

that the Electoral Department is not working satisfactorily in Western Australia on account of the starvation funds at the department's disposal. We talk of our shortage of money and the necessity for economy, and seeing that we can save more than £20,000 in the amalgamation of the State and Federal Taxation Departments, the point arises as to whether there should not be a similar amalgamation of the State and Federal Electoral Departments. The state of the rolls in the past has been something awful. On a previous occasion I mentioned that after the rolls had been cleaned up in one province, it was found that the names of 560 voters had to be deleted. The Minister for Works stated that something should happen in connection with the Electoral Department to alter this state of affairs. I think these items could well be cut out and an amalgamation effected. I know the Chief Electoral Officer is not responsible for the position because he has to depend upon clerks of courts and other officials for the information necessary to compile the rolls. These officials have so much to do that they cannot concentrate on electoral work, and the effect is seen in the Electoral Department. The Federal Electoral Department is up to date in my own district and the Federal officers seem to know all about the movements of people and are active in prosecuting those who fail to enrol. The Government would be well advised to consider this aspect, particularly in view of the fact that complaints are made from both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. MONEY: I endorse the remarks of the member for Kalgoorlie. A lot of confusion would be avoided if the qualifications for one roll were sufficient to guarantee enrolment on the other roll. The amalgamation could be effected and the department could do the rest. When an elector has lodged a claim with one department, and it is a valid one, that elector should be placed on the other roll as well.

The Premier: I agree with that.

4 o'clock a.m.

Mr. A. Thomson: Are the Government taking any steps in connection with this matter?

The PREMIER: We have been looking into this matter for some time past. It is a difficult question to deal with. As a matter of fact, the expenditure in connection with the State Electoral Department is not large, but it is essential that that department should be kept in order. The rolls are not in the condition that they should be.

Item, Registration of Titles and Deeds, £636:

Mr. MONEY: I am not certain that the Government are fully aware of the want of space and added safety in connection with the Titles Office.

The Premier: Yes, the Government fully recognise the position and it is receiving attention now.

Mr. MONEY: This is a very important matter because the whole of the titles belonging to the people of Western Australia are concentrated in the present office and the condition of affairs there is one of danger.

The Premier: Increased accommodation is being provided now.

Item, Leave on retirement of officers, £1,750:

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: This seems to be a very large amount for leave to officers on retirement.

The PREMIER: More officers have been retiring this year than, perhaps, at any other time before. That in itself explains the greater part of the increase.

Vote put and passed.

This completed the Estimates of the Minister for Justice.

Department of Colonial Secretary (Hon. F. T. Broun, Minister).

Votes—Office of Colonial Secretary, £12,572; Aborigines, £5,927—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned 4.8 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 24th November, 1921.

	Page
Question: Soldier Settlement	1896
Bills: Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 38.	
Gold Buyers, 3A.	1897
Mining Act Amendment, 3A., passed	1897
Constitution Act Amendment, Com.	1897
Local Courts Act Amendment, Assembly's Amendment	1897
Permanent Reserve (Point Walter), Assembly's Modification	1897
Auctioneers, 2A.	1902
Resolution: Federation and the State, Proposed National Convention Bill	1900

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

QUESTION—SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many returned soldiers have been settled under the soldiers' settlement scheme in the following districts:—Quellageting, Hindmarsh, Yorkkraine, North

Baandes? 2, How many are settled outside a 12-mile radius of existing railways? 3, Is it the intention of the Government to extend existing railway facilities in these districts; if so, when?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The localities quoted are not districts with specific boundaries. The number of soldiers settled under the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act between the Eastern Goldfields and Dowerin-Merredin Railways is 119. 2, Twenty-nine of the soldier settlers referred to in (1) are outside a 12-mile radius of existing railways. 3, (a) Yes; (b) I cannot say. Costs of construction are too high at present.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1, Factories and Shops Act Amendment.

2, Gold Buyers.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

3, Mining Act Amendment.

