

drains will be taxed for their construction, and even then only to the extent of the benefit conferred, and no more. Settlers who do not enjoy any advantage from them will be exempt. Lastly, there is always an appeal to the local court under the principal Act. I hope the second reading will be carried.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

BILL—SOLDIER LAND SETTLEMENT.

Second Reading.

Order read for the resumption of the debate on the second reading from the 9th September.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Schedule:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That, in order to correct an error, the figures £4,635,202 6s. 1d. be inserted in lieu of the present total in column 6 of the financial statement at the end of the schedule.

In trying to balance the figures, I discovered a typographical error of £100,000.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 8.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 14th September, 1926.

	PAGE
Question: Petrol tax	923
Bills: Traffic Act Amendment, Com.	923
Wyalcatchem Rates Validation, returned	929
Metropolitan Market, 28., Com.	929

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

QUESTION—PETROL TAX.

Mr. THOMSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Works: Were the figures supplied by the Minister in reply to my question of the 8th inst. regarding the amount of petrol tax collected for the June quarter correct, seeing that the same amount was previously quoted as collected for the March quarter?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: According to later advice received from the Taxation Department, the amount collected for the June quarter was £24,244 10s. 11d. The amount previously quoted, £23,058 17s. 4d., was actually collected during the June quarter, but represented tax due for the March quarter. The tax collected for the six months ended 30th June, 1926, totalled £47,303 8s. 3d.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 9th September; Mr. Lutey in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 6:

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) has moved an amendment, "That after 'reward,' line 7, there be inserted 'unless special permission in writing is obtained from the local authority for some particular occasion.'"

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am prepared to accept an amendment which has been drawn up by the Crown Law Department and which reads, "Except with the permission in writing of the local authority on some special occasion to be stated."

Mr. SAMPSON: I am quite ready to accept the Minister's suggestion, which will

mean greater opportunity for the examination of motor vehicles and will also have the effect of discouraging the illegal use of them. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That after "reward," line 7, there be inserted "except with the permission in writing of the local authority on some special occasion to be stated."

Mr. MARSHALL: Neither the clause nor the amendment will suit certain parts of my electorate, which are separated by hundreds of miles from the seat of local authority. The amendment would certainly prevent anything in the nature of an impromptu motor picnic outback, but still it is preferable to the clause. Times innumerable it happens that to overcome difficulties in the metropolitan area residents far outback are persecuted.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is not correct at all. The object of the amendment is not persecution but protection. Motor lorries are frequently to be seen with passengers seated on the side and their legs hanging down. I saw that only last Sunday.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not objecting to protection being afforded, but if people at, say, Peak Hill desire to have a picnic they must, under the amendment, obtain permission in writing from the local authority at Meekatharra, which means a fortnight for the course of post. If the Peak Hill people use a motor lorry without permission in writing, they will be liable under the clause as proposed to be amended. I repeat, to overcome difficulties in the city, people outback are persecuted. Legislation is constantly handicapping people located far from the capital.

Mr. DAVY: If the member for Murchison is right, the amendment is drastic. Does it apply to people desirous of travelling on a motor, or to the owner of a motor bus charging so much per head to carry people? If that is the only kind of case aimed at, surely it could easily be got over by the people hiring the motor lorry themselves. Suppose a body of people decided to hire a motor lorry, together with the driver; is it intended that the Act shall restrict the use of that motor lorry?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Mr. DAVY: They must get the written permission of the local authority?

The Minister for Railways: The lorry might be in bad order.

Mr. DAVY: But are you not going to allow the hirers of the lorry to use a little discretion for themselves as to that?

Mr. TEESDALE: I have an instance in which there is no hire or payment of any sort. The people use the lorry as a passenger vehicle, but supply their own petrol, and no money passes.

The Minister for Works: That is a totally different case.

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

Clause 5—Repeal of part of Subsection (2) of Section 7:

Mr. THOMSON: I want to be sure there is no possibility of this taking away from the local authorities the power to issue licenses. We have the assurance of the Minister that the Commissioner of Police is really the licensing authority in the metropolitan area.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The local authority is the licensing authority in its own district, whilst the Commissioner of Police is the licensing authority in the metropolitan area. At present the local authority may grant a license for a bus to run through another local authority's district. Again, in the metropolitan area the Commissioner of Police may refuse to grant a license for an additional bus in the city, whereupon the bus owner, if he can get a license from an authority outside the metropolitan area, is free to run within the metropolitan area and flaunt the Commissioner of Police. Lately a bus owner applied to the Commissioner of Police for a license to run from the Peel Estate into Fremantle and Perth. On the score that there were sufficient buses running on that route, the Commissioner refused to issue the license. The bus owner then went to the Rockingham Road Board and secured a license, under which he can come into the city despite the Commissioner of Police. If the local authority at Northam were to refuse to grant a license for a bus to run from Northam to York, it would still be open to the licensing authority at York to grant a license to run from York to Northam and return. Under such a license the bus would be running over the Northam roads despite the local authority at Northam. The object of the clause is to give the local authority control in its own district.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If a man licensed at Northam wishes to run his bus beyond Northam, must he apply to another local authority for further license?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is not the point. At present, under a license issued to him in Northam, the bus owner can run all over the State. Any little local authority outside the metropolitan area can issue a license under which a bus can run through the metropolitan area.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Under a license issued in Northam, where can the licensee run his bus?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Whenever the Northam Municipal Council gives him authority to go. What we are providing is that if such a bus comes into the metropolitan area it must run on the route prescribed by the Commissioner of Police. At present there is no power to enforce that, and a vehicle licensed in Northam to run to the metropolitan area can run in the metropolitan area wherever the owner likes. There is at present a bus running in from Jarrahdale. The owner applied to the Commissioner of Police for a route in the metropolitan area, but the Commissioner refused to give him one.

Mr. Thomson: Was that after he came in from Jarrahdale?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, before he applied for the license. When the Commissioner refused to grant him a route, that man secured a license at Jarrahdale and so put himself beyond the power of the Commissioner.

Mr. Mann: Under this clause what will happen when the local authority at Jarrahdale issues a license to a bus owner to run his vehicle into Perth?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Under this it could not be done.

Mr. Mann: There is a bus running from Narrogin to Perth. Who issued that license?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The local authority at Narrogin. But under this clause once that man comes into the metropolitan area, he must follow the route prescribed by the Commissioner of Police. Under his existing license he need not even go near Narrogin.

Mr. Mann: The only control desired by the Commissioner of Police is to see that that bus runs direct from Narrogin to Perth and back again.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is so. The Commissioner will be able to lay down a route for that bus to follow whilst in the metropolitan area. Again, that bus coming in from Narrogin is cutting up the roads of the various local authorities between Narrogin and Perth, notwithstanding which those intervening local authorities cannot prescribe a route for it to follow through their respective areas.

Mr. Mann: They might prescribe a route that would be unprofitable.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Crown Law authorities advise me that the courts would insist upon its being a reasonable route. It was found that licenses could be obtained outside the metropolitan area, and that the buses could then come into the metropolitan area and ply anywhere.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Section 7 of the Act seems to deal with public stands only. Obviously the licensing authority of the metropolitan area should have some control. The test should be whether a particular road is capable of carrying heavy traffic. Surely a bus owner could not make money by carrying heavy traffic over light roads. The Minister desires that buses licensed in the country should not be used in the metropolitan area. Any vehicle coming into Perth should conform to the rules of the metropolitan area. I do not know why we should grant anyone a monopoly to run buses. The heavy traffic is causing great anxiety, not only to local authorities, but also to the Government. It is the weight of a vehicle that tests a road.

Mr. Mann: Speed has an effect as well as weight.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. However, the position now is that if the first four lines of Subsection 2 are deleted, the stands to be used by all licensed vehicles will be under the control of the police in the metropolitan area and of the local authorities in the country districts. The police ought to control the stands of all vehicles coming into the metropolitan area, and that is evidently what the clause aims at.

Mr. Thomson: But that is not what it says.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think it means that.

Mr. Mann: That does not square with the Minister's explanation.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Section 7 of the Act deals with stands, and the licensing authority should fix the stands. If

it is intended that the licensing authority should determine the route that a bus may follow, it is another matter. I think the Minister has been dealing with the wrong clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not doubt that the Minister has explained his intention. He said that if a bus owner took out a license in Northam, and the York people objected, he could not go to York.

The Minister for Works: I said he could not ply there.

Mr. THOMSON: The Bill provides that the Governor may prescribe the routes within the metropolitan area or in any defined parts of the State to be served by buses. Later on it provides that the Minister may confer with the Minister for Railways and any local authority to satisfy himself that the roads proposed to be traversed are capable of carrying bus traffic without causing unreasonable damage to the roads, and that there are not sufficient other facilities for the conveyance of passengers to, from, or within the district to be served. The Commissioner of Police might receive an application from a bus owner to run to Katanning and might reply that, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Railways and of the Minister, there are already sufficient facilities for travelling to that town. The local authority at the other end might contend, "That is all very well for people living along the railway route, but the license should be granted for the benefit of the people living along the proposed bus route." Though such an applicant might be refused a license in Perth, the Katanning local authority might grant him a license to travel from Katanning to Perth. The object of the clause is to give the licensing authority control of the vehicles entering the metropolitan area. I suggest that Subsection 2 of Section 7 be retained, and that we add a provision to this effect, "But when in the metropolitan or other area such vehicles shall be subject to the traffic conditions applying therein." That would overcome the difficulty and would give the Minister the control he desires. I fear there is a possibility of restrictions being imposed on buses travelling from the country to the metropolitan area.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not intended to deprive the local authority of the right to license vehicles in its own district. The Crown Law Department say that this section of the principal Act en-

ables a person to obtain a license in any other district if the license is refused by the authority where his business exists. This amendment obviates that possibility. The Crown Law authorities say that if these words are struck out, there will be no interference with the position of the local authorities controlling the licenses within their own areas. Country vehicles plying for hire will not be able to enter Perth except by the routes prescribed by the Commissioner of Police.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Could I not use a vehicle in Perth that is licensed in Northam?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. This refers to vehicles that go on to stands, etc.

Hon. G. Taylor: This applies only to hired vehicles?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is all. It is proposed to prevent the local authorities from granting a license for a vehicle to ply for hire in the metropolitan area. It is understood that the Commissioner would allot a reasonable route along which the vehicle must travel in order to enter the city. Every bus must submit to the same conditions as apply to other buses. When it enters the metropolitan area it will come under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the York municipal authority objected to a Northam bus being run into its town, that vehicle could not run there.

The Minister for Works: The local authorities will, under this Bill, control their own traffic in a way they cannot do to-day.

Mr. SAMPSON: If the local authorities outside the metropolitan area issue their own licenses, we cannot limit the running of such licensed vehicles in portions of the State outside the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. SAMPSON: Will the owner of a Northam bus have to pay a fee for the vehicle to the Commissioner of Police if he runs with passengers into the city?

The CHAIRMAN: This clause does not deal with such a subject.

Mr. THOMSON: I should like to see the consideration of the clause postponed. There is some difference of opinion regarding it, and a doubt exists as to the effect it will have. I may be taking an extreme view of the position but I would prefer to have what was in the minds of the officials of the

Crown Law Department and of the Public Works Department embodied in the Bill, instead of leaving the question so open.

Mr. MANN: I am concerned about the control to be exercised by local authorities, particularly where long journeys are involved. A bus leaves Perth once a fortnight for Carnarvon. When the bus returns from Carnarvon it proceeds through territories controlled by several local authorities, each one of which may control the movements of the bus through its particular territory.

The Minister for Works: Each local authority will have the option of defining the route to be followed by the bus, but need not do so.

Hon. G. Taylor: But the local authority will have the power?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Mr. MANN: It may be that one local authority may direct the driver of the bus to proceed along a road that will not bring the vehicle within touch of the route that would be followed through the next road board area. With such a multiplicity of controlling authorities, it may mean the end of country runs by motor buses.

The Minister for Works: You do not think the local authorities will be so unreasonable, do you? If so, we should not trust them at all!

Mr. MANN: But each local authority will deal with the question of route from its own point of view, irrespective of the length of the journey itself.

Mr. Kennedy: But there is one road only from Perth to Carnarvon!

