. If they were not in a position to pay anything, they could get them free. If I could secure the money by some means—if we were to have a windfall or some charitably disposed person were to provide the necessary

funds—I would be only too pleased to extend the scheme.

Miss Holman: And in the country areas, too?

The PREMIER: There are many people who to-day have to live in lodging houses or rooms, who would be better off if they had the advantage of one of these comfortable little cottages, erected in one or other of the outer suburbs. Of course, the homes have been provided for indigent persons and very small payments, if any at all, have been required from approved applicants. The average cost, according to the particulars supplied to me, is rather higher than I thought, because I note that it ranges from £250 to £300.

Mr. Latham: They are four-roomed houses with a back verandah.

The PREMIER: Something like the cottages on the group settlements?

Mr. Latham: Yes, the same design.

The PREMIER: The cost indicated is about the same as that of a group cottage. They are quite comfortable and if lined and bathrooms are provided, they would be quite desirable, particularly for people who have no possibility whatever of securing for themselves more elaborate homes.

Mr. Hegney: They are much better than hundreds of people have in my electorate.

The PREMIER: And if money were available I would only be too glad to extend the scheme. That is all I have to say regarding the Loan Estimates, and I commend them to the consideration of members. They indicate the best we have been able to do with the money at our disposal.

Progress reported.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments made by the Council, now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2—Delete this clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: As the Bill left this Chamber it contained two clauses, one relating to exemption from disqualification under the Constitution Act of any member of Parliament who is also a member of the Lotteries Commission, and the other embodied the same provision but had application to future appointments. The Council have amended the Bill by deleting both those clauses and substituting another clause embracing the two struck out. The effect of the amendments is that practically the same provisions will be included in one clause of the Bill, but they will extend only to the end of 1934, instead of 1936 as originally provided. The clause will validate what has been done in the past, but that provision will not extend beyond the end of 1934. I have consulted the Crown Law authorities, who agree that this one clause will have the same effect as the two clauses contained in the prior Bill. The Crown Law authorities are satisfied that the Bill will overcome the constitutional difficulty. With regard to the extension of the term, I agree there should be a limitation. I have no objection to that. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2: Clause 3—Delete this clause.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3: New Clause.—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 2, as follows:—

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section six of the Constitution Act, 1889, or sections thirty-two, thirty-four, thirty-seven, thirty-eight, and thirty-nine of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, no disability, disqualification or penalty shall be incurred by any person who is at present both a member of Parliament and a member of the commission constituted under the Lotteries (Control) Act, 1932, by reason of having accepted or continuing to hold before or after the commencement of this Act the office of a member of the said commis-

sion or any emolument pertaining to that office, but no such office or emolument arising therefrom shall be held or enjoyed by any such member of Parliament beyond the 31st day of December, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four.

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2.)

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 21st November.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [5.47]: The Minister, when introducing the Bill last week, explained that it was designed to give local governing bodies in any part of the State power to instal a system of sewerage and drainage differing from the systems already installed. Anything that has for its object the improvement of the health conditions of the people should receive the support of the House. Unfortunately, many country towns along the Great Southern line have a contour that does not lend itself to a cheap system of drainage. I speak of the towns along the Great Southern line because I am more familiar with them than with towns in other parts of the State. Many of the towns seem to have been laid out on saucer-shaped areas and the persons responsible for the planning of them are greatly to blame. Going back to the early nineties, when the line was constructed between Albany and Perth, the railway engineers followed the line of least resistance. They surveyed a track that involved the company who built the line in the least possible expense. The result is that towns along the Great Southern line are so situated that to carry out a hygienic system for the removal of sewage and drainage is a very expensive task indeed. Most municipalities and road boards have borrowed sums of money to enable them to construct roads, footpaths, and reservoirs and, in

some cases, to instal electric light and other conveniences. Before a local authority can proceed with a sewerage and deep drainage scheme, however, it is necessary that the plans and specifications of the scheme be submitted to the Government for approval, and I presume, therefore, that they will be scrutinised with great care by the Government engineers before the Government approve of them. Unfortunately, during recent years, the ratepayers in many country districts have been saddled with heavy rates and taxes for public utilities already in existence. The depression has hit these country people very hard, owing to the low prices they are receiving for their primary products. The point I am leading to is the danger the local governing bodies may run into if they incur expenditure which the ratepayers will not be able to pay.

The Premier: The local governing bodies have to get the consent of the ratepayers before they proceed with the work.

Mr. STUBBS: The Premier is right. The previous Labour Government constructed a reservoir in the Wagin district to supply the town with water. The total cost was considerably above the amount fixed by the Government as being all that the people of Wagin could carry and it was ultimately written down to £21,500. The interest on that sum alone is a considerable amount for a handful of people to pay. I use Wagin as an illustration to show how easy it will be to throw on a town a burden which it will be unable to carry, especially in these lean years. The member for Albany (Mr. Wansbrough) has mentioned that the people of that town found their rates and taxes so heavy that they were unable to meet them. The Minister stated that £65,000 is to be expended at Northam. I know nothing about the capabilities of Northam to provide the interest on so large a sum, as well as a sinking fund, in addition to meeting the load of debt it may already be carrying. The proposed scheme is one that requires very careful consideration. There is not only the actual cost of construction, but of maintenance and pumping. If Wagin decided to instal a deep drainage scheme, I very much doubt if, with the 21½ million gallons of water in the reservoir, it could put the scheme into operation. I am not attempting to oppose the passage of the Bill, but am merely

pointing out what a heavy burden will be cast upon the taxpayers in many parts of the State if it is decided to proceed with schemes of the magnitude that Northam proposes to instal.

The Premier: Northam is a big town.

Mr. STUBBS: It is larger than the towns in the Great Southern district, except Albany.

The Premier: It is larger than Albany.

Mr. STUBBS: Is that so?

The Premier: Yes, three or four times larger.

Mr. STUBBS: Clause 2 of the Bill gives power to a local authority to raise money for the maintenance of any sewerage works. The other clauses of the Bill are principally machinery clauses. I shall mention a few of the principal clauses and explain what they mean. Clause 3 extends the borrowing powers of a local authority to enable it to provide sewerage and drainage; and the Government, if they choose, can guarantee the amount borrowed.

The Premier: We have the security of the whole town. We have guaranteed larger sums for private individuals in one business. We have guaranteed as much as £60,000 for the Albany Woollen Mills, and we have not much security there.

Mr. STUBBS: Are you likely to get the £60,000 back?

The Premier: I do not know.

Mr. Marshall: What about the Carnarvon freezing works? You will not get that money back.

Mr. STUBBS: Clause 4 provides that the local authority may strike a special rate, in addition to the rates they are authorised to strike under the Municipalities Act and the Road Boards Act.

