

sanitary service. The Controller wrote back to the secretary of the group settlers stating that the Health Department would supply the pans. The Health Department, when written to in their turn, replied that they did not supply pans, and that the settlers would have to get them from elsewhere. Evidently the Controller of Group Settlements was misinformed, or else did not make inquiries. The pans have not yet been supplied.

The Minister for Works: I will speak to the Premier about the matter.

Mr. HUGHES: In the original construction of the cottages, some of the windows were broken. As a result some of the homes have never had windows. The occupants, during six or seven months' occupation, have been corresponding backwards and forwards with the Controller regarding windows, but have not yet got them. The latest reply the settlers received was that the matter was being considered. With the summer coming on, and the flies being so bad, it is essential that the settlers should have windows in their houses. The windows were not broken through carelessness, but broken in the course of construction.

The CHAIRMAN: Of what group is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. HUGHES: A previous speaker referred to hospitals and public health under this item. I am showing that unless certain things are attended to, the demand on the hospitals is likely to be greater.

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this vote. I rule the hon. member out of order.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Other undertakings, £12,000—agreed to.

Lands Improvement Loan Fund:

Votes—Departmental, Salaries, Agriculture, £1,500; Contingencies, Development of Agriculture, Agriculture, £9,598; Development of Agriculture, North-West, £5,000—agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 5.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 28th November, 1923.

	PAGE
Deputy President, appointment ... ..	1677
As to prayers ... ..	1677
Motion: Standing Orders suspension ... ..	1677
Bills: Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment, 1s. ... ..	1681
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2s. ... ..	1681
Kolonup Racecourse, 3s. ... ..	1681
Lunacy Act Amendment, report, 3s. ... ..	1681
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2s., Com. report ... ..	1681
Native Mission Stations, 2s., Com., 3s. ... ..	1691
Gnowangerup Reserves, 2s., Com., 3s. ... ..	1692
Insurance Companies Act Amendment, 2s. ... ..	1693
Appropriation, 1s. ... ..	1694
Merredin Racecourse, 2s., Com., 3s. ... ..	1694
Busselton-Margaret River Railway Deviation (No. 2), 2s. ... ..	1695

### DEPUTY PRESIDENT, APPOINTMENT.

The Clerk announced that, owing to the absence of the President through unavoidable causes, it would be necessary to appoint a Deputy President.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move:

*That the Hon. J. W. Kirwan take the Chair as Deputy President during the absence of the President.*

Question put by the Clerk and passed.

### AS TO PRAYERS.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Do you not intend, Mr. Deputy President, to read prayers?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The proceedings had already been opened when the Clerk announced that the President was not present. It is contrary to Parliamentary practice in such cases to read prayers.

### MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [4.33]: I move—

*1, That Standing Order 62 be suspended for the remainder of the Session, 2, That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the Session as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages at one sitting, and to enable Messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith on their receipt.*

I do not wish hon. members to misunderstand the course I am pursuing. I trust they will agree to the motion, so that business may be expedited. If hon. members look at the Notice Paper they will see that there are a number of Bills down for consideration, and while I will not describe them as of minor importance, they are such as are not likely to be debated at great length. If the motion

be agreed to it will enable us to keep the Notice Paper clear, and as soon as a Bill is agreed to without much discussion, it will be possible to put it through the remaining stages and return it to the Legislative Assembly. I give my assurance to hon. members, that, should any member desire the adjournment of the discussion on any business before the House, I will be only too pleased to fall in with his wishes. Hon. members can have what adjournments they desire. Several important Bills, such as the Appropriation Bill and the Land and Income Tax Bill, will come before us in due course and they will require full discussion. I have no intention of using the motion in order to curtail discussion. The whole object is to facilitate the business and, by disposing of measures that can reasonably be dealt with at the one sitting, retain on the Notice Paper matters requiring further consideration. I hope the session will come to a close within a reasonable time, and that the carrying of the motion will convenience members.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.36]: I second the motion, and will take the opportunity of voicing my feelings of regret that the session has so far advanced and that so little has been done, due, of course, to lack of business from another place. Just as the Bills commence to arrive from the other Chamber, the Leader of the House desires the suspension of certain Standing Orders to enable him to get through the business as promptly as possible. We are ready and willing to sit early and late and to sit on an extra day or two each week, if it is possible to get through the business within a reasonable time. I am not fond of sitting here during the summer months. This is a suitable time to express regret that Parliament does not assemble earlier and get through the business while reasonably cool weather prevails. Now that Bills are coming from another place, we are not anxious that the business shall be rushed through without proper consideration.

Hon. J. Cornell: Are you going to vote for the motion?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I hope that the session will not be prolonged, but, at the same time, every measure brought before us should receive full consideration. I rely upon the statement made by the Leader of the House, that he will not attempt to force any measure through without full discussion. I will support the motion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.39]: I must oppose the motion for reasons I shall explain. The House has been sitting for four months and we have done nothing. Certainly we have done nothing of importance. Members have been brought from the country and then sent home again, although nothing has been done. No one is more anxious to finish the session than I am. At the time since it is our duty to analyse legislation and see that nothing slips through.

The Minister for Education: Nobody wishes you to do anything else.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is easy to allow something to slip through, and when we discover what has happened the next day, it is too late to deal with it. That is an important point. Hon. members will remember that we passed special legislation to avoid this rush at the end of a session. We altered the date of the general election in order that the Government might come down in June with the business prepared for parliamentary consideration, and finish the business before the summer months. Since that legislation was passed and an extra six months' grace was given to the Government, exactly the opposite results to those anticipated have followed, and we have been required to return after Christmas to finish up the work of the session. Such a thing did not happen prior to that legislation being passed. The real fact of the matter is that the Government did not have the business for the session ready for submission to members. A Property Bill was brought forward but we knew full well that it was not intended to go on with it. It was merely placed on the Notice Paper in order to keep the House together until the Government had something for members to deal with. Yesterday, for some unexplained reason, a special request was made by the Leader of the House for permission to move this motion. The Minister said it was because the Notice Paper was full of Bills to be dealt with. As a matter of fact, those Bills were not on the Notice Paper when he moved his motion.

Hon. E. H. Harris: He was preparing for them.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Ten Bills were brought down yesterday, and before we have even seen them the Minister moves a motion to suspend the Standing Orders so that he may rush them through. I do not know what happened yesterday, but I know we have heard in the corridors the usual sing-song that characterises the end of sessions of Parliament. This year, of course, there was a new version, as published in the "West Australian." This writing on the wall, combined with the split in a certain party, leads one to believe that the business is to be rushed through, and that the Government intend going to the country before the wolf and the lamb have time to lie down together again.

Members: They cannot go to the country.  
The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Will hon. members stop the conversation in which they are indulging.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member interjects that the Government cannot go to the country. In my opinion the Government can go to the country any time they choose. When we find that, in another place, members commenced dealing with the Loan Estimates, involving an expenditure of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions, at 6 p.m. last night and that those Estimates were finally bludgeoned through at 5 o'clock this morning, we must

realise that that may happen here if we agree to suspend the Standing Orders. Revenue Estimates involving an expenditure of seven millions of money have been passed in another place, and we will be asked to approve of the expenditure, although we have not seen those Estimates. Is it our fault that we have reached this stage of the session with so much to do and nothing done? We are asked now to agree to the motion which will enable the House to deal, if necessary, with Bills in one sitting. It is not fair to the Leader of the House to ask that Bill's be put through at one sitting. He has only just accepted the office of leader, and everyone knows what a difficult position it is. Mr. Colebatch was specially qualified for it. He could take up a Bill at 2 o'clock in the morning, put his finger on the defects, make the necessary amendments, and rectify the errors made in another place. We cannot ask or expect Mr. Ewing to do that. It is not fair to charge him with the responsibility of putting all this legislation through at one sitting. There is the Redistribution of Seats Bill, a most important measure. Week after week was spent on that Bill in another place in order to get a redistribution on which we could go to the country. The Bill passed its second reading weeks ago, but nothing has been heard of it since. I assume that it will come up again.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I am told it is dead.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is rather peculiar that such a Bill should be dead after having passed the second reading.