Mr. MANN: Then I will take another journey such as that from Perth to Merredin. After leaving Merredin a bus will proceed through the Merredin Road Board area, then through the Kellerberrin Road Board area, and the Northam Road Board area. At Northam the driver may be told to proceed to Perth via the Toodyay road and not by the Greenmount-road. The whole thing may become so unprofitable that the motor buses will not be able to carry on. If the police are to have power to collect fees and control the traffic in the metropolitan area, then one authority, either the police or the Minister, should define the route to be followed by such motor bus drivers.

Mr. Marshall: You will not get my support for that contention.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member will not trust his own Minister!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Is it not fair to assume that, should a local authority define an unreasonable route to be followed by motor buses, the court would at once declare that the route was unreasonable?

Mr. Marshall: It would be contrary to the intention of the Bill.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It would put these people to undue expense and make the business so unprofitable that the buses would not run over the country routes. If that were to follow, we should not agree to the measure.

Mr. Maun: That is what happened in Victoria.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But the Minister says that is not the intention.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Read in conjunction with the Act, we find that the provision relates to motors run "in connection with any business establishment." Does that refer to a business such as that of a carrier who uses a motor lorry, or to an ordinary business?

The Minister for Works: It may apply to either.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is very difficult to know exactly to what class of business this will apply.

The Minister for Works: If a firm had a business in Perth and a branch at Fremantle, the motor vehicle could be registered at either Perth or Fremantle.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Would the owner of a bus, who is living in Northam, be considered to have his business establishment there?

Mr. Thomson: I should say so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It seems to me that the clause was intended to apply to some special vehicles, for in 1919, when the Act was passed, motor lorries were not much in use.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: I take it that the object is to give control to local authorities so that the bus shall not compete with local vehicles. There is a bus running between Narrogin and Perth and it is allowed to go on the stand here and to compete against the local buses.

Mr. Thomson: But only so far as the run through the metropolitan area is part of its journey to Narrogin.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: That is so, but that should not be allowed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Amendment of Section 10:

Mr. CHESSON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"And by inserting after the word 'purpose,' in lines 8 and 9, the words 'or for any motor vehicle certified by an inspector of mines to be used bona fide by prospectors in the mining industry'."

The object of the amendment is to give relief to bona fide prospectors using motor vehicles solely for prospecting purposes, and in order to safeguard against imposition I have suggested that the certificate of an inspector of mines shall be necessary before the relief can be secured. Many men are prospecting in the dry areas where that task cannot be carried on without the use of motor trucks. The men are assisted by the State Prospecting Board and, in view of the provision in the Act, the local road board has to charge a licensing fee of £7 on account of the motor. The local authorities do not wish to penalise the men but they have to comply with the Act. Hence the imposition of the licensing fee I have referred to. In many instances it is necessary to cart water for a distance of 20 miles, and when the prospectors have filled their tank, they park the car and do not touch it again until it is necessary to come to town for food supplies. When they make the journey they cut across the bush, following a track they have prepared for themselves. Very often they do not use the main road at all until they come within half a mile of the township.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Most of the road boards in the goldfields areas would be very pleased to have such a provision in the Bill. The member for Cue has made it clear that as the clause stands the license imposed must be £7. There are many kinds of motor vehicles used in prospecting that never go on the roads other than when it is necessary for them to call for provisions. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There are very few prospectors using motor trucks, and those who do have them, have an advantage over prospectors using horse-drawn vehicles in that they have not to provide water for their horses. If the amendment were agreed to, the first difficulty would be to declare what was a prospector. We know there are many men around Hannans-street, Kalgoorlie, who call themselves prospectors. There is a Prospectors and Leaseholders'

Association, and there are members of that association who are never out of sight of the Kalgoorlie Town Hall. They too run around in motor cars.

Hon. G. Taylor: They would never come under this clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We think that the better way to assist the genuine prospector is through the mines development vote.

Mr. Chesson: I would be satisfied with that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am sure the Minister for Mines will repeat what I have said, because the Government are anxious to assist the genuine prospectors.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would be very desirable to exempt the bona fide prospector, but the difficulty would arise in getting an interpretation of "bona fide prospector." The company operating at Wiluna could claim that they too were prospecting and under the amendment would seek exemption. The Government are quite willing to assist the prospectors, but if the amendment were agreed to, hundreds would claim that they were entitled to benefit by it. I am giving the prospecting board authority to provide the relief sought in the case of bona fide prospectors.

Mr. CHESSON: I am perfectly satisfied with the assurance given by the Minister for Mines and therefore ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"and by adding at the end of the last proviso the following words 'and any vehicle used solely for the purpose of conveying children to and from school shall be exempt from vehicle license'."

My object in moving the amendment is to give relief, from the payment of an additional tax, to people who are desirous of sending their children to school. These people often have to provide a vehicle, generally an old sulky, and a horse has to be kept. The cost generally runs into about £30 a year. I desire the relief to be given only when a vehicle is kept solely for the purpose of driving children to school.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There are several objections to the amendment. First of all it is too small a matter to embody in the Bill. The amount involved is merely 15s. a year. If a farmer's income

is under £400 a year he gets paid for driving children to school. The amendment imposes no limit as to the class of vehicle; again, who is to determine whether it is to be used "solely" to convey children to and from school.

Mr. Thomson: The local authority.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The local authority would have a fine chance.

Hon. G. Taylor: If it is a matter of only 15s. a year, is it worth while putting it in the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is the whole point. The road boards have already put it to me that they have great difficulty in checking these vehicles that pay no license. The authorities have actually found them on the road and the drivers have promptly replied "Oh, we were just on our way to get a license."

Mr. THOMSON: The proposal came before the last road board conference and it is also being sought by people in my district. According to to-day's newspapers, on behalf of children in the metropolitan area it is proposed to utilise the Newcastle-street primary school for the purposes of a technical school. It is stated that because of the closing of this primary school no scholar hitherto attending it would have to travel more than a mile to attend another primary school. Contrast that with the position of country parents having children to send to school! The driving allowance is subject to an arbitrary figure of income beyond which it is not granted. Incidentally, how are the Education Department in a position to learn from the Taxation Department what a man's income is? The information is supposed to be sacredly confidential.

Hon. G. Taylor: It leaks out because many people go to others to make up their taxation returns.

Mr. THOMSON: A farmer with a gross income of £422 claimed the driving allowance for his children whereupon the Education Department sent back to him in detail the information he had supplied to the Taxation Department. His net income was only £130, and yet he was refused the driving allowance. Along the railway lines children are carried free of charge to the nearest school—and rightly so—the concession being granted without reference to parents' incomes. Further, I understand that within a certain radius children attending secondary schools and high schools in the metropolitan area travel free.

Mr. Heron: Yes, within five miles.

Mr. THOMSON: Frequently a country resident has to keep a sulky or a spring cart for the sole purpose of conveying his children to school. I regret that the Minister opposes my amendment. In view of numerous other expenses, the annual 15s. may represent something substantial.

The Minister for Works: Parents get back more in the driving allowance.

Mr. THOMSON: It is not impossible to define a vehicle kept solely for the purpose of conveying children to school. Moreover, local authorities are fairly wide awake.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The objections raised to this amendment are similar to those advanced against the amendment of the member for Cue. I understand that a father is entitled to the driving allowance if he is not earning a clear income of over £400.

Mr. Thomson: That is not so.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. If the man referred to has six children, the driving allowance of 6d. per child would mean 3s. per week to him.

Mr. Thomson: I do not say all the children are of school age.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We are getting down to petty matters if we include an exemption from a 15s. tax in an Act of Parliament.

Amendment put and negatived.

Progress reported.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—WYALCATCHEM RATES VALIDATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—METROPOLITAN MARKET.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 2nd September.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [7.31]: I well remember that in 1924 there was carried in this House a resolution dealing with a trust and moved by the member for Perth (Mr. Mann). We have talked markets for the metropolitan area for many years past. The City Council interested themselves in this question for years and I remember receiving deputations from them. Several Bills have been intro-

duced dealing with the question, but none proved acceptable to a majority of members. The Minister for Agriculture has now put up this idea of a trust which, as I say, was initiated in 1924. Without agreeing with all that he proposes to do, one can applaud the Minister for having taken the matter in hand. I will endeavour to show where I think the Minister is wrong. It will be seen that this proposal more or less leaves the matter suspended in mid-air. The financial clauses of the Bill are all-important. When we discussed the Bill submitted by the member for Perth and prepared by the City Council, it was estimated that a quarter of a million would be required by the time the markets were established and properly equipped. The Bill before us proposes to give the trust power to borrow against the security of the markets themselves. I do not know that the trust will be able to borrow very much without a margin. They have no right to come on the Government or on the ratepayers for any shortage or to provide a margin. It would be a simple matter for the Government, backed by the taxpayers, to borrow, or for the City Council to raise a loan supported by the rates of the City of Perth; but it is another matter when we ask a trust to borrow a large sum of money. True, the Government will be empowered by the Bill to make advances for the purpose of establishing the markets. But, again, the Government's only security will be the markets, and I doubt if the Treasurer will be prepared to advance very large sums of money against works over which he will have no control either in respect of their erection or lay-out or even their site. He will have no say as to where the site shall be, or as to whether the proposed buildings shall be suited to the business. Of course he can refuse to lend unless he is satisfied that the money is to be wisely spent; but who is to satisfy him? In the early stages of the establishment of the proposed markets, there must be difficulties and troubles and false steps taken. As to the financial clauses, we can deal with them in Committee; but if they are to remain as at present, it seems to me we shall be advancing the cause very little by passing the Bill. This proposed trust will be responsible neither to the Government nor to the City Council. I cannot see that that will be satisfactory. A trust such as it is proposed to set up ought to be responsible to some authority. After all, the trustees are to be appointed for a

short term, only three years, and possibly in the preliminary stage the term may be even shorter. But I do not see that we should suffer any disadvantage if to a greater extent than is provided in the Bill the trust were responsible to the Government or the City Council. Of the two, I should prefer the City Council, for it is their duty to provide these markets. I think the House will be favourable to a proposal that this trust should be made answerable to the local authority. When we come to the personnel of the trust we find that the producers are to appoint one member, the consumers are to have a representative, the City Council are to appoint one member and the Government to appoint two others. I do not know just how those representatives are to be appointed or who, for instance, will appoint the producers' trustee.

Hon. G. Taylor: The producers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is easy to say that, but it is difficult to know how such a representative can be appointed by the producers. Then, how is the consumers' representative to be appointed? Then one member is to be appointed by the City Council and two others by the Government. The appointment of those three presents no difficulty. The financial responsibility will rest upon those who use the markets. Probably they will be limited in number, and for the most part resident within easy distance of Perth. It is only right that the producers, the consumers and the City Council should be represented on the trust, but I should like an idea as to who the Government nominees will be. We are providing a monopoly within a limited area, the area covered by the municipality of Perth, exclusive of Victoria Park. So the area will not be very extensive, and it will cover that area over which the majority of the sales are to be made. The metropolitan area represents about 23 miles of houses from Midland Junction to Fremantle, but at Fremantle at any rate a market is already in operation. The idea of having central markets cannot be opposed, but when we seek to set up the markets we should endeavour to provide for their proper control, their proper maintenance and their proper conduct. Then there is the question of established markets. I do not know what amount of money has been spent by the people who run the markets already in existence, or whether they will be able to continue their business in the new markets without any

great additional cost. It must be remembered that all costs are passed on to the consumer, or alternatively passed back to the producer. The Bill is an improvement on the last that we considered, to the extent at least that under it grain, hay, straw, chaff and produce of that sort can be sold on railway landings by auction. That is a decided advantage, for such produce is costly to move and, of course, it is quite unnecessary that it should be moved since those things are sold in truck lots and to distributors. That provision I distinctly approve of, for unless considerable siding accommodation could be provided by the trust, there would not be room at the markets for selling in truck lots. Apart from that, it is essential that in the handling of cheap and bulky produce, every possible penny should be saved. One clause probably is more far-reaching than the Minister intends. It will prevent the sale under any circumstances of provisions or produce by auction within the metropolitan area; it provides that the trust may prohibit the sale in the metropolitan area of certain produce or provisions. However, we can consider that when in Committee. I urge the Minister to allow the City Council to have control of the trust. Some authority must have such control, and in my opinion the City Council constitute the proper authority. I do not know why the Government should seek the responsibility and outlay in respect of these markets. The Minister will agree that a trust without property, without anything at all to pledge, can scarcely borrow enough money for its purpose. They will have to secure land and will need a certain amount of working capital. A considerable amount of money will be needed; in fact, when the estimate was given on the previous occasion it was no less than a quarter of a million. While the Premier may be prepared to find that amount of cash, certainly he will have to depend upon the earnings of the market for his interest, and he will have no control over the market except so far as the two members he appoints exercise control, and that is not in keeping with the usual methods of making advances from the Treasury. While I am hopeful that the Minister will agree with the suggestion to make the City Council and the municipal area responsible for the market, I cannot do other than express the hope that something will result from the Bill. In many ways its provisions are more moderate than were those of the