The Premier: But councillors and road board members are men of judgment and know what the ratepayers can pay.

Mr. STUBBS: I am coming to that. I take it the men who are controlling the affairs of local authorities are sensible men and will see that the scheme is a feasible one. I am not altogether wedded to the proposal of allowing one particular engineer to design a scheme of drainage, because in years gone by this House has had the experience of Government engineers making failures of works that they designed. Since I have been a member of the House, I know of half-a-dozen big schemes that proved to be failures, yet

they were designed by men who were supposed to be competent.

The Premier: If the local authorities make default, we can take possession of the town hall. That would give us a good income.

Mr. STUBBS: Clauses 6 to 9 of the Bill either repeal or amend sections of the principal Act to conform to the new power proposed to be given to local governing bodies. Another safeguard is that the scheme must be approved by the Governor-in-Council. Therefore, I take it that it will bear the hall mark of the Government's engineers. The Bill, in my opinion, should not meet with any opposition from members of this Chamber. It is my intention to support the second reading.

MR. PIESSE (Katanning) [6.0.] I congratulate the Minister for Health on having introduced the Bill. It is desired to keep pace with the growth of our inland towns and other centres of population and to instal a modern sewerage system. I can understand that the Bill would more closely fit in with a scheme that is to be embarked upon by the municipality of Northam. There, I believe, the question of deep sewerage has been under consideration for some time. That town has arrived at the stage at which, with the approval of the ratepayers, it can undertake this work. From the Minister's speech, and from what I know of the people of Northam, there is every possibility of the work being begun at no distant date. But I am not so hopeful that towns like Wagin, Narrogin and Katanning will be able to take advantage of this Bill if it becomes law, though the local authorities in those places are hopeful in that direction. As the Minister has pointed out, a partial scheme was installed at Katanning. It provided for the carrying away of liquid waste, but only from a limited portion of the district. The local road board came to the conclusion that it would be very much more economical to sewerage the liquid waste than to cart it away, and Parliament was good enough last session at the request of the road board, to pass an amendment of the Health Act permitting a poll of ratepayers to be taken on that question. Then an agreement was arrived at with those people who desired to use the service. That work was carried out at a cost of £1,250, and I believe the cost of removing the liquid waste was reduced by a third. The new system

was also much healthier and more sanitary. The waste was taken away through pipes and treated at a small sewerage farm. As the Minister has pointed out, he has gone to considerable trouble preparing the Bill that will give further powers in connection with schemes such as I have referred to and when the time is ripe for towns like Kataning, Wagin and Narrogin to undertake complete sewerage, then we shall have a measure giving the local authorities the opportunity to do so. My only fear is that the Bill now before us may be passed rather hurriedly. There has not been any opportunity to get the opinion of the local authority, and therefore I hope that the Minister will delay the Committee stage. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

MR. LATHAM (York) [6.5]: I am afraid I shall be out of step with other members on this occasion. Personally I consider that the Bill is being introduced to amend the wrong Act. I do not think the Health Department should be asked to carry out this work.

The Premier: They are not doing the work.

Mr. LATHAM: They are going to supervise it. It requires an engineer to supervise this work. The better plan would have been to introduce what might have been termed a country sewerage Bill, and if it passed, it could have been administered by the Public Works Department. Then the local authorities could have been permitted to become the bodies to operate it. I notice that the Commissioner of Health is expected to do all sorts of things that he is not qualified to carry out. What does he know about engineering? Unless there is some co-ordination between the Works Department and the Health Department, I am afraid we are looking for failure from the beginning. All the Bill will do will be to allow the local authorities to instal sewerage systems for their towns.

The Premier: They cannot do that without an amendment of the Health Act.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes. They could do it just as the metropolitan area is doing it under a separate Act. I should like the country towns to have similar legislation, and with the approval of the Governor in Council, the local bodies would be the authorities in control.

Mr. North: The Bill will apply to suburbs also.

Mr. LATHAM: It will apply everywhere. Sufficient consideration has not been given to the matter, but what I am mostly concerned about is that we are handing to the Commissioner of Health the control of the sewerage system. From a bacteriological point of view he may be qualified for control, but not from the engineering point of view.

The Premier: He would have nothing to do with that.

Mr. LATHAM: If the Premier reads the Bill he will see that it does not refer to engineering; it says that the Commissioner shall decide, and I know the departments as well as does the Premier.

The Premier: The Northam proposal has been reported upon by a special engineer from the Eastern States.

Mr. LATHAM: Will it be constructed under his supervision? I understand it is 18 months or two years since the investigation was made. The estimated cost of the Northam scheme is £60,000. We should draw public attention to what the scheme in that town is actually going to cost. We have been told that the ratepayers themselves will have the opportunity to express their views on the question, but how many many people work out exactly what the cost is likely to be to themselves, and further whether they are able to meet the cost. There is not only the capital cost of construction, but the cost of house connections, and there will be additional water that will have to be paid for. There must also be a pumping plant or probably two. Anyone who knows anything about Northam is aware that statements are published about floods in that town at certain periods of the year. There are many things to be taken into consideration. We here are concerned because the Government have been asked to guarantee the £60,000. Further, there are the various rates to be added and in the aggregate the cost is bound to be fairly high. I find from the latest statistical year book that the population of Northam is 4,874 and that there are in the town 956 dwellings. Albany will probably require to instal a sewerage system if the Bill goes through. This town has a population of 3,919 and 1,033 dwellings, actually more dwellings than Northam and nearly 1,000 fewer people. I am afraid there is no im-

mediate chance of Katanning carrying the new system because additional water will be required. The Government would be well advised to allow the proposals to mature a little longer.

The Premier: The Bill does not commit us.

Mr. LATHAM: But the power is there. I expected the Minister when introducing the Bill, to tell us how much money would be saved. Probably there will be a saving, but of course we are aware that the installation of such a system will tend to healthier conditions. Water will have to be taken from the pipe line and we must not forget that the demand for water from Mundaring is becoming greater as the goldfields areas are being built up. It is the No. 1 pumping station that will supply the water that Northam will require. The Northam people have not been consulted about this proposal. Anyway I should have preferred the Minister for Works to introduce the Bill in which there should have been provision to enable local bodies outside the metropolitan area, or on the fringe of the metropolitan area—those not likely to be served by the city sewerage system—to instal sewerage system for themselves.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. LATHAM: If we were to pass the necessary legislation and it was put under the control of the right authority, it would permit many bodies outside the metropolitan area, and some within it, to put in sewerage systems where required. One clause of the Bill provides that the health authorities may formulate a scheme and then get the approval of the Government; and it is prescribed that the local authority shall forward such general plan to the Commissioner of Public Health, who shall examine the same and may avail himself of the assistance of any of the Government departments or their officers in the examination, and shall afterwards report to the Minister for Health. Not only is it a question of sewerage, but under the Bill we are to set up another authority for drainage. The Government do a certain amount of drainage, and so do the road boards and municipalities, and now we are to have the health authorities doing a certain amount.