Passed.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Repeal of Sections 66 and 67 of 52 Vict., No. 23, and Section 46 of 63 Vict., No. 19, and substitution of new provisions:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Hon members will recollect that this Bill was referred to a select committee, and that the select committee's report is as follows:—

Your committee has held two meetings, and has taken the opportunity of consulting the Hon. the President on the provisions of the Bill. As there appears to be no reasonable ground for the insertion of Subclause 5 of Clause 2, your committee recommends that the Bill be passed subject to such subclause being struck out.

With that subclause struck out, the Bill will be of advantage to the conduct of business. The Council will then be able to deal with such measures as the Nurses Registration Bill and the Stallions Bill without its being alleged that they are money Bills. If, however, the subclause is not struck out, we shall leave ourselves in the position of being able to deal with third class and fourth class measures while having sacrificed our present rights with regard to measures of first class importance, such as tax Bills and loan Bills. If the subclause remains in, then, although we can suggest an amendment, we cannot press it, or insist upon it; and that would not be in the best interests of this Chamber. We ought to be in a position to press a request we make, and, if that pressure is not yielded to, we should be able to seek a conference and discuss the matter with mem-

bers of another place, and so arrive at a conclusion in the best interests of the country. If the subclause is retained, we shall have no alternative but to pass a Bill without the requested amendment, or to shelve the Bill; and either course might be disastrous to the country. I move an amendment—

That Subsection 5 of proposed Section 46 be struck out.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendment.

An amendment made by the Assembly in the Bill now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3, add the following words:—47b. (1) Where the claim in any action is for an unliquidated demand or damages or other relief, and the defendant has given notice of his intention to defend same, the plaintiff may, by summons returnable to the chamber of the magistrates, apply for an order that the defendant furnish the particulars of his grounds for defence within the time named in such order. (2.) Should the defendant, without reasonable cause, neglect to supply particulars of his grounds of defence, he shall be liable to pay the plaintiff's costs of the proceedings in any event. (3.) The defendant may at any time before judgment amend his grounds of defence upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as the magistrate may order:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to. I have gone into the matter fully with the Crown Law authorities, and they say there are circumstances in which the amendment will facilitate the course of justice, and they see no objection to it.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have pleasure in supporting the remarks of the Leader of the House. Having gone into the matter carefully, I think the Assembly's amendment is advantageous.

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

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVE (POINT WALTER).

Assembly's Modification.

A modification by the Assembly of an amendment made by the Council in the Bill now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Council's amendment, Clause 2, add the following proviso:—"Provided that this power to lease shall not extend to any portion of the reserve within one hundred yards of the foreshore":

Assembly's modification, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert the word "fifty" in lieu thereof:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the Assembly's modification be agreed to.

It appears that some of the buildings already existing at Point Walter are within 100 yards of the foreshore. Consequently, to insist upon the amendment in the form in which it left this House would necessitate their removal, and certainly would not convenience the public. This is not a case of the alienation of any portion of a public reserve. It is simply an endeavour on the part of those looking after the reserve to make it serve the convenience of the public. So long as an area of 50 yards from the foreshore is maintained free of buildings, it should be sufficient.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: We decided that any new refreshment room should be at least 100 yards from the foreshore. I agree that there are existing refreshment rooms within 100 yards of the foreshore, and that if we were to insist on our amendment it might entail the removal of those buildings. Although within 100 yards, those buildings are well beyond 50 yards from the foreshore, and so I think the proposed 50 yards is too short a distance. I move an amendment on the Assembly's modification—

That "fifty yards" be deleted and "three chains" inserted in lieu.

Personally I think we should still keep it at 100 yards, for we have to look a few years ahead; but in view of the fact that the existing buildings are only about 75 yards from the foreshore, I agree that perhaps three chains will meet the case.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I regard 50 yards as a reasonable compromise. We should support the local authority which has done so much to beautify that reserve. In any case, the lease is only for five years, after which the Minister can intervene.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Will it be a temporary building?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: All the buildings there are more or less temporary. The local authority have spent a considerable sum of money on the reserve, and so have a burden of interest and sinking fund to carry. We should hesitate before depriving them of the rent they will get from the proposed lease.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I want to see the building erected on the one alignment with those already in position; because the

