

appreciate that such magazines as a rule are consulted only by the medical profession, and are not as widely read by the public as are newspapers. A section from the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act is also included in the Bill. This provides for the confiscation of any material on conviction. Under the Illicit Sale of Liquor Act, in the event of a conviction liquor may be confiscated, but if the case is dismissed, the liquor is returned to the owner. The same will apply in this instance. If a person is found hawking contraceptives and, after trial, is convicted of the offence, the material will become the property of the court and destroyed, or otherwise dealt with as the court decides. In the event of a dismissal of the case, it will be returned.

The Bill provides that prosecutions for offences against the Act may be commenced upon a complaint made by any person, and may be conducted in court by a police officer or constable, on behalf of the complainant. We believe this provision is necessary and desirable. Ordinarily, in the case of a prosecution for an offence under most Acts of Parliament, the police either cannot or are very reluctant to conduct a prosecution on the complaint of some other person. In this instance a person making a complaint may be either not financial enough to prosecute, or may not have sufficient experience to enable him to do so; consequently we have provided that upon a complaint being made, the police will be empowered to prosecute. In that way the Act will be more satisfactorily policed. The Bill is a short and simple one, and I think it will appeal to members generally. They might not have had the same experience of this business as I have had.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We have all had some experience.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The Bill is intended to prevent hawking or exhibition of contraceptives, and it will be agreed that the advertising of such articles should not be permitted to continue. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.

House adjourned 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 5th September, 1939.

	PAGE
Electoral: Swearing-in of members	488
Question: War-time legislation, commodity prices ..	488
Ministerial Statements: Relief workers	488
War between Britain and Germany	489
Bills: Geraldton Harbour Works Railway Extension, 3R.	491
Railway Level Crossings, 2R.	491
Swan River Improvement Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	493
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 2R.	504
Rights in Water and Irrigation, 2R.	510
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 2R.	514
Contraceptives, 2R.	514

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

ELECTORAL—SWEARING-IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to swear in the members for Guildford-Midland and Sussex.

Hon. W. D. Johnson (Guildford-Midland) and Mr. Willmott (Sussex) took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

QUESTION—WAR TIME LEGISLATION.

Commodity Prices.

Mr. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that there has been in Perth during the past few days an unwarranted steep rise in the wholesale prices of certain commodities? 2, Will he give consideration to the advisability of immediately introducing a measure for the purpose of controlling prices, both wholesale and retail?

The PREMIER replied: I intend to deal with that aspect in a statement I shall make to the House shortly.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Relief Workers.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: On Thursday last the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) asked a question on notice regarding the conditions of single men in camps and the reply was that the points

raised required consideration by the Minister for Employment. The Honorary Minister has now supplied the following reply:—

The suggestion that the rotation of work in the single men's camps be lengthened has been tried and proved a failure. Any young man of suitable age working in the camps who desires to improve his position either by seeking other employment or acquiring special training may, on application to the Minister, receive an increased rotation of work based on the present standard of two days per week. Each application will be considered on its individual merits and sympathetically dealt with. It is not considered advisable, even if it were legally possible, to withhold any portion of the men's wages, as any young man who could not save his own money would have very little qualification for special consideration. Every endeavour is being made to find suitable employment for young men and get them away from the camps.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—WAR BETWEEN BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.36]: I propose to make a statement to the House about the national emergency that has arisen. All members are aware that a state of war exists between Great Britain and Germany. While we all hoped, with what proved to be unwarranted optimism, that this dreadful catastrophe would in some way have been averted, we have to face the actual reality that it has now overtaken us and must be prepared to do our part with the utmost resolution and fortitude.

The State Government has, of course, received official information that Australia is at war with Germany. During the past couple of days I have consulted with His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, the Leader of the Opposition and other members of parties in the House, and also with the Lord Mayor of Perth to the end that we might be able to act unitedly and endeavour to take whatever steps are necessary to conserve the interests of Western Australia as an integral part of the Empire.

The time for talking has gone, and it is the responsibility of the Government and Parliament to set an example to the community by refraining from any form of undue or unnecessary panic or excitement in the conduct of the affairs of the State. We may have some differences; I hope and

am confident that they will not be of any great dimensions, and I feel sure that I am expressing the feelings of all members when I say that the Parliament of this State is united and inflexible in the determination to do everything in its power to assist the cause of the Empire in the dangerous days ahead of us.

Members: Hear, hear!

THE PREMIER: In every possible way we will endeavour to the utmost to prosecute the war successfully so that the cherished ideals of democracy may be preserved and may triumph over the curse of despotism. I feel that there is no occasion for this House to pass a motion affirming loyalty to the cause of the Empire. The spontaneous manner in which all sections of the community throughout the State have shown their willingness to do whatever lies in their power to maintain the cause of Empire has made patent to everybody that this community stands behind the Empire in whatever is necessary to carry the war to a successful conclusion.

In the session ahead of us the Government desires as far as possible to do its utmost to conduct the business of the House in such a way as to avoid controversial legislation or motions being brought down that would be likely to cause serious disagreement either amongst members or amongst parties in the House. The Leader of the Opposition got into touch with me early yesterday, as did the Leader of the National Party. I welcome their assurance that they are prepared in every way possible to assist in carrying on the government of the country, and to make everything else subordinate to the efforts of all of us in facing the days that lie ahead. It may be necessary for us to act quickly without giving an opportunity for the House to debate our action or give as much consideration as it would like to such action. I feel that the House will give us this credit, that anything we may have to do hurriedly will be done only because we are actuated by what we feel is in the best interests of the community as a whole.

As intimated in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, the State Government is not only willing but anxious in every way to co-operate with the Federal Government in the defence of Australia, and in any steps that may be necessary to carry out that defence to a successful issue. Consequently, when late

yesterday afternoon I received an invitation from the Prime Minister to attend a Premiers' conference at Canberra on Saturday next, I replied unhesitatingly that I would willingly proceed to Canberra so that we might all confer together as soon as possible. I shall leave by train almost immediately. I am sure that if any inconvenience is caused to members as a result of my hurried departure, they will readily assent to it in view of all the circumstances. Many matters must arise that it would be better for all the States to deal with in a uniform way. I expect it will be necessary almost immediately to take legislative action on questions of importance dealing with defence, perhaps a moratorium, and essential commodities such as foodstuffs. No doubt prices will have to be regulated and controlled, and power may have to be taken to eliminate hoarding by some individuals when such a practice may be detrimental to the rest of the community. These and other subjects will no doubt be discussed at Canberra, and uniform action concerning them suggested by all the Governments represented.

I desire to say nothing more at this stage, except to pay a tribute to the calmness and commonsense exhibited by the people of this State since this time of emergency arose. From the many assurances and offers of assistance I have received from all sections of the community, it is apparent to me that we are a united and determined people in this time of stress and emergency. Whatever happens, the normal production and industrial life of the State must be proceeded with. At this juncture our best contribution to the success of our cause is to maintain our production and keep our people in employment, so that we may meet any adversity that may come to us with quiet strength and fortitude. I will conclude by associating myself fully, as I am sure every member of the House will do, with the Prime Minister of Australia when he epitomised our position by stating, "We stand by the Empire."

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.45]: In common with the Premier, I desire to express the deep regret of the members on this side of the House that the British Empire has found itself engaged in what may be a very bitter and prolonged struggle. This is the more regrettable because the wounds of the last war are hardly healed and we find the nation again plunged into

conflict. We are all proud of the unity that exists within the Empire, a factor that is vitally necessary before any nation can embark upon a cause of this kind. Just as that unity exists between parts of the Empire so must it exist amongst the peoples of the Empire. I am, therefore, pleased to have the assurance of the Premier that in this House we shall be setting an example that might well be followed by the citizens of the State, namely that we will let party differences sink into oblivion, and turn our attention unitedly to giving to the Empire the best that we can as the need arises.

Two things are essential in the successful attainment of this objective. One is that our man power shall be so fitted as to be able to protect this country if necessary, and, secondly, that we shall carry on our industries so that our man power may be supplied with all necessary commodities. The Premier is about to leave for Canberra. I agree with him that whatever is done should be done on an Australian basis. That is most necessary. There are two matters in which the Australian and State Governments may encounter difficulty, one being that of getting sufficient money to see them through, and the other being the maintenance of supplies so necessary for our people. Both factors are vitally important. I hope the Premier will point out to the Federal Government the difficulty that will be experienced in this State of keeping our agriculturists in production—unless something is done to increase the price of the commodities that are being produced—should there be a call to arms. I believe all of us will be affected.

So many people will abandon their properties that we shall have great difficulty in maintaining a supply of those commodities that are so essential to the successful issue of a war. To-day there seems to be a surplus of wheat, but in 12 months' time we may find difficulty in obtaining sufficient supplies. I assure the Premier that anything we on this side of the House can do to assist either the Federal or the State Governments will very readily be done. In Australia we have the responsibility of maintaining the democracy and the Constitution under which we work, so that our people may remain a free people. We cannot say that of the nation with which we are in conflict. The responsibility is a grave one. Petty differences in politics are as nothing compared

with the unity that all parts of the British Empire are displaying in the maintenance of the freedom we have so long enjoyed. It does not matter how big or small the task may be, we stand completely behind the Premier in our desire to give effect to the wishes of the Australian and Imperial Governments.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [4.49]: On behalf of members of the National Party I endorse to the utmost the words of the Premier, particularly his wish that in this State we should make common cause with Great Britain and the rest of the British Commonwealth of Nations in meeting the conflict that has been forced upon us. We have one transcendent object, and that is to emerge victoriously from this conflict. Subject to this outstanding purpose, it is clear that our aim must be to maintain the industry and business of our country, so as to involve the minimum of unemployment and loss and dislocation. The Leader of the Opposition has said that the time is one pre-eminently for national unity, not only in this Parliament but in all concerns of the people. My party will lend the Imperial Government, the Federal Government, and the State Government every support in our power to enable the Empire to emerge victoriously from this struggle to preserve our national life and liberty.

Members: Hear, hear!

BILL—GERALDTON HARBOUR WORKS RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSINGS.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. E. Nulsen—Kanowna) [4.53] in moving the second reading said: I have here a small Bill.

Mr. Doney: Small, but dangerous.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not think so. It is a small measure, but if it is not passed the position will remain highly dangerous. We have too many level crossings, and desire some means of reducing their number. Many of the crossings are dangerous, and the Government has been

unsuccessful in securing the formation of a committee with the object of counteracting the danger. In numerous instances these dangerous crossings were created years ago, when horses were the means of transport. Now that we have modern rapid means of transport, no necessity exists for all of the extremely numerous crossings that have been constructed. No doubt bridges and subways could be substituted for such crossings, but in the present state of the finances the cost could not be met.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But people do not walk any faster now than they did before the introduction of motor vehicles.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No, but means of transport are far more rapid. In fact, many people do not walk at all. Unquestionably there are too many crossings, and the cost of putting in subways and overhead bridges will be beyond the financial capacity of this State for many years to come.

Mr. Sampson: The board should be fairly constituted.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It will be found that the board proposed by this Bill will be fairly constituted. Otherwise the measure would not be brought down, having regard to the rejection of last session's Bill.

Mr. Sampson: Last year's measure was a very bad Bill.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is perfectly obvious that we have a superfluity of level crossings. No member, I think, will deny that. Nor do I think any member will deny that many of these crossings represent a menace to the general public. It matters little what provision is made, apart from subways or approaches: accidents will still occur. Some people will say that the matter is a responsibility of the local governing bodies. If it is, the Government has not succeeded in inducing those bodies to agree to bear the responsibility of closing unneeded and dangerous crossings. The passing of the measure will remove the responsibility from the local governing bodies and place it upon a representative body, which will have power both to close crossings and to have closed crossings re-opened. Local governing bodies have to put up with selfish people who look at level crossings solely from a business point of view. If, as the result of closing a cross-

ing there may be some loss of business to such persons, they will offer strong opposition to its being closed.

