

by the board on or before the 14th day of February in each year; or, failing such a determination—it often fails—the Minister is called upon to make the determination. To carry out these complex conditions is frequently an unpleasant problem for all concerned. The tossing of a coin is generally resorted to, to indicate which member shall retire. I believe the Minister also resorts to the heads-and-tails method of determination. Sometimes the secretary for the time being places his own interpretation on the Act. Failing this, recourse is had to the department, and the Minister has to give a decision as to when a member has to retire, instead of the Statute clearly defining the question, as is done in this Bill. Many cases have come before the department where members of road boards have had to retire every year to comply with the board's interpretation of the Statute, and to work in with the regular number of wards. In other cases, to get at the multiple of the number to retire when two or four is the nearest number to the multiple, they retire either much sooner or much later than the term for which they are supposed to be elected, and in very few cases where a district is divided into many wards do any of the members sit for the three years, although in certain instances they should. It is about time that such a ridiculous system was ended. I hope the proposal in the Bill will be accepted. The system of triennial elections is in force, in connection with local government, both in England and Scotland. In the Act to amend the laws relating to local government in England and Wales, which was assented to in August, 1888, the provision regarding the election of county councillors is as follows:—

The county councillors shall be elected for a term of three years, and shall then retire together and their places shall be filled by a new election

In the Act to amend the laws relating to local government in Scotland, assented to in August, 1889, there is the following provision:—

The term of office of a councillor shall be three years, and in every third year the whole number of councillors shall go out of office, and their places shall be filled by election

In the "Times Weekly Edition" of the 26th September, 1929, there appeared the following:—

"There will be no elections in London next November, as the metropolitan borough coun-

cillors retire as a whole every third year, and the last municipal elections took place there only 19 months ago."

The law is still in operation. In England and Scotland the system has apparently worked well. It has been in operation for over 40 years. All the great evils expected to follow from making it possible to disturb continuity of office under the Bill, have not been experienced in the Old Country, otherwise the principle would have been long since abandoned. Only in rare cases, in which a complete change in membership was merited, would continuity be affected to any great extent. I hope that the provisions relative to triennial elections will be permitted to remain, and that in other respects the Bill will not be amended so as to interfere with its usefulness.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 10.4 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 14th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: Swan River crossings	1591
Alsatian dogs, compensation	1592
Bills: Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1A. ...	1592
Roads Closure (No. 2), 1A., 2A.	1592
Alsatian Dogs, 3A.	1592
Reserves (No. 2), 2A., etc., Com., etc.	1597
Cremation, Council's amendments	1599
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, Com.	1599
Fremantle Endowment Lands, 1A., 2A.	1605

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

QUESTION—SWAN RIVER CROSSINGS.

Causeway and Narrows.

Mr. CLYDESDALE asked the Minister for Works: 1, What is the estimated cost of the proposed new bridge over the Causeway? 2, Does he propose to construct a punt for vehicular traffic across the Nar-

rows? 3, If not, have the Government any objection to private enterprise undertaking the proposition?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No estimate has yet been made. 2, Not at present. 3, The Government are prepared to consider any proposal that may be made by private enterprise or local governing bodies for this service.

QUESTION—ALSATIAN DOGS.

Compensation for owners.

Mr. SLEEMAN: (without notice) asked the Premier: In view of the recommendation of the select committee that inquired into the Alsatian Dog Bill, is it the intention of the Government if the Bill becomes law to see to it that the committee's recommendation re compensation is carried into effect?

The PREMIER: I can only say that the matter will receive the consideration of the Government.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE (No. 2.).

First Reading.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [4.35]: In moving the second reading said: The Bill embraces certain road closures that were not before the department when the previous Bill was framed and brought down here. In respect of all the closures now submitted, the authorities and the department are in full agreement. The first provision covers the approach to the new trotting ground. Under it certain lands, the property of the Trotting Association, will revert to the Crown in consideration of portion of a street described in the Bill being closed and given to the Trotting Association in exchange

therefor. The result of the exchange will be a wide approach to the association's grounds, enabling the traffic to be handled more satisfactorily than would otherwise be possible. Another provision in the Bill deals with a small portion of road adjoining the Ford Company's motor works now in course of construction at Fremantle. The company has purchased from the Crown the land abutting on the ground, and the proposed closure is necessary for the carrying out of a scheme for the utilising of the whole area. Other clauses cover proposed road closures of small portions of roads in the municipalities of Claremont and of Midland Junction. These closings are necessary for the linking-up of land purchased for school requirements. The last clause deals with the proposed closure of Marquis Street and other streets in West Perth incidental to the establishment of the markets. All the proposed closures in that area have been resumed, but it is considered that parliamentary sanction is necessary. The Crown grant has already been issued to the market trust, and the road closed. I propose to lay the accompanying plans of the Table so that members may acquaint themselves fully with the facts. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG.

Third Reading.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [4.40]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.41]: It will be remembered that the select committee appointed to inquire into the Bill brought down certain recommendations, one of which was that if the Bill became law, the owners of Alsations should be compensated. That is only right. If we are going to destroy or confiscate property, certainly the owners should be compensated.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell interjected.

Mr. SLEEMAN: If the Government contemplated the confiscation of some of Sir James Mitchell's land on which he had spent money, Sir James would be the first man to cry out in protest.

Mr. Lindsay: They do that sort of thing now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Not without compensation. When a man's land is confiscated, that man is paid an amount equivalent to what he has expended on the land. Of course, if nothing has been expended on the land and if the Government require the land, it is only right they should resume it without compensation; but if a man has expended money on his land he is entitled to be recouped that money. So, too, with a dog; if a man has purchased a valuable dog and if under the authority of the law that dog is mutilated or destroyed, it is only right that the owner should be paid compensation. When we had an outbreak of rinderpest, compensation was paid for every animal confiscated by the State.