The Premier: If you establish deep sewerage, you must have it under the proper authority.

Mr. LATHAM: But the Health Department are not the right department for the work.

The Premier: I do not think they are.

Mr. LATHAM: That is all right. We might well ask the Minister for Health to bring in a general Bill so that any local authority might put in a sewerage system if they desire it, of course after consultation with the Works Department. I am concerned that the Commissioner of Public Health should be asked to say whether or not we should do these things. On a previous occasion, when a lot of septic tanks were being constructed under the latest amendment of the Health Act, I was most careful that none of the local authorities—the South Perth Road Board had a plan for putting in a large number of septic tanks—should do anything of the sort without consulting the Works Department and the Metropolitan Water Supply Department, for it might mean increasing the water pipe system. At Northam it may be found that it will necessitate relaying quite a lot of the pipe system. We have just extended the water supply scheme for Geraldton, and it will become a serious matter if the local authority at Geraldton come back on the Government to increase that water supply. Of course it will be all right at Northam, where the goldfields water supply main runs through the town, but at Geraldton, where they have a local catchment, it might mean great expense to the Government. The Minister for Railways, who represents Geraldton, said the pipes there were being re-laid. That might be because it is seen that more water will be required for the septic tank system. However, the last department to control these schemes is the Public Health Department.

The Premier: The Public Health Department should only come in as or when such a scheme affects public health.

Mr. LATHAM: Quite so.

The Premier: It would be absurd for them to have anything to say about the construction.

Mr. LATHAM: Clause 12 provides that the local authority concerned shall, if required by the Commissioner, furnish details of the proposed works, with the levels

thereof, and details of all proposed interferences with any street, road, bridge, culvert or permanent structure.

The Premier: That may be necessary from a health point of view.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not see that it could be. All the Commissioner is concerned with is the outlet, to see that the public health is not endangered.

The Premier: But the local authority might get out a plan that would affect the public health.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: The Commissioner could get the assistance of another department.

Mr. LATHAM: It is not easy to get departments to work in with each other. The Public Health Department will be setting up an engineering branch.

The Premier: Anything of an engineering character would be quite outside the sphere of health activities, and would necessarily be referred to the Works Department.

Mr. LATHAM: It seems to me wrong that the Health Department should have anything to do with the origin of the scheme.

The Premier: But it is not possible to do it at all without an amendment of the Health Act.

Mr. LATHAM: I think it is. Just as we have the Metropolitan Water Supply Sewerage and Drainage Act, so we ought to have a sewerage Act for the local authorities and permit them to form themselves into sewerage boards, always keeping them linked up with the Works Department, which have a knowledge of what quantity of water is available, and have the pipes and necessary plant to provide a water supply. I hope before Northam adopts this scheme the local authority will give some consideration to the interests of the ratepayers in point of the cost of the scheme. In a western town in New South Wales they have a system similar to the one in Perth with the filters on Burswood Island. The same complaint has been made there as has been made here. However, I understand that at Northam there is to be a sewerage farm, some two miles out of the town. Anyone who has been to Werribee will know that that farm is a very long way from the city, notwithstanding which complaints are frequently heard.

The Premier: I should think that at Northam the crude sewage will go through

filter beds; otherwise they could not have the farm within two miles of the town.

Mr. LATHAM: Unless they do treat the sewage, they cannot use that land for dairying, whereas if the sewage be properly treated, the land will have a value for dairying purposes. I will not oppose the Bill, but I suggest to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister for Health, that he withdraw the Bill and ask the Works Department to put up a comprehensive measure dealing with the whole question. We may have the goldfields wanting to come in.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: They do want to come in.

Mr. LATHAM: The goldfields are better entitled to a system than is Northam.

The Premier: This is not for Northam alone.

Mr. LATHAM: I know, but the whole thing is under the wrong authority. Who is to check the work of that engineer who came over from the Eastern States? He may be a highly qualified engineer, but his work ought to be checked.

The Premier: I would not dream of giving a guarantee until satisfied on all these points.

Mr. LATHAM: Well, let the Works Department have control. You may find the Health Department setting up an engineering branch for sewerage systems alone.

The Premier: They are a very modest department, with no ambitions in that way.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know that, but I know they use the Works Department when they have to report on buildings for public purposes, and I warn the House that the Bill will afford opportunity for a considerable enlargement of the Public Health Department.

The Premier: We have enough engineering branches as it is.

Mr. LATHAM: I agree that the Bill is wanted, but we should transfer it to the people who can control it and can give advice to the Government.

The Premier: Pass the second reading and I will examine all the points you have raised before we go into Committee.

Mr. LATHAM: If the second reading is carried, we may make a mistake that we shall regret.

The Premier: You do not know the Minister for Health; I should get into trouble if I made promises in his absence.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not going to oppose the second reading, but I do really think a mistake is being made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair, the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

Clause 14—Fees for licenses:

Mr. LATHAM: Last night the Minister said he was going to have an amendment to this clause drafted.

The PREMIER: I move—

That further consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clause 15—Passengers or goods not to be sent by unlicensed vehicles.

Mr. LATHAM: I shall vote against this clause. It will include any person who owns a motor car or a motor truck, and gives anyone a lift along the road. I hardly think the Minister desires that the clause should be so all-embracing.

The Premier: If we do not have something like that, we shall be opening the door to passenger-carrying without the payment of any license fees.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not mind a reasonable safeguard being imposed, but I object to the clause as it is now worded.

The Minister for Railways: People are constantly advertising that they are going to some distant town, and would be glad to have two or three persons as passengers in order to cut down expenses.

Mr. LATHAM: This is one of the worst features of the New South Wales Act. In that State the railways have got into an even worse financial position than they occupied before this protective legislation was passed.

Hon. N. KEENAN: This clause appears to cast upon the individual, who sends goods by an unlicensed vehicle, the onus of knowing whether that vehicle is licensed or not. There is an American touch about it. It puts people upon the "hot spot" and then waits to see what will happen to them. A

man may take a taxi believing it to be licensed, but it may not be licensed, and he may be guilty of an offence. The wording of the clause is entirely un-British.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is a class of agent who is always trying to secure passengers for people who are obliged to go to some distant town, and wish to cut down expenses by taking one or two persons who will contribute toward the cost of the trip. The owners of these cars may not be licensed to carry passengers, and yet they are doing so on these occasions.

Hon. N. Keenan: But this clause covers innocent persons as well.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It covers any person who sends or causes to be sent any passengers or goods by a vehicle that is supposed to be licensed for that purpose, but is not licensed. Members may be sure that the law would be interpreted in a reasonable manner, and would not cause hardship in the case of innocent persons. If a man wants to use his car for his own family or his friends he can do so, but it is time that people were prevented from carrying for gain passengers they are not licensed to carry.