Mr. Sampson: They might be justified in doing so.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I have read all the speeches delivered on last year's Bill, and the only contentious point seems to have been the constitution of the board. No member really objected to the closing of unnecessary crossings.

Mr. Doney: But what about the inconvenience to foot traffic?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Probably provision could be made for foot traffic; but even so, people will still be liable to be hit by trains unless there is a bridge or subway provided. They do not appear to take sufficient heed. When all is said and done, the responsibility is rightly that of the person using the crossing, and not that of the oncoming train. Last year's Bill provided that the board was to be constituted of the Commissioner of Railways, the Chairman of the Transport Board, the Town Planning Commissioner, and the Chairman of the Main Roads Board—the last-named to be the board's chairman—and the mayor of the municipality or chairman of the road board was to be the other member of the committee for the purpose of closures. Under the Bill the constitution of the board will be—a representative of the local authority in whose district the crossing is located, a representative of the Commissioner of Railways, and an independent chairman agreed upon by the Local Government Association and the Commissioner of Railways. I do not think a fairer constitution could be proposed. It seems quite equitable, and calculated to serve the desires of all parties interested.

Mr. Sampson: The Road Boards Association has been overlooked. At all events, it is not included.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Road Boards Association is practically represented by the local governing body located in the district where it is proposed to close the level crossing.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes. The interpretation clause provides for that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Bill provides for the formation of an independent, competent board whose duty it shall be to consider applications by the Commissioner of Railways or other persons for the closing of level crossings, to give

decisions after inquiries and thorough investigation, and to consider applications for rescission of orders for closure of crossings. If a crossing has been closed and the opinion is held that it should be open, any one interested can make application for its re-opening.

Mr. Doney: The applicant would not have much hope, though.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The order for re-opening can be granted. The Bill introduced last session for the amendment of the Public Works Act provided for a board with a preponderance of Government officials, and was rejected mainly on that account. The constitution of the board now proposed has been agreed to, in principle, by the local government association, and should overcome the objection raised last year. The association has agreed to this board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What is the local government association? I do not know of any such body.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The member for Swan knows all about the organisation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, he does not. No such body exists.

Mr. Sampson: The Minister means the Metropolitan Road Boards Association, not the country association.

Mr. Doney: There is no local government association.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is the Road Boards Association, and—

Hon. C. G. Latham: There are the Metropolitan Road Boards Association, the Country Road Boards Association, and the association of municipal councils.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I always considered those bodies as amalgamated. Meetings are held conjointly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is not so.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In any event, members will hardly argue that the representation proposed for the board is not fair to the interests concerned. A representative of the local governing authority in the district where a level crossing is under consideration will be a member of the board. Then there will be a representative of the Commissioner of Railways, and those two representatives will choose an independent chairman. Surely that will be regarded as equitable. I do

not think a board could be constituted more fairly. All costs and expenses incurred by the board, or in the carrying out of its decisions, will be borne by the Commissioner of Railways. The Bill will empower the closure of unnecessary and, particularly, of dangerous crossings. Repeated endeavours have been made by the Commissioner of Railways to obtain the concurrence of metropolitan local authorities for the closure of certain level crossings. In some instances the concurrence has not been forthcoming, and that constitutes one reason for this legislation. With a board on which the representation will be on such a fair basis, greater success may be achieved in that direction.

Mr. Cross: Provided the local governing bodies do not give away the rights of the people.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Of course that will not be done. Such a responsibility would be altogether too great. The board will have power to inspect crossings that are regarded as redundant, and recommend their closure. When, in the past, repeated endeavours were made by the Commissioner of Railways to obtain the consent of local authorities in the metropolitan area for the closure of level crossings, a committee, including representatives of the local authorities, was formed to consider the question, and all the crossings considered superfluous were inspected and recommendations made for their closure. The local authorities, when approached individually regarding the matter, opposed all such suggestions. The Bill will enable that matter to be dealt with more effectively.

All crossings are more or less dangerous from the standpoint of present-day fast-moving traffic. Members will agree upon the importance of eliminating all unnecessary level crossings in order to reduce the number of road accidents, avoid risks to the public who travel by rail, and relieve the responsibility and strain imposed upon engaged drivers. There is a very real strain on engaged drivers when negotiating level crossings in the metropolitan suburban area. They have to be on the qui vive the whole time in an endeavour to avoid accidents. Naturally, local authorities are disinclined to approve of the closure of level crossings in their respective districts, and the Bill will relieve them

of that responsibility. I submit that the provisions of the measure are fair. Seeing that the only objection raised to the legislation introduced last session had relation to the constitution of the board—

Mr. Doney: That was not the only objection.

The MINISTER for RAILWAYS: It was the principal objection.

Mr. Doney: Perhaps so.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The provision in the Bill this time should do away with the opposition formerly raised in that respect.

Mr. Warner: I do not think you will get away with that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I anticipate that the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) will support the Bill on this occasion. I read his remarks on the Bill presented last year, and I noticed that his principal objection was to the constitution of the board. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Seward, debate adjourned.

BILL—SWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [5.5]: Having regard to the events of the last two or three days, I presume it is hardly to be expected that members will view the Bill with any great enthusiasm. For my own part, I do not think that even in normal times I would entertain much kindly feeling for the measure, which has as its sole objective the beautifying of the South Perth foreshore. As a Bill for an urgent public work, I would be inclined to place it last on the list for consideration. Presumably members representing metropolitan constituencies will hardly agree with my estimate of the importance of the Bill. From that standpoint, I hope that those who may participate in the debate will indicate just exactly wherein lies the public urgency or importance of the Bill, which concerns one of the works I would tackle only if there were nothing else to undertake and we were absolutely forced to do something. If Western Australia were in a forward state of

prosperity, with no necessary public works clamouring for attention, and the Treasury had money to spare for non-essential works, I would agree to potter around and clean up the public estate in the manner suggested in the measure. Contrary to what members generally may imagine, I have a very deep appreciation of the capital city of Western Australia, its unique setting and its natural beauties; my aesthetic senses are very easily stirred; the ideal behind "The City Beautiful" always attracts me, but nevertheless I do not allow those considerations to jostle me out of my sense of proportion.

Members will agree that all the electorates throughout Western Australia contribute to the State revenue. We who reside outside the metropolitan area, have precisely the same right as members holding city seats to table our demands regarding matters such as that under discussion; but we say "first things first," which is the same as saying that everything must be attended to in the order of its economic urgency. I cannot discern the tiniest trace of economic urgency in the work covered by the Bill. I do not mind admitting that the Government has one excuse in that the job has been started. We can concede that point. The Coode-street jetty section of the work is one of the last in a very long job. I presume the operations are already under way, and it may be claimed that the undertaking has been responsible for maintaining many relief workers in the metropolitan area. Even so, as far as I can see, not the remotest element of urgency can be claimed for the undertaking, no matter how we may stretch our imagination.

Unfortunately, this measure comes before us at a time of what may be described as public penury, of acute public anxiety. I know the Government is not responsible for all that, because the Bill was drafted before the world situation became so fraught with anxiety as it is at the moment. Nevertheless, the legislation has been presented to members when, according to the Premier, the Government has not an extra penny to spare for the assistance of the wheat industry, and when defence works must supersede all other undertakings. Having regard to the situation that confronts us, I cannot understand why the Bill is not one to be set aside for the moment. I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill is out of joint with the times. Work, such as that covered

by the Bill, for the purpose of beautifying the homes and surroundings of the people of the metropolitan area should be postponed until the State is far more peaceful and prosperous than it is to-day. I have no doubt that the Government will say that the project entails relatively small cost to the Treasury, and that the major amount of the cost and the responsibility will fall upon the South Perth Road Board. That prompts this question: What have we heard about the cost of the work? I cannot recall the Minister's making any reference to the highly important question of cost. I ask him now, what will the construction of this section cost the ratepayers of the State, and, for that matter, exactly what it will cost the South Perth Road Board; also, how many extra relief workers will be at work and for how long? The Minister might at the same time give some information as to the extent, if any, that public health will be likely to benefit; or say whether the only result will be the beautification of the foreshore. I am not insisting that that would be the only result; but it is, on the Minister's own admission, one of the results; and since it was the only one he mentioned, I take it to be—in the mind of the Government—the principal result. I believe the work up to Manning Point has been done by the Government, with considerable assistance, as the Minister said, from the local governing bodies, namely, the Perth City Council and the South Perth Road Board. I have heard the particular ratio of expenditure variously expressed in this House. I have been rather keen to know what it is, so if the Minister will take an opportunity later to enlighten the House as to the actual proportions of the total expenditure, I shall be obliged. I should like the Minister to give an undertaking, if he can, that the Government will be called upon for expenditure dealing only with the reclamation work, plus the construction of the retaining wall. The Minister claimed, if I remember rightly, that this work, when completed, will be a wonderful asset. The nature of the asset the Minister did not make plain. I do not know whether he was speaking of an asset in the commercial sense; but, if so, I would like an explanation as to the source from which additional income may be expected. Twenty members of the House out of 50 represent either metropolitan electorates or electorates

bordering on the metropolitan area. As I said at the outset, if any of those members have information to give demonstrating that in the public interest, this work is really of great urgency and importance, I shall not mind supporting the Bill. The measure gives no room for debating the merits of the Act itself. The question, I take it, is only whether the Act is capable of beneficial extension to the South Perth section of the reclamation problem. I do not mind admitting that the answer is probably yes. My objection to the Bill is not on that score; but because—as I have gone to some trouble to explain—I consider this time, of all times, to be about the worst that could have been chosen for continuing the work envisaged in the Bill.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [5.14]: I am somewhat astounded at the hypocritical utterances of the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Doney: On a point of order, since the remark made by the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) was not correct, I certainly object to the word "hypocritical," and I ask that he withdraw it.

Mr. CROSS: I withdraw, but would like to point out that during the recent election campaign stories were circulated in South Perth.

Mr. Sampson: My word, there were. They were all stories!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CROSS: The stories circulated were to the effect that if a National candidate were returned, the Country Party would support the continuation of this particular work.

Mr. Doney: I objected to the time chosen to proceed with the work.

Mr. CROSS: That promise was made by a National candidate. I said at the time that, if returned, I would do whatever I could to get the work completed. My opponents, in an attempt to defeat me—ably assisted by the Country Party—said they would support the continuation of this reclamation work.

Mr. Sampson: I thought you said you would drop party politics.

Several members interjected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CROSS: The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) said that the only, or principal, reason for the resumption of this

work was the beautification of the foreshore. Evidently, the hon. member does not know very much about what this reclamation work is intended to effect.

Mr. Doney: I should be glad to be enlightened.

Mr. CROSS: A few years ago, before the reclamation work was undertaken at all, the foreshore of the river from the Causeway extending down to Mends-street, was little better than a swamp or a cess pool. It was a breeding ground for mosquitoes.

Mr. Doney: It was a disgrace to allow it to remain in that condition for so long.

Mr. CROSS: Steps were taken to remedy the position, with a view to eradicating the mosquito pest.

Mr. Doney: A pity you were not eradicated!

Mr. CROSS: Much improvement has been effected so far as the mosquito pest is concerned. As a matter of fact, in Victoria Park and South Perth, it is now possible to spray the water to keep down the pest.

Mr. Raphael: We shall keep the mosquito as a pet now!

Mr. CROSS: The mosquitoes have now been nearly driven away. The algae nuisance is being rapidly overcome. It is imperative that this particular work should now be completed. In almost all countries the mosquito is rightly regarded as a carrier of disease. Members opposite know that before the great Panama Canal project could be commenced, it was first necessary to drain the swamps and so gain effective control of the mosquito pest. The member for Williams-Narrogin also mentioned the question of health. First things should come first. This matter is of paramount importance, because the work will result in the eradication not only of mosquitoes, but also of the algae nuisance. In overcoming those two troubles, the Government is looking after the health of the people. Is the hon. member contending that, because of the paltry few pounds the work will cost, the Government ought not to proceed with it? He would not be game to say that in South Perth or Victoria Park.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CROSS: One would think that the cost was being borne entirely by the Government. Instead, huge sums have been expended by the South Perth Road Board and the Perth City Council.