Mr. Thomson: Not in every instance.

Hon. G. Taylor: And only after a long battle.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will admit the owners were not sufficiently compensated, but certainly they were compensated. And if the Government of the day did not pay sufficient compensation to those owners of stricken cattle, the fault lies at the door of the Government then in power. I hope the present Government will not permit this Bill to come into operation until they can see their way clear to compensate the owners of dogs mutilated or destroyed. The Premier, in reply to my question just now, said he could not make any promise. Naturally he could not, but I say that until we get an assurance that the owners of the dogs shall be compensated, we are entitled to do all we can to shelve the Bill.

Mr. Wilson: The Premier said the Government would give it due consideration.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Still, the Government may not see their way clear to compensate. Until we get a definite assurance that the owners of the dogs will be compensated, the House has no right to pass the Bill and thereby deprive the owners of the dogs of the large amounts some of them have paid for their animals. It was given in evidence before the select committee that certain of these dogs had cost £100, and that the dogs in some breeders' kennels represented a capital of £300 or £400. It would be monstrous to say to those owners that their dogs are to be mutilated or destroyed without compensation. I do not think members will be unfair enough to pass a measure such as

this without an assurance that compensation will be paid. I hope the Bill will be defeated.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [4.44]: I agree with the member for Fremantle. It was early pointed out that there is in the Bill no provision for compensation; and, in fairness to the sponsor of the Bill, it must be recognised that he could not put in the Bill any provision for compensation. I rather gather from the note of his remarks on the subject that he himself thinks the owners of the dogs should be compensated.

Mr. Lindsay: The select committee's report declares that.

Mr. DAVY: I believe the Premier also thinks they ought to be compensated. May I suggest that as it is too late to amend the Bill now and provide for compensation, the Premier might be able to arrange for a Minister representing the Government in another place to move the necessary amendment there. I would be very reluctant to vote against the third reading, seeing that the House has decided the Bill should be put on the statute-book. I should also be averse to its being enacted without some provision being made for compensation. This compensation should be on a fair and equitable basis to recoup the owners of these dogs for the destruction of their property, which would be brought about for the benefit of the whole community. If the Premier will say he will have the necessary amendment brought forward in another place, I shall be quite content. I do not want to have to vote against the third reading.

Mr. Sleeman: Suppose we pass the third reading, and no compensation is forthcoming, what then?

Mr. DAVY: If the Premier will tell me he will take steps to have proper action taken to provide for compensation, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. Sleeman: He cannot make that promise.

Mr. DAVY: If the Premier will say he agrees it ought to be paid, and will give consideration to the proper method whereby it can be arranged before the end of the session, I shall be satisfied. I do not want to see this legislation brought into operation minus any provision for compensation. It is not fair to take a man's property, or injure it, first, and then talk about compensation. It puts him in a most difficult position. He would have to sue the Government without any legal rights. The Government might pay compensation, but only a pit-

lance. The Bill should provide for compensation to be paid. If necessary, it should not come into operation except by proclamation so that the provision of compensation and the taking of action under the Bill may synchronise.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [4.48]: In addition to amending clauses of the Bill the select committee recommended that compensation should be paid. They did this after considering the whole question of the Alsatian menace. They say that those people who have bred these dogs should be compensated for any loss they sustain. That is part of the finding of the select committee. If the Bill passes the third reading and effect is not given to the recommendation, we shall be departing from the findings of the committee. On the other hand, if we provide for compensation, we may be establishing a dangerous precedent. We say that Alsations are a menace to Western Australia. We prevent their breeding, and it is now suggested the owners should be compensated. Someone else may conceive the idea of introducing a pest into Western Australia, and taking this as a precedent, may put up the plea for compensation as soon as steps are taken to get rid of the new menace.

Mr. Angelo: It would have to pass through Parliament first.

Mr. WITHERS: In my opinion it is creating a dangerous precedent.

Mr. Davy: There is no precedent about compensating people for the destruction of their property.

Mr. WITHERS: If we adopt the principle here, we may have to go on paying compensation to various people in perpetuity. It seems to me we should not pass the Bill without providing compensation, because that is recommended by the select committee, and yet if we do make that provision we shall be adopting a dangerous principle. I feel that the Bill should be allowed to stand over for the time being. At any rate, if nothing definite is done, I shall vote against the third reading.

MR. MANN (Perth) [4.50]: With a view to clarifying the position, this Bill, as members know, was referred to a select committee, and was amended in accordance with the desires of that committee. The select committee knew that they could not embody in the Bill any provision for compensation, but they went as far as they could by recommending it in deserving cases.

The Minister for Lands: Only three members of the committee were involved.

Mr. MANN: The interjection is not applicable. Members of that committee were appointed by the House to investigate the position, and they did so from every point of view.

The Minister for Lands: They were elected to investigate the Bill, not to make recommendations.

Mr. MANN: They were appointed to deal with it from every point of view.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. MANN: As the result of their investigations they put forward certain recommendations. We cannot do better than follow their advice. They suggest that people whose property is to be destroyed should be recompensed, and in very clear language they recommend compensation. Compensation has been paid in every instance where property has been seized or destroyed. Take the case of the rinderpest scourge.

The Minister for Lands: That was a very different matter.

Mr. Lindsay: What about the swine fever?

Mr. Davy: That was a case where animals were diseased.

The Minister for Lands: They were destroyed in the interests of the public.

Mr. MANN: People whose cows were destroyed because of the rinderpest were compensated. The Government appointed independent persons to go into the matter. They appointed the livestock auctioneers of Dalgety and Co. and Elder, Smith and Co. as valuers, because they were capable judges of the value of dairy stock.