people who are leasing the existing buildings ought to be considered.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The issue as between the local authority and this Committee is for metropolitan members to consider, but the principle at stake, namely the preservation of the foreshore, is one for all members. The people who propose to erect the new building are not so much concerned about its distance from the foreshore as about its precise site; they will try to plant their structure in front of those already there. I should like to see the foreshore preserved for 100 yards back, but I agree that Mr. Baglin's amendment is a fair compromise.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: When last the Bill was before us, Mr. Baglin warmly repudiated the suggestion that the Committee was asked to concern itself with the interests of certain people already at Point Walter. Now Mr. Duffell frankly confesses that he is concerned over that very question. Of course, that question has nothing to do with the Committee; it is one for the local authority. Mr. Duffell wants us to consider the alignment. But it is a tortuous coast-line down there and, in addition, there are big trees in the way of the alignment. I have gone thoroughly into the plan, and I agree that the site selected is a reasonable one. We should show some confidence in the local authority. I am satisfied that the members of the Melville Road Board can safely be entrusted with the work of looking after this reserve. They say, "We need additional refreshment room accommodation for the public. We have considered all the matters connected with the place, and this is the situation we regard as best and most suitable for a refreshment room, and we cannot put it up there if we have to go back more than a certain distance from the water's edge." They do not want to encroach upon places that are more suitable as playgrounds.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: This local governing body has spent a large sum of money upon the reserve. It has become over-anxious because it received a larger offer in the way of rent for this particular site than in other cases. I see no desire on its part to save the trees that are growing on the reserve. That does not enter into the calculation.

The Minister for Education: They have specifically told me that it does.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I do not doubt the statement of the Leader of the House. The buildings could be put on an alignment with those already in existence and no harm would be done to anyone, although the road board might not get so much rent as they otherwise would get. It is not desirable to allow buildings to be erected if they will interfere with the pleasure grounds of the people.

Hon. T. MOORE: I have recently visited Point Walter, and think it would be a mistake to allow the Bill to go through as amended in another place. Once the precedent is established, it will be used in an attempt to

make it apply to other parts of the river. On the other side of the Swan the foreshore has in many parts been sold to private individuals, and it is impossible to get along the beaches. Surely the public are entitled to have a reserve of three chains along the Swan River if it is possible to give it to them.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There is only a difference of 16 yards between the two parties in the Chamber interested in this matter. When people give their time and attention to looking after these reserves in the interests of the public, they are entitled to consideration at our hands. I support the proposal, and would have supported the original proposal.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I do not wish to do any injustice to the Melville Road Board, but that local authority has made mistakes in the past. The first request was for permission to erect a building on the river's edge, and it was intended to destroy 50 or 60 trees in carrying out the work.

The Minister for Education: It was not intended to put the building on the foreshore.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: What was intended? The buildings already erected are too close to the foreshore. But for that, I should have endeavoured to secure a reserve of 100 yards in depth. If the 50 yards reserve is permitted, it will establish that distance as a precedent for the establishment of similar reserves elsewhere. These tea rooms are generally used by people who spend the whole day at Point Walter, and it will not affect them if they have to walk a few yards from the foreshore to obtain refreshments.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: The difference is so small that I am largely tempted to vote for the amendment, though I cannot take the responsibility of going against the recommendation of the local authority. Because of the efforts of the road board to develop this place in the interests of the public, I think their views must be respected. A depth of 50 yards from the high-water mark provides a large playground for recreation purposes. The lease is only for five years; the building is only to be of a temporary nature, and I have come to the conclusion that we should be guided by the desires of the local authority.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: While I would be loth to thwart the efforts of a body such as the Melville Road Board, who have charge of the administration of the Point Walter Reserve, I consider that 50 yards is a very small distance to agree to. There does not appear to be any very great urgency about the Bill, and if we reported progress, I would ask members to inspect the site. We could go down by launch at the week-end and see for ourselves what the position really is. By this means, we could come to a decision which would be in the best interests of the general public. I do not know whether there is anything in the suggestion that there is a motive behind this—a motive that is not apparent to members—but I do not attach any great

importance to the question of the lease being one for five years. I consider that if the lease is granted for five years, it is practically granted for all time.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is a considerable amount of urgency about this matter. The summer is upon us now and these people want to get to work. As a matter of principle, I object to taking the control of concerns of this sort out of the hands of the local authorities. As for members of this House making an inspection, we could easily carry that principle to a ridiculous extent. It must be remembered that the board can only act in such a manner as this, in accordance with the approval of the Governor in Council. I consulted with the officers who would have to deal with questions such as sites along the foreshore, and I am assured that it was never the intention of those officers to allow buildings to be erected right on the foreshore.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The question to be decided is how far buildings should be erected from the foreshore. It is said that the lease is for five years, but I agree with Mr. Lovekin that once a lease is granted, it is more than likely that the lease will continue.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It could always be cancelled if it interfered with the interests of the public.