The Minister for Education: That happens here sometimes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But that was a Government Bill and an important one, too. The Loan Bill of £4,500,000 will mean that the State must find between £250,000 and £300,000 interest that will be a charge upon the revenue until the expenditure becomes reproductive. Millions of money has been spent, a lot of it without the authority of Parliament, and tens of thousands is not earning interest, nor is it likely to for some time. What will be our position if we spend another £4,500,000?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I must remind the hon. member that we are discussing a motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am explaining why we should not agree to the motion. The business is of such importance that we should have ample time to deal with it. Our revenue account is more than £6,000,000 short, and the interest on the deficit is £1,000 per day. The business before us is of sufficient importance to justify close scrutiny by this House, and no Bill of any importance should be put through all its stages at one sitting.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [4.49]: I am in accord with Mr. Holmes. There is no justification for the motion, particularly the

latter portion of it, at this stage. If the Minister wishes to expedite business he should preserve our rights under the Constitution that every stage of legislation should receive full consideration. The most he should have done was to bring down the first portion of the motion, permitting new business to be taken after 10 o'clock. To ask us to suspend the Standing Orders to enable Bills to be passed through all stages at one sitting and enable messages to be considered immediately after they are received is unprecedented and unpardonable. I move an amendment—

*That paragraph 2 be deleted.*

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.50]: Every session we have a similar motion, but the position is aggravated on this occasion because no serious attempt has been made to deal with the measures the Government have in hand. Last week we sat for only one night, and had to adjourn over the rest of the week because there was nothing to do. Now it is intended to rush everything through. Is that fair to the country? Should we be asked to sit here till the small hours of the morning? We should not. The average man sitting till 10 or 11 p.m. does very well. After that he must tire; he cannot be expected to exhibit the reasoning powers that he would otherwise do.

Hon. T. Moore: Members in another place went on much later than that last night.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Quite so, but the matter that engaged their attention should have been before them months ago. We were assured that the present Government would have the Estimates before Parliament early in the session.

Hon. J. Cornell: And they did.

The Minister for Education: These are the Loan Estimates.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: But was any attempt made to deal with them? Look at the amount of work to be brought before us during the next fortnight. I understand it is intended to try to finish the session at the end of next week.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They have no chance.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Government desire to do so. I object to it. The country has a right to expect us to give reasonable time and consideration to every measure. We cannot do so if the business is rushed through under a suspension of the Standing Orders. I trust members will take a strong stand and insist that ample time be devoted to considering all the important matters still to be brought before us.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—on amendments) [4.53]: Members misunderstand and misconstrue my intentions. It is far from my wishes that any business should be rushed through. Although the motion may be unprecedented and although, as Mr. Holmes said, I may not have the experience to handle the business as did my predecessor, I undertake to give earnest attention to every Bill and not to bring

any measure forward unless I understand it and can deal with it properly. The responsibility thus will be upon my shoulders.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It is on ours, too.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I took it upon myself to move the motion; as Leader of the House it appealed to me. The Government are not behind it; the Premier did not ask me to move it. We have 15 Orders of the Day on the Notice Paper. Many of them will require very little time. If any requires great attention, I shall agree to an adjournment. The matter will be entirely in the hands of members. I thought when we reached a Bill of no great importance we could put it through all stages. I assure members that nothing will be done by me to force legislation through the House. If the Standing Orders be suspended I shall use the privilege to expedite business only if it be the wish of the House that the business be so expedited. If any member desires an adjournment there shall be no opposition from me. I am quite aware there are important Bills to come before us, and I should be wanting in my duty if I attempted to rush any of them through. I hope to move the second reading of the Appropriation Bill on Tuesday next, and members will then have ample time to discuss the financial position of the State. The Taxation Bill and Loan Estimates are important alike to the Government and the people of the State, but I may reasonably ask members to trust me in this matter.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.58]: Having subordinated Parliamentary duties to other business recently, I may lay myself open to a charge of being unfair if I do not support the motion, but there is another obligation imposed upon us. We must consider whether it is in the best interests of the House to grant the Minister's request. Though it has been customary towards the end of the session to suspend Standing Order No. 62, in actual practice there has been little need for it. It depended upon the conduct of the business by the Leader of the House and what he brought forward before 10 p.m. The House always assisted him. I have compared our formidable Notice Paper with the Bills on my file, and there is nothing whatsoever on the Notice Paper to warrant the suspension of the Standing Orders. There is nothing of importance and nothing of a controversial nature.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That will come later.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Therefore, on the evidence before me there is no necessity to grant the Minister's request.

The Minister says he is asking for the suspension of the Standing Orders mainly with reference to what is to come. That is my main reason for opposing the motion. The Bills now on the Notice Paper are of little moment, but important measures are to come before the House. I am perfectly certain that when those important measures have come along and members have had an opportunity of perusing them, the Minister's request will

be granted, if necessary. I see no reason for granting it at this juncture. I suggest that the Minister withdraw his motion to-day, and submit it at a later date. If it is defeated to-day, he cannot move it again at any subsequent stage of the session. Hon. members can read the important Bills when distributed upon first reading, and thereafter decide whether such a motion as this should be carried. Those are the only circumstances under which I would support the motion.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	10
Noes	..	..	..	12

Majority against .. 2

#### AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. R. J. Lynn	

#### NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	

Amendment thus negatived.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	12
Noes	..	..	..	12

A tie .. .. 0

#### AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. Duffell
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. W. Carroll	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I give my casting vote with the Ayes, and declare the motion carried.

Hon. J. Cornell: What about further consideration?

Question thus passed.

# BILL—VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly, and read a first time.

## BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1. Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

2. Kojonup Racecourse.

Passed.

# BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

# BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

## Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 20th November.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [5.17]: This remarkable Bill appeared on the Notice Paper before the Government Bill dealing with the same subject had been disposed of. Most extraordinary tactics were adopted to secure the defeat of the Government Bill, and the advancement of this one. I do not know whether it is of much use opposing the Bill here; I think we may very well leave that to another place. But the House has endeavoured to shape a new course in taking charge of industrial legislation, taking it out of the hands of the Government and handing it over to municipal councils. We here are elected on a restricted franchise, notwithstanding which we endeavour to take charge of industrial measures and hand over their control to a body elected on a still more restricted franchise and on plural voting. Consider where this kind of legislation is likely to lead us. I endeavour to take a fair attitude towards all measures that come before the Council, but I believe that the measures of extremists, such as the extremists who conducted a riot some time ago in Fitzgerald-street, are likely to lead to such institutions as the Fascisti, while the attitude of this Chamber, as represented by the Bill, is likely to breed Bolshevism. It is bad when a body elected on a restricted franchise deliberately says to the Assembly, elected by three times as many electors, "You know nothing about this industrial legislation; we are going to throw out your legislation and set ourselves up as dictators." That is what we are doing. We are seeking to place it in the hands of a body elected on a greatly restricted franchise and on plural voting.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You have already given them similar powers.

Hon. J. E. DODD: That is the position: while extreme measures on one side may breed such institutions as Fascisti, extreme measures

on the other side, such as this, are likely to breed Bolshevism. The remarkable part of this extraordinary Bill is that whereas the Chamber time and again deliberately expresses abhorrence of legislation by regulation, the entire Bill is to be referred to regulations made by a municipal council. So we are seeking to amend the regulations of a municipal council in order to give that body the right to do something to protect workmen from unsafe scaffolding. Where is our consistency? Time after time do we object to legislation by regulation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: To taxation by regulation.

Hon. J. E. DODD: Yet this is to be handed over entirely to the municipal council to deal with by regulation.

Hon. T. Moore: It is Mr. Boyd's Bill.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I have no objection whatever to handing responsibility to the municipal council, a worthy body doing good work without payment. But let us look at this in another aspect. We are going to hand over to the Perth City Council the regulation of scaffolding, notwithstanding that the chief man in the council is a builder and contractor. Nor is he the only builder and contractor on the council. Instead of handing over this particular legislation to Government employees nominated only by the Act we passed, we are going to hand it over to a number of men who are themselves contractors. Again, I do not know the chairman of the Perth Road Board at present, but a builder and contractor was chairman of that board for a long time. We have around Perth quite a number of road boards. In future, I think, most of our big buildings will be in the road board areas. Yet the Bill does not apply to road boards, being restricted to municipalities. Why should the Perth Road Board, the South Perth Road Board, the Claremont Road Board, and various other road boards not be under any obligation in the matter?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Because you cannot put them in the same Bill with municipalities.