The Minister for Lands: No, they did not.

Mr. MANN: I know that one of the auctioneers of Elder, Smith & Co. was appointed a valuer of the damaged stock.

The Minister for Lands: Afterwards.

Mr. MANN: The Government paid according to the value placed up on the stock by these people.

The Minister for Lands: No fear.

Mr. MANN: Quite recently there was an outbreak of swine fever in Kalgoorlie. Some of the pigs were destroyed and the owners were compensated by the Government. Possibly the owners did not get the compensation they thought they were entitled to, but they got what the officials thought was due to them. Surely these Alsatian owners are entitled to the same consideration as the owners of the cows and swine. The member

for Mt. Margaret laughs one of his characteristic laughs, which convey nothing.

Hon. G. Taylor: They convey as much as your arguments do. They have embarrassed you somewhat.

Mr. MANN: These people have paid a large sum of money for the dogs. No valid reason has been advanced why they should not be compensated for their loss. I support previous speakers in their views regarding compensation.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [4.53]: I am amazed at some of the arguments that have been advanced. The very members who are supporting the recommendation of the select committee, which had no power to put it into effect, are opposed to the Bill.

The Minister for Works: It is easy to put obligations upon other people.

Mr. Withers: That is what the Bill does.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We are asked to pass a Bill which, in the opinion of the select committee, would suitably protect the State against the menace created by these dogs. The member for Perth and the member for West Perth would not accept the findings on matters concerning which they had power to make alterations, but something else, concerning which the committee had no power to act, they are now supporting, and pinning their faith to it.

Mr. Davy: We are not doing anything of the sort. I happen to agree with that recommendation.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I object to the hon. member supporting a recommendation advanced by people with whom the hon. member disagrees in respect to other principles.

Mr. Davy: I am entitled to criticise the Bill as much as I please.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The hon. member opposed the Bill that was brought down.

Mr. Davy: That is not true.

The Minister for Works: He supported the Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: In the same way as the Minister did. We have the same voices opposing the third reading on the recommendation of the select committee, that is to say, because the recommendation as to compensation is not embodied in the Bill. It is rather peculiar for a member to pin his faith to one recommendation and then oppose the Bill the select committee have gone

to the trouble of redrafting and recommending to the House.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you not agree with the recommendation?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, but not to this being used as an excuse for hanging up the Bill. The House is practically incapable of dealing with the recommendation.

Mr. Davy: Are you suggesting I am trying to hang up the Bill?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Someone is trying to do so. The Premier has said he will give the matter consideration. We should accept his word and pass the third reading. He is in sympathy with the recommendation. If he says he will give the matter consideration, the Minister representing the Government in another place can bring down an amendment to provide for compensation.

Mr. Withers: Will the pastoral industry and those concerned supply the funds for compensation?

The Minister for Works: Do you want to tax us for this purpose?

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay—in reply) [4.58]: It was not possible for me to embody any provision for compensation in the Bill, but the select committee have recommended that the principle should be included. I believe some compensation ought to be paid. The select committee satisfied themselves that the extreme limit of compensation would not be more than £1,000. I believe the pastoral industry would be prepared to pay. I will go so far as to speak on behalf of the agricultural and pastoral industries, who have £40,000 to their credit in a trust fund. If the Act will allow it, we will unanimously agree to any compensation to come out of that fund. It is the proper fund out of which such moneys should be paid. We are passing this Bill because the dogs are a menace to the pastoral industry. The Vermin Act was passed to enable animals that were a menace to the industry to be dealt with, and money was collected in order that the work might be thoroughly carried out. If we can pay, the fund I speak of is the proper one from which the money should come. As a representative of the Agricultural Central Advisory Board, who were the first people to suggest this legislation, I am in a position to inform the House that the board are prepared to do what I have stated in the matter of compensation. They are ready to find

the money needed to compensate Alsatian dog owners. The Premier has given the House an assurance that the matter will receive his consideration. Such assurances have invariably been accepted in the past, and I have not the slightest doubt that hon. members can safely accept this latest assurance of the hon. gentleman. Should the Bill be held up, I shall say that the purpose of those holding it up is to defeat the measure. If the Bill, now at its third reading stage, is not passed within the next few days, it will not be passed during this session; and next year more compensation will be required. I hope hon. members will give the measure fair consideration.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.3]: I support the third reading, and commend the select committee for the thoughtfulfulness, and also, as it seems to me, the sense of justice, which prompted them to add their recommendation.

The Premier: It is the easiest thing in the world to recommend that someone else should pay.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier will pay some of the compensation, and I shall pay some, and other members will pay part.

The Minister for Works: I object to paying anything myself, and I object to my electors being called upon to pay anything whatever.

Mr. SAMPSON: This is a community question. The select committee have shown that in the interests of the pastoral industry the Bill should become law. I want it to become law. At the same time, however, we should mete out justice to those who will suffer as a result of the passing of the measure.

The Premier: Where am I to get the money from?

Mr. SAMPSON: A suggestion has been made that the compensation should come from the vermin fund.

The Premier: It is so easy to say that the Government should pay. The Government have not an inexhaustible supply of money.

Mr. SAMPSON: The community would prefer paying the amount to letting the small number of persons concerned bear the loss. I daresay the Bill would never have been introduced were it not for the pastoral industry. That industry being of

first-rate importance to the State, the small amount of compensation involved is justified.

The Premier: It is very easy indeed to say that.