Bill introduced at the request of the City Council, which I considered went too far. What we seek to do is to bring the producer and consumer nearer to each other, to increase the consumption and use of our own products, to provide proper cold storage so that supplies may be equalised, and to provide the cheapest means for doing all those things. I have no desire to oppose the establishment of the metropolitan markets. I can only hope that the matter will be discussed by the people most concerned, and that we shall be able to induce the Minister to meet us when the Bill reaches Committee, where it can be dealt with much better than on the second reading.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [7.47]: I am pleased that a Bill has been introduced to provide for the establishment of a market in the metropolitan area. The present position is far from satisfactory. There is no definite area for markets, and accordingly the markets are spread over the city. While there have been no complaints from the health standpoint, it is obvious that since the buildings were not erected specially for the purpose of markets, there must be greater expense to maintain the essential hygienic conditions than would be the case if the buildings had been constructed for the purpose for which they are used. The Bill provides for the auctioneering of produce, which in the opinion of many people is desirable. At the same time there is a section who view it with disfavour inasmuch as, apart from other considerations, a large expenditure of time is thus involved. At present auctioneering commences at 7.30 a.m., the first products offered being vegetables. That auction continues until about 10 o'clock, when tomatoes and later on fruits are submitted. In the fruit season the auction continues until between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. This means that a great amount of time must be spent in the markets by purchasers. Looking at the question from the viewpoint of purchasers, the fact of there being several markets must mean that there is a limited number of buyers in each of the markets. If the markets were brought under one roof, it stands to reason there should be greater competition and consequently better returns for the producers and a saving of time, which means money, for the agents and other purchasers.

Mr. Pantou: As long as the retailers do not get their heads together.

Mr. SAMPSON: Whether they do that I cannot say.

Mr. Panton: I am not saying that they do it.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is sometimes reported that they do so, but often charges are made that, when investigated, cannot be substantiated. I am not here to blame or to defend the agents.

Mr. Mann: It is not a crime for the sellers, to put their heads together!

Mr. SAMPSON: I would pay a tribute to at least some of the markets. It is very difficult to carry on markets and in some instances I know that care is taken in order that proper consideration shall be given. The Bill is designed to give authority to establish a market, and in that market it will be provided that wholesale distribution of all products is carried out. When I say "all" I should except chaff and certain other farm produce, which very properly will be sold on trucks, thereby obviating unnecessary handling. A subclause has been included in the Bill to regulate the method of selling in the market, to prevent the adoption of fraudulent devices in relation to the sale and marketing of commodities, and to permit of sales by auction or otherwise being conducted by officers of the trust. It has been reported that in one auction mart a man has had regular employment during the greater part of the week and at the week-end has operated on the kerbstone market. That seems to be in the nature of a fraudulent device. He would be a very credulous person who would believe that any man regularly working in a market would be on other than good terms with the auctioneer. At any rate, grave suspicion would be created that goods submitted by auction in those circumstances would not always secure the utmost price available.

Hon. G. Taylor: One swallow does not make a summer.

Mr. SAMPSON: Quite so, but Subclause 5 of Clause 13 should prevent the possibility of anything like that happening in future. There is one at least of the markets that I think has the confidence of the producers—the Producers' Markets. I mention this specially because the Producers' Markets are largely owned by the producers themselves.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is that any guarantee of their integrity?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a very good argument in favour of it. I understand that under this measure it will be competent to

conduct sales by private treaty. I am convinced that this method is well worth a trial. Considerable time would be saved if private treaty were adopted. As I have already pointed out, several hours are occupied daily in disposing of the various products by auction. Under private treaty it would be possible for growers to assist in the stabilisation of the supply of products as well as of prices. In the Adelaide East End and New Markets a committee of growers control to an extent both the supply of fruit and vegetables and the prices at which they are sold.

Mr. Mann: The wholesale markets in Adelaide are owned by a private company under a charter.

Mr. SAMPSON: The committee are selected from among the producers themselves. The growers meet at regular period and determine what products are required and what are reasonable prices.

Hon. G. Taylor: In other words, they put their heads together.

Mr. SAMPSON: It has never been said that the price of fruit and vegetables in Adelaide has been excessive. As a matter of fact, Adelaide's prices, in point of cheapness, compare with those of any market in Australia.

The Minister for Agriculture: I think that prices in Melbourne are cheaper.

Mr. SAMPSON: In that I think the Minister is wrong. The Adelaide prices are low in every respect.

The Minister for Agriculture: I shall take your assurance.

Mr. SAMPSON: South Australia is noted for the low charges made for vegetable fruit, honey, dried fruits, etc.

Hon. G. Taylor: Cauliflowers are about 2s. 6d. per dozen.

Mr. Thomson: And here they are 1s. 3d. each.

Mr. SAMPSON: I recall the excellent report presented to the House by the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) towards the end of 1924. A motion was submitted by the hon. member to the following effect:—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that legislation should be introduced this session empowering the Perth City Council to establish markets for the wholesale disposal of vegetables, fruit, produce other than grain or chaff,—meat, fish, poultry and game under the conditions recommended by the select committee for the establishment of markets in the metropolitan area.

When the division was taken, the motion was defeated. Subsequently a motion was submitted by the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) to the effect that the Government should appoint a trust composed of representatives of the primary producers, consumers and distributors to arrange for the erection and control of markets. That proposal was put and passed. To a large extent this Bill seeks to give effect to that proposal. The report of the select committee set out that the establishment of a metropolitan market was the function of the City Council. With that view many will agree. It appears to be the function of the municipality, just as it may be argued that it is the function of that authority to make provision for lighting and tramways. In the latter instance the Government have taken charge.

Hon. G. Taylor: We see the error of our ways now.

Mr. SAMPSON: Possibly we do in the case of the tramways. It would have been better had they been placed under the control of a municipal trust. I am assured that the Bill will in no way interfere with any kerbstone market now established or likely to be established.

Mr. Pantou: Provided they sell retail.

The Minister for Agriculture: They all sell retail.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Bill will not interfere with them?

The Minister for Agriculture: Not with any existing market.

Mr. SAMPSON: Or any market established on similar lines?

The Minister for Agriculture: The provision of any future kerbstone market will be a responsibility of the Government. They can only be agreed to by the Government. Let us rest content with the existing markets.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not content only with the existing markets. The more open markets we have the better will it be for the consumer and the producer. Open markets are an essential, for they bridge the gap between the consumer and the producer, and have a material effect upon the cost of living. I am glad to have the assurance of the Minister that no interference is intended or will be brought about by the Bill. Special provision is made to enable market places for the sale of produce by retail to

be carried on. The personnel of the proposed trust is open to some objection and criticism. According to the Bill the trust will consist of five members. One is to be the representative of the producers, one of the consumers, and one is to be nominated by the City Council. Two others will, I presume, be appointed by the Governor, but there is no reference in the Bill to them. It is indicated in the Bill that one of the members shall be appointed by the Governor as chairman. I am sufficiently democratic to believe that where it is possible these appointments should be made by election. I realise the difficulty of securing an election for a representative of the consumers. Every man, woman and child in the metropolitan area, and possibly throughout the State, is a consumer. That is a difficulty which the Minister may be able to overcome. The difficulty is not so great with regard to the producers. I hope in Committee the Minister will accept an amendment providing that there shall be two representatives for the producers to be elected in a manner to be prescribed.

Hon. G. Taylor: And how many representatives of the consumers?

Mr. SAMPSON: I suggest that two of the members of the trust should be elected in the prescribed manner, by and as the representatives of the producers, one to be elected by and as the representative of the Perth City Council, and two to be appointed by the Governor, one of whom should be a representative of the consumers.

Mr. Pantou: What is the idea of the City Council?

Mr. SAMPSON: That is provided in the Bill. Evidently the Minister thinks the metropolitan local authority should be considered. This would mean that there would be two direct representatives of the consumers, because the Perth City Council would also represent the consumers. There should be no objection to the producers having two representatives. There is ample justification for it. There are two distinct classes of products. One class is made up of chaff and grain, and the other of fruit, vegetables, and the like.

Mr. Mann: Chaff and grain are not to be sold in the market.

Mr. SAMPSON: They will be sold under the control of the trust to the extent of being sold by auction on the trucks.

The Minister for Agriculture: If the producers want to sell chaff and grain in the

markets there will be no objection; if not, they can sell in the railway yards.

Mr. SAMPSON: Sales in the railway yards would save expense which would be involved in loading and unloading produce.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is the general practice to sell in the railway yards.

Mr. SAMPSON: The growers would appreciate the opportunity to elect their own representatives, and they might be given the privilege to determine who those representatives should be. It should not be a difficult matter to prescribe the method by which such election could be brought about. Probably the Minister will be able to overcome the difficulty with regard to representation for the consumers. This system would stand for democratic control. We cannot have that unless there is a method by which the representatives shall be elected. The Bill is not clear in respect of future kerbstone markets that may be established. The Victoria Park kerbstone market is not included in the Bill. In that ward there is the Bedfordale market, which was established by Bedfordale growers. Retail sales there under the kerbstone method are regularly carried out. I should appreciate a statement by the Minister in respect to this and similar markets. While the Bedfordale market has not been established by the Perth City Council it is carried out strictly in accordance with the public health regulations. Its work is much appreciated by consumers and producers. No doubt other open markets will be established as time goes on. In the case of these also it is important that everything be done that will have the effect of bringing together the consumer and producer. I am glad the Bill has been brought down. It is a step forward and will have my support. I hope it will quickly become law, and that it will not be long before the actual work for which it makes provision is entered upon.

MR. MANN (Perth) [8.10]: I am gratified at the introduction of this Bill. It is the one subject I have hammered away at during the five years that I have been a member of this House, and it is the one essential that I have endeavoured to bring about. My quarrel with the Minister is that he is placing in the hands of an irresponsible trust the provision and administration of such an important function as metropolitan markets, instead of leaving it in the hands of the Perth City Council. The most success-

fully conducted markets in the Commonwealth are those that are run by the municipal authorities. I speak of Sydney, but more particularly of Melbourne. So well conducted are the Melbourne markets that the growers are given a stall for 1s. a day between the hours of 4 a.m. and 8 a.m. The retailers then come in and take possession for the fee of 2s. a stall. It is reported that people are able to make their purchases there and save between 10 and 15 per cent. on the goods they buy. Butter is probably sold at 2d. or 3d. a lb. cheaper than in the shops, also fish, sausages and other goods. The reason for this is that there are no heavy overhead charges. The markets are conducted by one officer, a superintendent, and two inspectors. The markets are situated at the corner of Elizabeth-street and Victoria-street. This Bill makes provision for a trust of five members. If the services of these five gentlemen are to be given voluntarily we cannot expect to get first class service. There is no indication in the Bill as to the salaries they will receive, or whether they are to be full or part time officers. If they are to be full time officers, probably the Chairman will receive £750 a year, and the other members of the trust between £500 and £600 a year. On this account alone the cost of the board will be upwards of £2,000 a year.

The Minister for Agriculture: How do you know it will cost £2,000 a year?

Mr. MANN: I assume that these will be full time officials and that they will receive full time pay.

The Minister for Agriculture: Nonsense.