Hon. J. E. DODD: We have had the whole lot under one Bill. There was no need to bring in a Bill like this in order to place the thing in the hands of municipal councils. The Bill is an absolute farce. It imposes no obligations, fixes no penalties. There is nothing in the Bill. It has never been asked for by the municipal voters, nor by the road board voters. I have here the report of a conference held in August last, at which there were representatives from all the metropolitan municipalities. They passed quite a number of resolutions, but not one referring to scaffolding, although the very section of the Municipal Corporations Act that Mr. Lovekin seeks to amend is one that the conference sought to amend, in another direction. If we were to search the whole of the records of the various municipal and road board conferences I do not think we should find one at which those bodies have asked to be saddled with the obligation of

protecting workmen against unsafe scaffolding. Moreover, if we can legitimately ask that legislation of this nature be placed under the local municipal councils, we can legitimately ask that the Factories Act also should be placed under those authorities; and if the Factories Act can be placed under the municipal authorities, why should not the Mines Regulation Act be placed under the road board authorities in mining areas? It is all industrial legislation. Those are a few of the objections I have to the Bill. I agree with Mr. Gray, who said the introduction of the Bill and the way it was brought about would give his party some good electioneering propaganda, and that they would be a very foolish party indeed if they did not make the best possible use of it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It will help us materially, also.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: That is why they are voting to reject it.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I do not know. One cannot lose sight of the extraordinary methods used in the attempt to put the Bill on the statute-book. We are going to say to the Assembly, elected by three times as many electors as were we, "You fellows do not know anything at all about the business for which you were elected. We, who were elected on a restricted franchise, are the distastors, and are not going to give Parliament the right at all, but are going to pass it over to another body even more select than are we." I will vote against the Bill, although I am prepared to leave it to the Assembly to be dealt with as they think fit.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.28]: I intend to oppose the Bill. Mr. Dodd has referred to it as a farce. I think he might very well have referred to it as a pantomime, with Mr. Lovekin in the character of Harlequin. I do not know what is the object of the Bill; whether it is camouflage, or a smoke screen put up by Mr. Lovekin; or whether, in view of the fact that ultimately he will have to face his constituents, he is not providing a line of retreat against the time when he shall be attacked for the attitude he took up in connection with the Government Bill that this Bill is intended to replace. There were two reasons given for rejecting the former Bill. The first was that it was not necessary because up to the present there had been no accidents. If it was not necessary a few weeks ago to provide for the safety of the workmen employed on buildings, nothing has happened during the last few weeks to make this new Bill necessary.

The Minister for Education: You have got home there.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Another reason given for the rejection of the former Bill was that it would increase the cost of building, because the regulations would necessitate plans being submitted and fees paid. The new Bill now proposes that the City Council shall frame the regulations. Will they not charge for the work they do?

Hon. A. Lovekin: No.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: If they do not charge the people concerned for inspections, the burden will be cast upon the ratepayers. Someone must pay the cost.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I am inclined to think the Bill is out of order.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Someone will have to pay for the inspections and the duties that will have to be carried out. Whether the cost is thrown upon the ratepayers or the contractor or the owner of the building, is quite immaterial. Undoubtedly there will be an added cost thrown upon someone.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The cost will be included in the other fees.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I do not know how Mr. Lovekin is going to make bricks without straw. There cannot be competent supervision unless it is paid for. It is suggested that a Government department cannot be trusted to do this work, and that it should be handed over to the City Council. I have no wish to disparage the City Council, the members of which do good work, but I would sooner deal with a Government officer than I would with an officer of the City Council. The work could be done better by a Government official, and I think he would be subject to less interference. The Bill is merely brought forward to bring this House into contempt, and I oppose it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.33]: I would not have spoken but for the remarks of Dr. Saw.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I can always raise you.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The clown usually makes the people laugh.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Dr. Saw asks why the Bill is necessary. He knows well why the other Bill was thrown out. It was discussed here for hours in his presence. What the House objected to was the creation of another Government department, with its chief inspectors and other officials travelling all over the State. It was shown that a way out of the difficulty was to introduce a Bill of this kind. It was stated in his presence that such a Bill would be introduced. I cannot believe a gentleman with the brain capacity of the hon. member can have forgotten this. Under the Bill now before us, each municipality will be able to deal with its own buildings. If a building is going up in York, Albany, Geraldton or Wyndham, it will not be necessary to send a Government inspector all the way there to inspect the building, and, as the Minister said, to show the contractor how to tie knots. The building surveyor in Perth deals with everything in connection with buildings in the city except the tying of the knot. If the building surveyor in Perth cannot superintend the tying of the knot as well as a Government officer, I shall be surprised. Dr. Saw asks who will pay. I suppose the builder will pay, and ultimately the owner.

Hon. A. Lovekin: For a very good reason.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Would he pay under the other Bill?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Who besides the owner should pay for the supervision of the building? Under the other Bill the general taxpayer from Wyndham to Eucla would have been called upon to pay for the supervision of these buildings. This is an entirely different Bill and is a feasible and logical one. It creates no new department and no new Government inspectors who know nothing about the job.

Hon. H. Stewart: And saves travelling expenses.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Possibly an inspector would have been appointed for some political reason. A municipal officer, however, is not appointed through any strings being pulled, but because he knows his job. The two Bills are as different as the South Pole is from the North. I support the second reading.

#### *Point of Order.*

The Minister for Education: I doubt whether the Bill is in order. The Council cannot initiate any legislation that will place a burden upon the people. The Municipalities Act gives power to municipalities to make regulations for certain things.

The Deputy President: Does the hon. member ask for my ruling?

The Minister for Education: I am giving my reasons for asking for your ruling.

The Deputy President: I thought the Minister intended to discuss the Bill generally.

The Minister for Education: No. If we pass this Bill we will give power to municipalities to place a burden upon the people. This House has no right to do that.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Read the amending Constitution Act.

The Deputy President: The amendment of the Constitution Act, which particularly provides for the case the Minister mentions, is contained in the volume at the end of our Standing Orders. The section I refer to is as follows—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys, or imposing taxation, shall not originate in the Legislative Council; but a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to impose taxation, by reason only of its containing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties, or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses, or fees for registration or other services under the Bill.

I rule that the Bill is in order.

#### *Debate resumed.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [5.39]: I regret it has been thought necessary to bring down this Bill. The responsibility in a matter of this kind should rest with the Government. The Bill that was defeated is to be replaced by this one.

Hon. H. Stewart: Was that not a private Bill?

Hon. A. Lovekin: It was originally.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Not at all. It was never introduced in the Legislative Assembly as a private Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You got ahead of the other one.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Mr. McCallum's Bill was on the Notice Paper first.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Government acted in the capacity of a midwife.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The case put up by Mr. Dodd in opposition to the Bill is a clear one. He gave so much valuable information to the House that it is hardly worth while dwelling on the matter at present. Several members made it clear, when the former Bill was dealt with, that they did not think it necessary to protect human life.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Who said that?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Several members indicated that by their vote.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I withdraw the remark, for I find I have made a mistake. They took certain action which defeated the Bill. It is now desired to place the responsibility on the municipality, which should not be called upon to bear it. If they had wanted it, they would have asked for it at the recent conference. I am not prepared to divide the House. Let the Bill be dealt with in another place. If a division is called for I shall vote against the Bill, which I think is out of order. Members were given an opportunity to pass a Bill that would have been more advantageous to the people than this one. If the Bill is passed, I hope it will do some good, but I fail to see the necessity for it when so much was said in the direction of its being unnecessary as there had been no accidents to protect those who were using scaffolding.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It was not said that it would not be necessary to protect them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Members did say so. Every member who opposed the first Bill said there was no necessity for it. Mr. Holmes said so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: My objection was to the new department.

Hon. H. Stewart: On a point of order. I want the Minister to withdraw the statement that every member who opposed the Bill did so on the ground that it was not necessary, as there had been no fatal or serious accidents. I took part in the division on the point that the Chairman should leave the Chair, but did not make use of the expression mentioned by the Minister.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: To what expression did the hon. member take exception?

Hon. H. Stewart: The Minister said every member who opposed it voiced the sentiment that the Bill was not necessary because there had been no accidents. I did not make use of that expression.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

Hon. H. Stewart: The Minister made a very sweeping statement.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I could not be expected to see into the mind of every member who voted against the Bill but without speaking to it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have interpreted our attitude.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I would not dream of doing so. When a member votes against a Bill without speaking to it, he does that for reasons that he himself understands best, and I would not for a moment infer that it was possible for anyone in his right senses to say that Mr. Stewart, for instance, who voted against the Bill without speaking, said so and so, when we know that he did not address the House. I have no intention whatever of inferring that he said anything. But there are members who spoke against this Bill, and they said distinctly that there was no necessity for it, especially because there had been no accidents. If there was no necessity for the Bill on that score three weeks ago, there can be no necessity for a similar Bill to-day. Those members who intend to vote for this measure and who were opposed to the previous one will show by their action how inconsistent they are. But I need not take up the time of the House any further.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am sorry if Mr. Baxter does not like what I am saying.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Don't look at me; I did not say "Hear, hear."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As the Government representative in this House, I am asking for certain things to be done, because the Government consider that they are necessary. We introduced the previous Bill because it was thought that risks were being run without some such legislation on the statute-book. That danger was admitted by some members to exist three weeks ago. To-day some of those members declare that it does not exist. I wonder what has happened in the meantime.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [5.48]: The issue is simple. The Scaffolding Bill introduced by the Government a few weeks ago has been defeated. It met a fate common to many Bills, a fate that many Bills in the future will also meet. The position now is that the Bill before us purports to give municipalities power to make regulations to deal with scaffolding. This House by a majority considered that there was no need for the previous Bill that was introduced, and evidently the member who introduced the measure we are now dealing with considers that there is a necessity for some action. He considers that a municipality should have the power he proposes to give them. The Bill does not say that a municipality "shall" do such and such a thing; it says that a municipality "may" do so. The House decided that the Government should not control the matter; is it now going to declare that a

municipality should not have the power it is proposed to give them if it is thought necessary to do so? That is the simple issue. It has been said that the municipal authorities are not the right people to be entrusted with this kind of business. If my memory serves me rightly, the municipalities to-day are entrusted with a duty of far greater importance: I refer to the administration of the Health Act. That being so, I am prepared to support the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.51]: I supported this Bill when it was introduced, and voted against the previous Bill. I do not wish to magnify in any way the explanation advanced by the Minister, but I did not claim there was no necessity for any measure such as the preceding Bill which was defeated, or even the Bill now before us.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Has the hon. member already spoken on this Bill?