MR. CHESSON (Cue) [5.5]: The measure having got so far, I do not feel inclined to vote against the third reading. While agreeing with the select committee's findings, I consider that the owners of Alsations should be compensated. The suggestion of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Lindsay) is sound. There exists a fund of £40,000 contributed by agriculturists and pastoralists, and the dog owners should be compensated out of that. The Bill practically means the destruction of the usefulness of the dogs. Their sterilisation implies that in a short time Alsations will disappear from Western Australia. It is only right, therefore, that compensation should be paid. The difficulty ought to be got over—if necessary, by an amendment of the Vermin Act. The dogs are being classed practically as vermin, on the ground that they are destructive of sheep. Hence the suggestion of the member for Toodyay is well grounded.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	7
Majority for					19

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Latham
Mr. Brown	Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Clydesdale	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Coverley	Mr. North
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Doney	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Wilthers
Mr. Rowe	Mr. Mann
Mr. Sleeman	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).*Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mount Magnet) [5.12] in moving the second reading said: The Bill embraces some proposals which have come before the Lands Department, and which have been finalised up to the stage when Parliamentary approval becomes necessary. The first proposal relates to the elimination of small areas from the King's Park and Observatory reserves, both being Class A reserves, with the object of providing for the circus at the entrance to King's Park and of permitting of the widening of King's Park road entrance from Thomas-street. Members are aware that much of the work has already been done. I regard the proposal as of distinct advantage both to the King's Park and to the city.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who gave permission to do the work?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not know. That is not my business.

Hon. G. Taylor: We ought to find out before passing the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Whoever gave permission did not do wrong, because a very fine thoroughfare will result.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who did the work?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not know. That is outside my province. I know only what is necessary for this Bill. The interested parties, namely the Perth City Council, the King's Park Board, and the Lands Department, were all agreed; and action was taken under the Permanent Reserves Act, which, it was considered, gave the necessary power to amend Class A reserves for the purpose of providing roads so long as not more than one-twentieth of the area of any reserve was taken for the purpose. The Bill is needed only because some element of doubt seems to exist as to whether the Permanent Reserves Act gives the necessary power. The work was done on the understanding that those who did the work had the requisite power. Now, however, there is some doubt as to whether they really have that power under the Act. The Bill will, of course, legalise the position. The second proposal in the Bill is to empower the Quairading Road Board to sell the land on which the Quairading hall is erected, in order that the proceeds of sale may be applied to the construction of another building

on a more suitable site. The Quairading Road Board propose to erect a more substantial hall. There should be no objection to their realising on the present hall site in order to fulfil the same purpose in a larger sense. The final clause of the Bill deals with land at Geraldton held by the Druids. Portion of that land contains two cottages, and the Druids are anxious to sell these cottages and devote the proceeds of sale to improvement and enlargement of the hall erected on the other part of the land. The society is anxious to sell the land as well as the cottages, but the land was not given to them as an endowment. When the land is surrendered to the Crown, it will be sold under the ordinary provisions of the Land Act, subject to the value of the improvements, and the value of those improvements only will be handed over to the society. The Crown will get the value of the land.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No one will object to that.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Members will thus see that the Crown is not giving the Druids the privilege of handling the value of the land, which was a gift from the Crown, and which, on that account, the society should not have the right of selling. There is no departmental objection and I am advised that the Geraldton Municipal Council have also approved. Until such approval is received by the department, the surrender will not be accepted. The approval of the council is necessary for the subdivision of the land on which the cottages are erected, and as permission has already been given by the council for the erection of the cottages, it is not likely there will be any objection to the sale of them separately. The plans, which I lay on the Table, will explain the proposals in detail and, if necessary, I can deal further with them in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. DAVY (West Perth) [5.7]: One or two remarks I have heard from hon. members suggest that a certain amount of explanation is necessary regarding Clause 2, and as I am in a position to furnish it, it is perhaps best for me to do so. It is not the first time that this question has cropped up. When a portion of a permanent reserve was taken in order to widen Hay-street, it was done by way of a proclamation, purporting to be issued under the powers of the Permanent Reserves Act. There was considerable doubt as to whether those

powers were sufficient, and it was decided that an Act of Parliament would be necessary to make sure. Exactly the same thing has occurred in this instance. Speaking from memory, I think that the provision in the Permanent Reserves Act is the effect that notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, nothing shall prevent the survey and excision of any part of a Class A reserve for the purposes of a road through or over it. It was thought that the Act would cover the widening of King's Park-road. But when the proclamation, which was regarded as sufficient, was issued, doubt was raised and in order to make sure the Bill has been introduced.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [5.19]: Many such Bills have been introduced in this House while I have been a member, and the House has always been jealous regarding interference with Class A reserves. When it was originally decided that any interference with such a reserve could be effected only by means of an Act of Parliament, a wise decision was arrived at. We have two examples before us now. In one instance, by the issuing of a proclamation, a part of the Parliamentary ground was sought. That was done through a Government that was easy to reach. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I occupied the position you now hold, and it became my duty to prevent that course being followed, and the proposed action was stopped. Those who sought to widen Hay-street by taking in part of the Parliamentary grounds were prevented from doing so. After later attempts, the Perth City Council were able to get the ground they sought. In the latest instance, those who control King's Park thought they were in order by having a proclamation issued so as to have King's Park-road widened. The Bill is merely to validate that action.

The Minister for Lands: It will make doubly sure.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I object to action being taken and work carried out before Parliament is asked to agree to the excision. Parliament would be loth to inform a local authority that they would not agree to the action taken, and require fences to be re-erected, roads pulled up and the reserve placed in its original condition.

Mr. Davy: Of course, the Act allows certain things to be done, and it was thought

that it covered the action taken in this instance.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I realise it is a laudable desire on the part of those concerned to widen King's Park-road, but it should be done in the proper way. I know that one of the prime movers in this matter has no respect for the law when he desires to do something.

The Premier: You are not referring to one of our law makers, are you?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, to one who is supposed to be a law maker. We should be very jealous regarding interference with Class A reserves, and not allow action to be taken and Parliament consulted later. I shall not oppose the second reading of the Bill, but I wish to emphasise the point that we should not allow Class A reserves to be interfered with except by Act of Parliament.