Mr. Sampson: Poor old ratepayer!

Mr. CROSS: We are determined to see the work brought to a conclusion. Road boards and other local governing bodies on both sides of the river are making attempts to get the Government dredge into their areas, so that reclamation work can be proceeded with there. Very recently, a deputation waited on the Minister for Works requesting him to give all the help possible to remove the algae nuisance and assist in the eradication of the mosquito pest. That was the reason given by a local governing body for a request that the dredge be moved to the Melville water. Members must have seen reports in the Press stating that the Mount Lawley, East Perth and Maylands districts are anxious to get the dredge on their side of the Causeway. The Bill merely aims to give permission for the completion of the work on a small area that was overlooked when the original measure was passed in 1925. I repeat that the South Perth Road Board has spent a large sum of money in this direction. At one stage it was spending far more than the Government, having actually paid for the pumping and the work on the dredge and, in fact, for the whole of the activities. Surely members cannot complain about that. Furthermore, the board paid interest and sinking fund on the dredge. What was the attitude of the Government represented by members opposite when it was in power? That Government discontinued the work of the dredge and put men out of employment. The men rendered workless in that manner were put on sustenance and the Government had to pay £5,000 or £6,000 interest on the dredge.

Hon. C. G. Latham: How many men are employed now?

Mr. CROSS: There are 40 men employed on the work altogether.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Every day?

Mr. CROSS: On some portions of the work—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Ah, that is different.

Mr. CROSS: There are not 40 men employed all the time.

Mr. Thorn: You ought to speak the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CROSS: When the work is in full operation, there are 40 men employed daily.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Six.

Mr. CROSS: No. There may be six on the dredge itself, but other work has to be

done besides that carried out on the dredge. If the Bill is defeated, and the work is discontinued, interest will still have to be paid. In addition to interest, there is a sum to be found for depreciation. The dredge is a machine that depreciates rapidly when it is standing idle. Even if the dredge is not kept at work, a sum of between £7,000 and £8,000 has to be found for interest and depreciation charges. By the passing of the measure and the expenditure of a small amount of money, work can be provided for a number of men, and it will be work the carrying out of which is desired by the people of the metropolitan area. There is no objection to it from any section in the greater metropolitan area. All agree that the improvement is desirable because it will result in the eradication of mosquitoes and algae. There is one matter to which I hope attention will be paid when the work is undertaken. When the engineers took steps to put in hand the work on the Melville Water foreshore, they erected a retaining wall. During the winter months the effect of the reclamation has been to prevent surface water on private property along the foreshore from draining effectively into the river, with the result that residents have been temporarily flooded out. I hope that when the work along the Perth Water foreshore is undertaken, there will not be a recurrence of these conditions. Something should certainly be done. A mistake has been made by somebody and it ought to be rectified.

Mr. Sampson: Does the Bill deal with that matter?

Mr. CROSS: The Bill provides for power to be given for reclamation work to be undertaken. When that work is begun, I do not want a recurrence of the mistake made on the Melville Water foreshore. I hope the House will not take much notice of the views of the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney), but will support the Bill in the interests of the people's health. The hon. member said that we must attend to first things first. This reclamation work is one of the "first things" that should be supported.

MR. RAPHAEL (Victoria Park) [5.24]: I wish to support the measure. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) has asked for the truth to be spoken. I do not want to refer to past history, or to deal with matters

touched upon by the member for Canning (Mr. Cross).

Mr. Doney: Particularly since they are not referred to in the Bill.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The work done by the dredge has been of considerable value and credit is due to the Government for having expended in this direction a certain amount of the money that is paid by way of taxation by the people of the metropolitan area. I cannot understand, my Lord Mayor—

Mr. Sampson: The unfortunate Lord Mayor!

Mr. RAPHAEL: It is not often I allow myself to be deluded into the belief that I am addressing the City Council. It was lucky for me that the Chairman of Committees was not in the Chair or I would have been given the cane. The work done in the reclamation of the mud bank along the river in the vicinity of South Perth and Victoria Park reflects the greatest credit on every Minister for Works who has held office during the Labour regime over the past nine years. We are aware that the objective of the Coalition Government always was that there must be no major work carried out in the metropolitan area. That was clearly indicated following the defeat of the Labour Government and the entry into office of the coalition Government. That Government was not in power many days before Mr. Lindsay, the then Minister for Works, tied up the dredge "Stirling," with the result that for the next three years there was no reclamation of the foreshore, despite the fact that the Perth City Council was prepared to pay a large subsidy towards the running of the dredge.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Have you any idea how much the council does pay?

Mr. RAPHAEL: At the present juncture the council does not pay anything.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But when the dredge is working in the council's area?

Mr. RAPHAEL: The agreement was for a period of three years.

Mr. Cross: It would depend on the arrangements.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I think the arrangement was for the payment by the council of £500 a year for a certain period and then £750. I am not quite sure of the agreement, but I think it was £500 for a certain time and then either £750 or £1,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is a small proportion.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Yes, it is a small proportion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You said the council spent a large sum.

Mr. RAPHAEL: The sum is a large one for the City Council to contribute when there is no necessity for it to do so. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the liability to the council only commences with the pumping of the shell or mud or silt, or whatever it is, because the council has the gigantic task of filling in the reclaimed area with sand and planting grass and the construction of playing areas, flower beds, etc. So the council's proportion of the cost is far greater than that of the Government.

Mr. Doney: We knew all that.

Mr. RAPHAEL: A good job has been done and credit is due to the council for the amount of money spent on the reclamation work. The South Perth Road Board will be entitled to equal commendation when the reclamation is completed in its area. That board has spent £30,000 in reclaiming the foreshore. Admittedly, as a result of this work, a good deal of money will be saved in the long run, because every year the Perth City Council has to incur considerable expense in destroying mosquito larvae. That expenditure will not be necessary when the reclamation work is completed. Men have to be employed all the year round when the flood waters are not in evidence in spraying kerosene over the low-lying areas. I support the Bill so that the reclamation work may be completed on one side of the Causeway. Fifteen or 18 months must elapse before the work can be completed in the South Perth area, even with the dredge working full-time. Then we expect that the Perth City Council will enter into an agreement with the Government to permit of the dredge being taken to the other side of the Causeway, with a view to work being commenced on the marshy land on the northern side of the bridge. The Perth City Council has already approached the Minister for Works and informed him that it was again prepared to recommend that a subsidy should be paid to the Government in connection with the continuation of the work of reclaiming the foreshore on the other side of the bridge. The Leader of the Opposition doubted the statement of the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) when he said that at times 40 men had been employed on the work. The truth is that there have been as many as 60 or 70

engaged on the work of reclamation. There might only be a few men on the dredge itself, but it is not the dredge alone that is engaged on the work. The object of the Bill is not solely to continue the good work that has already been done, but it will put a certain responsibility upon the road board or the municipality—whichever body happens to be concerned at the time—to provide employment for local residents. Therefore the House should not hesitate to support the measure. Any person who drives over the Causeway at the present time cannot fail to be impressed by the great improvement that has already been carried out by the removal of unsightly hoardings and the filling in of the anything but attractive areas. All must agree that a very good job has been done, but the work will not finish there because in a year or 18 months' time further improvements will be carried out, tennis courts will be laid down and the locality will be beautified beyond recognition. I hope the Bill will be agreed to, in which event those engaged on the undertaking of beautifying that part of the foreshore of the river will proceed to carry on the work to completion.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.33]: As I understand the position, the Bill proposes to amend the Act of 1925 to permit the South Perth Road Board to resume land on the foreshore to be reclaimed on certain terms. The Bill sets out a further area over which the land will be resumed by the road board on terms similar to those that have obtained in the past; in other words the road board will be able to apply uniform principles of resumption to the whole of the reclaimed land along the river foreshore. The House, in my opinion, will be justified in passing the Bill. The Minister has made out a case for the Bill and he has told us that the money is to be found not by the Government, but by the local authorities.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not for dredging.

Mr. McDONALD: This does not concern dredging; the object of the Bill is to make the whole position uniform and the Minister has made out a case for the passing of the Bill.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.34]: I do not agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. The Swan River Improvement Act passed in 1925 empowered the Minister to reclaim the land along the

shores of the Swan River in the vicinity of East Perth, Maylands, Burswood Island, Victoria Park, and South Perth. All that the Bill proposes is an extension of the area still further, an area that was not prescribed by the Act passed in 1925.

Mr. Cross: What is wrong with that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The proposal is to extend operations to a new area, but we limit the expenditure of money as is shown by the plan presented to us by the Minister the other evening. The cost of this additional work must therefore be taken into consideration and we are justified in asking the Government what the cost is likely to be. It will run into a considerable sum of money.

Mr. Cross: It will cost the road board much more.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: According to a report that appeared in the "West Australian" in which the Minister was said to have delivered a lecture to the deputation, he told those present that since 1925 the Government had spent on reclamation work no less a sum than £114,462 and that the council had spent only £2,500. The member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael) informs us that the City Council has spent a considerable sum of money. I would not call £2,500 a considerable sum of money.

Mr. Raphael: I did not quote £2,500 or any other figure.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am merely quoting the figures reported by the newspaper as having been mentioned by the Minister for Works on the occasion of the deputation that waited on him and which he lectured. I know that the member for Victoria Park cannot remember figures and that was why he said the City Council had been generous in its expenditure. As a matter of fact, the City Council contributed very little. I am prepared to accept the figures that were quoted by the Minister. Perhaps recently the City Council has contributed a little more.

Mr. Raphael: You do not know what the City Council has spent.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not intend to object to the second reading of the Bill, because most of the work is almost completed or is well under way. But even the optimism of the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) may be of little avail because I am sounding a note of warning that in all probability the Government will not have

the money with which to continue these operations. It may again find itself in the position that the Government was in between 1930 and 1933. It would be far better to tie up the dredge. The member for Canning told us that the dredge cost between £4,000 and £5,000 a year for interest and sinking fund. I doubt the accuracy of those figures.

Mr. Cross: I am right.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If my memory serves me aright the cost in that respect is about £1,200, and so the hon. member's figures are a great exaggeration. The Government may be compelled to tie up the dredge because of shortage of money. That was the reason why the Government in 1930 tied it up. Even then only six men were employed on it and the cost to run the dredge ran into £1,000 a month. I have frequently watched operations there and have never seen more than ten men employed on the dredge.

Mr. Cross: You are wrong; there are 40 men there.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think so. In any case, the Minister might have taken the House into his confidence and told us something about the estimated cost of the work. The original plan has not yet been given full effect and there still remains authority for its completion. There is the land around Burswood Island and the Causeway that has not been yet touched. The member for Canning told us that the main object for the passing of the Bill was the destruction of mosquitoes which cause so much disease. I have never heard such an extravagant statement made in this House before, but one would expect it from the hon. member from whom we are accustomed to hear such assertions. The work will neither employ the number of men that the hon. member stated nor will it eradicate the mosquitoes. I was unfortunate enough to have to stay at South Perth for a little while last year, and the mosquitoes were worse than I have known them to be since I have lived in the city.

Mr. Cross: They were trying to chase you out.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The hon. member stated that the National Party candidate in South Perth advocated further expenditure on this work and was taxed for his statement by the Country Party.

That being so, there is justification for voting against the Bill. If he advocated that course, the policy was not endorsed by the people of South Perth.

Mr. Cross: Yes, it was.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It was not, because they did not return the representative of the National Party. However, we are not going to be so small-minded as that. If this work is going to serve a useful purpose, we shall raise no objection to it, although I repeat my warning that there are many other calls on the Treasury of much greater importance. I know, and the hon. member must know, the conditions prevailing in our agricultural areas, which are sadly in need of the money that is being expended on this work. The hon. member must know that there is great necessity for expenditure in the country districts.

Mr. Lambert: I should like to see a lot more money spent on water supplies.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, on water supplies outside the city.