Hon. A. Lovekin: The hon. member formally seconded the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I believe I did say a few words on a previous occasion.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the hon. member merely formally seconded the second reading he may proceed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I also made a few remarks.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: In that case the hon. member cannot make a second speech.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I make a personal explanation?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes, if the hon. member confines himself to the personal explanation and does not discuss the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not wish to magnify the explanation made by the Minister, but he is wrong in attributing to me—

The Minister for Education: I did not attribute anything to you.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am glad to know that. It is unfair that remarks of that nature should be made, because they reflect upon hon. members and on their desire to see that wise legislation is passed. We are here as a House of review, and when such remarks are made and motives are imputed to hon. members, a wrong idea is given.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not making a personal explanation, he is replying to the Minister.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: At any rate I am glad, Mr. Deputy President, that you have given me the opportunity to make these few remarks. I hope in the future the Minister will recognise that we are all actuated by the one desire, and that is, to do the right thing.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (East) [5.53]: I intend to support the Bill. Some hon. members declared that there was no necessity for it, but after the reply of the Leader of the House those hon. members must be convinced that there is a necessity for it. There is no need to debate that point any longer. The difference between the Bill before the Chamber and the Bill brought in by the Government is con-



siderable, inasmuch as the previous Bill meant the establishment of another Government department, whereas the Bill now before us will be administered by the municipalities. When once a Government department is created it soon grows, because the tendency is that the larger the staff a Government officer can get around him the greater becomes his salary.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In Melbourne the municipal authorities do this work.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is essentially a matter for a municipality to attend to. Their officers are obliged to pass plans and to visit buildings in course of construction. Then why not put in their hands the extra duty of inspecting scaffolding? The work can be carried out to far better advantage and at less cost by a municipality. I trust members will see the advisability of placing the Bill on the statute-book. At the same time I am glad the Bill introduced by the Government suffered defeat.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.57]: I accept the assurance given by the Minister that he did not desire to attribute to any member something that did not take place. I understood the Minister to say that every member who opposed the Scaffolding Bill expressed the opinion that the Bill was not necessary because there had been no fatal or serious accidents arising out of the erection of faulty scaffolding. The Minister inadvertently made that statement, which to my mind, was too sweeping, and I felt it was necessary to enter a protest, because at that stage I had not intended to speak on the Bill. I did not speak on the Scaffolding Bill introduced by the Government, but I participated in the division, and yet in the statement made by the Minister I was included as one of those who had expressed the opinions set out by him. However, that is all past and I have accepted his explanation. Other hon. members are in precisely the same position as that occupied by myself. With regard to Mr. Dodd's statement that this House has protested on a number of occasions against government by regulation, I think that hon. member has made a mistake. Since I have been a member of this Chamber, during the past six years, members have objected to taxation by regulation. From a perusal of the Acts passed in recent years by New South Wales and Victoria, and to a certain extent by the Commonwealth, I am amazed at their brevity in many instances, as compared with the length of similar Bills in Western Australia, for they leave a great deal to administration by regulation. I do not know that I have ever protested against the framing of regulations, because we have our remedy. If there should be some necessity to protest against regulations dealing with scaffolding coming within the scope of the Municipal Corporations Act, it must be remembered that hon. members have their own remedy. Regulations must be tabled and if no exception is taken to them prior to the expiration of a fortnight, they become law. Mr. Dodd has inadvertently misjudged the

temper of the House. We have frequently, during recent sessions, protested against the imposition of fees. This has been referred to as "taxation by regulation." The Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill is the natural corollary to the action taken when the Scaffolding Bill was defeated. I have protested in the past against new and unnecessary legislation being applied to the whole State, with consequent increases in administrative charges and the unwarranted building up of public departments. I have protested against that tendency, because it is against the economical administration of Government departments and the economical expenditure of public funds. The Bill is a move in the right direction, in that it will permit local governing bodies, wherever possible, to deal with local matters. This will avoid any unnecessary costs to those affected. Since the Factories and Shops Act was passed, we have seen inspectors travelling for enormous distances throughout the State. Owing to the comprehensive nature of the definition of a factory, there must be a considerable amount of unwarranted expenditure in supervision involved in the operation of such industrial measures. I do not say that that supervision is not necessary, but I have always advocated the most efficient and most economical methods in connection with the supervision of industry. It is quite evident that my attitude regarding the Bill is on all fours with my past actions. I have always pointed out, as I did in connection with the Factories and Shops Act, for instance, that we require to be careful in a young State like Western Australia not to build up unnecessary departments and so involve people engaged in industries in unwarranted expense. As Mr. Holmes put it, we do not want a Scaffolding Bill that will constitute a haystack or a windmill as an erection, and apply such a measure from Wyndham to Eucla and from Fremantle to the South Australian border. We have had instances of what a farce this sort of thing can lead to. Under the Mining Act a clay-pit is a mine; yet under the Factories and Shops Act a clay-hole, where bricks are made, perhaps 500 miles away towards the North-West, for instance, is a factory and has to be registered as such.

Hon. T. Moore: What has this to do with the Bill?

Hon. H. STEWART: I am illustrating what has taken place in connection with legislation of this description. In such instances we have dealt with legislation, perhaps necessary in connection with cities, and made it apply to villages and small centres throughout our vast area. That was the case with the Scaffolding Bill. The Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill is a suitable substitute for the Scaffolding Bill and for that reason I support the second reading.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan) [6.6]: I regret the references made this afternoon to the effect that the Bill is

something like a pantomimic effort on the part of the mover.

Hon. T. Moore: It will be before it is finished.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: If my memory serves me aright, it was as a result of a challenge to Mr. Lovekin, that he should not pull down without constructing, that the Bill was brought forward. It is aimed at dealing with the position on a basis that will not be so expensive as would have been the case under the Scaffolding Bill, with the inevitable provision of a new department. •

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The hon. member said the Bill was not necessary because there had been no accidents and quoted insurances in support of his contention.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I will leave Mr. Lovekin to deal with that interjection himself. If I am right, the Bill is simply the result of a challenge from members themselves. They should respect it as such and not offer criticism against the mover personally, which amounted to something like insults. I think Dr. Saw is sufficient of a gentleman to make the amende honorable. I am in favour of the Bill as it stands. I believe the municipal authorities can cope with the work. Their officers are required to supervise the construction of buildings in the metropolitan area. Members realise that large and important buildings are being erected in the metropolis and the municipal officers are required to approve of the plans and superintend the erection of those buildings. What difficulty would there be in the inspection of scaffolding by such officers? I happen to know that a third officer was appointed by the municipal authorities recently and that he had to be thoroughly experienced in connection with building operations.

Hon. J. Cornell: You trust the municipalities to catch the men who water the milk!

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The facetious hon. member may sometimes put a difficult man like myself off his arguments. It may be claimed that the municipality of Perth can carry out this supervision effectively and has done so in connection with building operations in the city.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Mr. Lovekin's paper, the "Daily News," has complained bitterly about them.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I am simply giving my opinion. It was because the Scaffolding Bill provided for another department and imposed taxation that I opposed it. War taxation is still with us and it is still heavy. I will oppose any movement that will tend to impose more taxation, particularly if the work can be done efficiently by some authority already established. I support the second reading of the Bill. If, as forecasted, another place will deal with it as suggested, they may do so.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [6.10]: When the Scaffolding Bill was before the House I supported it, but it was defeated. The Bill before us is the substitute provided

by Mr. Lovekin. The Scaffolding Bill would have been applied to the whole State. The Bill before us refers only to municipalities and makes no provision regarding buildings in road board areas where many important structures are being erected to-day. In view of this it will be necessary either to introduce another Bill dealing with road board areas or to move an amendment to include them.

Hon. H. Stewart: It will mean another Bill.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Apparently this point has been overlooked by Mr. Lovekin. There is another feature to be considered, and that is that local governing authorities have in most cases suitable officers who can carry out this work without the necessity for the creation of another department. I consider the people will benefit and they will not be required to pay such high fees.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [6.12]: I had no intention of speaking on the Bill because I thought it would have a pleasant passage through this House. Simply because I voted for the Scaffolding Bill and it was defeated furnishes no reason why I should crawl into a corner and refuse to support a Bill which will give the same result in another way. I see no reason why the matter should not be dealt with in the way suggested.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: You think it is a circus, not a pantomime.