MR. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [5.23]: I have no objection to the Bill, but I am in doubt as to whether it will validate the excision of that part of King's Park that was made over to the Subiaco Municipal Council for the purpose of road widening. I cannot find anything that will cover that portion running down Thomas-street that was taken over by the Subiaco Council. I suggest that the Bill should cover that part, if it is necessary.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Reserves A1720 and A3495:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I accept the explanation of the Minister regarding the position. We should jealously guard our parks and reserves, particularly King's Park. There has been some suggestion of taking part of the park for the purpose of widening Mount's Bay-road. If that is suggested, I hope Parliament will be consulted before anything is done.

The Minister for Works: I do not know of any such suggestion, other than taking some of the sand and stone from one part and filling in some of the bends of Mount's

Bay-road. That will not involve any infringement on the park area.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope that is so. Before anything of that sort is done, Parliament should be consulted. In those parts of the park, if the sand is interfered with, the rocks will be interfered with too. I hope Parliament will be consulted before anything is done there. We should safeguard our park.

The Premier: Except, of course, when it comes to lawn tennis!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That does not mean the surrender of any part of the park.

The Premier: It means virtual surrender.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. We should allow people to stroll through the park and play games there. That is what it was intended for. When it comes to reducing the size of the park, it is a matter for regret.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CREMATION.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; Mr. North in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 3.—Insert at the end a proviso as follows:—"Provided that nothing in this section shall prevent the dead body of any person of Asiatic race being cremated in accordance with the religion to which the deceased belonged, subject, always, to such regulations as may be prescribed in regard thereto."

Mr. NORTH: The Bill was passed in this Chamber on the understanding that an amendment would be made in another place to permit Asiatics to carry on as at present. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2. Clause 14, Subclause (1).—Insert new paragraphs as follows:—“(a) To approve of sites for the erection of any crematorium, and requiring that proper plans and specifications of all buildings, fittings, works and apparatus to be used for a crematorium shall be first submitted to and approved by the Commissioner, and providing for all such buildings, fittings, works and apparatus to be erected, completed, and maintained to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, and to prohibit the erection on any site not approved as aforesaid, or the use of any such buildings, fittings, works or apparatus not erected or completed or maintained to the satisfaction of the Commissioner. (c) Conferring on the trustees or controlling authority of any cemetery, power to obtain and exercise licenses under this Act, and providing for the devolution of licenses on the successors in office of the licensees. (d) The granting of authority in such manner at such specified times or places, or the withholding of any such authority to exercise any rites or ceremonies recognised by or peculiar to any race or sect or community in connection with cremation.”

Mr. NORTH: This amendment relates to regulations and might well be accepted. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

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

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I entirely approve of the proposed amendment, but I should like it to go further. There are officers other than members of the field staff of the Forests Department who have not the right to go to the board and therefore have no right of appeal.

The Premier: I am not aware of any.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There are such officers and they should have the right of appeal to the board. I have no desire to hold up the Bill, but the point should be investigated and an amendment moved in another place. Does not the Premier agree that as we have an Arbitration Court and an Appeal Board, everyone in the service should have the right of appeal to one or the other?

The Premier: Yes. If there are any who have not, I have no objection to an amendment.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 6:

Mr. DAVY: This amendment is really consequential on Clause 5.

The Premier: The principle involved is contained in this clause.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, it crops up here for the first time. I object to the principle that a member of the civil service may appeal only through the Civil Service Association. It would have two results that would be distasteful to me. Every civil servant who wished to have the right of appeal would be compelled to belong to the association. If for any reason he were unacceptable to the association, he would be deprived of the right. I find it difficult to understand how members on the Government side, who from their expressions of opinion on other matters have really liberal tendencies, can consider this proposition just. The second objection is that if only the association can represent a civil servant on an appeal, there will have to be two trials. A civil servant would first have to put his case to the association and the association might decline to go on with it. We are creating a tribunal to consider the complaints of civil servants, and it is the tribunal to which every civil servant should have an absolute right to go. A man might have a poor case, but the only people entitled to adjudicate on that are the members of the appeal board. I can quite imagine that a civil servant might have made a nuisance of himself or had a row with the secretary of the association—not that I think the present secretary would be influenced by any personal motives—but a secretary might conceive a dislike to a member, not bother to listen to him, and refuse to take up his case. It is entirely wrong to leave room for

such a possibility. I propose to amend Clause 4 by moving to strike out the first subclause.

The Premier: Your object will be met by voting against the clause.

Mr. DAVY: It is really Subclause 1 to which I object. I move—

That Subclause 1 be struck out.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No one will object to the association acting on behalf of any of its members, but I do object to the association being the only body that can approach the appeal court. If we agree to the clause, we shall then hand over the whole of the service to the association. I have no objection to the association appearing for officials, or on behalf of a group of them, but I want it to be done at the request of the officials, and I want to give the right to the official to appear for himself.

The PREMIER: This amendment is really in accordance with the spirit of the age. There would not be any Public Service appeal boards, or many other things, except for organisations and associations. It is generally conceded now that throughout the whole ramifications of industry, unions, organisations or associations are the proper thing.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: To take charge, body and soul.

The PREMIER: The individual worker cannot approach the Arbitration Court; he can only through an organisation obtain an award covering wages and conditions of employment. Individual effort has been eliminated, almost, individuals have no powers with regard to industrial legislation.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, they have.

The PREMIER: No individual in the country to-day can approach the Arbitration Court, State or Federal. He must do so through an organisation.

Mr. Davy: An individual can approach the Industrial Arbitration Court.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. Davy: Yes, if he has a personal grievance.