The Premier: And it is not fair to other people who do pay their license fee.

Mr. Latham: Why not redraft the clause to specify those people?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A Bill is generally drafted to cover everything desired in a general way without going too much into detail. This clause has been framed with that object in view. As regards the matter of draftsmanship, in nearly all Acts of Parliament there appears a good deal of what to the layman seems redundant verbiage, but what is, in fact, necessary for the effective administration of the measure. If a silly person brought an utterly trivial case before a court, he would probably be mulet in costs. This measure, like other measures, will be administered reasonably. The clause should pass as printed.

Mr. RODOREDA: After the Minister's explanation the clause should be supported whole-heartedly. It refers to agents who seek out passengers and goods to be carried, so to speak, under the lap. The clause might well be made more drastic, so as to include the person who does the conveying or transport, to the detriment of the license holder. Such a person should be penalised.

The Minister for Railways: The man who does the conveying first offers or agrees to

convey, and therefore is included in the clause.

Mr. RODOREDA: I refer to the agent for the man who does the work with the car.

The Minister for Railways: I think the clause covers his case.

Mr. RODOREDA: Very well.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister might agree to the addition of some such words as "unless it is shown that the service is performed without fee or reward." Surely the English language is not so poor a thing that the clause cannot be made to express what is desired. I happen to know what occurs with vehicles not licensed for the carriage of passengers. The clause includes the driver of a car who merely gives a friendly lift along the road. That should not be an offence.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	20
Noes	16

Majority for 4

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Heguey	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Brockman	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Seward
Mr. Latham	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Warner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Welsh
Miss Holman	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Lambert	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Millington	Mr. Brockman
Mr. Mungie	Mr. Mann
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Keenan

Clause thus passed.

Clause 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Commercial goods vehicles not to be used for passengers:

Mr. LATHAM: This is a harsh clause, imposing a penalty of £20. Moreover, it is a provision which cannot be policed. A driver returning empty after delivering a

load cannot, under the clause, even pick up a man carrying his blankets along the road. Many of the men who would be picked up could not afford to pay 1s., for the ride. Knowing that the Committee had passed a clause such as this, I would not dare to take the risk and pick up a man on the road.

The Minister for Railways: You would not dare to do a lot of things.

Mr. LATHAM: What is the use of discussing the Bill? We might just as well stop and let it go to another place and let them deal with it there.

The Premier: Why depend upon another place?

Mr. LATHAM: We know that we can do nothing here.

Mr. Moloney: You have done very well so far.

The Minister for Railways: We accepted a lot of amendments last night.

Mr. LATHAM: We should amend the clause so that it will definitely provide that it shall apply only if a man accepted payment for the conveyance of passengers.

The Minister for Employment: How could that be proved?

Mr. LATHAM: If you can prove one thing, you can prove another. The Government could not have men going round the country policing such a provision as this.

The Premier: You know it would be impossible to prove that a man accepted payment.

The Minister for Railways: The man would say, "Don't mention anything about this," and that would be the end of it.

Mr. LATHAM: Are we passing clauses like this just for fun? We know what is done to-day. People are stopped on the road, quite legitimately, by inspectors, in the course of their duty. It will be pretty hard if a man cannot pick up a chap who is walking along the road with his swag, just because of a clause like this.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Do the insurance companies allow people to pick up passengers?

Mr. LATHAM: They do not stop them from doing so, but should a man give another a lift in his car, and through negligence, cause him to sustain injuries, he is liable for damages.

Mr. Wise: A man will have a job to carry his wife and family on his vehicle if the clause is agreed to.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course, and he will not be able to carry a parcel for his brother. It was for such reasons that I wanted the Bill to be referred to a select committee, which would have saved a lot of argument.

The Premier: But the House refused to do that.

Mr. LATHAM: And the House was unreasonable.

The Premier: You cannot reflect upon the House.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not; I do say members were wrong.

The Minister for Employment: All the members were out of step except you.

Mr. LATHAM: If the Minister, who knows everything, desires to say so, he is welcome to do so. There is something the Minister does not know regarding what he has been doing this evening. He knows now, and he knows that what was done was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the clause about what the Minister has been doing.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Minister will give consideration to the point I have raised. I have not been able to draft an amendment that would meet the desires of the Minister. I want to assist him to protect the person who is licensed.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I am very surprised at the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition, especially at his suggestion that it is useless discussing the Bill. He has gone off the deep end with a vengeance. He accused me of not showing any consideration, and yet, for three or four hours last night, we discussed the Bill and amendment after amendment was accepted by the Government. Now when we object to a small amendment that may be foolish, the Leader of the Opposition says that they had better leave the Bill to the Upper House and let them put the boots in.

Mr. Latham: I do not think you should say anything about the Government's attitude. You did not accept one amendment.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Get hold of "Votes and Proceedings"!

The Minister for Employment: There is the usual amount of truth in the Leader of the Opposition's statement.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Apparently, because the Leader of the Opposition did not get his way regarding the select committee, which would have killed the Bill for the time being—

Mr. Latham: A select committee has never killed a Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have been a member of this House much longer than the Leader of the Opposition, and I know that Bills have not been killed in that way, but murdered!

Mr. Latham: I would not have suggested anything of the sort.

The Premier: All the transport interests wanted the Bill to go to a select committee for no other purpose than to kill it. I know that much.

Mr. Cross: Outside influences!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Leader of the Opposition was absolutely unwarranted in his statements. I told the House I would accept any reasonable amendment that would not affect the principle, and that we would give every such amendment reasonable consideration.

Mr. Latham: Will you give reasonable consideration to my suggestion now?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Although the Bill was introduced a week ago, the Leader of the Opposition said he had not had time to draft an amendment on a comparatively simple issue such as that under discussion.

Mr. Latham: I could have drafted one, but not one acceptable to you.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The hon. member knows that there is the Crown Law Department, and all he had to do was to tell the officials what he wanted and the amendment would have been drafted for him. He has a secretary and he could have sent him to have the amendment drafted.

Mr. Latham: It is very simple!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Leader of the Opposition has had experience, and when he makes that statement, I know he means it literally, not sarcastically.

Mr. Latham: It know it is not simple.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Well, I do not know! We have the Crown Law Department and a Parliamentary Draftsman for the convenience of members, so that they can draft amendments in con-

formity with Parliamentary procedure and practice, and yet the Leader of the Opposition says he could not do it! His attitude is entirely unreasonable. It appears to me that there is no desire for the Bill to be passed, that things are to be allowed to drift on and continue in the same old way. If the Bill be not passed, and some co-ordination of transport achieved, I am afraid the State will be in Queer-street.