Hon. J. CORNELL: This question does not only affect Point Walter. We cannot logically refuse to grant a lease for the erection of a building under similar circumstances along the river foreshore in other parts, if we agree to this proposal. I would like to see the buildings farther back from the river. If it is a question of making people walk a greater distance, let the people who want spot lager walk up the hill.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I am sorry the question of preference to different types of traders has been introduced. Mr. Cornell has suggested that those who want certain refreshments should walk up the hill. It should be remembered that perhaps 75 per cent. of the people who visit Point Walter will arrive on the grounds at the top of the hill.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: And they will immediately go down to the water's edge.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Probably, but what right have we to interfere with the people who have interests there?

Hon. J. CORNELL: But we are interfering with the rights of the people as a whole.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: On the contrary, if the suggestion of other members were agreed to, the effect would be that they would have buildings erected up the hill where the beauty of the spot really is, and people would have to walk down lanes between shops to get to the water's edge.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Not at all. That is what you would bring about.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Mr. Duffell does not know what he is talking about. He knows as much about this as a cow does about a sideboard.

Hon. J. Duffell: On a point of order, I object to the hon. member speaking of me in that manner.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Point Walter is within my Province. I would not presume to argue with Mr. Duffell on the question relating to one of those lakes in the metropolitan-suburban areas, the names of which I do not know. Mr. Duffell, however, is an expert. He knows exactly the spot where these buildings should be erected and how many people will go there.

Hon. J. Duffell: I know just as well as you do.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Exactly!

Hon. J. Duffell: If this can be killed, you will kill it.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: If I looked to Mr. Duffell to get support it would be no good to anyone. Why draw in this question of other interests; it has nothing to do with the Bill? After twenty years' experience with the Melville Road Board, I can assure the Committee that that body is one of the most energetic among the local authorities.

Hon. J. Duffell: We do not doubt that.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: The board has shown great enterprise in its tramways and lighting system. They spend in water alone, on their reserve, between £200 and £300 a year. It is purely an honorary board. The reserve is controlled by a committee who give the grounds their personal attention every day. Representatives of the committee are there every night and on every holiday and they know exactly what is in the best interests of the reserve and of the people who patronise it. Yet we have some members here who can say what is in the best interests of the people far better than those who give the reserve their daily attention. The lease is for five years and if at any time the Governor in Council desires to terminate it, on the ground that the lease is not in the best interests of the public, it can be terminated without compensation. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I agree that there is no necessity to raise the question as to the interests of the different traders. The question involved is the principle governing the distance from the foreshore that shall be reserved for the people. I discussed this matter with two members of the Melville Road Board yesterday and they took me to task for supporting a distance of 100 yards. They gave me a guarantee that even 50 yards would force buildings up the hill. If we fix the distance at 50 yards, the bathing sheds will have to be removed. I was given a definite assurance that no buildings would be erected on the foreshore. I am concerned about the policy for the future, and I intend to support 66 yards, which is little enough for the purpose.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: My remarks previously were based on the statement by Mr. Lynn when the question was last before the Committee, that unless the building could be erected within 100 feet of the foreshore, it

would not be constructed at all. It is our duty to see that as much as possible of the foreshore is reserved. Three chains is little enough.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am concerned regarding the future aspect. I hope that some day there will be tree-planted roads on both sides of the river to Fremantle, and for this purpose three chains would be little enough.

Amendment on the Assembly's modification put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	11

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamerley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. R. J. Lynn	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived; the Assembly's modification agreed to.

Resolution reported.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: To give members an opportunity to visit the reserve, I move an amendment—

That the consideration of the report be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Amendment put and negatived.