Mr. MANN: There will also be a secretary and a staff of clerks, and administrative officers. All this expense would be obviated if the control were placed in the hands of the Perth City Council.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It would be pretty dearly bought.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member should not make such an interjection. He is representing a class of growers that would have been insolvent long ago had it not been for the Perth City Council. The Perth City Council established kerbstone markets and opened up an avenue for the growers represented by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson).

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The council did good service.

Mr. MANN: Then why not give them credit for doing so?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I give them credit for that, but would not give them the control of the whole of our markets.

Mr. MANN: In doing that the City Council were successful, and rose to the occasion. That being so, surely they are entitled to have the opportunity they seek. The council provided the opportunity for the growers in the hon. member's electorate, and thus enabled the people to secure cheap produce supplies.

Hon. G. Taylor: And good produce, too.

Mr. MANN: In doing that the City Council provided a sufficient answer to the contentions of the member for Guildford.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But that has no bearing on the subject!

Mr. MANN: Most of the successful markets in the Commonwealth are those owned and controlled by municipal authorities. If we provide that the central markets are to be controlled by a trust, there must be conflict of authority. The City Council control and administer the Health Act and, of course, the markets must come under the operations of that Act. Another point is that no provision is made in the Bill for taxation. We must presume that the markets will be free from taxation.

Mr. Thomson: They would be free if controlled by the municipalities.

Mr. MANN: If the markets were to be built on an area comprising anything from five to ten acres and shop frontages were provided, the people occupying those shops would be free from municipal rates, whereas the people doing a similar business in shops on the other side of the street would be compelled to pay municipal rates. Thus the latter would be at a disadvantage, compared with those occupying the shops owned by the trust.

The Premier: The difference will be made up by higher rates.

Mr. MANN: Then the consumer will not get the benefit?

The Premier: No, he will not.

The Minister for Agriculture: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. MANN: Following the interjection of the Premier, it simply means that the overhead expenses will be increased, and thus the consumer will get no benefit.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Mr. MANN: That is the point.

The Premier: The City Council can have the markets if they put up a reasonable proposal.

Mr. MANN: I am glad to get that offer from the Premier, because the Perth City Council are prepared to establish markets that will serve the same purpose as those suggested in the Bill.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But Parliament decided against that. Why flog a dead horse?

Mr. MANN: In the course of time, events change, and surely we are not so pig-headed that we will not change with those events. If the member for Guildford thought last year that the Perth City Council should not control the markets, but this year holds a different opinion, surely he will not adhere to his former attitude.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But it was Parliament that decided against the City Council.

Mr. MANN: At any rate, I am pleased to receive the assurance from the Premier. The Bill that I introduced for the Perth City Council some years back received very short shrift in this Chamber.

The Premier: I do not know of any Bill that was so friendless.

Mr. MANN: There was an unholy alliance that bordered on a conspiracy to destroy the Bill. Many members, including the Premier himself, now regret the action they took.

The Premier: Oh dear, no!

Mr. MANN: Had that Bill been agreed to, we would have had the markets now. Members could have amended that Bill if they found anything objectionable in any clause.

The Premier: It was objectionable from first to last.

Mr. MANN: It was not. If it was, the present Bill is just as objectionable, because, with the exception of one clause, the Bill is practically a copy of my Bill.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is not.

Mr. MANN: I found it difficult to support that one clause, when introducing the Bill. That was the toll clause. The City Council have shown their sincerity regarding the markets question in that they have resumed upwards of 11 acres of land for the purpose of establishing them. Everything possible has been done by the City Council to justify their attitude. Even at this late hour I trust the Government will give to the City Council the opportunity they desire. They represent the proper authority to control central markets and would probably conduct them with less expense to the grower and to the consumer than the trust that is to be appointed. Clause 11 of the Bill makes provision for storage. I take it

that means cool storage for fruit, meat, vegetables, fish, poultry, and so on.

Mr. Thomson: The markets would be of little use unless provision for cool storage were made.

Mr. MANN: Then again we have a company of local investors who have spent upwards of £60,000 in establishing up-to-date freezing works and cool chambers. Those people would not have spent that money if they had known that the Government intended to introduce legislation to authorise the establishment of opposition works.

The Minister for Agriculture: But now you ask that the City Council should have power to establish opposition works!

Mr. MANN: That is so.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do not know what you want.

Mr. MANN: I do know, and so does the Minister. The gentlemen controlling the works I refer to approached the Minister before they constructed them and, although the Minister gave no promise of any kind, he rather encouraged them to go on with the expenditure of their money.

The Minister for Agriculture: How can you make that statement? You have no proof of that.

Mr. MANN: Yes, I have. The Minister will not deny that those gentlemen approached him. Although he did not give them a promise at all, he rather encouraged them to go on with their proposal. In consequence they have made adequate provision for cool storage for produce for many years to come. Constantly we hear the questions asked, "Where is the patriotism of the local people?" "Where are our local investors?" "Why don't they do something for the benefit of the community?" When we find men game enough to spend their money in establishing big works on the most economical lines, we are confronted with Bills such as the one under discussion, seeking to make provision for opposition to the already established concerns! I realise that those gentlemen had to take a risk, and they have to put up with the position. On the other hand, is it economical to have two such concerns established to cater for a minimum amount of business? The people concerned have been in business here for many years. Apart from the obsolete plant owned by the Government, theirs is the only provision of cool storage available. No complaints have been heard regarding excessive charges made by the company. They were prepared to

establish their works anywhere the Minister liked to suggest. Had he suggested establishing them at Marquis-street, the company would have erected the works there. The point is that some encouragement was given by the Minister to those men to spend their money, and now the Government are advancing this opposition proposal. It is not economically sound to have two such concerns to handle the available business here.

Mr. Richardson: The company will probably have to go out of business.

Mr. MANN: When the select committee sat in September, 1924, to inquire into the establishment of markets in the metropolitan area, Captain Wade, who is the representative in Australia of the Port of Manchester, a man of wide experience regarding markets, said that the Manchester markets were controlled municipally, and that they were the most up-to-date markets in England. He affirmed that they were carried on to the great advantage of the producers and of the consumers. He told the select committee that the Manchester markets were more successful than any of the other markets in England that were owned by companies or trusts. In view of his experience he had no hesitation in recommending that the municipal authorities here would be in the best position to control the markets. Then Mr. W. E. Bold, the Town Clerk of Perth, also gave evidence, and he was asked to make a statement. In the course of his evidence he said—

I take it that the only phase of the market question that this committee desires to discuss with the City Council is as to whether the City Council is disposed to undertake to provide the necessary market accommodation in Perth, and if so, on what basis? The City Council takes up the same position now on this question as it has always done, namely, (a) it considers the establishment of centralised markets in Perth to be a public necessity; (b) that it is willing to purchase the land, erect the buildings and provide the necessary facilities for the establishment of up-to-date markets, provided it has a satisfactory guarantee that after it has expended the capital, the market business will be carried on in the markets.

That is what the City Council ask for, nothing more; that is what the Minister proposes for the trust. The Minister has offered no tangible reason why the trust should give better service than the City Council. I have shown that in other cities municipal councils have given more effective services than have been rendered by markets controlled other than municipally.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: The producers do not think so.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is not in a position to speak for the producers. He knows nothing about it. Will the hon. member go down and see the producers in the districts represented by the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) and by the member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson)? Will he ask them about it?

Mr. A. Wansbrough: I am talking about them.

Mr. MANN: The producers you represent come to Perth once a year!

Mr. Teesdale: Yes, for the Show.

The Minister for Agriculture: At any rate, the producers are satisfied.

Mr. MANN: In Adelaide there are two markets, each controlled by companies. As the member for Swan said, the position there is not at all satisfactory.

Mr. Sampson: I did not say that.

Mr. MANN: That was all that could be inferred from the hon. member's statement. He said that the growers had put their heads together to control the market.

Mr. Sampson: I said that a committee had been formed to stabilise the market.

Mr. MANN: That is the same thing.

Mr. Thomson: Is that not reasonable?

Mr. MANN: If the growers can put their heads together to control the markets, the retailers and the consumers cannot be blamed if they put their heads together as well. What is good for one is good for the other. In Melbourne the growers stand alongside each other and offer their produce for sale. There is keen competition, each doing his best to get rid of his produce.

Mr. Sampson: The Adelaide markets you speak of are wholesale.

Mr. MANN: Of course they are. It is a great sight in Melbourne to see the women going to market each morning from 8 a.m. to midday. The trams proceeding in all directions are laden with women taking their supplies of produce home. Two years ago the Minister for Works and I visited those markets, where we were told that anything up to 15 or 20 per cent. was saved on the purchases.

Lieut.-Colonel Denton: Who gets the benefit?

Mr. MANN: Both parties, for the consumer is brought into touch with the producer.

Mr. Panton: What is your poor middleman going to do under your scheme?

Mr. MANN: He can look after himself.

Mr. Panton: I thought you were interested in him since you are leading the unemployed.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is keeping well away from the unemployed this year; he is not lining them up outside as in former years.

Mr. Panton: No, I am leaving them to a brainy man like you.

Mr. MANN: Whilst I congratulate the Minister on having brought down the Bill, I am constrained to disagree with him in the control he is suggesting.

The Minister for Agriculture: When you moved your motion I was with you.

Mr. MANN: Yes, the Minister, who gives consideration to these matters, followed the evidence taken before the select committee, heard the debate in the House, and voted for the motion. At that time he was of opinion that the City Council should have control, and nothing has since occurred to cause him to change his mind.

Mr. Millington: Yes, that vote has occurred.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member, if he chose, could say something about that vote.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: This is proper constitutional government, the wishes of the House being carried out.

Mr. MANN: Words of wisdom from an unexpected source! I know I am beating the air in endeavouring to prevail on the House to give this authority to the City Council, but I am very much relieved to have the assurance of the Premier—

The Minister for Agriculture: He is not piloting the Bill.

Mr. MANN: No, but he has to find the money; there is no provision here for the money.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Bill is in possession of Parliament now.

Mr. MANN: Yes, but the Treasurer will have to find the money for the establishment of the market. That is what has been influencing the Treasurer during the last few days—the questions how he is going to find the money, and whether or not he should do so. I think he has come to the conclusion that it should be done by the City Council. I will support the second reading, for I realise that central markets are a necessity, but I hope the Minister will not be averse to amendments in Committee.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [8.35]: The hon. member who has just sat down contends that the City Council should have the power to erect these markets. The select committee, in reporting upon the establishment of central markets, declared that adequate cold storage must form part of the marketing scheme, and that facilities should also be provided for retail markets within the area. The hon. member pointed out that already provision has been made for cold storage in the metropolitan area, and contended that those who invested their money in those cold stores would not have done so had they known the Government proposed to establish cold stores in respect of the central markets. But it was not to be imagined that the trust, when erecting these markets, would omit the provision of essential cold storage. I will support the second reading, because to a great extent the Bill is on the lines of the amendment I moved to the motion submitted by the hon. member in 1924. Moreover, I can do so since one of the planks in the constitution of our party is the improvement of the handling and disposal of produce. The Bill introduced by the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) made no provision for representation on the management of the markets, but provided that £250,000 could be borrowed for the erection and construction of markets. It provided also that after the establishment of the markets, all prescribed articles of merchandise brought for sale into the metropolitan area in quantities of a value of more than £1, otherwise than direct to the consumer, should be sold in the market and that, secondly, no goods could be sold in the markets until the market toll had been paid on such goods. It was provided that there was to be a toll upon all such products.

The Minister for Agriculture: Yes, even when they came into the shop.

MR. THOMSON: That is so. I had sympathy with the member for Perth in his introduction of that Bill, but those whom I represent have always maintained that the producers should have representation on the management of the central markets. That is a sound, reasonable request to make, for all the commodities going into the market are provided by the producers. I hope the Minister will accept an amendment giving the producers at least two representatives on the trust. We once had a representative of the producers on the Fremantle Harbour

Trust, although I regret to say we have not that representation to-day.

Mr. Sleeman: Your interests are pretty well safeguarded.

MR. THOMSON: That is debatable.

Mr. Sleeman: You know it is true.

MR. THOMSON: I do not. Since the industrialists and the business people have representation on the Fremantle Harbour Trust, surely those supplying the bulk of the products exported through Fremantle should have representation on that trust.