Hon. G. POTTER: If members were competent to deal with the matter under the Scaffolding Bill, surely they can deal with the present Bill, which will accomplish the same result. With all due respect to Mr. Dodd and his wide experience, I differ from him on that point. If the House is destitute of any knowledge of industrial affairs, why should we not send the Bill forward to another place where, so Mr. Dodd says, there are industrial experts, and from whom we can get the benefit of their views. Then, as to the competency of municipal officers to carry out the duties suggested, it must be recognised that the building surveyors employed by the local governing authorities are well trained men eminently suitable to carry out the inspection of scaffolds. Yesterday I had a rather embarrassing experience regarding the misuse of phrases. I do not care what Mr. Lovekin said in opposing another measure. My impression was that the opposition to the Scaffolding Bill was not on industrial grounds, but from the standpoint of financial administration. It was never intended to be suggested that it was because any hon. member was so callous or indifferent to the protection of human life that the opposition to the scaffolding legislation was due.

Hon. T. Moore: Some of them are indifferent to it.

Hon. G. POTTER: Like Mr. Harris, I would like to see the provisions of the Bill extended to cover road board areas. If that be accomplished, Mr. Lovekin will have successfully disposed of the criticism against his action,

and for that reason I will support the second reading of the Bill.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [7.30]: As one who had something to do with the removal of the Scaffolding Bill from the Orders of the Day, I have taken a keen interest in the debate on this little measure, and cannot understand why so much venom has been introduced.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Where was it introduced?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: It has been discharged on our heads not only by Dr. Saw but by the Leader of the House.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: On a point of order, is the hon. member in order in referring to me as having made venomous statements?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think the remark is a personal reflection on the hon. member. At any rate, he regards it as such and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I shall exclude the hon. member.

The Minister for Education: I hope he will exclude me, too.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think Mr. Willmott might make a general withdrawal.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Under your direction I withdraw, but surely members will recollect that just prior to tea we sat under far greater reflections from the Leader of the House.

The Minister for Education: In what way?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Minister practically accused us of being murderers.

The Minister for Education: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: "Hansard" will prove every word I say.

The Minister for Education: The hon. member has no right to make those statements, and I ask him to give an unqualified withdrawal. My statements will stand the light of day. The hon. member should not be permitted to make such statements without being compelled to withdraw unqualifiedly.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Minister has already withdrawn the remark to which Mr. Willmott takes exception, and I ask Mr. Willmott to withdraw the remark he just made.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Minister has not withdrawn. He withdrew in respect of only one or two members. There are others entitled to a withdrawal. The Minister did not make a general withdrawal.

The Minister for Education: I take the opportunity to make an unqualified withdrawal, with the exception of saying that the statement was made by some member of this House. I am sorry if I attributed it to another member wrongly.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Minister might be more explicit and say what the statement was.

The Minister for Education: The statement was that there was no necessity for the Scaffolding Bill because no lives had been lost.

I, with Dr. Saw, contended that if that were so three weeks ago it might not be so to-day. I withdraw any reflection I cast upon any hon. member.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Nothing gives me greater pleasure than to hear that withdrawal, and therefore I have no wish to continue that line of argument. Why this little measure should have evoked so much heat, I do not know. If the other Bill was good, why is not this Bill equally good? I understand the whole argument in favour of the Scaffolding Bill was that workmen on scaffolds should be protected. Now Mr. Lovekin has evidently considered there was something in those arguments and has brought down this measure. If there is anything in the arguments of hon. members, he was perfectly right in thus attempting to safeguard the lives of those workers. In my opinion it is an unnecessary safeguard, because the statistics of the insurance companies show that up to the present no one has suffered. I can only conclude that a great deal of heat has been engendered by the suspension of the Standing Orders. Last session I voiced a similar opinion when Mr. Colebatch was here. I said I could not understand why it had a somewhat irritating effect on members, but that effect is certainly apparent to-day. There is an irritability seldom experienced in this Chamber. The placid air that generally prevails is not with us.

The Minister for Education: I hope it will return.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: So do I. I hope the Leader of the House will not become irritable through sitting such long hours listening to the debates. To sit here for so many hours is very strenuous indeed, and if the Leader of the House does not look after his own health I, as a colleague from the South-West Province, might well feel it my duty to do so for him.

The Minister for Education: Very kind of you.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I wish to see him in his present position for a long time, but if he is going to keep us here night and day bludgeoning the business of the House through—this great list before us and more to follow—some of us may survive, but he will not. We do not want any more by-elections.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I remind the hon. member we are discussing the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. T. Moore: He has nothing to say on the Bill.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The hon. member just before tea objected because someone dared to support the Bill. I shall not twit him with the interjection he made, because he has probably forgotten it, but I am going to support the Bill. The arguments put up in its favour are so sound that I cannot do otherwise than support it. The drawback to the Scaffolding Bill was the injustice and annoyance it would have caused, and the building up of another department. This Bill leaves it to the proper bodies to

deal with scaffolding. The Municipal Corporations Act confers great powers on the corporations to deal with many things. Why hand this power over to the Machinery Department, especially when some of us have suffered under it in the past and do not wish to be screwed under its thumb in future? I have confidence in the local governing bodies. I have always voiced the opinion that we should give them greater powers, and that many of the functions exercised by the Government would be very much better discharged by them.

Hon. A. BURVILL (South-East) [7.40]: I support the Bill because it will be the means of protecting the lives of workmen. I would not have spoken but for certain remarks that have been passed. I opposed the Scaffolding Bill, not because it would have afforded protection to workmen, but because it would have been the most expensive method possible to do that. It would have meant creating another department with a centre in Perth, and the fact that its activities would have extended over nearly a million square miles did not appeal to me. The Minister said that similar legislation in other States was administered by two or three inspectors. How he could possibly believe that such a small number of inspectors would suffice, I cannot imagine. This alteration to the Municipal Corporations Act will do all that is required. Under the Act it is the function of municipalities to protect pedestrians from falling bricks and stones when passing under scaffolding. Why the Act cannot be altered to provide this additional power I cannot understand. It will be a better and cheaper method for the workmen, for the contractors, for householders, and for the councils. If we created a Government department we should be building up another staff of clerks, a great deal of whose time would be occupied in travelling to different parts of the State. The Bill should be amended to include road boards as well as municipalities. With this amendment and proper safeguards provided, the measure will be a great improvement on a Scaffolding Act.

Hon. W. CARROLL (East) [7.42]: I support this Bill for the reason that I supported the Scaffolding Bill. I opposed the motion to kill the Scaffolding Bill. I thought legislation was necessary to protect the lives of the men engaged in the building trade. I supported the Scaffolding Bill because nothing better was offering. Now that this Bill has been brought forward, I cannot do otherwise than support it because it seeks to secure the end aimed at by the former measure. I admit that this Bill will undoubtedly attain that end in a very much better and cheaper manner than ever the Scaffolding Bill could have done. The Municipal Corporations Act gives municipalities power to make regulations dealing with practically everything connected with buildings, except the scaffolding necessary

for the erection of buildings. Evidently that was omitted through an oversight when the Act was framed. If this Bill be passed the omission will be repaired. The Government, with very great benefit to the people of the metropolitan area and the State generally, could hand over a great many other duties to the municipalities. If the metropolitan water supply and sewerage and the tramways were handed over to the municipal authorities, or to a board appointed by the municipalities concerned, it would be a great benefit to the State.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Would you do the same in the country districts—hand them over to the road boards?

Hon. W. CARROLL: Unquestionably.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Then we would not have a sinking fund for 50 years and the Government getting it at the end of the time.

Hon. W. CARROLL: When we have tramways in the country districts, it will be time enough to consider what we shall do about the control. Until then we are not concerned with what might possibly take place in the future. At present we are concerned with a situation that has actually arisen. What I took to be a threat was uttered, "Pass your jolly old Bill, and we will get another place to defeat it."

Hon. T. MOORE: That is what will happen, all right.

Hon. W. CARROLL: What will happen in another place does not concern or interest me in the slightest degree. This House is perfectly within its rights in dealing with the present Bill. Any possible effect which anything we may do might have upon another place ought not to influence us if we believe that what we are doing is right. It seems to me that opponents of the Bill are not seriously concerned for safety of life and limb in connection with scaffolding. Otherwise they would see that this measure affords a great deal of protection. In effect, opponents of this measure say, "If we cannot get what we want, we will not have anything at all." I believe that another place will not be so utterly lost to all sense of what is proper and just as to defeat the Bill.