Mr. Raphael: This Bill deals with water, does it not?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We have a right to protest against expenditure on works that could wait. I like to see our city being beautified. It is, as the member for Williams-Narrogin said, a beautiful city, though we are making it more artificial by the works that are being carried out. I loved the irregular foreshore of the Swan River, but now it has been aligned so evenly that one can see the hand of man on it, and the work, instead of improving Nature, has disfigured Nature.

The Minister for Mines interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Formerly the foreshore was beautiful. The member for Canning evidently knows nothing about algae. Some of the best rivers in England are constantly being, not dredged, but improved by machines that cut the weeds so as to cure the algae problem. The idea there is to cut channels right through. At one time we were told that Burswood Island was the cause of the growth of algae in the river, and now we are told that the presence of algae is due to the irregular shape of the river. It is nothing of the sort: those are merely plausible arguments.

I intend to disappoint the hon. member by saying that we do not propose to vote

against the Bill. At the same time, we have the right to point out to the people that huge expenditure is entailed in the work being done. The Minister, when moving the second reading, might well have given us some figures. Perhaps he will take the opportunity, when replying to the debate, of telling us the monthly cost of carrying on this work; how many men are employed, and what the additional work will cost. Apparently the proposed work will be confined to a small strip shown on the plan, a strip of perhaps three-quarters of a mile, though I could not determine the scale of the plan. However, there is already authority for expenditure, and by the time the work authorised by the 1925 Act is completed, an amount considerably more than four or five times what has already been expended will be required. I have given the figures quoted by the Minister to the Perth City Council when he was approached by that body a little while ago.

I would not have spoken this afternoon except for the fact that the member for Canning desires us to contribute our quota to the debates. There is really no need for much talk on the Bill because all that is proposed is to extend the Act passed in 1925 to cover a small area shown on the plan that has been tabled. I hope the Minister, in his reply, will give us the information I have mentioned: otherwise we shall have to raise the question at a later stage. Seeing that the member for Canning has mentioned the point, the Minister might tell us the number of men employed during the last month the plant was operated, the number paid for by the Government, and the cost of constructing roads along the reclamation works.

Mr. Cross: None has been constructed in South Perth.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Oh yes; I know more about South Perth than does the hon. member. The Minister might also tell us the estimated cost of the additional work shown on the plan. If he does so, we shall know exactly how the money is to be spent and what might be expected. Still, I want the member for Canning to understand that this House will not feel in the least annoyed with the Government if, during the next 12 months, it has to order the tying-up of the dredge, as was done by the Government in 1930-33, and I am sure the people of South Perth, if that necessity arises, will approve

of such action without making too much noise.

Mr. Cross: There is no need for that yet.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Millington—Mt. Hawthorn—in reply) [5.48]: Judging by the remarks of the last few speakers, the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) must have made a good fighting speech.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, the member for Canning did that.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill was explained in a few words by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald).

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, there is more in it than that.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: In reply to the question raised by the member for Williams-Narrogin, the extra cost to the Government of anything proposed to be authorised by the Bill would be merely that of the fixing by the Surveyor-General of the high-water mark for about three-quarters of a mile. That is the only expenditure that will be entailed by this measure.

Mr. Doney: I want to know the expenditure on reclamation and construction for the section.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That has nothing to do with it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why not?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Because it has already been agreed to; it is part of the scheme. This Bill has been introduced at the request of the South Perth Road Board.

Hon. C. G. Latham: So that that body will not have to pay compensation.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. May I explain it in this way: the high-water mark having been determined, the holder of land on the foreshore would be entitled to the same compensation as anyone else, but he would have to forget that the foreshore existed and would receive no compensation on account of his land having been severed from the foreshore. That is contained in the original measure. The piece of foreshore from Manning Pool to Mends-street jetty is now being formed.

Mr. Doney: All we want to know is the cost of that.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have not agreed with the South Perth Road Board to resume the land and build roads on the reclaimed area. That is a matter for

the South Perth Road Board. What we have actually agreed to is that the board, after having obtained the private land, shall not be placed at a disadvantage. As this is part and parcel of the scheme, we do not want the authorities responsible for the reclamation work—the Perth City Council and the South Perth Road Board—to be put at a disadvantage. The Bill was merely introduced so that the plan might be completed. So far as the Government is concerned there is no need to extend the operations of the Act. We could go ahead to-morrow, but do not wish to proceed until the South Perth Road Board is satisfied and knows where it stands in respect of any liability for resumption. It is not prepared to go ahead until it knows that and can tell the rate-payers what is included in its liability. When the Bill is passed the local authority will know for what it is responsible with regard to severance from the foreshore, without which safeguard it might have to pay special compensation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does not Section 2 of the Act limit the operations the Government is permitted to carry on?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. We are not going as far as we are empowered to do by Section 2.

Mr. Doney: Would Section 2 of the Act allow you to do this particular work?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The reason why we included this in the Bill was stated by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) namely, that the South Perth Road Board should not be liable for the severance from the foreshore.

Mr. Doney: There has been some Government expenditure on the job.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The only amount involved is that comprised in the action of the Surveyor-General in fixing a high-water mark.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are the people of South Perth paying for the whole of the work?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I did not say that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You conveyed it to my mind.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The agreement with the South Perth Road Board was that we should do the reclamation work and build the wall. It would then be responsible—

Hon. C. G. Latham: For the levelling?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: For the land resumption, levelling, and roads. The original Act empowers us to build roads. On this reclamation the local authority is going to spend as much as will the Government.

Mr. Doney: How much is the Government spending?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The sum of £20,000 has been allotted for the work. I am assured by the engineers and the Under-Secretary that the expenditure so far has worked out at about £9 per week per man. We consider the job a good one. Great difficulty is being experienced in carrying out the undertakings that work out on a fifty-fifty basis as between wages and material.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does that mean paying the basic wage or allowing a margin for skill?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think the Leader of the Opposition expects me to know all the details with such exactitude. Before I agreed to the work being done the engineers assured me that this was how it would work out. The South Perth Road Board desires the protection given to it by the Bill. The suggestion has been made that other works are of greater urgency. That may be so, but the Leader of the Opposition did not nominate them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Speaker would not allow me to do so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: All the major works in the metropolitan area are almost complete. I am referring, of course, to roads and to the works comprised in the loan expenditure. In future a percentage of the money available will be spent in the country districts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the city drainage?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are governed in the matter by the 5d. rate. We cannot undertake any further major works because there would not be sufficient income to pay the interest and sinking fund on the loan.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Could not the rate be put up by Act of Parliament?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but at the present the rate is fixed by Act of Parliament at a limit of 5d. We cannot contemplate any further major works the charges upon which may not be met out of the present rate. The Canning Dam is nearing completion, and the sewerage works are

within a reasonable distance of completion. Although we had 2,000 men employed on the metropolitan water supply and sewerage works, that number will diminish by next Christmas to 300 or 400. As these works are completed we shall have to commence placing men in the country districts. I do not think the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) wishes to reduce these undertakings to commercial propositions. If we did that we would have to stop many works in the city. He complained that country water supplies were not being carried out in the order of their importance. Apart from the Goldfields water supply scheme and the two irrigation schemes in the South-West, I have authorised in the last few months the expenditure of over £200,000 on country water supplies. We are looking for work of a useful character, and wherever dams have been justified they have been authorised and put in hand. The country districts have not been neglected.

We are constructing roads we would not ordinarily build, because we must have work for the unemployed. What would the hon. member know about roads being required for defence purposes? Every request that has come from the Commonwealth Government has been acceded to without demur. We have built roads and in some instances they are dual purpose roads, but in others they would be useful only for military purposes. In no case have we refused any request that has been made by the Commonwealth Government for reasons of defence, and certainly not with regard to any road. We do not nominate works of a defence character; that is done by the Commonwealth Government. It is our business to accede to those requests if we can, and we have done so. Our offer that we should carry out works, instead of a new department being set up by the Commonwealth Government, has been renewed.

Reference has been made to the justification for this particular work. I am under the impression that members opposite have a great respect for local government. I also have a respect for it. When, as has been suggested, I gave a lecture to the Perth City Council, I was only doing my best to inspire it to spend more money. There was no need to inspire the South Perth Road Board, which has done wonderfully well. I am not sure how much has been spent in the

reclamation work around the Point, but the South Perth Road Board has contributed largely towards the expenditure. It is also responsible for the construction of roads, for top-dressing and for the beautification of the area. What I said, in respect to the £149,000—I think that is the correct figure—was that it represented the amount the Government had spent on reclamation work. In conformity with its agreement the Perth City Council had contributed £2,500. That is correct.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I agree that it is correct.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And this was dished up to mean, as the Lord Mayor put it, that I claimed the Perth City Council had spent no more than £2,500. What I said was that that was all the local authority had contributed towards the Government's expenditure for the reclamation work. I understand that the City Council has spent between £60,000 and £70,000.

Mr. Marshall: It must have spent more than that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This money was spent in top-dressing and in resummptions, so we are told. What I said will stand. It is the business of the City Council to find work for the unemployed, just as it is the responsibility of the Government. With a view to inspiring the Perth City Council to spend more money, I also said that the Subiaco Municipal Council had spent £2,500 in subsidising Government reclamation work, and that the Nedlands Road Board had spent £3,000. A small road board like Nedlands has contributed more to that reclamation work than has the great city of Perth. Nedlands raised a loan for the purpose. I still contend that if it is, according to what people tell us, the Government's business to find work for all those displaced from private industry, there is also a responsibility on local bodies. Where we find that a body like the South Perth Road Board is prepared to co-operate in finding work—and its share of this work amounts to £20,000—such a road board should be encouraged. Even though in troublous times the Government must find work for unemployed people, the burden on the Government is appreciably reduced if local bodies will, as in this case, find pound for pound with the Government. Should I be asked whether this is a work of urgency—

Mr. Doney: It is not an urgent proposition.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: My reply is that any job which will provide useful work is urgent. I may inform the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) that when the Government propose to spend money in the country on works that have no prospect of returning interest and sinking fund, metropolitan members are disinclined to quibble about such expenditure. Almost invariably, such works do not pay. Purely from the aspect of return from the expenditure, the Government would not embark on those works. However, we take a wider view. At this stage it is highly undesirable to raise the issue of the metropolitan area versus the country districts. Can the member for Williams-Narrogin contend that whether in respect of water supplies or roads or other kinds of public works the country has not had a fair deal? He knows very well that over 90 per cent. of Federal grants in aid of roads—a total of over three-quarters of a million per annum—is spent in country districts. And similarly with regard to loan moneys expended on road construction. I maintain that it is undesirable to spend loan money on roads, because the funds received from the Commonwealth each year suffice to make the necessary advances in our road programme. However, we have had to build roads out of loan in order to provide work. Thus it is inadvisable to raise at this stage the issue of country versus city. The beautifying of the Swan River is a worth-while work. The State surely may continue, carefully, the reclamation as we have done. Let me point out that we have not done nearly all the work covered by the original measure.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I know you have not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Once the reclamation has been taken up to the Causeway, it will stop there; but we want to clear up the south side of the river. In reply to an interjection from the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) the member for Williams-Narrogin said it was a disgrace that this work had been left so long.

Mr. Doney: No. The member for Canning said it had been.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I presume the member for Williams-Narrogin

relented after hearing what the member for Canning had to say.

Mr. Doney: By no means.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 2.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: An assurance from the Minister as to the probable cost of the entire work is desirable. The hon. gentleman can give it to-morrow on the third reading. In his reply he raised a point which aroused my curiosity. What is the actual cost so far of this work, and what is the estimated cost of completing it? I refer to the work under the Bill, not to that under the original measure. Members should inspect the plan which has been laid on the Table. Prior to the production of that plan, there was no authorisation for the work—none whatever. I admit that the Government can do all sorts of things without authority. I have complained of the present Government's having done so, though not more than any other Government. The practice has grown up gradually. However, the Chamber should have the information for which I ask.

The Minister for Works: Do you refer to money the Government has spent on the whole scheme?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, only to the money spent in the South Perth Road Board area and the estimated cost of the additional work authorised by the Bill.