Mr. Latham: You are not warranted in saying that. We did not oppose the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Leader of the Opposition has made all sorts of unreasonable statements, and has accused me and the Government of being unreasonable. Candidly and frankly, without any equivocation, I say the Government wish the Bill to be passed, because they are anxious to secure co-ordination in connection with transport facilities. We are anxious to give protection to the railways, but we are not desirous of preventing others from operating their services. We desire reasonable co-ordination and regulation. We want to protect those engaged legitimately in various transport services from unreasonable competition. We should know where we stand. Is the Bill to be passed, or is it to be dropped altogether? According to the vote on the second reading, members agreed to the principle and yet on nearly every clause, Opposition members are critical and want to move amendments. Surely the Bill is not all bad. Opposition members are not prepared to support any of it, apparently.

Mr. Latham: We have supported a lot of it.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There was a greater need for a Transport Bill when the Leader of the Opposition was a Minister because the railways had a deficit of between £200,000 and £300,000, principally due to unfair competition.

Mr. Latham: You know that is not right. It was because we lost the timber trade.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: When I left office as Minister for Railways four years ago, all preparations had been made then to carry out the necessary inquiries with a view to introducing a Bill embodying similar principles.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think we are getting away from the clause.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, and from the Bill and from lots of

things that we allowed the Leader of the Opposition to do in obstructing the passage of the Bill.

Mr. Latham: There was no obstruction at all.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We should know exactly where we stand regarding the principle. We desire co-ordination and regulation.

Mr. Latham: And prohibition.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is nothing in the Bill regarding prohibition.

Mr. Latham: This clause means prohibition.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Bill suggests prohibition only in respect of things that are wrong. It will prevent competition that is not legitimate. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition wants to whittle the provisions away until the Bill will become useless. He is not reasonable.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The Minister has not been quite fair in his statement. We are just as anxious as he is to pass the Bill, and I cannot understand why he should have worked himself up into such a rage.

Mr. Tonkin: Speak up!

Mr. Marshall: Like a little man.

Mr. Latham: You shut up!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member had better proceed.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Merely because we suggest the inclusion of a few words, the Minister has protested against any infringement of principle. All we ask is that if a man gives another a lift along the road, he shall not be liable to prosecution. If he received payment, it would be a different matter.

The Minister for Railways: The law is administered reasonably here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: We desire reasonable protection to be provided for the railways. We realise the gravity of the existing position, and we want to see this co-ordination brought about.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The clause places on the owner of the vehicle all the responsibility for any contravention of its provisions, while the driver of the vehicle escapes. The owner may be miles away from the spot where the driver picks up a man to give him a lift, notwithstanding which it is the owner, not the driver, who is penalised. Surely when the driver commits an offence

it is he who should be liable to the penalty, or at the very least he should be jointly punished with the owner. I suggest the driver should be included in any penalty.

Mr. McDONALD: In a number of cases the clause might prove to be harsh. Under it, in the event of a bush fire, the farmer could not go out and collect fire-fighters; could not go around and pick up, say, any men working on the road.

The Premier: Do you imagine that anybody would prosecute in a case like that?

Mr. McDONALD: It is not sufficient to say that there shall be no prosecutions; the point is the man is made guilty of an offence.

The Premier: Our Criminal Code is full of clauses that are never brought into action.

Mr. McDONALD: But in every instance there is some guilt involved. These cases are creating new offences not previously contemplated. Taking up a man on the road, going to help a neighbour with a bush fire, taking a sick man to hospital—all these things, commendable acts in the past, are by the Bill made offences against the law. I do not think that people by doing innocent acts should be rendered liable to be stigmatised as offenders against the law. I move an amendment—

That after sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph (b) there be inserted "(iii) in a case of special emergency."

If that be agreed to, it will not be an offence if a person is carried in a commercial vehicle in a special emergency.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I particularly drew the attention of the draftsman to this, and asked him to provide that, even if the driver received a reward, he should not be prosecuted. I cited to him an accident at Gingin in which a man broke his leg at 9 o'clock at night, and a friend in town, having been rung up by telephone, went to Gingin and brought the man down to hospital. I told the draftsman we did not want such an action to be made an offence. Because of that, the draftsman inserted the proviso to Clause 13.

Mr. Latham: But there is a differentiation between vehicles there.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: At all events, I have no objection to the amendment if the hon. member thinks the proviso to Clause 13 is not sufficient.

Mr. PIESSE: Some restriction is necessary against passengers being carried by commercial vehicles in competition with our

railways. I suggest to the Minister that he might consider including certain words in line 2 of the clause.

Mr. Marshall: That cannot be done. You cannot go back beyond the amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: I suggest the amendment requires some extra words. It should be made to read "the person so carried is carried in a case of special emergency."

Mr. McDONALD: I agree that these words should be added to the amendment, and would like to have them incorporated in it.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment will be altered accordingly.

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

Clauses 18-23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Power to grant, etc., applications.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in the first paragraph the words "final and without appeal" be struck out, and "subject to appeal to a magistrate" be inserted in lieu.

If a person has a grievance because of the action of the board with regard to his application for a license he should be allowed to appeal against their decision to a magistrate.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A magistrate is not likely to be infallible, any more than the board would be. Because some applicants may think that the majority of the members of the board are wrong in their decision, the hon. member wants that person to be given the right to go before a magistrate and have that decision upset. I cannot agree to the amendment.

Mr. MOLONEY: I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should have moved such an amendment. This would mean that a magistrate could upset the decision of the board. I would remind the hon. member that he has departed from the attitude he took up earlier in the debate, when he said he wanted to preserve the authority of the board.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member is trying to draw a red herring across the trail. When I asked that the board should be given additional power, it was to enable them to make further investigations if required. In the case under review a man

may be deprived of his livelihood as a result of the decision of the board, and should be entitled to appeal against that decision before a magistrate. Our magistrates have shown that they are quite competent to discharge their duties.

The Minister for Works: What would a magistrate know about matters relating to transport?

Mr. LATHAM: This is a question not of transport but of the fitness of a person to receive a license. There would be no appeal unless the applicant had a good case.

The Premier: There is far more than that in it. What does a magistrate know about the necessity for a particular service, etc?

Mr. LATHAM: The board would be represented in the case that was heard by the magistrate. They would not allow an applicant to appeal against their decision without having their side presented.

The Premier: They could only engage a solicitor, who would know no more than the magistrate.

The Minister for Railways: They would not pursue a man to the last ditch, and they could be termed vindictive if they engaged a solicitor to appear on their behalf.

Mr. LATHAM: There are always two parties to a case, the aggrieved person and the defendant. In a case like this the magistrate would probably invite the representative of the board to appear in order that he might hear the facts from the other side.

Mr. Moloney: You would place the board in a pillory.