The PREMIER: Insofar as it may be a breach of an award that has been made through an association. It is in keeping with the spirit of the times that an appeal can only be made through an association or organisation. It may seem strange in respect to the Public Service, but it is only

in keeping with what is done in the industrial world outside.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Did the association ask for this?

The PREMIER. I do not know what the attitude of the association is, but I think it is a fair thing apart from what the association may think.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: When an award is given it covers all sections of an industry, irrespective of whether the workers are members of an organisation or not. The Premier is right in saying that the organisation should appeal to the court, but this Bill should not give an organisation the sole right to appeal. A person should have the right to appeal to the court without being a member of an organisation. A civil servant is classified and if he does not like his classification, he should have the right to go to the appeal board off his own bat. By this we are compelling all employees in the service to join the Civil Service Association. That is not right. Nobody believes in organisation more than I do, and I say good luck to the Civil Service Association for their very complete and fine association that they have brought into existence. I remember it in its swaddling cloths and have watched it grow to the power it is to-day. Its functions should be to show to those in the service the advantages to be gained by joining up, but we should not pass an Act declaring that "unless you are a member of the association you have no right of appeal."

Mr. THOMSON: I hope the Premier will not press for the carrying of the clause. I do not agree that it is the spirit of the age; I have always opposed compulsion and I will continue to do so.

The Premier: Did you oppose the Dried Fruits Bill, which was compulsion? You are voting for compulsion every day.

Mr. THOMSON: We have in the service a fine body of men, and whilst I have no objection to the members of it joining an organisation or a union, I take strong exception to an Act of Parliament which will preclude them from being able to appeal individually against classifications. There is no parallel between the Arbitration Court and an appeal against a decision of the Public Service Commissioner, for the appeal is by an individual, whereas the Arbitration Court deals with the whole of an industry. If the clause be passed, it will hand over the classification of the Public Service

to an outside body. What would be said if we were to provide that no farmer requiring assistance from the Agricultural Bank should obtain it unless he were a member of the Primary Producers' Association? That is exactly the principle contained in the clause. I have no objection to a man joining a union and asking that union to look after his interests before the appeal board, but I take strong exception to any suggestion that he should be compelled to follow that course. As the member for West Perth has said, the clause practically means that a man will have to stand two trials. I am not opposed to either the Civil Service Association or the Teachers' Union, but it is not right that we should force, say, the head of a department to join the union and then ask the union's executive—his subordinates—to sit in judgment upon the appeal he desires to have made to the appeal board. I am sorry the Government should have taken up this provision, which is certainly not in the interests of the service. I will support the amendment.

Mr. DAVY: Just one further argument I should like to urge against this clause. In many cases these appeals are appeals by individuals, and their evidence frequently consists of comparisons between their jobs and other jobs. Constantly these appeals get down to something very like a contest between two individuals. One man is claiming a rise and another is claiming a rise, and the one says, "My position is far more important than his;" and the other retorts, "Nonsense, that man's position is not nearly so responsible as mine." Now how can one person properly represent the cases of both appellants when there is anything in the nature of a contest between them?

The Premier: But the clause does not prevent an individual from going to the board and presenting his own case.

Mr. DAVY: It means that the appeal has to be lodged by the association and conducted by the association. It is the appeal of the association.

The Premier: Although the association makes the appeal, the individual is not eliminated. He goes before the board and puts up his case.

Mr. DAVY: But the association is the appellant and has the sole conduct of the proceedings.

The Premier: The individual is not eliminated.

Mr. DAVY: He has to do as he is told. Moreover, the association is to have the absolute right to determine whether or not a man shall appeal. And if the association finds a contest for preference going on between two rivals, the association will decide which one shall be put first. Every time there is a series of appeals, as for instance, after reclassification, there is a great deal of heart-burning between members of the association as to the respective values of their positions. Where that happens it is only proper that the individual should be entitled to put his own case and make his own appeal. The Premier sought to draw an analogy between our industrial arbitration legislation and this measure. I suggest they are quite different one from the other. The object of the one is the settlement of industrial dispute by arbitration, whereas the Bill is to allow John Smith or Jack Jones to come along and have individual wrongs righted. Why should those men have to place at the tender mercies of the association their right to appeal? So the clause is not an extension of the principle mentioned by the Premier. It is quite different from that, and is thoroughly vicious and improper, for it takes away the right of the public servant to go before the appeal board for himself.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	14
				—
Majority against	5
				—

AYES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Davy	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thomson
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North
Mr. Sampson	

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cowan	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	
Mr. McCallum	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived

Mr. DAVY: It appears that this is brought down as a party measure by the Government.

The Premier: It is not.

Mr. DAVY: There can scarcely be two opinions upon this matter. It is difficult to understand the point of view of a man who thinks that another should be compelled to belong to the Civil Service Association and be unable to make an appeal unless that body agrees to put it forward. I wish I were a better arguer and more eloquent.

The Premier: The victory is not always with the best arguer.

Mr. DAVY: I do not propose to hold up the business, but I do propose to divide the Committee on each clause which contains this objectionable principle. I move an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	14
			—
Majority against	1
			—

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Doney	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. North
Sir James Mitchell	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Withers

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 5, after "by," in line 15, the words "an officer or" be inserted.