Mr. WARNER: The Minister referred to high-water mark and the filling in behind a 4ft. wall, together with the resumption of land without compensation. Will he explain what he meant?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The wall will be built to a level of 6ft. above low-water mark and the area inside the wall will be reclaimed with the siltage pumped from the water. The high-water mark will be fixed by the Surveyor-General and the area reclaimed is that referred to.

Mr. WARNER: That does not touch the point I want cleared up. If a man has 100 acres behind high-water mark at present,

and the area inside the wall is raised by siltage to the height mentioned by the Minister, will the land covered by the silt be taken from the owner of the area, without any compensation?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The usual compensation will have to be paid for all land that is taken from an owner. The land reclaimed will be valued and owners will have the right to claim compensation, but they will have no claim because they have been severed from the river. The Bill merely prevents any claim for severance.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In view of Sub-section 2 of Section 4 of the parent Act severance is excluded as a ground for compensation. What the member for Mt. Marshall is anxious to learn is the position of the owner whose property may be damaged by the reclamation. He wants to know if the owner can claim compensation. I am doubtful if such a claim would lie. Personally I cannot see how such land could be adversely affected. Rather would it be improved.

Mr. CROSS: I would like an assurance from the Minister regarding the position of property owners along the river frontage. The work carried out on the Melville Water frontage has had a detrimental effect on properties. Owing to the nature of the silt pumped from the river for reclamation purposes, the water is not able to flow off the properties during the heavy rains and gardens and yards have been flooded. The non-porous nature of the reclaimed area prevents the water from soaking away freely. Steps should be taken to prevent any recurrence of that trouble. Obviously someone will have to remedy the mistakes made on the Melville Water frontage reclamation scheme.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: The Bill seeks to amend the inspection of Machinery Act,

1921. It has become necessary owing to the increased general use of machinery which is not provided for in the present Act. For instance, refrigeration has now become an important factor in the life of the community. There is nothing in the parent Act to control refrigeration. Some very big plants have been erected in many parts of the State which might easily become a menace to life and property, especially in congested areas in cities and towns. A couple of years ago, an accident occurred at the Ayrshire Dairy, when two men were killed and one injured. Air compressors, electric, and crude oil engines are being used more extensively than in the past. As a matter of fact, this measure might almost be termed a machinery Bill; it is essentially one for consideration in Committee. One of the new provisions of the Bill deals with engineers' certificates and the class of work to be performed by a man holding such a certificate. There has been a long-standing demand by the engineering fraternity for the granting of such certificates; and my predecessor, the late Mr. Munsie, promised that when the Bill was being amended, provision would be made for these certificates. An alteration is also made in the composition of the board of examiners for engine-drivers. At present, the board consists of three members, but it will be found to be unworkable because the proposal now is to make provision for an engineer's certificate. It is also necessary to make provision for a qualified engineer to examine candidates for the engineering certificate.

As I have said, the Bill is one really for consideration in Committee. I propose, however, to explain some of its provisions. The definition of "boiler" is being amended by striking out certain words. Many boilers are not used for working machinery, and, in a strict legal sense, cannot be said to be used "for any manufacturing or other like purposes." Scores of boilers now in use are not used for those particular purposes. Boilers which have been installed in hospitals, institutions, clubs, hotels and various other places, can hardly be said to be used for manufacturing purposes. If such boilers exploded, a considerable amount of damage would be done. The working pressure of the majority of these boilers exceeds 60lbs. per square inch, and in some cases is as high as 150lbs. per square inch. Under the

Act, no control can be exercised over such boilers. True, they have been inspected since 1922, and no question has been raised about their inspection; but the proposed amendment is desired so that they may be legally inspected and brought under the regulations. In effect, this proposed provision will make legal what hitherto has been the practice.

The Bill also proposes to amend Paragraph (b) of Section 2 of the Act. In all the other States of Australia, as well as in New Zealand, it has been found that air receivers which are exempt from inspection are definitely a source of danger. In this State at least six air compressors of less than five cubic feet capacity have burst, but luckily without causing injury to any person. One burst in Bunbury last January and caused much damage; and it is almost certain that, had any persons been present in the building at the time, they would have been severely injured, perhaps fatally. Practically all these receivers are used in garages for tyre inflation. I do not know whether the garages still supply air free, but I hope they do. The receivers are worked at not less than 150lbs. per square inch working pressure. The limit of not less than nine inches internal diameter, suggested in the proposed amendment of the definition, is taken from a British Standard Specification issued in 1938, and it would ensure that practically all air receivers would be subject to the safety provisions of the Act. Our desire is to ensure that proper safety precautions will be provided wherever these air receivers are in use.

The Bill contains a definition dealing with refrigeration. Under the Bill "refrigerant" means any substance used to reduce temperature by its expansion or vaporisation. A comprehensive definition of refrigerating machinery is also included. In view of the fact that the unit system of refrigeration will not be subject to the provisions of this measure, a definition is included which states that "unit system" means a system which can be removed from the user's premises without disconnecting any parts containing refrigerant. It is not intended to bring within the scope of the Bill frigidaire and the like refrigerators. This definition is essential, because throughout the Bill these

refrigerators are mentioned, and means for their protection and installation are provided. I may add that these definitions have been adopted from the Standards Association of Australia Refrigeration Code. Provision is also made for a definition of "ton of refrigeration." This is required in order to fix the size of refrigerating machinery, which must be under the control of certificated persons. The definition has been adopted from the Queensland Act, but extended to make it equitable for assessing the comparative capacities of machines working with refrigerants other than ammonia. The proposed definition sets out the various classes of refrigerants that may be generated and how they are to be divided for the purpose of control.

Section 15 is amended to provide that refrigerating machinery must not be left in the charge of any person under 18 years of age if the refrigerating gas used is likely to cause injury to persons or property in the event of its escape from the system owing to the incompetence of the person in charge. A similar provision in relation to boilers is contained in the existing subsection of the Act, but we have slightly amended that to make it clear that the application will be to boilers used for generating steam only. There is also an amendment to Section 16 which is being included so that owners of boilers and machinery will know definitely what their obligations are in regard to notifying the inspector that they intend to use such boilers or machinery and obtaining a certificate before actually putting them into use. There have been many instances of owners of boilers having failed to notify the department that they propose to use such boilers. Consequently the existing section has been re-drafted to make plain what are the obligations of people using boilers.

A new paragraph has been added to Section 17. This amendment will give the same powers in regard to the erection of winding engines as are already provided for in Subsection 3 for lifts. At the present time, if anybody desires to erect a lift, he must notify the department, submit plans and information as to materials to be used. The department then must ensure that the plans are carried out. Winding engines are used for raising and lowering material or men, and I think members

will agree that the department should exercise as much control over such engines as it exercises over ordinary lifts. On more than one occasion a winding engine has been erected and when application has been made to the department for a certificate the granting of such certificate has been found impossible. The Bill provides that the department shall have the same responsibility with regard to winding engines as it has over lifts. A similar paragraph is being inserted to cover refrigerating machinery. If the Bill becomes an Act those who propose to erect refrigerating machinery of the size contemplated under the Act, will be called upon to supply to the department the necessary plans so as to ensure that suitable materials and methods of construction are employed in the erection of the plant. These powers are similar to those existing in the provisions relating to new boilers. They are intended to be used only in the case of refrigerating plants using ammonia, carbon dioxide, or any other gas that might cause injury or death to persons in the vicinity, in the event of the gas escaping from the plant owing to the failure of any part of the equipment. We know of fairly large refrigerating plants existing in the hub of the city. In the event of the dislocation of any such plant the whole of the building in which it is situated may easily become affected by the escaping gas. Even if injury were not occasioned to people inhaling the gas, a panic might quite easily be caused, resulting in mutilation or death through people endeavouring to escape.

The amendment to Section 19 is also necessary. This is to be achieved by deleting the word "engine" and inserting after the word "where" in the seventh line, the words "any refrigerating machinery or." The amendment has been made so that the safety provisions of the Standards Association of Australia Refrigeration Code can be enforced in the case of refrigeration plants used in buildings that are also used for offices, restaurants, shops, etc. I could take members to some fairly large refrigerating plants existing at very little distance from factories where numbers of girls are working. If anything went wrong with those plants and the gas—some of which is rather deadly—were to escape, disastrous results would probably follow. The Bill provides that the department must be notified as to just where such plant is

to be erected, so that the department may be sure that the machinery can be isolated in the event of the refrigerant escaping. Section 34 has been re-arranged. Some doubt has been experienced by people proposing to repair boilers as to when they have to notify the department. The re-arrangement of the section is designed to make it quite clear that the owner is required to notify the department before commencing any repairs or alterations that have not been ordered by an inspector, and to notify the department when repairs or alterations have been completed, whether ordered by an inspector or otherwise.

The Bill also proposes that to Section 37 shall be added the following.—

Where there is no clearly defined grate area, 15 square feet of heating surface shall be deemed equal to one horse power for boilers of the multi-tubular or locomotive types, and 20 square feet of heating surface for other classes of boilers.

This amendment is necessary owing to the introduction of oil, gas and pulverised fuel firing, where there is no defined grate area. Therefore, the horse-power can be assessed only by comparison with similar boilers fired with wood or coal. We also anticipate the introduction of electrically heated boilers in the near future. The horse power computed as suggested will be in all instances less than it would be in Queensland, and in the case of water-tube boilers it will be only one-half. Section 53 is amended by the insertion of a new subsection relating to engineers' certificates. There is no intention of insisting that every person engaged in the operation of machinery shall have such a certificate, but it is provided that a man engaged in erecting or maintaining certain machinery must have a first or second class certificate according to the size of the machinery. This man could, of course, have a dozen men working under him, such as engineers, fitters and others, who would not be required to hold a certificate. The new subsection defines the size of plant on which the engineer-in-charge would be required to be the holder of an engineer's certificate. A certificated engineer will not be required on any plant of less power than is specified in Subsection 1. An engineer holding at least a second-class certificate will be required on any plant exceeding these limits and up to the limit set out in the proposed Section 56, Subsection 2, of the amendments, which limits

would vary from about 600 horse-power to 800 horse-power in the case of reciprocating steam engines or internal combustion engines, and as specified for turbines, electric motors and refrigerating machinery. We also propose to alter Section 53 to read—

Every person employed or acting as a driver in control of any winding engine, any engine or engines driven by steam or compressed air, any crane fitted with a jib, any internal combustion engine or engines, any air compressor or compressors, any locomotive, or any refrigerating machinery to which this Act applies shall hold the required certificate under this Act.

The most important item in the amendment is the insertion of the words "any winding engine." The Crown Solicitor has given a ruling that regulations relating to the granting of winding enginedrivers' certificates available for electric winding engines only and specifying the qualifications of candidates for such certificates cannot legally be gazetted until these words are inserted. At present a candidate must first obtain a third steam and second steam enginedriver's certificate before he can qualify for a winding enginedriver's certificate, even if he desires to drive only an electric winding engine. The reason for inserting the words "crane fitted with a jib" in lieu of "crane and hoist" is that the crane and hoist driver's certificate applies only to cranes fitted with a jib. There are quite a lot of cranes not fitted with a jib, and so we propose to alter the provision to bring it into line with the different classes of machinery used.

The words "air compressor or compressors" have been inserted because there is at present no provision for certificated control of air compressors driven other than by steam or internal combustion engines. If a compressor is driven by a steam or a combustion engine, the driver must hold a certificate, but if the compressor is electrically driven an uncertificated person may take charge of it. The words "refrigerating machinery" have been inserted for the same reason and will be qualified by the new paragraph (g) in the proposed new Subsection 4. The word "locomotive" has been included to provide for the certificated control of locomotives driven by internal combustion engines. This request was made by the Federated Enginedrivers'

Union. This will not apply to electric locomotives, because "electric tramcars, railway carriages and wagon rolling stock used on privately-owned railway and tramway systems" are exempted from the provisions of the Act by an Order-in-Council.

Mr. Marshall: What about small electric trains that run about mines?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They could be exempted.