The Minister for Railways: They do not pay any charges.

MR. THOMSON: Indirectly they do, and moreover during the wheat season they provide work for hundreds of men at Fremantle.

Mr. Sleeman: You know you could not get better treatment if you were there yourself.

MR. THOMSON: We are entitled to representation, both on the Fremantle Harbour Trust and on the central markets trust, and I hope the Minister will accept an amendment giving the producers two representatives on the central markets trust. I cannot see what justification there is for giving the City Council representation on that body, since the council will perform no function in respect of the market.

The Minister for Agriculture: But certain rights will be taken from them. They have certain rights under the Municipalities Act.

MR. THOMSON: That is so, but the City Council will not send anything to be sold in the market. Despite that, they are to have a say in the management of the market and in the fixing of the fees to be levied on the producers dealing with the market. If the producers are to have but one representative in five, they will be hopelessly outnumbered. There is amongst the producers such a diversity of interests that they ought to have at least two representatives.

Hon. G. Taylor: You ought to get some producers into the City Council.

MR. THOMSON: I am afraid we are not likely to achieve that, for there is not much primary production going on within the city. I assume it will be the province of the trust not to make a profit and pay it into Consolidated Revenue, as is done by the Fremantle Harbour Trust; and that therefore the fees to be levied will be the lowest compatible with the payment of interest and sinking fund on the cost of the market. I cannot follow the reasoning of the member for Perth when he says we might

have in the markets a row of shop fronts, the occupiers of which would pay no rates, whereas a shopkeeper on the opposite side might be paying a high rent. I cannot see that it will make the slightest difference to the consumers of Perth whether the shops are owned by the municipality or by the market trust. True, the municipality might be able to reduce its rates in other directions. I am in favour of giving to the local authorities of the metropolitan area control of the public utilities, but when we come to the matter of marketing products, the people producing the commodities should have some say as to the fees to be levied. I propose to support the second reading and I trust the Minister will accept an amendment to provide greater representation for the primary producers together with one or two other slight amendments which I shall move in Committee.

MR. MILLINGTON (Leederville) [8.46]: This measure is worthy of support because it embraces the principle of public ownership and control. I am compelled by circumstances to support it, because it offers an opportunity to deal with an urgent matter immediately, and I see no other prospect of providing what is so urgently needed, namely, a central market. In my district there are some primary producers, in addition to thousands of consumers, and they have been agitating for a central market. In fact they were responsible for the deputation that waited on the Minister when he promised to refer the question to Cabinet. Afterwards they constituted a deputation who were informed by the Minister that he proposed to introduce this Bill. As a member of the select committee that dealt with the question of a central market, I was one who realised the need to preserve the principle of public ownership and also to adopt whatever means would be likely to give immediate effect to it. At that time the Government made it clear that it was impossible for them to find loan money for the building of markets, and the select committee, in recommending that the City Council should be the controlling body, were mainly influenced by that consideration. When the select committee made their recommendation there was no alternative. We put up our case to the House and it met with serious opposition from both sides. In fact it appeared to have very few friends.

Hon. G. Taylor: None at all, I think.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Even one member of the select committee did not stand with us.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is so.

Mr. MILLINGTON: In considering likely means to obtain a central market for Perth, one needs to bear in mind the opinion expressed by this House. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) said nothing had happened since the recommendation was submitted to the House. One significant thing has happened, namely, that this House, by a vote, has declared emphatically against control by the Perth City Council. Consequently I am not disposed to waste time in an effort to induce the House to change its opinion.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not think the House did that. It would not accept the Bill then submitted; that was all.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Many people confuse the direct motion submitted by the member for Perth when presenting the report of the select committee with the Bill that he introduced previously. A member might oppose a Bill for a dozen different reasons, but when a motion is submitted embodying a specific principle and the House turns it down, it is useless to pursue that course any further. This House said that in no circumstances would it agree to the Perth City Council having control. I am disposed to consider this an urgent matter. Therefore, this is not the time to quibble over the question whether the control of a central market should be vested in the City Council or in a public trust. We have reached a stage when I feel sure the House will support the principle of control by a public trust. I have no prejudice against the Perth City Council. I am of opinion that, given proper safeguards, the City Council could run a central market.

Hon. G. Taylor: The question is whether municipalisation would be better than control by a trust.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I have discussed this matter with members of the Perth City Council and have told them that I would not risk losing a central market at this stage just over the question of control. Having committed myself to that, I intend to stand to it, and I shall not support any amendment designed to substitute control by the City Council for that of a public trust. The time when it was opportune to consider

that has passed for ever. I am satisfied that the opinion previously expressed by this House will be re-affirmed. I can understand the primary producers having an objection, although I have no particular objection. I am supporting the Bill. The primary producers object because there appears to be no prospect of the City Council giving them representation on the board of control.

Mr. Sampson: You opposed a trust previously.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Yes, because having been a member of the select committee that submitted a recommendation to the House, I supported it right through.

Mr. Mann: You believed in it.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Certainly I did at that time, because there were only two courses open to us, one Government control and the other municipal control. We were informed that there was no prospect of the Government raising the money; they told us that distinctly, and therefore we recommended that the City Council should be given control. Now, however, we have a proposal from the Government who are prepared to back a central market. Further, the House objects to the City Council having control. If members doubt that statement of the case, they have means of deciding whether it is right or wrong. To those who desire the early establishment of a market, there is no alternative to supporting this proposal. As to the many details, I have been discussing them with residents of my district for the last two years. I have pointed out that what they have to do first of all is to support control by a public trust, which means that the control, to a large extent, will be removed from the Government. I have impressed upon them that instead of putting up to the Government their ideas as to how the markets should be established and controlled, such representations should be made to the trust, because the responsibility is being placed upon a trust. I fail to agree with those who consider the proposed trust an irresponsible body.

Mr. Mann: To whom will they be responsible, the electors?

Mr. MILLINGTON: We shall want to know how the trust is constituted before we can pass an opinion on that. To say that a public trust is a body on whom no reliance can be placed is ridiculous. The whole of the Melbourne water supply is controlled by a public trust.

Mr. Mann: Whose members are councillors from the various municipalities around Melbourne and who are elected by the people.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I venture to say that no man will be able to appoint himself to the proposed trust. He will need to have some qualification to gain a seat on the trust. He will have to be responsible to someone. Would any member say that under this proposal the five members of the trust would be responsible to nobody and could play fast and loose with the funds?

Mr. Mann: To whom would they be responsible?

Mr. MILLINGTON: In the first place to those who appointed them.

Mr. Mann: Who would that be?

Mr. MILLINGTON: And then to the Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, they would not be responsible to the Government.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I have an idea they would be.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not under this Bill.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The trust will be a body on whom reliance can be placed.

Mr. Sampson: You can only assume that.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The Government will appoint four of them.

Mr. MILLINGTON: As to the reliance to be placed on such a trust, the Government—and for that matter the City Council, if they had control—would have to appoint men who were experts. I take the view that the Government do not hold themselves up as experts in the matter of the construction or control of city markets. Therefore they propose to hand the control to a special board. On that board will be representatives possessed of an intimate knowledge of the construction and control of markets. The producers, in nominating their representative, would have regard to that, and the same applies to the City Council.

Mr. Sampson: It does not say that they will be nominated.

Mr. MILLINGTON: There is always a way of ensuring that the consumers will be satisfied with the man appointed to represent them on the trust.

Mr. Sampson: Let us insist upon an election.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I do not intend to go into details. The hon. member can discuss with the Minister the question of how he intends to discover whom the producers desire shall represent them on the trust.

Mr. Mann: You are taking it all for granted.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I presume the hon. member is not arguing that amongst the producers there is no man capable of faithfully representing the producers of this State. As for the consumers, there will be no difficulty in getting a capable representative.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Whom does the member for Swan wish to elect?

Mr. Sampson: The best men.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Whom do you mean by the electors?

Mr. Sampson: The producers should have the privilege of electing their representatives.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Consideration has been extended to the City Council by giving them the right to nominate a representative on the trust. No objection can be taken to that. There is an assurance that a capable man will be appointed. As to the proposal for holding an election to decide the representatives, I think it possible to go too far with elections.

Mr. Sampson: Do not be pessimistic.

Mr. MILLINGTON: We do not elect experts. If we want an engineer or a surveyor, it is not a question of appointing a popular man. We appoint a man who has the qualifications. The producers, in selecting a capable representative, would not look for the most popular man. It is possible to go too far with the principle of elective control. In any case I presume that duty will rest with the producers, who will find means to convey to the Minister whom they desire to represent them on the board. They would certainly raise objection if a man to whom they took exception were appointed to represent them.

Mr. Mann: They objected recently to an appointment to the Fremantle Harbour Trust, but without effect.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I have not raised any objection to the Perth City Council, but if the member for Perth desires to raise objection to this trust I could give him one hundred and one reasons why men elected to the Council are not capable of running a central market. On the occasion of municipal council elections the question of markets may not be a vital issue.

Mr. Panton: It never is.

Mr. MILLINGTON: In municipal elections there is no possible way of ascertaining why a man has been elected. The hon. member is continually objecting to the crea-

tion of a trust of experts on marketing, but he is surely not prepared to say that the whole of Perth City Council is comprised of experts on this subject. Then we come to the two representatives of the Government. Naturally the Government, having the responsibility of finding the money, will see that they are properly represented from the financial and business points of view. When it comes to a question of establishing these markets I presume that consideration will be given to those who intend to do business with them. Evidence will be taken and advice invited from the producers, from the merchants and agents in the metropolitan area, and from the consumers. The trust will take advantage of all the expert evidence and advice that can be obtained in Australia. To say that these trusts will be incapable of carrying out the idea embodied in the Bill is ridiculous. In view of all the delays that have occurred, those who desire to have this work gone on with cannot oppose the Bill. It is not my intention to go into all the details as to how the market shall be controlled, and as to what will happen in the suburbs with the smaller markets. I have discussed this question with growers and with the Minister. I refer to the suburban markets.

Mr. Mann: You have a lot of inside information.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The hon. member also has inside information. A good deal of what he said to-night appears to have been inspired from a certain quarter. In the matter of inspiration honours are easy. This does meet with the approval of the producers. As to the consumers, I know that a deputation very representative of consumers asked that this Bill should be introduced. The same thing applies to the agents. It seems that the only one who has any serious objection to it is the hon. member, who is wedded to an old and unfortunate love.

Mr. Mann: Very successfully.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The Bill preserves the principle of public ownership and control. It also affords a prospect of providing for proper control, control that will be truly representative of all the interests associated with the market. I see here, and here only, a prospect of getting, in the immediate future, a central market that will be not only a Perth market, but one for the benefit and service of all producers between Albany and Geraldton, an extent of 600 miles of

country from which the produce is marketed mainly in the metropolitan area. This Bill not only has my support but my enthusiastic support. I am confident that the producers, the consumers, and the agents and merchants who are handling this produce are satisfied that this is a solution of their present difficulties. They also realise that sooner or later it is inevitable that a central market will be established. They desire that this should be done before greater expense is incurred in regard to private markets. I believe everything has been at a standstill in view of the knowledge that this Bill would be brought down.

Mr. Sampson: When will the markets be established?

Mr. MILLINGTON: Our first duty is to pass the Bill. Our next is to hurry on the Government so that they may establish the trust. As we have done our utmost to influence the Government to introduce this Bill, so I presume we shall see that the business is gone on with.

Mr. Sampson: I hope it will be done quickly.

Mr. MILLINGTON: The Government are in earnest in this matter and I am sure every means will be taken to proceed with it. The member for Perth objected to authority being given in the Bill to include cool storage. One body, with which I was discussing the subject, was most anxious that this right should be included. All the wholesale products will be handled at this market. Does the member for Perth suggest, in view of this fact, that the sole monopoly of cool storage should rest in the hands of a private company? I hardly think he would advocate that.