Hon. E. ROSE (South-West) [7.47]: I support the Bill. I was one who assisted to kill—

Hon. T. MOORE: That is the word, "kill." That is proper and right.

Hon. E. ROSE: I was one who assisted to turn the Scaffolding Bill down, not because I did not consider it necessary, but because I thought that its provisions should form part of the Municipal Corporations Act, as proposed by the present measure. In opposing the Scaffolding Bill I said that I thought it would involve great expense in the creation of another department. I said that the country districts did not require that Bill, which would involve primary producers in unnecessary expense in the erection of even silos and sheds. The inspectors' fees would have added materially to the cost of building in

country districts. I shall vote for the present Bill because I do not believe that it will add much to the cost of building, and because I consider the municipalities the proper authorities to control such a matter. The municipalities have control of building operations in other respects, and why should not they have power to control scaffolding? I feel certain that the majority of members here, if not elsewhere, will support the measure. I trust another place will recognise the advisability of giving municipalities, and possibly also road boards, the power and responsibility to inspect and supervise scaffolding.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [7.50]: I would not like the Bill to go to a division without expressing my views on it, because of certain references made to-day. A good many members seem to be smarting under the introduction of the Bill. I am glad some remarks have been withdrawn. I opposed the Scaffolding Bill simply because I considered it unnecessary to appropriate funds for the appointment of inspectors to travel throughout the length and breadth of the land when the same end could be attained much more cheaply. This measure will attain the object aimed at by the rejected Bill, and without the creation of a new department and the appointment of special inspectors. Inspectors under existing Acts have become a nuisance. I also support the Bill because of the arguments used by those who favoured the Scaffolding Bill, arguments appealing to us to care for life and limb of persons engaged in building operations. Protection has been given to the community with respect to hoardings, and possibly there may be some lack of control in municipalities as regards scaffolding. I am quite willing that the operation of the Bill should be extended to apply to certain road board districts. I feel that we can safely leave the duties under this measure to the local authorities.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [7.52]: I oppose this Bill, because I think the time spent on it by hon. members will be wasted. I believe the Government have a little self-respect, despite their wobbling when the screw is put on them. Having sent along a Government Bill of the same purport this session and had it killed, as just mentioned, the Government can never accept another measure of a like character.

Hon. A. Burvill: This is a better Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE: This Bill means that instead of the Government having the right to say how the country shall be run, certain members here, having by unfair tactics defeated—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Hon. T. MOORE: Under your direction, Sir, I will do so. What I said was my opinion.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The remark must be withdrawn unreservedly.

Hon. T. MOORE: I unreservedly withdraw it. I believe that some mem-

bers, who are smiling here now, know that this Bill is a mere camouflage. Opponents of the Scaffolding Bill know they will have to go before their electors, and I am pleased to think that then the question of that Bill can be resurrected. What they did with regard to the Scaffolding Bill will be trotted out to them night after night, and I trust the ghost of the Bill will haunt them at election time.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I suggest to the hon. member that he should confine himself to the merits or demerits of this Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE: I oppose this Bill because it represents a waste of the time of the House. Believing the Government to have some self-respect, I ask members to view this measure as a pure waste of time. Let us try and get the viewpoint of the Government. If members believe that the Government are prepared to swallow this measure after the defeat of their own Bill, that the Government are prepared to accept such a vote of want of confidence—

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Ministers would want the capacity of an ostrich.

Hon. T. MOORE: Even a greater capacity.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—in reply) [7.56]: After the remarks of Mr. Moore, one can understand how it is that the Government still survive. Evidently there is some sort of coalition. Mr. Moore apparently is not so much concerned for the worker who uses scaffolding, as he is to save the face of the Government.

Hon. T. Moore: Nothing of the kind. I say the Government have some self-respect.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: This Bill was no after-thought. Hon. members will recollect that I put it up immediately after the other Bill came to this House, and said I was going to move it. I did so quite properly, because it is laid down in all the procedure that two Bills dealing with the same subject can be before the House at the same time, and that the House can lay aside one and proceed with the other, as it thinks fit, or throw out both measures. By putting up this Bill, I gave the House a choice between two measures. I gave hon. members, from my point of view, what Dr. Saw has been pleased to call "a better 'ole."

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I withdraw that. It is not "a better 'ole."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is perfectly clear from the debate we have just had that this is a better Bill in the interests of the country.

Hon. T. Moore: That is not the opinion of the Government.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The other Bill provided for the creation of a new department, with an army of inspectors to travel, as Mr. Burvill said, over a million square miles. They were to go and inspect a shed, a haystack, a windmill, or a silo erected anywhere in the country. Before the farmer could proceed with such a work, he was to give notice to the inspector and pay fees. That sort of thing is impossible in this country. The

Scaffolding Bill provided only for the worker on scaffolding. The public were not considered in it at all, but were totally ignored. I put up the present Bill because in 1834 the Legislature, rightly or wrongly, decided that there should be a Building Act, so that buildings put up should be of certain strength. Later on, in 1906, the Legislature again, rightly or wrongly, decided that the local authority was the proper authority to deal with the buildings, and consequently they merged the Building Act of 1834 into the Municipal Corporations Act of 1906 *en bloc*, and under that Act the municipalities, or some of them, framed regulations to govern the buildings. The only thing not provided for is the scaffolding. Under one section of the Act the obligation is cast on the municipality, where the building abuts on a street or footpath, to see that a covered way is provided under which passengers can walk without being injured by bricks or debris falling upon them. The only point was the omission to provide for the supervision of the scaffolding. Mr. Dodd, whose remarks I always treat with the greatest respect, referred to two points.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: He said the Bill was a farce.

\*Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is easy to call things by any name at all. Mr. Dodd said the House was endeavouring to take out of the hands of the Government industrial legislation.

Hon. T. Moore: Is not that so?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, it is not, because the House has already taken this matter out of the hands of the Government departments, and placed it under the control of the municipalities. All that the Bill does is to supply what the Government, with the assent of Mr. Dodd and others, omitted to put into that Act. Mr. Dodd was a member of the Ministry for many years, yet he did not think of amending the Municipal Corporations Act or bringing in a Scaffolding Bill. So it was not of very great importance, even to a Labour Ministry. Then Mr. Dodd quotes what happened at the municipal conference, and says they did not ask for a Scaffolding Bill. It is true they did not. Let us bear in mind that the Legislature has not been asked for anything of the sort up to the present moment.

Hon. T. Moore: Did you consult Mr. Bold about it?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, I consulted no one at all, neither the mayor nor the town clerk.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Who is the mayor?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot tell you at present. I consulted no one, but put up the Bill of my own volition.

Hon. T. Moore: Mr. Bold made a few suggestions to you.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, he made none. I did not discuss the Bill with him. The municipal conference evidently forgot all about a Scaffolding Bill. It supports the belief that there was no immediate necessity for the Bill, and because there had not been any accidents due to faulty scaffolding.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The general elections may have constituted a necessity.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Possibly, but I do not want to take up that line of argument. When the Bill was put up I did not discuss it with any of the councillors. But I noted the other day that the municipality of Perth, in their report, which was adopted by the council, commended this very Bill and objected to the Government's attempt to take this matter out of their hands by means of the Scaffolding Bill, since it was a duty cast upon the local authority. The explanation given was that it was surprising no one had ever thought of it. That is not surprising to me because, as I say, there had been no accident due to faulty scaffolding. Had there been such accident, attention would have been drawn to the necessity for the Bill years ago, and we should have had legislation. Now that attention has been drawn to the matter, I am producing the Bill and asking that the municipalities shall be obliged to look after the scaffolding as well as the buildings and hoardings. But Dr. Saw wants to swallow the camel and strain at the gnat. We do not require a new department when we have a huge deficit; we do not want to employ inspectors to travel over a million miles of territory inspecting every bit of scaffolding around a haystack or a silo. Reference has been made to a pantomime. To produce legislation of that sort certainly does savour of the pantomime.