Mr. Marshall interjected.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member will be all right by the time he wishes to drive an engine.

Member: The Minister must not reflect on an hon. member.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am not reflecting on him. If it became necessary, electric locomotives used on or in any mine could be added to the exemption. Amongst the exemption provisions is one to make clear what is meant by a "boiler of less than 6 horse power" and another to reduce the area of cylinder from 200 to 114 square inches. These will not affect machinery in the agricultural areas because those districts are already exempt, but if the exemption limit for a certificate to control an internal combustion engine is reduced to 114 square inches, which will be equivalent to one cylinder of 12 inches instead of 16 inches diameter, it will bring our Act into line with the South Australian law and the recommendation of the conference of representatives of all the States. This amendment will create no hardship because the enginedrivers' award provides that the same rate of wages must be paid regardless of whether the enginedriver is certificated. Two other exemptions provide for refrigerating machinery not exceeding 5 tons capacity and any automatically-controlled refrigerating machinery which, in the opinion of the Chief Inspector, complies with the regulation, is fitted with adequate safeguards and is so certified by him in writing. The same applies to an air compressor not exceeding 500 cubic feet of free air per minute; provided it is fitted with satisfactory safeguards, the Chief Inspector has power to exempt that class of machine.

I have mentioned an alteration to the board of examiners. The present board consists of three members and the Bill proposes to

increase the number to five if necessary. If there was an examination for engineers, an engineering representative would sit on the board with the Chief Inspector and the other representative. If there was an enginedrivers' examination, an enginedrivers' representative would sit on the board. If a candidate desired an engineer's certificate and an enginedriver's certificate, it would probably be necessary to have a representative of each branch present, and so we are proposing a board of five if necessary.

Provision is made for a member holding an engineer's certificate to be appointed from without the service for the purpose of granting engineers' certificates. The Bill makes clear that the holder of a winding enginedriver's certificate shall be a member of the Enginedrivers' Union. I observe that the member for Williams-Narogin (Mr. Doney) smiles at that proposal. The representative of the Enginedrivers' Union for the last 20 years has been the secretary of the union. Mr. Breydon holds the qualifications of a certificated enginedriver and to my knowledge has been general secretary of the union for 20 years, but owing to ill-health he has retired from that position. It has always been implied that the Enginedrivers' Union should have a representative on the board of examiners, but the new secretary—I do not know who he is—may not be a certificated enginedriver and the man to be appointed to the board must hold a certificate of competency.

The Bill also stipulates that the deputy Chief Inspector may sit on the board in the event of the Chief Inspector not being available. At present when the Chief Inspector is not available the board of examiners cannot legally sit. In the event of a third examiner not being present, the Act makes no provision for someone to take his place, and therefore the board cannot legally sit. We now propose that the Minister having satisfied himself that an appointment is necessary may temporarily appoint somebody to take the place of one who is sick or for other reason. The Bill provides for the granting of two grades of engineers' certificates and two grades of refrigeration certificates. No provision is made for an electric winding drivers' certificate because that is unnecessary. A new paragraph will be inserted in Section 55 and reads—

An internal combustion engine-driver's certificate of service or a boiler attendant's

certificate of service or a crane and hoist driver's certificate of service granted under the principal Act shall entitle the holder to the same privileges as a certificate of competency of the same class.

This particular paragraph will safeguard the rights of the holders of service certificates that were granted under the principal Act. The holders will not have to come up for further examination, and their positions will be safeguarded. The same thing applies to engine drivers in charge of refrigerating machinery. Many men to-day in charge of refrigerating machinery will be allowed by this Bill to continue in control of it as they would be under the Act. Two other paragraphs provide for the granting of service certificates to persons who have been in charge of refrigerating machinery. Certain paragraphs deal with the size of the refrigerating machinery of which the driver is in charge, the length of service, etc. A man can obtain a service certificate provided he satisfies the board that he has been in charge of the machinery for a certain length of time and as to his competency, and no further examination will be required. The same thing applies to the issue of a second class certificate.

A new paragraph in connection with Section 56 defines the privileges of the holder of an unrestricted first-class and second-class engineers' certificates respectively. These certificates will not be granted indiscriminately. The regulations when drafted will set out the technical qualifications and practical experience required of the candidates. Certificates will be restricted according to the training and experience of the candidate, and driving privileges will not be granted unless the candidate can satisfy the board that he is competent to drive the types of engines mentioned on the certificate. This procedure will be necessary only in connection with the erection or maintenance of a particularly large plant. We have also re-arranged the paragraphs of Section 56. They will not add to or take from the holder of a winding engine driver's certificate any privilege, but merely make the meaning more clear. Two new paragraphs that will be added extend the privileges of a first-class or second-class steam engine driver's certificate to include air com-

pressors driven by electric motors. The following words—

Provided that such engines and boilers are so situated that the chief inspector or his representative is satisfied the engine-driver can efficiently discharge his duties without danger to any person or liability of accident to such engines and boilers.

will be unnecessary, because Section 68 will deal more fully with the matter. Then there are those who take charge of some big section of engineering. The chief inspector has to be satisfied that the engineer can, if necessary, look after a large section of machinery. The same thing applies to first and second-class refrigeration certificates. The chief inspector must be satisfied that the extent of the machinery is not too large for the engineer to look after by himself. An extension is provided in the case of Board of Trade certificates. As the present section stands, the board has power to grant steam certificates only to the holders of Board of Trade certificates. It is felt that the board should have power to grant internal combustion certificates to the holders of marine motor engineers' certificates granted by the Board of Trade, and also the appropriate engineers' certificates granted under the Act. At the moment if a man has a Board of Trade certificate under the Act we can only grant him a steam certificate. Seeing, however, that the Board of Trade allows certificates in the case of other classes of engines, it is proposed to take power to extend this part of the Act to Board of Trade certificates.

A new and important paragraph has been added to Section 68 and reads as follows:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 56 to the contrary, if upon the report of an inspector the chief inspector is of the opinion that any person cannot efficiently discharge his duties while in sole charge of any machinery, boiler or boilers, without danger to any person or liability of accident to such machinery, boiler or boilers, he shall serve the owner with notice in writing, requiring him, on and after a date to be specified, to place part or parts of such machinery, or any boiler or boilers, under the control of some other person or persons who shall hold such certificate or certificates as may be required.

When Section 68 was originally drafted, the large internal combustion engine power houses such as those of the Wiluna Gold

Mines Ltd., and the Lake View and Star Ltd., were not contemplated, so that provision was made only for steam engines and their boilers. Some of the big plants comprise many classes of machinery. The intention of the amendment is to cover any likely combination of steam engines, internal combustion engines, electrically driven air compressors, and refrigerating machinery. The definition of machinery includes all types of engines and any machinery driven by any engine or motor as defined. This will give the Chief Inspector power to overhaul these machines or sets of machines. He will satisfy himself that the man in charge can look after this machinery, otherwise it may be necessary for him to get someone to assist.

The Bill proposes to amend Section 70 by inserting after the first paragraph a new paragraph dealing with the erection or re-erection of any boiler that requires to be set in brickwork. Under the Act a boiler can be taken out or erected, or the brick work set about it before any hydraulic test is made. Because the brickwork has been erected, a boiler test cannot be made. The same thing applies to a boiler that has been taken down and re-erected elsewhere. The boiler may be damaged in transit. It is proposed to amend the Act to provide that the boiler shall be examined before it is shifted, and hydraulically tested before any wall or brickwork is erected around it. The authorities will then be sure that the boiler when erected has not been damaged in transit.

Provision has also been made with respect to qualifications required to be held by applicants for the position of inspector. The regulations will set out the qualifications required to be held by applicants and to provide also for medical examination. The regulations provide that locomotive engine-drivers shall present themselves for medical examination every few years, but the Act as it stands gives no authority for calling upon them to do so. Winding-engine drivers are required by the Mines Regulation Act, Regulation No. 8, page 53, to present themselves for medical examination every 12 months; but crane-drivers are not at present required so to present themselves, although they may drive cranes on top of high buildings and on wharves. They should be examined at least every two years. Locomotive engine-drivers have to

be examined for sight and other matters every two years; and it is only reasonable that men driving cranes on high buildings, especially with men hanging on the hooks, should be similarly examined to ensure that they are keeping fit. There is no direct authority whatever in the Act for the existing regulations relating to winding-engines, hoists, and cranes; and therefore authority is required to permit regulations to be promulgated dealing with refrigerating machinery, the proper ventilation of buildings in which such machinery is erected and used, and also the fastenings of the doors of refrigerating rooms. On the last point I might add that we want to ensure that in the event of a break the gases can be controlled to some extent.

In the Second Schedule the Bill provides an alteration bringing lifts and escalators into the schedule. They are not provided for as yet, and a court of law might hold that certain lifts or escalators were not being "used in any manufacturing or industrial process." The object of the amendment is to remove the possibility of doubt. In the Seventh Schedule the Bill proposes to delete the words "in good repair and." It frequently happens that repairs or alterations are postponed for some months; and it is not strictly in accordance with Sections 30 and 44 to withhold the certificate until such repairs or alterations have been completed. According to the schedule as it stands, the inspector is supposed to give a certificate that the machinery is in good repair. The department argues that a machine or an engine or a boiler may be quite good enough for the purposes for which it is intended to be used, and yet from an inspector's point of view might not be in good repair. Presumably an inspector requires a machine or an engine or a boiler to be in tip-top repair before he gives a certificate. However, the Chief Inspector informs me that many boilers and machines are quite good enough for the purposes for which they are to be used, though such boilers and machines could not be conscientiously described as being in good repair. Hence the amendment proposed. The same remarks apply to a further paragraph of the Seventh Schedule having reference to machinery being sufficiently guarded, as well as in good repair. It has been pointed out to me that many machines are not in need of the same amount of guarding

as they would be if used among other machinery.

Mr. Marshall: That applies to the State batteries also.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Probably that difficulty will be overcome by this amendment. This is a Committee Bill, intended to bring the present Act up to standard, particularly in view of the alterations in machinery and their continual changes in style. The measure was prepared for my predecessor, the late Mr. Munsie, but owing to his death it was shelved. Last session being the third of a Parliament, the Bill was not brought down. It has been long awaited by the Machinery Department, and I am convinced that its passing not only will prove of great benefit to the department and the inspectors but will enable owners of machinery to know exactly where they stand under the law. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [8.16]: As I interpret the Bill and the Minister's explanation of it, the measure is designed to give further clarity to the rather difficult question of riparian rights, and to ensure in regard to streams for whose water there is some competition, that those waters are distributed with justice to all concerned. The House will agree with me that those are helpful objectives; and if the commissioners, who of course have already been appointed to control such streams, do not travel beyond the powers I have indicated, not much trouble will ensue from the new section if enacted. The commissioners appear to exercise control over the irrigation areas known as Harvey No. 1 and Harvey No. 2, Waroona and Collie. The Bill seeks a fairly liberal extension of that control. At first sight the measure did not appear to have practical implications beyond the coastal area; but, as members specially interested will have observed, apparently wherever in the State there is a river, or for that matter

a stream worthy of the name, there will the Bill be also. I recall the Minister's mentioning the names of certain brooks. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman named Bancell's Brook, Logue's Brook, Wungong Brook, and Byford Brook. Later in his speech he said he had been advised that the Bill referred only to those brooks. I do not think the Minister meant that. I think he meant to convey that those particular brooks were the ones which it was especially desired to bring under control.

The Minister for Water Supplies: I mentioned those brooks as examples.

Mr. DONEY: The Minister did say he had been advised that the Bill referred to those brooks, and only those brooks.

The Minister for Water Supplies: Oh no!