Report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

RESOLUTION—FEDERATION AND THE STATE.

Proposed National Convention.

Message from the Assembly received and read desiring the Council's concurrence in the following resolution:—

That this Parliament is of opinion that the Bill to make provision for the National Convention for the purpose of a revision of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament, is unreasonable in its provisions, and that this Parliament is further of the opinion that any convention to revise the Commonwealth Constitution should consist of an equal number of representatives of each State.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.42]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Assembly's Message to be taken into consideration during the present sitting of the House.

I move this motion because the Premier in another place thought it desirable to suspend the Standing Orders there and get the motion passed. The motion was passed at once with the ready consent of all sections of that House. I think it will be preferable that the protest from the Parliament of Western Australia be made immediate and emphatic, rather than that the matter should be extended until the next sitting of the House.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: There being 16 members present, I declare the motion carried by the requisite majority.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.43]: I do not intend to unduly delay the House in moving the adoption of the resolution. The position is plain and simple. We entered into a Federation which was an equal partnership of the self-governing States. That is expressed, not only through the debates of the different conventions, but in the Constitution of the Commonwealth itself. The conventions which framed the Constitution were in all cases composed of an equal number of delegates from each of the States, in recognition of the principle that it was to be an equal partnership between the self-governing States. The Constitution preserved that principle by conceding two Houses of Parliament, in one of which every State should have equal representation. The effect of this was that no law should be passed by the Parliament of the Commonwealth unless it had obtained the consent and approval of the Chamber in which all the States were equally represented. The Constitution further preserved that principle by providing that no amendment of the Constitution should be carried, unless it had received the endorsement of a majority of the States in addition to the endorsement of a majority of the people of the Commonwealth. In every respect, therefore, the Commonwealth establishes and preserves the principle of an equal partnership of all the self-governing States. The proposed convention is to be on this basis, that each State shall elect the same number of representatives it now elects to the House of Representatives. This would give New South Wales 27 members, Victoria 21 members, Queensland 10 members, South Australia seven members, and Western Australia and Tasmania five members each. In addition it is provided that the Parliament of each State shall elect three members, and that the Senate of the Commonwealth

shall elect six members, and that the House of Representatives shall elect 12 members. This would serve to increase the disproportion between the representation of the small States and that of the large States, because an additional 12 members would be elected by the House in which the two large States have predominant voices. The result would be that out of 111 members, the two largest States would have 68 odd members, and the four smaller States 43 members. That would destroy entirely the basic principle of the Federation, and I think we are entitled to enter an immediate and emphatic protest. We are in a partnership; we are entitled to protest against a breach of a fundamental principle of that partnership, and it is that on these matters of dealing with the Constitution the States shall have equal rights. I move—

That this Parliament is of opinion that the Bill to make provision for the National Convention for the purpose of a revision of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament, is unreasonable in its provisions and that this Parliament is further of the opinion that any Convention to revise the Commonwealth Constitution should consist of an equal number of representatives of each State.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [5.48]: I desire to second the motion moved by the Leader of the House, and I congratulate the Government on taking such prompt action. We are grateful indeed for that because Western Australia would be placed in a very bad position so far as the proposed constitution of the Convention is concerned. I feel very keenly on this matter, but I am afraid that little can be gained by giving expression to one's opinions at the present time. I cordially endorse the views so clearly enunciated by the Leader of the House. We at least expected to be given fair representation at the Convention, but in view of what is proposed, or if it is intended to carry out the present arrangement, I doubt whether Western Australia will be represented at all. It is going to be a burning question in Australia and we look to the Prime Minister to deal with it in a more statesmanlike manner than he has done. Western Australia has been most unfairly treated, and while I feel that the present may not be the time to say too much, I trust that influence may be brought to bear on our representatives in the Commonwealth Parliament so that the constitution of the Conference will not be such as to destroy the prestige of Australia. I sincerely hope that the emphatic protest made so promptly by the Premier and his Government will bear good fruit.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [5.50]: The people of Western Australia generally will be extremely disappointed with the proposals that have been made by the