Mr. LATHAM: That interjection could apply to any kind of appeal from any court.

The Minister for Railways: The board would refuse to renew a license only for a good and sufficient reason.

Mr. LATHAM: Sometimes the authorities are officious in matters of this kind, and it is difficult to get anything out of them. The board would be more considerate in dealing with these questions if they knew an appeal could be made against their decisions.

The Premier: Is there any right of appeal against the decisions of the Milk Board, which possess very great powers?

Mr. LATHAM: I remember the Premier, when in Opposition, putting up a strong case against boards with autocratic

powers. Any bus owner or other person applying for a license, if he had a good case, would get a much better deal from a board of three than from a magistrate.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	21

Majority against 9

AYES.

Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Seward
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. North	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Collier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Cross	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Warner
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Wise
Mr. Neesham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Welsh	Mr. Coverley
Mr. J. M. Smith	Miss Holman
Mr. J. H. Smith	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Millington
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Marshall

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. RODOREDÁ: What bearing on this clause has "Section 8" mentioned at the beginning of the second paragraph? There appears to be a misprint.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This clause was taken holus bolus from the Traffic Act, and I think the reference is to Section 8 of that Act. There appears to be a mistake. I move an amendment—

That the words "Without limiting the powers of the board under Section 8," in lines 5 and 6, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. NORTH: The second paragraph of the clause has the effect of overriding all existing regulations of the Traffic Act, which have been fought over for years. Regulation 193 under the Traffic Act definitely states where the various buses can go and where they cannot go, where they can pick up and where they cannot pick up. It would be better to let the existing bus regulations apply, and give the proposed board power, under the regulations

clause of the Bill, to promulgate new regulations. This would moreover imply that regulations could not be promulgated without submission to Parliament. The clause as drafted would upset all bus routes.

The Minister for Works: Bus owners are now asking for alteration of routes.

Mr. NORTH: Yes. In fact, the clause would undo all existing regulations, which have been thrashed out after years of argument. I move an amendment—

That all words of the clause after the word "eight," in line 6, be struck out, with a view to the insertion of other words.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Will the board have power to prescribe conditions that will over-ride others already prescribed under the Traffic Act?

Mr. Latham: They will, and what is done under the Bill will prevail.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The subclause is the same as a provision in the Traffic Act, and no hardship has resulted in the past.

Mr. North: Will the present regulations continue?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, if the board do not alter them. If, after a thorough investigation into the whole position, it appears to the board that it is necessary to effect an alteration, they will be able to do so.

The Minister for Works: As soon as the board are appointed, I shall have a sheaf of suggestions from the bus owners themselves to send along.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Surely the board should have the right to consider the regulations, and if it is in the interests of all concerned to do so, they should be able to alter them.

Mr. Latham: Is it proposed to amend the Traffic Act by repealing provisions that are included in the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. Latham: Then there will be dual control.

Mr. Griffiths: Clause 56 affects that position.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Bill goes further than the Traffic Act which deals with traffic matters alone. Under the Bill, co-ordination is aimed at, which goes further than mere traffic control. Hence the necessity for the board to have the power set out. The probability is that the board will not disturb regulations that have proved satisfactory over

a period of years, but will deal with those that have been proved unsatisfactory.

Mr. McDONALD: Clause 33 provides that no license shall be necessary regarding commercial goods vehicles that operate within a certain radius of the general post office.

The Minister for Railways: Those are public vehicles.

Mr. McDONALD: Should not a similar provision be inserted with regard to buses? Is there any principle involved that warrants differentiation with regard to buses?

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 25—Conditions of omnibus licenses:

Mr. DONEY: Perhaps the Minister will explain the reason for the inclusion of paragraph (d). I am not disputing the fact that relevant industrial awards should be observed, but surely the awards will apply, irrespective of whether the paragraph appears in the Bill or not.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know whether it is proposed to use this provision as a penalty against persons who apply for licenses. The Arbitration Court will decide whether industrial awards or agreements are being observed, so why duplicate such a power?

Mr. Hegney: It merely insists upon the law being carried out.

Mr. LATHAM: The Arbitration Court will see to that.

Mr. Needham: The court does not police awards, but issues them.

Mr. LATHAM: At any rate, a complaint will have to be lodged and I do not see why this power should be duplicated. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) be struck out.

Mr. MOLONEY: I oppose the amendment, which will not do any good. The paragraph is an indication that the board will see that the requirements of the law are observed. Award rates are not always observed to-day, and the board will see that they do prevail. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition does not understand the functions of the Arbitration Court or he would not say that the court police awards.

Mr. Latham: Well, the industrial magistrates will do so.

Mr. MOLONEY: Neither do the industrial magistrates. That shows the hon. member's ignorance.

Mr. Latham: You want the enforcement of industrial awards and agreements by an easy process.

Mr. MOLONEY: Now that the Leader of the Opposition realises the position, if he is really in earnest, he will recognise the necessity for the paragraph. It will let people know what is expected of them, and the board will be asked to see that the law is observed. No one with the interests of the community at heart, would desire exploitation or sweating conditions for the employees. Should there be no industrial award operating, this will be an indication that proper rates of wages must be paid.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will give us some proof of his sincerity. He criticises paragraph (d), but conveniently skips over paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), which are in the same category and against which his complaint could also be lodged.

The Minister for Employment: The question of industrial awards has become an obsession with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. NEEDHAM: And that is why we want to call his bluff.

Mr. Latham: A little more money for the A.W.U. and Trades Hall.

Mr. NEEDHAM: What the hon. member knows about the Trades Hall is very little.

Mr. Hegney: It would not fill an egg cup.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That has nothing to do with the clause.

Mr. NEEDHAM: There is in existence a competent authority to see that the things required in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) are done. The hon. member offers no objection to them, but he wants paragraph (d) excised.

Mr. LATHAM: I am thoroughly in earnest about this. The board is to issue licenses. Paragraph (a) deals with the type of vehicle to be used in the transport of passengers. Paragraph (b) prescribes that the provisions of every Act applicable to the vehicle shall be complied with, and paragraph (c) provides that the vehicles shall be insured. Paragraph (d) is for the enforcement of industrial awards and agreements. Why should the board have to interfere with those things? If the employees have any grievance, the unions will take up the case. I object to the board being made a tribunal

to see that awards and agreements are being complied with. It is entirely foreign to the legitimate work of the board, and because of that I wish to have paragraph (d) struck out.

Mr. CROSS: It is important that paragraph (d) should remain in the Bill, in the interests not only of the employees but of the owners of transport services. Since the Bill has been before the House an owner of transport trucks has asked me to see that provision is made to ensure that another owner shall be compelled to observe award conditions. He said that man was employing boys and paying them £1 a week and food.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This provision is to be found in all similar legislation in other parts of the world. Clause 47 provides a limitation of the time the drivers of motor vehicles may remain continuously on duty. All such provisions are similar to Board of Trade regulations in other activities. Without paragraph (d) the board would have no control over industrial conditions in transport services.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 26—Power to board to attach conditions to licenses:

Mr. LATHAM: Will the Minister agree to the striking out of the word "specified" in paragraph (d) and the substitution thereof of the word "maximum"?