Mr. DONEY: All the same, I will not insist on that particular interpretation, because the Bill in fact makes it quite plain that any district and any stream may by proclamation be constituted a controlled area or a controlled stream. The Minister's explanation went to indicate that the proposed new powers are in no sense arbitrary but are essentially helpful. My personal belief is that that is so. Nevertheless, there are two or three points which the Minister might further clarify, and perhaps there are one or two undertakings that he might be inclined to give. For instance, he should state just exactly the nature of those happenings which he believes will invoke a proclamation. On that particular point the Minister had this to say, that the Government "would not step in arbitrarily," "would not enter into matters to an extent further than was necessary" and "would not intervene unnecessarily," and so forth. I want to know what the word "necessary" is interpreted by the Minister to cover. Are we to understand that the Government will intervene when, and only when, there are disputants in some riparian trouble, and the commissioners' aid sought in consequence? I think that is what was intended, but I am anxious that the Minister shall also seek evidence of general assistance from the local governing authority, be it municipal council or road board. The Minister and members generally will, I think, realise that passions run high in riparian disputes, and it is easy to conceive a position where the evidence of the contending

parties would not be particularly reliable. I suggest that the word of selected road board or municipal witnesses would be of material help to the commissioners, and generally, be much more reliable than the evidence tendered by one or other of those immediately concerned in the dispute. Semi-official evidence of that description would be particularly desirable because the provisions of the Bill strike deeply into local prejudices and beliefs as to riparian rights. The House will appreciate the fact that a landowner, born and bred on a property through which runs a valuable stream of water, would naturally resent what he would regard as the interference of later comers either up or down stream. He would feel that the passing of the years had given him some sort of proprietary rights in the waters of the stream that every day had flown, so to speak, under his nose. He would be so sure of his position in this regard that he could easily be prompted, as the Minister explained the other evening, to show his resentment by sitting on the top of his barricade in the middle of the stream waiting for the appearance of anyone who might care to raise an objection from further down stream. To straighten out difficulties of that type is certainly not a quick or easy task, and I think the statutory powers of a local governing body would be of considerable assistance to the commissioners.

If I heard the Minister aright, he claimed that all settlers along the course of a stream had equal rights to the water in that stream. There again my understanding of the position is entirely at variance with what the Minister considers to obtain. I have always thought, and I believe it to be correct, that the landowners who took up their holdings 40 or more years ago have a far greater and better title to the water than those who selected areas at a later stage. The Minister for Lands, for instance, would know pretty well that in the case of the older settlers, their river boundary nearly always—I know there have been exceptions—runs lengthwise along the middle of the bed of the stream. Consequently, that confers upon such early settlers rights that the later settlers certainly do not possess. The earlier settlers thus enjoy the right to draw from the stream water sufficient for all domestic and

stock purposes and, in addition, such supplies as are necessary to irrigate five acres of land.

The Minister for Water Supplies: But the earlier settlers may be those whose holdings are lower down the stream.

Mr. DONEY: Of course.

The Minister for Water Supplies: Then how would they get on?

Mr. DONEY: They would have to take the luck of what came to them, and such people would most likely be concerned in disputes to which the provisions of the Bill would apply.

The Minister for Water Supplies: That is so.

Mr. DONEY: But that does not establish the Minister's point that all settlers have equal rights in the water available. Section 14 of the principal Act sets out the rights of the two different types of settlers, and shows that considerable benefits are enjoyed by those who take up their property first, such as those who selected their holdings 40 years ago.

The Minister for Mines: Some of them may have taken up holdings higher up the stream and constructed dams, so that there may not be much water at all for those lower down.

Mr. DONEY: Quite so, but the man upstream who takes up such an arbitrary attitude has not the law on his side. The settler lower down has, and that is the end of it.

The Minister for Mines: There is no end to it.

Mr. DONEY: Naturally that would lead to a dispute that the Bill is designed to correct.

The Minister for Mines: There would be a lawsuit at the end of it.

Mr. DONEY: Of course, the later settler has this right that he can get such water as is regarded as his fair share by license from the Government. In that respect both the earlier and the later settlers are on the same basis, but only after the protected settler has satisfied his legal rights under Section 14. If the stream happens to be one with a plentiful supply for all, then the question of a license does not arise. Each settler can draw whatever water he requires without let or hindrance. Only when water is scarce are disputes likely to arise. When there is plenty for all, no trouble will be experienced.

The Minister for Water Supplies: There is no such stream in this State.

Mr. DONEY: Pardon me! I would mention such streams as the Blackwood and the Murray Rivers. There are quite a number that I can recall. The Minister must know of them. We had the Minister's own admission during his second reading speech when he said there were a number of streams in connection with which the intervention of the commissioners would not be required.

The Minister for Water Supplies: I said there was no dispute in regard to them.

Mr. DONEY: Why not? Simply because there is sufficient water in the streams for everyone. I am not objecting to the Bill.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No; this is just a friendly discussion

Mr. DONEY: The Bill provides for districts or individual streams to be brought under the control of the commissioners by way of proclamation. If that could be done by way of regulations and not by proclamation, I would not push the question regarding municipal or road board assistance. If it were done by regulations, then the member for the district, or any other member, would be in a position to debate the merits of the provision in Parliament and advance the point of view of the local governing authority. I had that in mind when I looked through the parent Act and found everywhere references to proclamations, to such an extent that it appeared to me futile to proceed with the idea of substituting the word "regulation" for "proclamation" in the Bill. Members who represent constituencies on the coastal fringe are much more deeply concerned with this Bill than are those of us who represent electorates further east. Of course they may know of some objections to the Bill. Personally I have no objection to it at all; except that when we reach the Committee stage I shall certainly seek the assistance of members in obtaining the acceptance of an amendment to make road board evidence available to the commissioners when they are settling disputes.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [8.31]: I know the Minister has had many complaints from settlers in the district I represent in regard to the particular matter now under discussion. I agree with him that the time has arrived when the Government should exercise some control over

streams outside irrigation areas. The Minister now has control of all waters in irrigation areas. When moving the second reading of the Bill, he pointed out that the powers now being sought were asked for in 1914, when the present Act was before the House. Section 27 of that measure was inserted by another place and we have had trouble ever since. The trouble has been gradually accentuated during recent years. Still further difficulties will arise in regard to the use of water in these streams or brooks. Times have changed during the last 25 years. The Act which the Bill seeks to amend came into force 25 years ago. Many more people have settled along the streams and brooks, and water is being used much more freely to-day than ever before. Not only are the streams and brooks in my district affected, but rivers also; and, as I said, the difficulties must increase. The Minister has told us that he has received many complaints. I know that is so, because there have been complaints from all parts of the district I represent.

Mr. Doney: You have had no trouble in the case of those rivers that customarily run in summer time?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, particularly last summer. We have had trouble with a river which never will be dry.

Mr. Doney: If dry, it would not be running; that is my point.

Mr. McLARTY: The Minister also told us that settlers had suffered much hardship as the result of damming streams and conserving water. I know that to be true. I can instance a settler who was able to dam a stream, thus securing abundance of water for himself, while the settler below him was unable to obtain a sufficient supply even to water his stock.

The Minister for Mines: He may be one of the pioneers mentioned by the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Mr. McLARTY: What I have said is a fact. I have attended many meetings of persons who have settled along streams and who have asked me to do something to assist them in their distress. I have interviewed the Minister and his advisers on a number of occasions, but always received the same reply: they were sympathetic, but told me the matter was one for civil action. Civil action is costly, and very often be-

yond the means of the settler. Even if he took action and succeeded, in all probability he would be no better off, because, apparently, it is not the Government's duty to see that the water is allowed to run. In some cases settlers along certain streams have offered to make a payment if the Government would exercise some control. Their offer, however, was refused because the Government felt that, if it accepted such a payment, it would be compelled to provide the water required by the settlers. This would involve storage, which is not possible on many of the streams that have been referred to. The Minister also said that certain rivers might never be affected. He mentioned, among others, the Murray River.

Mr. Doney: The Minister forgot about that.

Mr. McLARTY: The Minister mentioned the Murray River, and referred to it as being one of the rivers not likely to be affected. Probably he is right, but there is even a danger that a river like the Murray might become affected, particularly during such conditions as were prevailing last summer. It would be possible for people to dam the Murray River and so prevent settlers lower down from getting water. I am glad the Minister intends to consult the Irrigation Commission in regard to these streams. I think I can claim I was partly responsible for having local representation added to the Commission. I consider, however, that the Minister would be well advised also to consult the local authorities when he proposes to exercise control over any stream. The three lay members of the Irrigation Commission all live in irrigation areas and are not likely to experience any difficulty in the future with respect to streams in such areas; but difficulty will arise where streams are not situated in irrigation districts. The three lay members would not perhaps have that intimate knowledge of streams outside irrigation districts that we would like them to possess. Consequently, the Minister would be well advised to consult the local governing body in regard to such streams over which he proposes to exercise control. Apart from the legal rights that those living on streams possess, I feel they have a moral right to the use of the water. Considerable suffering has existed in the past and no end of bad feeling has been occasioned. I do not think any of us can have any real

objection to the Minister's exercising some control over these outside streams and I hope the Bill will become law.

On motion by Mr. Warner, debate adjourned.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [8.41] in moving the second reading said: This is a very simple Bill; really a one-clause measure. It is introduced to correct a minor defect in the Plant Diseases Act. Provision is made for adding a subsection to Section 18 of the principal Act to permit of the department's obtaining a recoup of the expenses incurred in cleaning up and destroying abandoned orchards. One of the greatest bugbears to commercial orchardists to-day is the presence in their vicinity of abandoned orchards than which there is no greater breeding ground for insect pests or fungus diseases. Members will recall that previous to 1933 the Act declared an abandoned orchard to be one that had not been worked habitually, or for a long period had been neglected or uncultivated. We discovered, however, that people were able to circumvent that provision by occasionally stirring round one or two trees and pretending that the orchard was in fact occupied and worked. Consequently a small amendment to the Act was put through in 1933 making it possible for the superintendent of horticulture to certify in writing to the Department of Agriculture that such orchards had not been worked, cared for or cultivated for the preceding two years. That tightened up the position, but a little misunderstanding exists as to the person upon whom the cost incurred in destroying trees on abandoned orchards should fall. The amendment removes that doubt and provides that where the department is forced to take action in the interests of the fruit industry, it has the right by law to be recouped for such expenditure. That is the whole substance of the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Thorn, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONTRACEPTIVES.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [8.44]: I listened with considerable interest to the speech of the Minister for Health when he moved the second reading of this Bill, which I intend to support. About two years ago, sometime in 1937, there assembled in Perth a number of representative people who discussed the need for the introduction of legislation of this kind. That conference included people of varying political opinions and representatives of most of the churches in the State. After the matter had been fully considered, a decision was reached that a deputation should wait upon the Minister for Health to urge that legislation be brought down. The Minister gave the deputation a sympathetic hearing and said he would refer the matter to Cabinet. We were afterwards advised by him that although Cabinet was sympathetic there would be no opportunity owing to the lateness of the session to introduce a measure. Members of the conference re-assembled this year and again met the Minister, with the result that the Bill now before the House was prepared. The deputation was representative of the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, the Congregational Church, and the Salvation Army and also included representatives of the medical and pharmaceutical professions. The Women's Service Guild and the Country Women's Association were also sympathetically inclined. The members of the deputation agreed that there was an urgent need to try to cope with the evil of the indiscriminate distribution and advertising of contraceptives. No doubt existed in their minds of the danger of the continued existence of this menace to the State both from a moral and an economic point of view, bearing in mind the vast area of the State and its small population. They realised—I realised at any rate—that the business of advertising and distributing contraceptives had been reduced to a very fine art, and I regret to say that the Press has taken a very prominent part in encouraging the advertising of those goods. One can scarcely open a paper these days without observing flag-

rant advertisements in connection with this very serious matter. Again, as the Minister pointed out, children of very tender age have been employed to distribute literature flagrantly and unblushingly advertising contraceptives. I understand that under the Postal Act the Commonwealth Government has power to inflict a penalty on people guilty of sending this matter through the post.