Mr. North called attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Would the member for Perth suggest that no power should be given to the trust to establish cool stores? All the wholesale products mentioned as coming within the scope of the Bill will be handled at the central markets. The trust will have discretionary power. It may be that for the time the trust will not enter into the question of cool storage, but the power must be given to that body. As it will be responsible for controlling the markets in the interests of the whole community, which

includes the producers, this matter can safely be left in its hands. No exception can be taken to this power being given to the trust. The time for ventilating ideas and collecting evidence will come when the experts are appointed. Such questions cannot be dealt with effectively by the House, nor by the Government. I believe that this is the method most likely to be successful in the direction of controlling the marketing of produce, and that it is the only one which gives any prospect of the immediate establishment of central markets. I, therefore, heartily support the Bill.

MR. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin) [9.10]: I support the Bill, and congratulate the Government on having brought it forward in this form. There is no doubt Perth has been much behind the sister capitals of Australia in the matter of central markets. It has been one of the disabilities, not caused by Federation, under which our small producers have suffered, that they have not had any market for their especial benefit, and for the purpose of bringing the consumers and producers more closely into touch with one another. I hope Parliament will pass the Bill, and that when it becomes law money will be provided immediately for the work, and that the Government will go ahead with it and facilitate the operations of the trust in commencing the undertaking. The Bill is a great improvement on that which was introduced by the member for Perth.

Mr. Mann: Your memory must be failing you.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That Bill met with no support in this Chamber. It only had the effect of delaying the whole matter for a time. I very much prefer this measure. I am glad the Government accepted the decision of the House as to the form of control to be exercised over the markets. It is true a motion was brought forward by the member for Perth suggesting that the markets should be established by the City Council. The Leader of the Country Party subsequently moved an amendment in favour of a trust, on the lines laid down in this Bill. I certainly congratulate and thank the Government for having introduced a Bill on the lines of the amendment moved by my leader.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: In that case a board was provided.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am sure he is entirely satisfied with the lines along which the Bill proceeds.

Mr. Mann: One of your party signed a report against it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It shows that he was not tied down as some members are.

Mr. Mann: It shows how much he was tied down.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It shows that he had a free hand to do what he thought best with regard to the provision of markets for primary producers.

Mr. Wilson: Did he not sign the report?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The report is signed by the chairman only. The member for Pingelly was not present at the meeting when the decision was arrived at. It was passed by his brother members in his absence. I am pleased that the Government are adopting the constitutional procedure of carrying out the decisions of this House, properly and fairly arrived at, as to the form in which the markets shall be controlled.

Mr. Sleeman: Is this the exact form you wanted?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is on the general lines that were laid down. There is one point with which I entirely disagree. The only weak point in the Bill is the inadequate measure of representation proposed to be given to the primary producers as compared with that given to the consumers.

Mr. Sleeman: If the producers get as good a deal under this Bill as they get from the Fremantle Harbour Trust, you will have nothing to complain of.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am in accord with the remarks of my leader on that point. I am not in a position to debate the unfortunate position that has arisen through the primary producers having no representation on the Fremantle Harbour Trust. I want it laid down in this Bill that such a position of affairs is not repeated in regard to the control of these markets.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We do want good men and proper management.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I want both those features, and I do not like criticising the Bill extensively seeing that the Minister has brought down a measure which on the whole is very satisfactory. As regards representation of the primary producers, I do

hope that in Committee the Minister will agree to their being given two representatives out of five on the trust. The Bill proposes that the Government shall have two representatives, the primary producers one representative, the consumers one, and the City of Perth one. I fail to see why the representative of the consumers should not be nominated by the City of Perth, thus giving representation to both the city and the consumers in one individual.

Mr. Panton: The City of Perth does not represent consumers, but the ratepayers.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Whoever may be nominated by the City of Perth will be representative of the consumers. As an alternative, though a less desirable one. I suggest that the Government reduce their own representation from two members to one. Still, the better scheme would be to have two representatives of the primary producers, two representatives of the Government, and a representative of the consumers nominated by the City of Perth.

Mr. Panton: I would like the primary producers to get two representatives and the City Council none!

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That would be acceptable, but I was not anxious to suggest so drastic a departure from the Minister's proposal. The point I wish to emphasise again is that in order to secure proper control of the markets in the interests of the producers, who are going to find all the products to be sold there, who are going to occupy the stalls, pay the rents, and keep things going, we should give that section two representatives on the proposed trust. The first question the trust will have to deal with is the site of the proposed markets. In 1912 the Government of the day resumed a large area of centrally situated land for the purpose of establishing markets. This area, comprising several acres, is situated near the West Perth station.

Mr. Mann: Is that a central situation for retail markets? There is no tram service.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The trams are being extended every day, and there is no reason why an extension, possibly from Leederville, should not pass that way. At any rate, the Government own several acres of centrally situated land there; and I suggest that the question of utilising that area for the proposed markets receive immediate consideration from the trust.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [9.20]: As a member of the select committee which inquired into the question of markets, I wish to say a few words. My name, I understand, has been mentioned as that of a dissenter from the select committee's recommendation. I was not present when the recommendation was decided upon, and I was surprised when I learnt that the report had been presented. My only opportunity of dissenting, therefore, was on the floor of the House. I admire greatly the clever way in which the member for Leederville (Mr. Millington) has wriggled out of an awkward position. The only conclusion I can come to is that that hon. member and the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) were hand in glove with one another and thought the City Council should control the markets. I am pleased to know, however, that the member for Leederville has come back to my way of thinking. Now he is evidently of opinion that the Government should erect the markets and control them.

Mr. Mann: No. He says he does not want Government control.

Mr. BROWN: If the City Council are to erect the markets, they will have to borrow a considerable amount of money for the purpose, and this will mean a heavy burden on the ratepayers of Perth. If the Government erect the markets, the cost will be borne by the whole population of Western Australia. The evidence given before the select committee proved that new markets are an absolute necessity. The present market accommodation is all over the place. To have the whole of the markets concentrated in one large building would be far better for the grower and also for the consumer. On the question of disposing of produce, some persons hold that it should be done wholly by treaty. Before the select committee, the auctioneers and commission agents stated that they had found a charge of 5 per cent. insufficient and had been compelled to raise it to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which I think is the present rate. The select committee were told that quantities of produce sent to the existing markets frequently realised only a twopenny stamp to the grower. I do not say definitely that under the control of the trust the markets will give better prices, but I do hold that with such control there will be no possibility whatever of any underground engineering. My one regret is that the Bill does not go far enough. It is impossible to make a success of markets

without having a large cool store attached. It was stated in evidence before the select committee that a hawker will buy a quantity of fruit on a hot day, when the sale is good, but that in our uncertain climate a sudden cool change may cause him to have most of the fruit left on his barrow. If there is no place to store the fruit, it is wasted. The existence of a large cool store attached to the markets would enable the hawker in such circumstances to place the fruit in the store for a nominal payment, and thus the present waste would be avoided. We know that in Western Australia grapes can be bought well into May and occasionally even at the end of June, though no grapes would be found on the vines for months previously. Grapes sold at that late period are taken out of cool storage, and it is by that means the public are enabled to enjoy them right to the end of June. That is another strong reason for the establishment of cool storage in connection with the markets. On the question of sale by treaty I wish to mention that some time ago I went through the very extensive Sydney markets, to go over which takes hours, and that in not one instance did I see an auctioneer employed. The whole of the produce brought to the city markets was sold by private treaty. Under the Bill, the trust will be empowered to regulate the disposal of the products, and that is a highly desirable system. The trust are not expected to impose exorbitant charges, but simply to make both ends meet and provide a sinking fund. The select committee also went into the question of the sale of meat, though I do not suggest for a moment that meat could be disposed of in a public market. Other accommodation will have to be provided for that branch of business. I do not know whether the select committee's recommendation on that particular phase has received attention. However, the sale of meat is a question entirely apart from the disposal of other products. I hope that when the Bill is in Committee larger representation will be given to consumers, who should have two representatives on the trust. The Perth City Council should also have a representative. Again, of the total membership of five, two should be representatives of the primary producers. The conduct of the markets by a trust is in the best interests of producers and consumers alike and must be to the advantage of the people as a whole. It may be asked, if we leave the matter to the City Council what assurance have we that they will be

able to erect the markets immediately? On the other hand, if the matter remains in the hands of the Government, they will be able to secure suitable land and construct the necessary buildings almost straight away. Again it may be asked, what difference would it make whether the concern is run by the Government or by the City Council? If it is run by the City Council, the Government will have no control whatever over it.

Mr. Thomson: The City Council would give the producers representation.

Mr. BROWN: The members of the trust must be responsible to somebody. If they are to be elected, by whom will they be elected? Or are they to be appointed by the Government? If they are elected by the people or by the growers, they can be called to account by their electors; and that should be the position. If representatives prove incompetent or fail to do their duty to the satisfaction of growers and consumers, they ought to be put out of their positions in favour of more capable men. In any case, the members of the trust should be responsible to someone. Not having read the Bill very carefully, I do not know how the members of the trust are to be appointed—whether by the Minister or by the people.

Members: By the Government.

Mr. BROWN: The only point as to which I have misgivings is the possible creation of another trading concern. However, I hardly think there is danger of that in this case, because by the appointment of the trust the Government will wipe their hands of the whole business, leaving the trust to make ends meet. That is a very desirable method.

Mr. Panton: If the trust goes bankrupt, the Government will have to take over the markets.

Mr. BROWN: The trust will have to impose such charges for the use of stalls and space as will yield sufficient income to meet working expenses, interest, and sinking fund. I am unable to say whether the commission agents and auctioneers are making fortunes at present. We growers, when we get very small cheques in return for our consignments, think the agents and auctioneers are doing well; but the fact remains that when produce brings poor prices, the commission also runs down low. According to the evidence of the auctioneers and agents, the business cannot be done for less than 7½ per cent. I hope that the trust will find means of lessening that charge. The matter will be entirely in their hands, and it will be for them to

regulate charges. It will also rest with them to decide whether produce shall be sold by auction or by private treaty. Firmly believing that this will be a splendid Bill both for the people of Perth and for the growers, I support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet—in reply) [9.29]: I thank the House for the manner in which the Bill has been received. The discussion has been largely in favour of the proposals of the Government. There have of course been suggestions, but these can be dealt with in Committee. The main objection raised was as to the personnel of the trust, hon. members opposite stressing the necessity or the advisability of appointing two members to represent the producers. They have complained that the producer has been overlooked when the personnel of other bodies has been determined. They should remember that this is the first time that the principle of providing representation for the producers has been initiated in legislation. They should be satisfied with the establishment of the precedent.

Mr. Sampson: There is a complaint that the producers have no representation on the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is a very definite step forward because it does not leave the question undecided.

Mr. Sampson: Previously the producers had representation on the Harbour Trust.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: But that was not dealt with in legislation.

Mr. Thomson: No, this establishes the precedent.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill does not leave the question at the will of anyone; the proposal is embodied in the legislation. That is a decided step forward in the interests of the producers and hon. members on the Opposition side of the House should be satisfied with it. The Leader of the Opposition drew attention to a very important matter regarding the personnel of the trust. He said that they would have great powers and would have to finance the whole proposition. It is desirable, seeing that the Government have to stand behind the trust from a financial point of view, that the Government shall have the right to appoint men capable of carrying on the business. If the producers, the Perth City Council, or any other body of men, raised the capital necessary for the establishment

of central markets, they would have the right to insist upon the appointment of such men.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The City Council would raise the money against the municipal rates.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But in this instance the people to be appointed will have no property.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, but the Government will be behind them. There is no other way of meeting the situation and for that reason it is essential that the Government shall have this power, seeing that they have to find the money, and that the whole of the taxpayers, producers and consumers alike, will have to accept the financial responsibility. The Government are not only entitled to select the representatives but should see that the men appointed are competent to manage such an institution. As time progresses, there will be opportunities to amend the measure should it be deemed desirable to afford other interests increased representation. That can be done so long as it meets with the approval of Parliament. I hope, therefore, hon. members will not urge that point, because I consider the individual who will be selected to look after the interests of the producers will be a representative one. Some gentlemen discussed the point with me and although they desired to have two producers' representatives on the trust, I do not think they objected very strongly to the proposal for one producers' representative.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: How do you propose to choose the members of the trust?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government will have to select a representative of the producers, but I have promised those concerned that the man chosen will be a bona fide producer. It would be impossible to conduct an election among the producers to choose their representative.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You could not do it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Every producer would be entitled to a vote.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But I presume that after the first year you will allow the people who use the markets to have a vote.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Even then the expense of conducting the election would be considerable, and I do not know that it would be desirable. In a position such as this the members of a trust will

act merely in the capacity of landlords. In effect, they will be the directors of the markets.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But they will have enormous powers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think it advisable to conduct an election, because the producers can put forward their views regarding their representation on the board. At the present stage when the Government will be initiating the institution, the best way is for the Government to select the producers' representative. In arriving at their decision the Government will naturally consult those who are producers.