The Minister for Railways: The board has discretion in this matter.

Mr. LATHAM: Very well. Will the Minister give us an idea of what is meant by paragraph (e)?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In some instances the board are empowered to issue licenses at fees based on certain figures, and naturally the board will want to be in possession of those figures, for without them they will not be able to arrive at a satisfactory basis.

Mr. Latham: If we give the board that power, they ought to be bound to secrecy.

The Minister for Railways: I have no objection to that if the hon. member can put up a satisfactory amendment.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—That after "board," in line 2 of paragraph (e) there be inserted "and which shall be confidential documents."

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I see no reason why the statistics of fares collected on a bus upon which a certain percentage must be paid by way of license fees should be of a confidential character.

The Minister for Railways: Whose business is it, except the board's?

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: It is the public's business.

The Minister for Railways: But the board are empowered to do all this on behalf of the public.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: The public are entitled to know the earnings on any given route, that they might see whether the services rendered are commensurate with the returns. The figures of the Kalgoorlie tramways are published.

Mr. Latham: But they have a monopoly.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: No, permission has been given for a bus to run from the Kalgoorlie Hotel to the Crown Hotel in Boulder. In the metropolitan area the takings of the tramways and the percentage paid to the local authority are disclosed. The earnings of the Kalgoorlie tramways, not only the fares but money received for advertisements, are subject to a 3 per cent. payment to the local authority. All these figures are of interest to the public. I see no reason why the returns of the business derived from these licenses should not be disclosed.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The board will be appointed to carry out certain public duties. Information may be required for some arbitration court proceedings, or may be required for the use of Parliament, in which case it would become public property. We should be establishing a dangerous precedent if we carried the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: Why should we regard as confidential a business that is operating against a public utility, that is itself obliged to publish full information concerning its activities? I hope the amendment will not be accepted. If we are going to foster competition against the railways and tramways let us ensure that it is fair competition.

Mr. WISE: I am opposed to the amendment. Later on in the Bill we shall be asked to consider the relationship of aircraft to transport methods, and the conditions that will apply to them. At present we know

nothing about the financial operations of companies handling aircraft in this State, and it may be desirable that we should do so.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Period of license.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That the word "expire" be struck out, and "be renewable" inserted in lieu.

This would make the clause less harsh in its effect than it is now.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	19
				—
Majority against	..			7
				—

AYES.

Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Seward
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. North	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Collier	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Cross	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennelly	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Wise
Mr. Needham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda	

(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Welsh	Mr. Coverley
Mr. J. M. Smith	Miss Holman
Mr. J. H. Smith	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Brockman	Mr. Millington
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. Munste
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Marshall

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—"and the fee charged shall be proportionate to the fee charged for the full term."

I am merely asking that a pro rata fee shall be charged if a license is issued only for a portion of the financial year. These fees are fairly heavy, and constitute a considerable burden upon the owners of vehicles. It is possible already to get a license for half the year, and I want to open the way for a person to pay a fee for

a proportion of the year less than six months.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: I oppose the amendment. At Albany there are two bus proprietors who are running an excellent service. Between May and November they do not make enough for bread and butter. Now the hon. member wants to enable competitors to come in on a small fee, and do them out of their trade when the traffic has improved.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We do not want to make it possible for people to cater only for the cream of the traffic to the detriment of established interests.

Mr. Tonkin: Surely the board would not agree to that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the board think that, say at race time, additional transport facilities might be allowed, they would see to it that the fee charged was not too low in the interests of those who were already running the service. To do otherwise would be obviously unfair.

Mr. Needham: I did not suggest anything so ridiculous.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No; and I am sure the hon. member did not mean anything of the kind. The board can be relied upon to do what is fair by all parties, and their action should not be hamstrung.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: The license fee is to be determined by the board, and based on the earnings of the vehicle. Whether the duration of the license be long or short, if the fee is based on the earnings of the vehicle it should be a fair proposition.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 29, 30, 31—agreed to.

Clause 32—Commercial goods vehicle not to operate unless licensed:

Mr. PIESSE: This is a most important provision. The Minister should clear up grave doubts existing as to the need for licensing farmers' trucks as commercial vehicles. This clause might be read in conjunction with Clause 33, which makes exceptions from licensing. Apparently all farmers' trucks are to be prevented from running on any road unless the owner's place is not less than eight miles from the nearest centre, or unless there is exemption under the First Schedule. Under those conditions a farmer located at a siding eight

miles from his market town, Katanning, could not without a special permit carry goods or stock to Katanning unless it were grist to the mill or sheep to the show; nor could a farmer nine miles out from Katanning carry his produce there. Further, there is danger in the word "solely" contained in paragraph (c).

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The whole question is dealt with in the First Schedule. If when that schedule is reached the hon. member considers that the exceptions are not sufficiently wide in the interests of country users of trucks, he can move additions. This Bill includes matters that are not included in existing traffic legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 33—Application of Part:

Mr. FERGUSON: There are many unreasonable clauses in the Bill, but this seems to me the most unfair and lopsided. The effect it will have upon vehicles in the country districts must have been lost sight of by the Minister. It provides that no license shall be necessary for commercial goods vehicles that operate within a radius of 15 miles from the General Post Office, or for those that operate solely within a radius of eight miles from the place of business of the owner. In the country districts goods are delivered far more than eight miles from the place of business and in Bunbury storekeepers deliver goods 16 miles away. The clause means that if a country storekeeper delivers goods more than eight miles away, he will have to take out an additional license, the cost of which will be added to the price of the goods delivered.

Mr. Latham: And who will police such a provision?

Mr. FERGUSON: It will be very difficult. There should be no differentiation between the metropolis and the country district. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) "eight" be struck out and the word "fifteen" inserted in lieu.

Mr. RODOREDA: I support the amendment. Rather than penalise the country districts, we should give them an advantage compared with the metropolitan area. Already through the mail order system, big business concerns in the city are slowly strangling the country storekeepers.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. PIESSE: I do not know that even the amendment will deal with the difficulty I have already drawn attention to. A man may have to travel 40 or 50 miles to his market.

The Minister for Railways: You can deal with that in the First Schedule.

Mr. WISE: I want some information from the Minister regarding this clause. Will it mean that all goods carted from Fremantle to Perth will be conveyed in vehicles not licensed under the Bill?

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (c) "solely" be struck out and the word "principally" inserted in lieu.