We in this State, I understand, have no power to take action and thus the people who are evidently making money out of this business have a free hand to continue their operations. I observe that the Bill is almost a replica of legislation in existence in Victoria. As the Minister pointed out, there are glaring instances of necessity for legislation. The matter is particularly distasteful and dangerous, in more ways than one. Certainly it is bad enough to have these articles in the homes of married people, but it is more dangerous when unmarried people are encouraged in this direction. It is a well known fact that shortly after an engagement is announced these articles are distributed, and shortly after marriage the letter-box is again found to contain documents giving full instructions. I have before me various exhibits of the kind.

I realise that the Bill is a step in the right direction, and while I compliment the Government upon having had the courage to introduce such a measure, I consider that it does not go far enough. I should like to see much more drastic legislation introduced to prevent entirely the use of contraceptives. I do not believe in the use of contraceptives. Although I am a layman, I venture the opinion that the use of them is unnatural and dangerous to health, and I think members will find that medical opinion has been given along those lines. I would go further and say there is every reason to believe that the use of contraceptives is, in many instances, the cause of some ailments from which women suffer. There are other aspects of the question. The moral point cannot be disregarded, and there is the economic side also. I venture to say that we in this country realise the necessity for populating the vast areas we have to govern. In this regard we have often been told that a baby born here is the more valuable migrant. The defence aspect also enters into consideration. A little while

ago, previous to the world again being converted into a shambles, the Commonwealth Government asked for volunteers who were prepared to defend our country. The response was fairly generous. But if we are going to defend this country, we must have a virile male population. Yet the use of contraceptives is destroying the potential forces of this nation at the very source of life. It is useless to be continually preaching from Parliament and from the public platform the necessity for populating this country in order to defend it if we shut our eyes to the danger in our midst occasioned by the indiscriminate distribution and use of these articles.

There cannot be any two opinions as to what the use of these things leads to. Undoubtedly it leads to race suicide, and that is something which Australia cannot afford to indulge in. To my mind, the use of contraceptives is practically legalised vice. A little while ago I read that in 1924 the National Birthrate Commission of Great Britain discussed this important matter, and appointed a committee consisting of representatives of medicine, public health, education, sociology and religion, over which the Bishop of Winchester presided, to investigate further the ethical aspects of birth-control. The committee reported on the 25th May. I realise that the provisions of the Bill do not permit of a general discussion of the subject of birth-control, but the word "contraceptive" certainly postulates the other, and it is impossible to discuss the matter properly with only a passing reference. However, this is an extract from the committee's report—

The ideal method of birth-control is self-control. Such self-control must be agreed upon by husband and wife and be carried out in a spirit of service and sacrifice. Therefore, so far from giving any general approval to the use of contraceptives, the line of real advance lies in a deeper reverence, a return to greater simplicity of life, and, not least, a drastic reformation of our social and economic conditions.

This, to my mind, sums up the position concisely and correctly, and indicates the proper approach to this very important and delicate subject. That portion of the report emphasises the true aspect of the question, the moral as well as the economic. It deals also with the spiritual and natural sides. We cannot ignore the question of population and its

bearing on the defence of Australia. With the indulgence of the House I will quote some figures to give members an idea of the dangerous position we are in as regards natural increase of population. The figures refer to Victoria, and are up to 1938, that being as far as I have been able to go. To keep Australia's population stationary, the average Australian family should contain four children. It actually contains an average of slightly over two. In 1881 every 1,000 married women mothered 320 children; in 1911 the figure was 236; in 1933 it was 196. In 1872 the birth rate in Victoria was 36 per 1,000 citizens; in 1926 it was 15 per thousand. In 1871 42 per cent. of the population was under 15 years of age; and in 1936, 27 per cent was under 15 years of age. With an increasing population all our vast pioneering capital expenditure, the cost of our roads, railways, government and private undertakings would have been spread over a larger number of people. The per capita cost would have been less. To import English migrants will not solve the population problem, because the English birth rate is 14.4, which is lower than our own. The lowered birth rate in England has recently occupied the serious attention of the House of Commons. Whilst other countries are increasing their birthrate, we are committing race suicide. I have here figures taken from the "Sunday Times," referring to Western Australia in 1938.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is getting rather wide of the Bill.

Mr. NEEDHAM: If you, Mr. Speaker, say I cannot quote figures in connection with this matter, I must bow to your ruling.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith. Do you think the population would increase if contraceptives were not advertised?

Mr. NEEDHAM: We cannot separate population from progress.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should show cause why these things should not be advertised.

Mr. NEEDHAM: If you, Mr. Speaker, object to any further quotations, I will go no further. Perhaps I have given sufficient figures to show that something must be done to prevent this evil. When addressing members of the Kindergarten Union a little while ago, Professor Cameron pointed out the necessity for increasing our population. I wish to emphasise that if legislation of this nature is not passed,

instead of our population increasing naturally it will undoubtedly decrease. The evil must be stopped. The more we consider it the more proof is given to us of the necessity for action. Although the Bill does not go as far as I should like, I support it wholeheartedly and hope it will become law. Since the measure was introduced I wrote to the Governments of Tasmania, New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia to ascertain whether legislation of this nature had been introduced there, and, if not, whether the respective Governments intended to do so. Up to now I have received a reply from New South Wales only. The letter from the Chief Secretary of the New South Wales Government is as follows:—

In response to the inquiry contained in your letter of the 15th inst. I have much pleasure in forwarding copy of the Obscene and Indecent Publications Act, 1901, in force in this State. Your attention is invited to the definitions of "obscene publication" and "indecent advertisement"—Section 3. It may be mentioned that considerable difficulty has been experienced in proving that literature comes within the meaning of the definitions, and at the present time consideration is being given to the question of amending the Act by adding to the end of Section 3, after the word "operation," the words "or to the use, distribution or sale of contraceptives for the purpose of birth control."

It will be seen that if the measure now before the House becomes law, three States, Victoria, where legislation is already in existence, New South Wales, and this State will have taken steps to cope with the evil. I support the second reading.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [9.7]: The Minister is to be commended for bringing down this Bill. I was a member of several deputations that were referred to by the member for Perth (Mr. Needham). I have had considerable experience of life, but admit that the revelations made to the Minister by members of the deputation amazed me.

Mr. Cross: You always were innocent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: The Minister said the subject was a delicate one. I admit that; but there is such a thing as false modesty. We have a plain duty to perform. I can safely say that the blatant advertising of contraceptives constitutes a disgrace and is a reflection upon us. It certainly reduces the prestige of our newspapers to a degree that

is not very nice to speak about. Victoria has already passed legislation almost word for word with the Bill brought down. As the Minister explained, he went to the English Act for a few definitions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is no English Act.

Mr. BOYLE: The draft English measure. I understand that such legislation is proposed at Home. The whole object of the Bill, I take it, is to prevent what one may term an impudent and nationally destructive form of business exploitation of youth. I say that advisedly. The Minister will remember that a reverend gentleman who was a member of a deputation that waited on him gave an instance where a youth of sixteen in one of our public schools had been formally appointed agent for an Eastern manufacturer of these rubber goods! He was working on commission in the expansion of this pernicious traffic.

Mr. Lambert: Is that proved to be a fact?

Mr. BOYLE: I think members will agree that when a reverend gentleman gives such an instance as something that actually occurred within his own knowledge, one does not question his bona fides. It is a shocking thing for any member to have to bring to the attention of the House. The business has now reached an extent that is nothing less than a public scandal. The deputations necessarily were of a private nature, but were none the less effective. They included two medical men, and representatives of every religious body in Western Australia. I have a great admiration for those representatives of the churches. They did not screen the position, nor did they seek refuge in false modesty. They spoke from their hearts, and moreover with a wide knowledge of the subject. Some of the things they said could not be repeated in any place whence they might reach the public. I have no intention of repeating them here. But the fact remains that whatever may be the causes to-day of Australia's declining birth rate, this vile traffic is an agent. The Minister said that the Bill had nothing to do with the birth rate. However, we cannot separate the cause from the effect. In Australia we have to-day a population of less than seven million people. We are today at war. Would we not be in a vastly different posi-

tion if the birth rate of 1901 had continued in like proportion until this year of grace? In 1901 the birth rate was considerably over 30 per thousand persons. In 1922-24 it was 25.15 per thousand. In 1937 it had fallen to 16.68. That represents an alarming drop in what should be the natural increase in a young country like Australia. Incidentally I may state that the Russian birth rate in 1937 was 49 per thousand, as against our 16.68.

Mr. Lambert: The Russians put their foot on the accelerator.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: I do not regard this as a subject for display of levity or facetiousness.

The Minister for Lands: Look at the different conditions. The last war contributed somewhat to the result.

Mr. BOYLE: Possibly that is so. I merely allude to the difference between the two birth rates. As the Minister for Lands has said, the last war may have had some effect; but that would hardly apply to the birth rate for 1932-34, when the war had been over for 14 years. Nor would it apply to the 1937 rate. Fortunately for us, in this regard the death rate of infants under one month has reached the lowest point in Australian medical history, 27 per thousand. That is a tribute, naturally, not to Australia but to sanitation and medical skill. I have no intention of proceeding with further statistics in the matter, but we have a duty to perform in this regard. The first step, as the Minister for Health explained, is to put a period to the business of exploitation of the disgraceful traffic in contraceptives. Those of us who represent country towns have had chemists coming to them and referring to the brazen effrontery of children of 15 or 16 entering their shops and asking for these things as if they were ordinary articles of merchandise. When the shame of approach to the subject is destroyed in youngsters, when we find the public Press putting forward these objects as something of a common merchandising nature, have we not broken down one of the safeguards of youth—fear of consequences? And that is the position to-day. One of the deputations of which I was a member included, I am glad to say, representatives of the Council of Chemists of Western Australia. I think the Minister will

agree with me that their support of this legislation was emphatic. Mr. Hugh Howling emphasised that the mother and the baby were a far better business asset to chemists than was the trade in these objectionable articles.

The Minister for Health: He does not stock them.

Mr. BOYLE: The three deputations on which I attended gave me a far better opinion of some of my fellow human beings, and gave me a horror of the easy way in which some of us holding responsible positions go about with our eyes shut on these questions. I am not lecturing the House, but laying bare my own delinquencies in connection with the subject. We see these advertisements, and make no effort whatever to stop them.

Mr. Raphael: How can we stop them, anyhow?

Mr. BOYLE: I am surprised at the interjection from the member for Victoria Park.

Mr. Raphael: They cannot be stopped without a measure such as this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: We can stop the advertising of them, and that is what the Bill aims at. We are told that matter printed in the Eastern States on this subject comes into Western Australia without let or hindrance. Western Australia even now has the power to stop the distribution of such printed matter. For my part, if there is one thing the Government has done that meets with my unqualified approbation, it is the bringing down of this Bill.

On motion by Mr. Lambert, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.19 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 6th September, 1939.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	518
Question: War time legislation, export prohibition and price control	518
Bills: Traffic Act Amendment, 1R.	518
Builders' Registration, 2A.	527
Hire-Purchase Agreements Act Amendment, 2A.	529
Rural Relief Act Amendment, 2B.	534
Motions: Unemployed, homes, building materials and land allotments	519
Health Act, to disallow by-law	525
Traffic Act, to disallow regulation	526
Milk, daily rations for school children	538
Stock Diseases Act, to disallow regulations	544
Obituary: Mr. E. A. McLarty	546

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Supply Bill (No. 1) £2,500,000.

QUESTION—WAR TIME LEGISLATION.

Export Prohibition and Price Control.

Mr. TRIAT asked the Premier: In view of the present disturbed conditions has the Government given consideration to the immediate introduction of legislation to provide—(a) That no Western Australian goods, foodstuffs or any article, manufactured or otherwise, be exported until local demands are first satisfied; (b) that prices of all goods, manufactured or otherwise, all foodstuffs, raw materials, metals, wools, clothing, oils, etc., be fixed and controlled, this to apply to all imported goods as well as to Western Australian products?

The DEPUTY PREMIER (for the Premier) replied: The Government has given consideration to the introduction of suitable legislation. The Hon. the Premier intends to discuss the matter at the conference of Premiers which is to be held in Canberra on Saturday next. Suitable emergency legislation is certain to be introduced immediately following the return of the Premier.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

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