Mr. Panton: Where does the right of the City Council for representation on a trust of this description arise?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Under the Municipal Corporations Act the council have the right to establish markets. Certain of their rights are taken away under the Bill. Having taken away certain of their rights in the city, I consider the council are entitled to representation.

Mr. Teesdale: And that is only fair, too.

Mr. Mann: In addition to that, the Perth City Council deal with by-laws, the Health Act, and so on.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They administer the city laws, and we cannot ignore that fact when it comes to a matter of representation on a trust of this description. I consider the representation provided for the council is fair. Considerable objection can be raised to the election of representatives at this stage. The people who will be asked to elect the representatives would not have in mind the necessity for appointing men knowing something about finance. The work of the trust in the initial stages must be largely concerned with the financing of the markets. It is essential, therefore, that we shall have sound men on the trust because they will have to shoulder great responsibilities.

Mr. Thomson: That is why we ask you to appoint two producers.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a mistake to stress too much the question of the representation of producers.

Mr. Thomson: But there are some who have great experience in connection with marketing matters.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is wrong to take up the attitude that the producers are the only people in the

community that count. We realise the importance of the producers, but we must remember that without the consumers the producers would not be able to carry on. It is all-important to the producers that they shall have as many consumers as possible. One of the great difficulties in Australia is to find markets for our commodities. To-day we have many boards established by the Commonwealth Government and they have introduced means and systems by which, in order to secure markets overseas, various products have been pooled in the country and higher prices have been charged for those commodities in Australia, enabling them to be sold overseas at a lower figure.

Mr. Sampson: That is because of the difficulties arising from the high tariff.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We have the Paterson butter scheme under which the best quality butter is sent overseas and sold at a price less than the poorer quality is sold for in Australia.

Mr. Thomson: But that applies to other products as well.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not the point. The producers require more consumers, for that is the all-important point. In these circumstances it is not right for the producers to say they should have this and have that and demand more representation than other sections. They should realise that all sections of the community are dependent one upon the other. In effect, the producer could not produce unless there were facilities provided for him by the consumer.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Will the Government accept the nominee of the producers?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have already informed a deputation that waited upon me that we would consult them regarding the appointment to be made, but the man selected must be one in whom the Government have confidence regarding his capacity to handle financial problems. The member for Perth (Mr. Mann) spoke about an irresponsible trust. The body to be appointed under the Bill can hardly be regarded as irresponsible. They will have to act in accordance with the powers vested in them by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. Mann: Will the members of the trust be responsible to the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: They will be responsible to the Government. Furthermore, the Auditor General has cer-

tain powers under the Bill to audit the trust's accounts, while the trust must present annually a return to be laid on the Table of each House of Parliament. The members of the trust will be no more irresponsible than are the members of the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The members of that body are responsible to the Minister and to the Government.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: And that will be the position regarding the members of the markets trust.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, and the Government will appoint two of the members of the trust. The Government, therefore, will have a direct and very considerable influence on a trust of this description. The member for Perth also said that the cost of administering the affairs of the trust would run into about £3,000 a year. Why should it do so? Why should the administration of markets by a trust comprising merely directors, run into anything like £2,000 or £3,000 a year? Will the whole time of the members of the trust be taken up by the their duties as landlords? Certainly not. Do the directors of the Western Australian Bank give the whole of their time to administering the affairs of that bank? Of course they do not. They leave that to the officials of the institution.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What has the Minister in mind in regard to payment of fees to members of the trust?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We will arrive at a decision on that point later on. The Bill provides that the members of the trust will be paid such fees as the Government may think necessary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What do you think will be a fair thing?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot say at this stage.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should be able to tell us now.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: After we have appointed the members of the trust, we will be able to go into the question of fees to be paid.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That will not do.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: When we appointed a board in connection with the Muresk College we did not fix the fees until the members of the board had met and determined what their duties would be.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That was different; that was an advisory board.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In this instance the members of the trust will not be paid as full-time officials. That would be a ridiculous position. They are not. The Fremantle Harbour Trust are not paid as full-time officials, although that is a concern vastly more important than the markets trust will be. I do not propose to refer at length to the statement by the member for Perth that the Bill is just as objectionable as that which he fathered in this Chamber. Members opposite answered that contention very effectively themselves. The present Bill has nothing objectionable in it.

Mr. Mann: Apart from the toll clause, what is the difference?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill fathered by the hon. member provided for all commodities coming into Perth—

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Or passing through.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, that was not so.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill provided that all goods coming into Perth of a value greater than £1 had to pass through the markets. That meant that producers who brought their commodities to shops in the city for sale would have to put their goods through the market first. This Bill does not provide for that at all.

Mr. Mann: That is so, but with that exception it is the same.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member's Bill provided that all goods taken into the railway yards would also have to go through the markets. That objectionable feature does not appear in the present Bill and that is the essence of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is no monopoly proposed except at auction.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. The member for Perth also made an observation that I regarded as very unfair. He said that some persons had provided cool storage and he proceeded with an argument that was contradictory. He said that the City Council should have the control of the markets and should make all necessary provision for the requirements of producers and consumers, such as are included in the Bill. What does he stand for? Either the City Council should have the power he suggested or they should not have it. His suggestion that I gave them a promise—

Mr. Mann: I did not say that; I said that you did not promise them anything but you encouraged them.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I did not encourage them. Some people told me they proposed to erect cool storage facilities and asked me if the Government intended to provide ice works. I said, "Not that I know of; I have no idea that they intend doing so." As a matter of fact the Government have not done it. They are getting rid of the cold storage at Wellington street. In any event, there should be room for additional cold storage in this growing city.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: So anyway, if you did encourage them you did quite right.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I told them that, so far as I knew, the Government had no intention of erecting ice works. That was quite correct. But it was not a promise that cold storage would not be provided. Cold storage is provided at the Westralian Meatworks at Fremantle and is not availed of. My statement was perfectly true, but was not a promise at all.

Mr. Thomson: You could not dream of erecting central markets without providing cold storage.

Mr. Sampson: Will the Minister refer to the kerbstone markets?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have already said that existing kerbstone markets will not be interfered with. I told the deputation we could not have kerbstone markets right up against the central markets, a heavy interest bill on which will have to be met. However, we are not interfering with the existing kerbstone markets.

Mr. Sampson: Not even if the area be extended?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The extension of the area will be the responsibility of the Government of the day. The trust will have no power to extend the area; that is for the Government of the day.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Metropolitan area:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is here provided that the area is restricted to the

metropolitan area, exclusive of Victoria Park, but that the Governor may by proclamation extend the boundaries to include other areas within or beyond the area of the said municipal district. So, apparently, there will be no limit at all to the area that these central markets may be called upon to supply. I do not know why this extension should be provided for.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Because the residents of other areas may desire the establishment of markets under the trust. If a good case be put up to the Government of the day, the Government will have power under this clause to extend the area.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But it might be extended to Fremantle or to Armadale.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That will be the responsibility of the Government of the day. The trust cannot by proclamation establish markets elsewhere. Only the Governor in Council may do so.

Hon. G. Taylor: Will the additional markets be under the trust?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Fremantle markets are owned by the municipality. So if the Fremantle area were included, the power of the trust would be seen to be greater than the power of the municipality.

Mr. SAMPSON: The City Council in their recent loan provided funds for the extension of the kerbstone markets from Wellington-street to Moore-street. Under this plan the present area of half an acre will be extended to an acre and a half. I ask the Minister whether any objection is likely to be raised to this extension of the existing kerbstone market.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is only anticipating things to talk of what might happen. The City Council have not extended the kerbstone markets.

Mr. Sampson: The plans are ready.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: But they are not likely to be gone on with. As I have said, under the Bill the existing kerbstone markets will not be interfered with. If we are to deal with supposititious cases we shall get nowhere. Let us deal only with what exists.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I understand from the remarks of the Minister that before the Government agreed to establish further markets

under the trust, there would have to be a request from the people who required such markets.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is so.
Hon. G. TAYLOR: Then that is a safeguard.

Mr. MANN: The Minister said we should not make provision for supposititious cases. But the extension of the kerbstone markets does not come under that category. The City Council have made provision to extend those markets to $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres. A survey has been completed making provision for a new street from Wellington-street to Moore-street, with kerbstone markets extending down the new street. This work has been in hand for some months, the land has been cleared and all provision made for the immediate extension of the kerbstone markets. At present the growers selling their produce at those markets have to make use of the footway for 100 yards beyond the official boundary of the markets in order to find space for their stands. Are they still to stand along the footway, or are the City Council to be permitted to extend the markets down the new street? No one will deny the privilege the consumers have in purchasing at the kerbstone market, or the benefits conferred on the small growers. One grower who comes in from Welshpool tells me he never takes less than £15 or £16 on a Saturday.

Mr. Panton: Will not those small growers use the central markets?

Mr. MANN: It depends upon where those markets are situated. The kerbstone markets are on a good tramway service and quite close to the railway station.

Mr. Teesdale: The Minister has said he will not interfere with them.

Mr. MANN: But will he allow the City Council to extend those markets? When replying to the member for Swan he rather suggested that it would not be permitted. He referred to the extension as supposititious. It is nothing of the sort, for financial provision has been made for it.

Mr. Panton: There is nothing to prevent the trust from opening kerbstone market branches.

Mr. MANN: Of course there is. You have not read the Bill. The trust deals only with wholesale markets. I should like an assurance from the Minister that the municipality will not be prevented from making this necessary extension to the kerbstone markets.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Clause 12 provides that with the approval of the Governor the municipal council may provide market places for the sale of produce by retail, but not otherwise. That gives the City Council all the power they need, so long as they obtain the consent of the Governor-in-Council. If the proposition was reasonable they would obtain consent, but it would be a bad thing if the City Council had a market competing with the metropolitan market and neither was paying its way.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for Perth said the City Council were adding another 1½ acres to the kerbstone market. Would the Government prevent them from covering in that area for a kerbstone market? It strikes me as being far-fetched to say that 1½ acres covered in would constitute a kerbstone market.

Mr. Mann: They have three-quarters of an acre at present.

The Minister for Agriculture: They can add what they like so long as it is a retail market.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The proviso to Clause 2 empowers the Governor to extend the boundaries of the metropolitan area, as defined in the Bill. If it was extended to include the Subiaco Council, the Claremont Road Board, the Claremont Council and all the local authorities to Fremantle, would they have any representation on the trust? It would not be fair if such districts were brought under the measure and were given no representation.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The representation provided for in the Bill would not be interfered with. The Bill deals with a defined area and there is no intention to give representation to other interests.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Bill provides for certain representation for the defined metropolitan area, but it does not provide for representation for other districts that might be included in the metropolitan area later on.

Mr. Panton: You would have to come in as consumers.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would not be prepared to come in under the representation given to the Perth City Council. They do not represent the whole of the metropolitan area. If we were brought under the measure, we should have fair representation. The Bill as it stands is quite fair, but if the boundaries are extended, the outside municipalities should be given representation.

The Minister for Agriculture: All of them.

Mr. RICHARDSON: They should be given fair representation. I am prepared to say that the Minister, in framing this Bill, has had assistance from the Perth City Council, and that they have looked after their own interests.

Mr. Mann: Do not libel the Perth City Council.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am merely saying what I believe to be true.

Hon. G. Taylor: You will have to apologise to-morrow for insulting the Perth City Council.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I do not think so. The Perth City Council have had some say in the framing of this Bill.

Mr. Mann: Then they did the job very badly.