The Premier: There is nothing to prevent an officer from doing that now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, there is. It is necessary that the workers should be protected by an organisation, but it is extraordinary that senior officers of the service should want the protection of an organisation. It is not very cheering to the country. Imagine senior officers being unable to look after themselves when appealing to the appeal board. It cannot be necessary

in the case of an officer drawing £900 a year to act in concert with other officers of the service. The Bill compels officers to ask the association to appear for them. The association may refuse to do this. They may say the officer has no case, and that they cannot take the appeal before the board. Is it right that this Chamber should place such power in the association's hands? There is nothing to prevent any State employee from asking the association to take up his case, nor is there anything to prevent the association from doing it. It is unthinkable that any public servant would desire such authority to be centred in the association. Public servants are capable of looking after themselves. The provision in the Bill means compulsory unionism for all officials; and that, in the case of civil servants who have been in State employ for a series of years, is a shocking thing. Fancy the chief of the Government Printing Office applying to one of his subordinates, who happens to be on the executive of the association, to present his case to the Appeal Board! We should not force the Government Printer or any other public servant into such a position. The provision does nothing to help the people of the country, who pay the salaries of public servants, nor does it help the public servants in any way. We on this side have not the slightest objection to organisation.

Mr. Sleeman: It does not look much like it!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should object to being forced into an organisation whose executive included the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Sleeman: I should be very sorry to have you in any organisation with which I was connected.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The only people who will benefit from the provision—by having their authority strengthened—will be the executive of the association. I hope the Committee will leave civil servants as free as possible in the matter of going before the Appeal Board. All the officers are not on the same financial mark. Those drawing, say, £1,000 a year should not be compelled to join the association.

Mr. DAVY: As apparently the Premier is not informed of the view of the Civil Service Association on this proposal, I shall read something which has been handed to me, and which I understand emanates from the asso-

ciation. It puts their case in favour of the principle here embodied, and the association's secretary desires to have it read to the Chamber. To me it appears an entire vindication of the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition and other members. It is as follows:—

To give the Civil Service Association or the Teachers' Union the right to approach the board on behalf of individuals as well as groups, and to bring the approach to the board into line with Public Service Regulation 52, whereby the association is constituted the channel of communication between the service and the Government

That is not a correct statement. The object of the proposed amendment is to give the Civil Service Association the sole right to approach the board.

The alteration of the section was first suggested by the remarks of His Honour Mr. Justice Northmore when presiding over the board in 1921. He then expressed the opinion that it would facilitate the work of the board, and exercise a reasonable check on frivolous appeals, if all applications were made through the medium of the association.

My comment on that is that it is not the function of a judge to make such suggestions. However, I can quite understand that the judge, at the end of a long series of appeals of which naturally some were frivolous, might make some such remark—

The Premier: In desperation.

Mr. DAVY: Yes. I do not think it is any argument in favour of taking the step proposed. Now comes what seems to me the crux of the matter—

The assumption that the amendment will bar any appreciable section of the service from the right of appeal is based on wrong premises, and insufficient knowledge of all the circumstances.

That is priceless. It admits the possibility of a section of the civil servants being barred from the right of appeal. If a provision proposes to bar one solitary individual from the right of appeal, I am opposed to it. The Civil Service Association here admits that a section—"not an appreciable section"—will be barred. That is sufficient to condemn the provision in my eyes.

A consideration of the following facts may make the position clearer:—(1) Membership of the association embraces upwards of 90 per cent. of the officers on the Public Service list including heads of departments and senior officers in every branch; and it may be said that practically the whole service endorses the proposal.

"Upwards of 90 per cent." may perhaps be interpreted as 95 per cent. What conceivable reason is there for compelling 5 per cent. of the civil servants to join the association against their will? If the association is the good thing we understand it to be, eventually every civil servant will belong to it. If even one over fifty per cent. of the service is in the association, the object is attained. The only danger to the association will arise when so many civil servants are out of it that collective bargaining by those in it can be defeated by State employees outside it. Some members of this Chamber and a section of the community have no regard for the rights of the individual. I have the greatest possible regard for them. I hold them to be just as sacred as the rights of the community. In my opinion, the individual should never be sacrificed for the benefit of the community unless it is absolutely and entirely essential. I want the people of Western Australia and members of this Chamber to get back to that outlook which is largely to be credited with the success of the British race in the world. This is a sample of the overriding of the rights of the individual by the juggernaut of the State.

The Premier: For a great part of the time in Britain, the individual had very few rights. You look back through history.

Mr. DAVY: The rights of the individual and the insistence upon them has been carried down from the earliest times.

The Premier: The lords and the barons had all the rights, and the individual very few.

Mr. DAVY: And it was the lords and the barons who started to assert their rights, and that has come down to us through the years until we lead the world in the recognition of the rights of the individual.

The Premier: We are a long way behind the rest of the world in our recognition of the rights of the individual.

Mr. DAVY: In these days we are beginning to get desperately away from the principle of the rights of the individual, and this Bill is another indication of the method employed to crush the rights of the individual in favour of the majority banded together in an association. I promised to read the statement I have referred to. It proceeds—

The board as constituted consists of a judge of the Supreme Court, a representative of the

Government, and a representative of the association, and was created at the instance of the association—

I agree, and the association deserves all credit and the gratitude of its members for doing so—

—It might therefore be rightly regarded as the members' tribunal.

Apparently, the idea is that the association is the creator of the board, and therefore the only people who will have any rights before the tribunal will be the members of the association.

Hon. G. Taylor: Absurd!

Mr. DAVY: That is a very narrow view, and I do not think it would be approved of by the majority of the members of the Civil Service, if put to them in the proper way. The statement proceeds—

There can be no conceivable hardship imposed on any public servant other than that of paying his annual subscription to the association, which varies from 6s. to 30s. per annum according to salary.

That is a candid confession that the object is to compel every member of the service to join the association.

The Premier: A jolly good principle, too.

Mr. DAVY: I entirely and absolutely disagree with the Premier.

The Premier: The hon. member is away back in the dark ages.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	14

Majority against 1

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Doney	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cowan	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Leonard	(Teller.)
Mr. McCallum	

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. DAVY : I said I would divide the Committee in every instance where the principle I have been referring to crops up. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (c) of Sub-clause 5, after "by," the words "any public servant or" be inserted.