Hon. T. Moore: This Bill does, certainly.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are you the clown?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot follow the logic of hon. members. A little while ago a Scaffolding Bill was necessary to the preservation of life and limb. That first Bill has gone, and now nothing at all is wanted.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: This is the tombstone you are erecting to its memory.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is scarcely a tombstone; but to put it against myself as strongly as possible, it is this: That because certain members cannot have the whole loaf in the protection of life and limb of the workers, they are prepared to refuse to take the portion of the loaf offered to them. That is the reasoning operating in the minds of some hon. members. I do not wish to pursue this, because I feel the House is with me in this matter, and I am sure that if another place be not actuated by prejudice they will accept this Bill in the spirit in which this House sends it to them. I have only one other point to touch upon, and that is in reference to what Dr. Saw said. The hon. member is always paying me compliments that I am not sure I deserve. He referred to this as a pantomimic Bill and designated me as the harlequin. I take that as a compliment. Because there are in a pantomime more people than the harlequin; for instance there are the clown and the policeman. When last I saw a pantomime, the harlequin was the chap always doing something. If a maimed

man came across the stage the harlequin gave him a tap with the wand, and the fellow would be up again and walking about. He would create and do all manner of things, and, what is more, at the finish of the performance, the harlequin got the better deal, because he went off to the altar with the columbine. We have not a columbine here yet, but they have one in another place. We may have one here before long, when the harlequin, to carry out the suggestion of the hon. member, may have the luck to go off with her. Then, when we come to the clown, he is always doing something wrong. He is taking somebody else's ideas, filching them, stealing other people's sausages, picking up red hot poker and burning his own fingers with them. And the end with the clown is not as glorious as the end of the harlequin who goes off with the columbine. The clown goes off with the policeman—goes to oblivion. I can assure the hon. Dr. Saw that if he plays his part and does get hauled off in the way the clown is hauled off, I will do the best I can to secure his release.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Thank heavens I will not appear before the Children's Court.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That would be a very good court for the hon. member to go to, because it has power to release on probation. I have nothing more to say about the Bill. I thank hon. members for the way they have received it. I am convinced it is the better way of dealing with the scaffolding question.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

## BILL—NATIVE MISSION STATIONS.

*Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.14] in moving the second reading said: The Bill provides for the making of fee simple grants of 1,000 acres each to the Perth Diocesan Trustees, Forrest River, and to the Benedictine community, Drysdale River, such grants to include main buildings and improvements. The grants of course will reduce the area of the holdings by 1,000 acres. It is not possible at present to give the clear lines of demarcation, as the lines have not yet been surveyed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is this all the missions have asked for?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot say, but it is all the Government are giving them. I think they are well satisfied to get 1,000 acres, including all their improvements and buildings. The Forrest River Mission is a Class A reserve of 100,000 acres, leased to the diocesan trustees as an aboriginal mission station for 21 years at a peppercorn rental. The mission has been

doing very good work, and it is gratifying to know that the Government and the people are prepared to give them something by way of fee simple for the work they have done. The passing of this Bill will excise 1,000 acres from the reserve of 100,000 acres I have described as being Class A reserve. The Forrest River Mission depends mainly upon voluntary contributions and subscriptions, which average from £1,900 to £2,000 a year. This is very satisfactory, and helps to keep the mission going. The expenditure consists principally of travelling expenses, outfits, freights, salaries and supplies. There are 136 natives on the roll, and a staff of five to look after them. The mission runs 389 cows, and 410 goats, the latter being most prolific, and no doubt very useful to the people at the mission. There are 16 buildings. The mission has done a considerable amount of cultivation in the way of growing such produce as cabbages, turnips, beans, beetroot, tomatoes, potatoes, melons, etc. This bears out the contention of Mr. Miles and other members representing the north that a good deal can be done there in the way of this kind of development. The mission has opened up in a small way in this matter, but its work proves that certain things can be grown there and is beneficial to the State.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They grow cotton there.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. I understand that some of the cotton from the mission is at present on its way to England.

Hon. H. Stewart: Have they started making cheese from goat's milk yet.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have not heard of it. No doubt when the mission gets the fee simple of the land it will be able to do better work than it has done in the past. The Drysdale River Mission has a special lease of 50,000 acres. It has expended £1,750 on buildings and £430 on agricultural development. This money has been spent in the right direction. The mission grows tropical products such as coconuts, rubber, sugar cane, rice and pineapples. Their work appeals to me very much. The mission authorities seem to be doing something that is not done at the other mission. None of these five items is mentioned in connection with the Forrest River Mission. The plan shows that the Drysdale Mission is situated on the Bluff, in Napier Broome Bay. I suppose the latitude is different from that of the Forrest River Mission, which accounts for their being able to produce tropical fruit of this kind. The work shows what can be done in that part of the State, and that there is quite a large amount of agricultural and tropical development going on in the north. This may be classed as experimental work. Both missions are doing well for the aborigines and are very kind to them. The annual expenditure on the Drysdale Mission is £500; 30 natives are housed there and rations are issued to 1,800. The missions are humanising and civilising the blacks. There are four priests looking after the mission, and I be-

lieve everything is conducted in an orderly and proper manner. The work carried out by these two missions is a credit to them. I hope the House will be satisfied that it is the right thing to give them the encouragement they deserve, as embodied in this Bill. I wish to express my satisfaction, as Minister for the North-West, that I am able to bring this Bill before members, in the hope that what is being done by these missions will be taken up by other missions. The Government will always be pleased to recognise their good work in the way that it is proposed to do for the two missions mentioned in this Bill. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [8.20]: I thought we should have heard more details upon this subject from members representing the north. I support the Bill. I am interested to hear the work of the Drysdale Mission in connection with the growing of tropical products. This is an instance of what good pioneering work is being done there.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [8.21]: I support the Bill. Both missions are doing useful work, and demonstrating what can be done in the north along these lines. In addition to the items mentioned by the Minister, the Forrest River Mission grew at least one ton of cotton last year, and have shown what can be done in this direction around Wyndham. They are also raising pigs. This will be one of the most profitable industries in the north. I regret the missions have not a longer security of tenure of their leases. I hope they will be given the right to renew them. Some steps should be taken to give them a greater security of tenure, such as would be afforded by a 99-year lease. I understand that was what they were aiming at when they asked the Government to bring down this Bill. I hope the Government will see fit later on to accede to the request. The missions are showing what can be done in the growing of tropical products.

Hon. H. Stewart: Can you tell us anything about their rubber growing.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not know anything personally about the Drysdale Mission. Rubber is not being grown at the Forrest River Mission. There is a native rubber which grows in the Kimberleys along the river banks, but the Drysdale Mission is evidently experimenting in the growing of Malayan rubber.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.24]: I support the Bill. I am not doing so for what the missions are doing in the way of Christianising the heathens, but for the work they are doing in tropical agriculture.

The Minister for Education: Do you not think they are doing good work with the natives?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It would take more than the eloquence of the Minister to convince me that any mission can do good amongst

the natives in the north. One of the moral or legal customs of the natives there is that when one member of a tribe dies they kill the member of another tribe in order to keep the balance of members even between them. What did we do during the war? We started out to kill, murder, plunder and destroy in all directions. I am surprised that these missions have not been able to get the freehold of the land they occupy. Whilst they are doing good they can always appeal to me for an extension of their leases.

Hon. H. Stewart: The power behind the throne.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister has not said what the missions have done towards Christianising the heathens. Presumably he agrees that nothing has been done, or can possibly be done to improve their method of administering their own affairs..

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

## BILL—GNOWANGERUP RESERVES.

### *Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.28] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to grant to the Gnowangerup Road Board Lots 5 and 53 in fee simple with power to sell; the proceeds of sale to be devoted to improving Gnowangerup block 22, which has been reserved for a soldiers' memorial hall. Lot 5, on which the road board office is erected, is now vested in the Minister for Works, who is satisfied with this arrangement. Lot 53, on which the agricultural hall stands, is also vested in that Minister. The unimproved value of lots 5 and 53 is £110. It is considered that the buildings on lots 5 and 53 are unsuitable for the purposes for which they are now being used. The Minister for Works has no objection to the removal or sale of these buildings. The approval of the Executive Council was obtained some time ago for a 999-year lease of lot 22 to the road board as a site for a soldiers' memorial hall. The proposal of the road board is to build a memorial hall on lot 22.

Hon. H. Stewart: It has been built.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hall will be used as an agricultural hall and road board offices. The Returned Soldiers' League are prepared to transfer to the road board all rights they may possess. All the difficulties that may have existed have been overcome and the road board authorities are willing to take over the land, the sale of which has to be carried out to the satisfac-



tion of the Minister for Works. The cost of the memorial hall is to be £3,000.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the date of your information, because I think the hall was opened in September last. I was present.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: My information is quite clear. Tenders have been called in anticipation of the Bill being passed. It is necessary for the Bill to be passed in order to legalise what has so far been done. The Gnowangerup people have taken for granted that Parliament will give them what they desire, namely the right to sell the land and invest the whole of the money in the memorial hall which will be under the jurisdiction of the road board. It is a good thing to know that those people have so much confidence in the Government. The least we can do now is to grant the power that is sought. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [8.35]: I support most of what the Leader of the House has said. The Bill is somewhat similar in its purpose to the measure that was before the House last night to permit a readjustment of property granted to a public body at Kojonup. In the present instance it is proposed to dispose of certain land so that the proceeds may be utilised for the payment of a building which has already been erected. I think I am right in saying that the information given to the House by the Minister was supplied on the understanding that the Bill we are now considering would be put through by the Government. The people at Gnowangerup had that much confidence in the Government that they went on with the work of erecting the building in anticipation of the legislation being put through. The structure is roomy and of Doric design. It is a credit to the co-operation of the people of the district, and to the voluntary subscribers. The hall was opened late in August or early in September by the Governor at the request of the sub-branch of the Returned Soldiers' League. It is a fine tribute on the part of the people of the district to the services that were rendered to the Empire by the men who enlisted from that part of the State. I am sorry there is not one member in the Chamber representing a metropolitan or metropolitan-suburban province, because I wish to state that if the people of the capital had constructed a memorial in any way comparable to that erected at Gnowangerup, a town some 250 miles from the metropolis, they would have had something to be proud of, and it too would have been a fine tribute to the services rendered to the Empire by those men who enlisted in the metropolitan area. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