Mr. RICHARDSON: So badly is the Bill framed that their idea is to claim the whole of the representation for the metropolitan area. The member for Claremont must, and the Minister for Lands—if he were present—would recognise the injustice of the present proposal. Perhaps the member for Fremantle will realise that if markets were established at Fremantle the Perth City Council would claim control. In the absence of an assurance from the Minister that outside municipalities included in the metropolitan area will be given fair representation, I shall vote against the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—The metropolitan market trust:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 all the words after "members" in line 1 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"Two of the members of the trust shall be elected in the prescribed manner by and as the representatives of producers; one shall be elected by and as the representative of the council of the City of Perth, and two shall be appointed by the Governor, one of whom shall be a representative of consumers."

To allow the producers but one representative would be inequitable. The market will deal with a variety of produce. In addition to chaff and other forms of produce, it will handle fruit and vegetables. There should be a representative of both sections on the trust. Consideration is already given to the consumers, and to the Perth City Council, and there will also be a representative of the Government on the trust.

Mr. Sleeman: But no representative of the employees.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is a wide-spread desire that the producers should be represented by at least two members. There are two representatives of the consumers, one a direct representative, and the other through the Perth City Council. It should be possible to devise a means by which, at small cost, representatives of the producers could be elected. The producers would know then that the men who served them would be those of their choice. The Dairy Produce Control Board of Victoria, the Dried Fruits Control Board of Victoria, and the Federal Dried Fruit Export Control Board all have their representatives elected by the producers.

The Minister for Agriculture: They are nominated.

Mr. SAMPSON: Mr. Yates, the representative of the dried fruit producers on the Swan, occupies his position as a result of an election. I believe the Minister would support the proposal if he felt it could be carried out without great expense. In many districts the producers are already organised. If they realised that the appointment of their representatives depended upon further organisation on their part, there would be no difficulty with regard to holding an election.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It does not matter so long as we get on the trust good solid members, who are suitable to the job.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is no reason why this result should not be obtained by the election of two representatives of those producers who use the markets. The Minister could accept the amendment without weakening his control. The trust will really operate only at the Government's responsibility, for they will have to find the money. I certainly think the Legislative Council will hold up the Bill if there is left in this clause the words "one shall be nominated by the Council of the City of Perth." Furthermore, I would point out that the Minister will have to obtain the consent of Parliament before the money required for the erection of central markets can be allocated for the purpose.

Mr. LAMBERT: I should like to know why the Council of the City of Perth should have the right to nominate a representative on the trust. Whom do the Government seek to have represented through the Perth

City Council as distinguished from other municipal bodies in the metropolitan area?

Mr. Mann: The City Council are the only municipal body affected by the Bill.

Mr. Thomson: But the operation of the measure can be extended.

Mr. Mann: Only by the Government.

Mr. LAMBERT: With all due deference to the City Council, I regard their representation as quite unnecessary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment. The member for Swan said certain boards were elective—for instance, the Federal board for dairy produce. If my information is correct, the members of that board are nominated by the Federal Government.

Mr. Sampson: I was definitely informed so regarding the board for the export of dried fruits.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The dried fruits industry is organised by Act of Parliament, and a vote can be taken because all the fruitgrowers are registered. However, the boards mentioned by the hon. member have no financial responsibility, and are purely advisory. They cannot authorise the expenditure of a penny.

Mr. Sampson: This trust will be subject to the Government.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The dairy produce and dried fruits boards are merely advisory. There is a vast distinction between an advisory board and a trust of this character, with full responsibility for the administration and success of the institution. I agree with the Opposition Leader that especially in the initial stages it is essential to obtain the services of good, sound men. Among the producers there are unquestionably men who, if put forward, will be able to deal with the situation; and why, in such circumstances, should we go to the expense of an election?

Mr. Sampson: A vote could be taken through the associations.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Perth City Council could not hold the matter up by refusing to appoint a representative, since the Bill provides for a quorum of three. Therefore if the City Council representative never attended, it would not matter much. The City Council have power under the Municipal Corporations Act to establish markets, and that power is taken from them by this Bill. Further, they administer the streets and

the locality where the proposed markets are to be established. Accordingly we consider they should have representation on the trust.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The amendment is rather confused, since it proposes the striking out of various things. The better course would be to subdivide it, and then the question of two representatives of the producers could be taken by itself.

Mr. LAMBERT: There is no reason why the City Council, any more than other municipalities or road boards, should have special representation. I agree that the functions of the trust will be primarily those of business men. The City Council, while having the power to establish markets, have never done so. In the circumstances I fail to see why any semi-apology should be tendered to them over this Bill. I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill which will meet the requirements of the people, but the Bill will include a grave defect if we concede the right to the City of Perth to have a representative on the trust. If we concede that right and at a later stage desire to interfere with any one of the numerous directions in which the City Council are interested, they will claim a similar right. We should not agree to any such faint-hearted apology for curtailing the rights of the City Council. The Government interfered with their rights regarding the trams and the electric lighting scheme, but no similar provision was made then. Unless the Minister contends that the matter is vital, I will test the feeling of the Committee on this point. If it is necessary to have a municipal representative on the trust, that representative should be the nominee of the whole metropolitan area within a reasonable radius.

Mr. SAMPSON: In view of the fact that the amendment deals with more than one principle, I ask permission to withdraw it so that we can deal with the points raised seriatim.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The member for Coolgardie was wrong in suggesting that my remarks reflected upon the City Council and their ability to appoint a suitable man. It is obvious that somebody will have to find the money to finance the markets, and if the City Council were willing to find the money and to manage the concern, the Minister would be well advised to allow the local authori-

ties to do so. The trust will be spending Government money and I should imagine the Government would be greatly relieved to hand over to the City Council the responsibility of finding the money and shouldering the responsibility of the venture. Not only the markets, but also the trams and other activities represent proper spheres for the City Council who should be allowed to carry on such undertakings.

Mr. PANTON: The Committee overlook one vital. One would think from the remarks of hon. members that the markets concern merely the City of Perth; they concern a large proportion of both the consumers and the producers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not a very great proportion.

Mr. PANTON: A large proportion of the vegetables and fruit consumed in Kalgoorlie and also in Albany come from the city markets.

Mr. Lambert: Nine-tenths of the supplies come from the metropolitan area.

Mr. PANTON: Evidence taken some time back showed that the agents had to procure their supplies for Kalgoorlie and other outer districts from the city, so that consumers all over the State are interested in these markets. When the vegetable growers of Spearwood and the contiguous districts take their supplies to Fremantle and find the local market glutted, they come on to Perth and dispose of their goods there.

Mr. Mann: The point is that the Perth City Council represent the only local authority upon whom a restriction will be placed.

Mr. PANTON: I have no objection to the producers having two representatives on the trust, but I have a decided objection to the City Council having one representative. The fact that they will lose certain rights accruing to them under the Municipalities Act does not entitle them to a representative. If the Government appoint certain representatives there are only two other classes to be considered, namely, the producers and the consumers. I do not agree that it will be practicable to elect representatives of the producers and the consumers off-hand. For the first year they ought to be appointed, after which some means may be found of satisfactorily electing them. I hope that before the clause passes, the reference to the City Council will be deleted.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 of Subclause (2) the words "to be appointed by the Governor" be deleted.

If that be carried I will move that the next succeeding word, "one," be struck out and "two" be inserted in lieu, thus providing for two representatives of the producers on the trust.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. I have stressed the point that it is impossible to hold an election by producers who are not organised. And it would not be reasonable to have an election by any section of the producers; it must be all or none, and until the producers are properly organised they cannot as a whole, hold an election. Further, an election of the producers' representative is not desirable. Such a representative ought not to be elected on sentimental grounds, and the producers themselves have no financial responsibility. All the existing boards on which the producers are represented are purely advisory, whereas this is to be a trust with full financial responsibilities, and so business capacity in its members is essential.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause (2) "one" be struck out and "two" inserted in lieu.

That will provide for two representatives of the producers on the trust.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: This is really the crux of the whole thing. I am appreciative of the action of the Government in providing that there shall be one representative of the producers on the trust.

Mr. Panton: Are you prepared to eliminate the City Council?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, I am. If the trust were to be of three members, I could understand the producers having one representative, the consumers one, and the Government one. Such a trust would appeal to me much more than that proposed in the Bill. But since the Bill provides for a trust of five members, the producers should have two representatives, the Government two, and the consumers one. After all, the two members representing the Government are not likely to be producers; they will almost certainly be consumers.

Mr. Sleeman: If resident in the metropolitan area they are not likely to be producers.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No, probably they will be civil servants. Whatever they may be by vocation, they will almost certainly be consumers. This is a good Bill, but if it can be improved upon, the Government ought to take the broad view and accept the amendment.

Mr. PANTON: It is only fair and reasonable that there should be on the trust two representatives of the producers. I am now assuming that the City Council will be eliminated. The trust is to provide markets for the sale of fruit, vegetables, fish and numerous other commodities. There is a vast number of producers directly interested in a wide diversity of products.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope members will not press the amendment. The producers are quite satisfied with one representative.

Mr. Sampson: No, I have had letters to the contrary.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: On the other hand, I received a deputation who felt that this was the first time the principle of giving the producers representation on a board or trust had been adopted and they were well satisfied.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: the Minister must have the right to select the first members of the trust.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I have given the producers who met in Perth last week a promise that they will be consulted.

Mr. THOMSON: Naturally the Minister is reluctant to depart from the Bill as introduced. We appreciate the action of the Government in bringing down the measure and making provision for one representative of the producers on the trust, but as the Government will have the appointment of the first five members of the trust, the Minister could with safety accept the amendment and give the producers two representatives. The producing interests are large and the main reason for introducing the Bill is to provide a market for the commodities raised by the producers. The trust will have the power to levy charges on the goods sold in the market, and consequently the producers are vitally concerned. I have received communications from various organisations stating that they are delighted with the Bill, but expressing the hope that two representatives would be conceded. I hope the Minister will depart from the precedent

that has become established to get his Bill passed as drafted.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to deal with the amendment.

Mr. THOMSON: I am appealing to the Minister to accept the amendment.

Mr. A. Wansbrough: Are you agreeable to the City Council having no representation?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, I am agreeable to their representative being cut out.

Mr. BROWN: I support the amendment and urge the Minister to accept it. The success of the market will depend upon the patronage of the producers, and if they feel that they have fair representation on the trust, they will realise that it is to their interests to patronise the market. Sometimes a producer gets returns from the markets that he considers are unjust, but if he has fair representation on the trust, he will feel confident of getting a square deal from the market.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 15th September, 1926.

Bills:	Page
Government Savings Bank Act Amendment, 3a.	954
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 3a.	954
Federal Aid Roads Agreement, 3a.	954
Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment, 3a.	954
Herdsmen's Lake Drainage Act Repeal, 3a.	954
Vermin Act Amendment, 3a.	954
Soldier Land Settlement, Com. report ..	954
Forests Act Amendment, 2a., Com. report ..	956
Jetties, 2a.	959
Navigation Act Amendment, 2a.	962
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2a.	963
Motion: Industrial Arbitration Act, to disallow regulation	954
Adjournment, special	965

BILLS (6)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Government Savings Bank Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

- 2, Plant Diseases Act Amendment.
 - 3, Federal Aid Roads Agreement.
 - 4, Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Act Amendment.
 - 5, Herdsmen's Lake Drainage Act Repeal.
 - 6, Vermin Act Amendment.
- Passed.

BILL—SOLDIER LAND SETTLEMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

MOTION—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. E. H. Harris:

That Regulation No. 128 under the Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1912-25, relating to Industrial Boards and Boards of Reference, laid upon the Table on the 19th August, 1926, be and is hereby disallowed.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40]: Mr. Harris is seeking to bring about a disallowance of Regulation 128 under the Industrial Arbitration Acts 1912-25, not because he has any objection to the regulation so far as it goes, but because he considers it does not go far enough. Parliament has no power to amend regulations; it can only disallow them. In giving reasons for the disallowance, Parliament can suggest the amendment which it desires should be made. That is Mr. Harris's position. He is under the impression that there is no effective check on the expenditure involved by industrial boards and boards of reference, that there is a temptation to these bodies to extend their sittings, and hours of sittings, for the sake of the fees, and that therefore a proviso should be added to the regulation as follows:—

Provided that the President of the Court of Arbitration shall first certify that the time occupied and charged for by the chairman and members of the said respective boards in the performance of their duties is fair and reasonable, and that the proceedings be-

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