Progress reported.

BILL—FREMANTLE ENDOWMENT LANDS.

First Reading.

On motion by the Minister for Works, leave given to introduce the Bill, which was read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [8.13] in moving the second reading said: The land proposed in the Bill to be surrendered to the Crown and dedicated by the Governor for the purposes of the Workers' Homes Act, is part of the Fremantle City Council's endowment lands. It was desired by the council that they should have the right to erect workers' homes on the endowment land, but the area was vested in the council for endowment purposes and their Act does not give them the right to erect workers' homes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why don't you give them the right?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: The council then suggested that they should surrender the land to the Crown and that it should be vested in the Workers' Homes Board, so that workers' homes could be erected on it. An agreement has been reached between those concerned as to the area set out in the schedule, and the council desire the land to be surrendered and vested in the Workers' Homes Board, so that, when funds are available, homes may be erected there.

Mr. Thomson interjected.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: It is intended that the homes shall be erected and sold.

Mr. Stubbs: Will they be sold as freehold or leasehold?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: As freehold. The area will be laid out on town planning lines by the Town Planning Commissioner, and when funds are available homes will be erected and sold. The land

is situated just beyond the Beaconsfield tramway terminus, and is a nice elevated position overlooking the ocean and really excellent land for homes. There is, and for a considerable time has been, a shortage of homes in the Fremantle district, and it is believed that under the easy terms provided by the workers' homes scheme, this proposal will be the means of providing homes within the reach of workers.

Mr. Davy: It is a much more sensible scheme than the Fair Rents Bill.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: I think it will have the effect of combating the high rents in that district for a long time to come.

Mr. Thomson: What do the council propose to do with the money received for the land?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: The council will not receive payment for the land, but will surrender it to be vested in the Workers' Homes Board. The land will be the property of the board for the purpose of erecting homes, and the homes will then be sold.

Mr. Stubbs: The board will set a value on the land?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: Yes; and the houses will be erected and disposed of. That has been done in other districts, notably West Subiaco and Leederville, but there mainly on the leasehold principle. The homes to be built at Fremantle will be on freehold conditions. The Tramway Board has stated that when the scheme is undertaken, the line will be extended to serve the area. It is desired that the Bill should be passed as early as possible. I cannot guarantee that the board will have money to go ahead with the scheme at once. Had the Loan Council made available the funds originally requested, we might have been able to accelerate the erection of workers' homes throughout the State, but the shortage of money has necessitated a great curtailment of workers' homes activities.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The council could borrow the money under the Federal scheme.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: They have no authority to do so.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, let us give them authority.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS**: That would necessitate an amendment of the Municipal Corporations Act. The Workers' Homes Act provides for a scheme of this kind and the council preferred that the Workers' Homes Board should undertake it.

The board have been very successful and have conducted their business really well. Since their inception I do not think a single loss has been sustained.

Mr. Davy: They carry on in the simplest possible way; a secretary and office boy could do the job.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have a trained and experienced staff and therefore are in a better position to handle the scheme than the Fremantle council would be, seeing that the council have neither the staff nor the experience. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2) RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

1, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment.

2, Reserves (No. 1).

With amendments.

House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 19th November, 1929.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1606
Questions: Mine Workers' Relief Fund	1606
Industrial stabilisation committee	1607
Wheat, bulk handling, Geraldton	1607
Migration Agreement	1607
Bills: Licensing Act Amendment, 3R.	1607
Main Roads Act Amendment, recom.	1607
Electoral Provisions, 2R., defeated	1608
Sandalwood, 2R.	1608
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Assembly's	1608
Message	1615
Roads Closure (No. 2), 1R.	1615
Fremantle Endowment Lands, 1R.	1615
Hospital Fund, 2R.	1615
Forests Act Amendment, 1R.	1624
Mental Deficiency, 2R.	1624
Aborigines Act Amendment, 2R.	1631

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1, Treasury Bills.

2, High School Act Amendment.

QUESTION—MINE WORKERS' RELIEF FUND.

HON. H. SEDDON asked the Honorary Minister,—1, What are the rates and conditions applicable to beneficiaries under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund? 2, How many persons—men, women and children—have received benefits under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund? 3, How many persons—men, women and children—are now receiving benefits under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, (a) Maximum allowance 45s. per week; (b) married couples receive 25s. per week if husband not eligible to either invalid or old age pension. If invalid pension obtained the allowance is 15s. per week, whilst 10s. per week applies if old age pension is granted. A further 5s. per week is payable for each child under 14 years of age; (c) widows: under 40, no children, a maximum grant of £19 10s. Under 40, one child, 30s. per week for six months after husband's death, then 7s. 6d. per week until child attains age of 14. Under 40, two children or more, 15s. per week and 5s. for each child until age of 14. 40 to 50, 20s. per week for three months after husband's death, then 15s. per week for three months, and then 10s. per week until remarriage or death. An extra 5s. per week allowed for each child to age of 14. 50 to 60, 20s. per week until remarriage or death. An extra 5s. per week allowed for each child to age of 14. 60 and upwards, 10s. per week and assistance rendered in applying for old age pension. An extra 5s. per week allowed for each child to age of 14; (d) single men and widows: 25s. per week if not eligible to invalid or old age pension and subject to similar provisions as (b); (e) cause of incapacity must be attributable to an industrial disease acquired in the metalliferous mining industry of Western Australia. Contributions to the fund must have been consistently paid whilst working; failure in this respect, the benefits abate on a pro rata basis. Where men are over 60 years of age when relief is sought, the Board views that incapacity is also to a great extent due to advancing years, and the allowance is at the rate of 10s. per week. Where benefits are being extended under the Miner's Phthisis Act or Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act, no relief is