## BILL—INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.42] in moving the second reading said: The Insurance Companies Act 1918 requires insurance companies except life insurance companies that may be doing business in this State, to deposit as security a sum of £5,000 with the Treasury. Life insurance companies are dealt with under another Statute. The companies on starting business in the State, deposit with the Treasury £5,000 and in exchange for that bonds are issued carrying interest at the rate of 4½ per cent. The object of the Bill is to bring all companies into line. The position has become somewhat difficult because it has been learned that there are canvassers in the State representing companies that are not registered here, and they are carrying on operations without having lodged anything in the shape of security. Those companies are competing, in the opinion of the Government unfairly, with the companies that are registered in the State who have deposited the security required by the Act of 1918. In other words there are agencies carrying on business in the State for companies outside the State. The Bill will require those agencies to fall into line with the other companies and pay to the Treasury the sum of £5,000.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I thought they all paid that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No; these companies to which I refer can carry on agencies here and have their offices in Sydney or Melbourne. I understand that there are 10 different companies so operating in the State and all will be obliged under the measure to fall into line with the other companies. The Bill will simply deal in equity and fairness with members of the community and see that those who are agents or canvassers here for firms in the Eastern States are not placed in an advantageous position compared with others who have their offices here and employ staffs. The Bill must appeal to hon. members as fair and just. Naturally, it will assist the Treasurer somewhat, because we need as much money as we can get. If there are 10 of these companies who will be required to put up £5,000 each, that will mean £50,000 for the Treasury.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What will you do with that money. Will it be placed in a trust fund?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Treasury bills will be issued carrying 4½

per cent. interest. The firms who deposit £5,000 receive  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. interest on the money, which remains with the Government until such time as the company concerned goes out of business.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Government, in effect, borrow the money.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: And the firms depositing receive  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. interest, which is reasonable. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.47]: I support the second reading of the Bill. I am a director of a life assurance company and also of a fire insurance company. It is news to me that there are people here from other States as agents who are transacting business on behalf of head offices located in the Eastern States.

The Minister for Education: They are here now.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If that be so, it is no fair to the people here who have to pay a deposit to the Government. It may be that the Bill does not go far enough. For that reason, I support the second reading, but ask the Minister to defer the Committee stage to the next sitting of the House.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West—in reply) [8.48]: I agree to Mr. Holmes's request with the greatest pleasure. I hope in the meantime he will make inquiries to find out for himself that the statements I have made are correct.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I do not doubt them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am glad the Government have done something that meets with his approval.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

## BILL—MERREDIN RACECOURSE.

### *Second Reading.*

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.50] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is a small one containing two clauses. I have a plan showing the different reserves affected by the Bill which hon. members can inspect. Merredin reserve No. 14223 is vested in the Merredin Road Board. The reserve is to be extended by taking in adjacent blocks, which will make a total area of 112 acres. The enlarged reserve will then be suitable for the combined purposes of a racecourse, show ground, and recreation reserve. People in the country districts are now concentrating

upon improvements to one area rather than dealing with three or four different blocks. The road board intend to devote their energies to the improvement of the combined area for the purposes I have indicated. Reserve No. 13563 is the present racecourse reserve and under the proposal of the local people will no longer be required. The board desire power to sell the racecourse reserve free of all trusts affecting it. At the present time there is an overdraft at the bank in connection with the racecourse, and it has been guaranteed by several individuals jointly and severally. It is desired to apply the proceeds from the sale of the racecourse block, first, to clearing off the overdraft and, secondly, to devote the balance to the improvement of the new and enlarged reserve. This scheme will benefit the people of the Merredin district. The new block will be under the control of the road board. It is the intention of the Government to make a responsible body in each district assume power regarding the control of reserves of this description. The Bill will mean that a lot of unnecessary expense and supervision will be avoided by concentrating the work on the one ground. I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

Hon. W. CARROLL (East) [8.55]: I have pleasure in supporting the Minister's remarks. He has explained the position fully. This is one of several similar Bills we have already dealt with. I hope the House will agree to the second reading and if members do so, I am certain the people of the Merredin district will be pleased at the action this Chamber has taken.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [8.53]: I support the second reading. The principle involved is essentially one of co-operation. Mistakes were made in many of the older districts in days gone by, when they saw fit to have different areas with their respective sets of buildings for racecourse, sports, show ground, and other purposes. People nowadays are adopting a different attitude and, by steps such as those taken at Merredin and other centres, co-operation has been resorted to and one set of buildings will be made to serve the purposes of the interests concerned. This is all to the advantage of the residents of the localities affected, and I am glad the Government have brought forward Bills to overcome the difficulties that were experienced in former times.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time

### *In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and passed.

# BILL—BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER RAILWAY DEVIATION (No. 2).

## Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [9.0] in moving the second reading said: The state of the Notice Paper now, thanks to the assistance of hon. members, fully justifies the motion they were good enough to endorse this afternoon. We have cleared a good part of the Notice Paper and now have an opportunity to go ahead with the more important business. Last session authority was given for a deviation of the Busselton-Margaret River railway, which is called deviation No. 1. It has been found that the limits of that deviation fall a few chains short of embracing what is thought desirable for the construction of the line. Hence the necessity for this Bill. The proposed deviation is warranted in order to provide a good junction with the Flinders Bay-Margaret River railway, which was purchased many years ago from Millars'. The second deviation will avoid the steep grades and unnecessarily sharp curves at the extreme north end of the Flinders Bay line. I have the plans here and shall table them so that members may investigate the matter for themselves.

Hon. T. Moore: Are the people of the district satisfied with the deviation?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think so, because it certainly improves the grades and shortens the distance. The Bill of last session was not quite sufficient by a few chains to cover the deviation required. The length of the deviation is  $2\frac{1}{4}$  miles, the ruling grade 1 in 60 and the sharpest curve 10 chains. That is a pretty sharp curve. I should like to have curves of 20 chains radius.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Cannot you get better grades than 1 in 60?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is a reasonable grade.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is costly to work.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. This deviation will improve the line and the cost will be £7,000.

Hon. A. Burvill: What is the existing grade?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think 1 in 50. I take it this is the best that can be done to improve the line.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the resumptions of land?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They are the ordinary powers embodied in every Railway Bill.

Hon. H. Stewart: They are not the ordinary powers.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

*That the Bill be now read a second time.*

## Point of Order.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: On a point of order, is not this Bill foreign to the title? The title is "An Act to authorise a deviation of the Busselton-Margaret River Railway," but the

Bill contains clauses for the compulsory purchase of land.

The Minister for Education: It is possible to alter the title. I think there is something in the hon. member's contention.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Can you deviate without resuming the land?

The Minister for Education: If the hon. member will move the adjournment of the debate, I shall make inquiries and ascertain whether there is anything in his contention.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I did not ask the Minister to make inquiries. I asked for your ruling, Mr. Deputy President, as to whether the Bill is in order.

The Deputy President: Unless the hon. member wishes to proceed with his point of order, I would like him to accept the suggestion of the Minister and move the adjournment of the debate. To-morrow the President will be here and the hon. member can obtain a definite ruling from him. I have not yet had time to read the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Certainly.

## As to papers.

Hon. H. Stewart: Will the Minister obtain any reports on the deviation and any information regarding the resumption?

The Minister for Education: Yes, and if I cannot get the papers by to-morrow I shall agree to a postponement until they are available.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 28th November, 1923.*

	PAGE.
Questions: Piece Workers	1696
Prorogation of Parliament	1696
Leave of Absence	1696
Bills: Brookton-Dale River Railway, 1B.	1696
Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway, 1B.	1696
Appropriation, Standing Orders Suspension	1696
Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment, 3A.	1696
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com.	1696
Permanent Reserves, 2B.	1699
Yarramony-Newcarrie Railway, 2A.	1700
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, returned	1706
Lunacy Act Amendment, returned	1706
Kojonup Racecourse, returned	1706
Appropriation, all stages	1706
Land Act Amendment, Com.	1706
Native Mission Stations, returned	1712
Gnowangerup Reserves, returned	1712
Opticians, 2B.	1712
W.A. Trustee, Executor & Agency Co., Ltd., Act Amendment (Private), 2B.	1713

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