As the paragraph stands, it will mean that if a commercial goods vehicle is used for any purpose other than those mentioned in the First Schedule, an extra license will have to be procured.

The Minister for Railways: What else can he carry?

Mr. LATHAM: He may find it necessary to go into the town empty.

The Minister for Railways: He would not be carrying anything at all then.

Mr. LATHAM: But he is not permitted to go on the road at all. And if he were carrying stores to the mines, he would not be permitted to carry wood to the mines. It ought to read "principally used" instead of "solely used." We have it in the Traffic Act.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	6

Majority for 18

AYES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Latham	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Troy
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. North	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Wise
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Cross	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Withers
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Needham

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Conditions of commercial goods vehicle license:

Mr. LATHAM: This is the worst thing I have seen in any Bill.

The Premier: No, your colleague said the other was the worst.

Mr. LATHAM: It is asking the board to do the impossible. How can the board go around all over the country, from Shark Bay to Esperance and out to the South Australian border, to find out whether a man driving a truck has been on duty more than five hours. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) be struck out.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	19

Majority against 8

AYES.

Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Seward
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Patrick	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clothier	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Collier	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Cross	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Moloney	Mr. Wise
Mr. Needham	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 42—agreed to.

Clause 43—Commercial goods vehicles to be registered as motor vehicles:

Mr. LATHAM: Is it proposed to re-enact Sections 10 and 10a of the Traffic Act?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If this Bill passes we will re-enact Sections 10 and 10a of the Traffic Act for six months as from the 1st January, but if the Bill is

not passed those sections will be re-enacted for 12 months.

Mr. Sampson: What is meant by "properly licensed"?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A person may be licensed under one section of the Traffic Act and not under another. He must be licensed under every section that has a bearing upon his license.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 44—Aircraft not to operate unless licensed:

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Government realise what they are doing by the inclusion of aircraft in this measure. Every nation is doing what is can to encourage aircraft. Certain routes are operated in this State at great expense to the people of Australia. Immediately the State legislates for aircraft and exacts from them certain fees, it will be a definite instruction to the Commonwealth Parliament to withdraw their subsidy.

The Premier: I am most anxious that the present subsidy should be withdrawn, because the taxpayers of Australia are being robbed for the service they are getting.

Mr. LATHAM: There is no more efficient service in the world than that operating in the north, and from the west to the east.

The Premier: The subsidy is being withdrawn at the end of the contract; that is when the overseas subsidy starts.

Mr. LATHAM: I know that tapers close about the end of the year.

The Premier: That is, for the overseas contract.

Mr. LATHAM: It is not stated that there will no longer be any subsidy for the service in Western Australia. We have the best trained pilots in the world operating our air routes. We provide nothing for the air-craft. Even the grounds are provided and maintained by the Commonwealth Government.

The Minister for Railways: Only some of them.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know of any that are being looked after by the State.

The Premier: We bore the cost of preparing the ground at Marble Bar, and are thinking of paying the cost of an all-the-year-round ground at Wyndham.

Mr. LATHAM: When I was Minister for Lands, the Commonwealth obtained from

this State reserves for landing grounds; and we spent no money whatever on those grounds. There is no unfair competition of aircraft with railways, the charges of the former being so much higher. The Minister for Health, if he were here, would uphold the aircraft service, which he desires to extend to the North. Further, the cheapest and most useful form of defence is aircraft.

Mr. Wise: This provision applies only south of the 26th parallel.

Mr. LATHAM: But the transportation of goods and passengers is from here. The clause applies to any aircraft coming south of that parallel. Let us not make the regrettable error of butting in on the aircraft service. I hope the clause will be negated.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Bill is designed to co-ordinate all forms of transport. A few years ago motor cars were not thought to be an effective competitor in transport. Let us not make the same mistake regarding aircraft. The license fee to be charged to aircraft is purely nominal, for the purpose of registration. Aircraft itineraries will not be affected in any degree by this measure. In a few years aircraft may become serious competitors in transport. It is a matter of Australian public policy to encourage aircraft, and the board will not hamper aerial services.

Mr. Latham: We are duplicating control by this clause. The Commonwealth already have control.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We must have some little control in the licensing of aircraft. It is not anticipated that the board will take drastic action in regard to aircraft, seeing that the cost of transport by air is so heavy.

Mr. Latham: Then let the aircraft alone.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: At the present juncture it may not be necessary to do much in the way of regulating aircraft. However, it is an important form of transport, and the board should have power to co-ordinate or regulate it in the interests of the country. Regulation by the board might also be essential in the interests of aircraft. The board might feel called upon to prevent competition which would render an air service unprofitable.

Mr. Latham: Have you consulted the Commonwealth authorities about this?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. Raphael: Do the Commonwealth authorities consult us about anything they do?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Not in the slightest.

Mr. Latham: Unfortunately they are the superior authority.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Where our powers of legislation conflict with theirs, the Commonwealth are paramount and we cannot do anything regarding that.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 28th November, 1933.

	PAGE
Questions: Education, Training College	2103
Ministerial travelling allowances	2103
Assent to Bills	2103
Ministerial statements: Forests Act Amendment Bill	2103
Bills: Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	2106
Constitution Acts Amendment, Assembly's	
message	2106
Land, 3R.	2106
Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment, report ...	2106
Permanent Reserve (A1162), 2R.	2106
Augusta Allotments, 2R.	2108
Reserves, 2R.	2112
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 2R., Com. ...	2113
Fremantle City Council Lands Act Amendment,	
2R., Com. report	2123

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION, TRAINING COLLEGE.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to re-open the Claremont Training College after the Christmas vacation? 2, (a) If so, will it be residential? (b) If not residential, what provision will be made for attending country teachers? 3, (a) Have

the Government considered the advisability of supplying the necessary lectures through the University to obviate the opening of the college? (b) If so, what would be the cost to the department? 4, What expenditure is it anticipated will be incurred by the re-opening of the college? 5, Has the University submitted a scheme for the training of teachers? 6, Has the Teachers' Union, or any other body, officer, or person submitted a report on the re-opening of the college?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1 to 6, The whole matter of the immediate future of the Training College is now receiving the special consideration of the Government, in the light of all the information received from various sources, but no definite decision has yet been reached.

QUESTION—MINISTERIAL TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: Having regard to the resolution carried by the Legislative Council on the 24th October last, relative to Ministerial travelling allowances, etc., can he indicate when the particulars will be made available to members?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: To prepare the desired information requires the examination of a very large number of vouchers over each of the years mentioned in the resolution, and naturally takes a great deal of time. When the return has been completed it will be presented to the House.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Yuna-Dartmoor Railway.
- 2, Southern Cross Southwards Railway.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.38]: During the course of my speech in reply to the debate on the second reading of the Forests Act Amendment Bill, I promised to obtain certain information for members. I now have the in-