Prime Minister in connection with the suggested Federal Convention, and whatever differences may exist as to the form the amendments to the Federal Constitution should take, everyone must be agreed that at the Federal Convention the sovereignty of the States should be recognised. So long as Federation exists, the States have a perfect right to claim equality of representation, and if any convention be ultimately formed in which the equality of the States in the matter of representation is not regarded, the decision arrived at at the Convention will go before the people, a large number of whom will be prejudiced against us. If, on the other hand, the Convention be on the basis of the Convention that originally framed the Commonwealth Constitution, that is, the basis of equality of representation of the States, whatever amendments may be suggested by that Convention will go before the States which will view those amendments in a sympathetic way, inasmuch as it will be felt that there has been no departure whatever from the original idea under which the States joined in the Federation. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the proposal that has been brought forward, and join with Mr. Ewing in congratulating the Government on taking the prompt action that they have done to protest against the proposals of the Prime Minister.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [5.52]: I endorse the action which has been taken by the Government, but I realise at the same time that it is only necessary to support that action very briefly. However we may differ in connection with the policy of the Government, if there is one thing we are unanimous upon, it is that we have never had a fair deal from the Federal Government. The feeling is fairly unanimous throughout Australia that there has been a distinct breach of faith on the part of the Federal Government towards the smaller States. In South Australia the Government are taking similar action, and the Tasmanian Government are doing likewise. I would have been surprised if a motion of this kind had not been brought forward by the Leader of the House this afternoon. Personally I am satisfied that it will have the unanimous support of all sections of the community because, however much we may disagree with the policy of the State Government, we agree that we must fight for our rights, because Western Australia has been ostracised by the Federal Government. In discussing the question of the new States movement, it has been practically promised that all the States would have equal representation at the Conference, and I know throughout the length and breadth of Australia, the different people who have advocated this movement have been assured that in connection with any convention to be held for the purpose of bringing about an alteration of the Constitution in that

direction, all the States would have equal representation. That has been understood if not actually promised. We would be lacking in our duty if we did not enter an emphatic protest and did not join with the other smaller States who also are fighting for their rights. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion and I feel satisfied that it will be carried without a dissentient voice.

Question put and passed.

BILL—AUCTIONEERS.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.55] in moving the second reading said: The Bill repeals the Auctioneers Acts of 1873, 1881, and 1897 and re-enacts the law in a consolidated form with a few necessary amendments. Members are aware that under the Auctioneers Act there are three classes of licenses, a general license, a country license, and a district license. The fees for these licenses are £25, £15, and £5 respectively. It is not intended to make any alteration in that regard. The general license covers the whole State. The country license applies to the whole State with the exception of Perth and Fremantle, and the district license has effect only within the magisterial district named therein, any part of the city of Perth and the municipal district of Fremantle being excluded. It will be desirable to make a small amendment arising out of the fact that since the greater Perth scheme was established, the old position has been somewhat altered. An anomaly has been created in that a person may hold a license to sell by auction in Subiaco under more advantageous terms than in the neighbouring suburb of Lederville. The main amendment proposed is that a person wishing to obtain a license must apply for a certificate to the resident magistrate for the magisterial district in which he resides. He must satisfy the magistrate that he is a fit and proper person to hold such a license. The application is to be heard in public and may be opposed by any objector, but the objector must give notice of his intention. The magistrate is given power to award costs to either the applicant or the objector. On the granting of a certificate the license will be issued by the Treasury on the payment of the prescribed fee. Licenses are to be issued annually on the 31st December, and provision is made that when a license is taken out in the latter part of the year the fee shall only apply to that proportion of the year. Provision is also made for the transfer of licenses by endorsement on application to the resident magistrate and on the payment of a fee of £1, and for the issue of temporary licenses to enable an auctioneer to act by his deputy in case of illness or other sufficient cause. The Bill otherwise substantially re-enacts the existing law. Since the Bill

passed another place it has been subjected to close scrutiny by auctioneering firms and others, and it has been found that there are one or two provisions that need to be inserted. For instance, it is intended to re-enact the old provisions for holding auction sales at night. The sale by auction of wool in Western Australia is likely to become an important matter, and it is customary to hold these sales at night. There is also need for some provision for auctioneers to act on behalf of firms. When the second reading is carried I shall place on the Notice Paper the several amendments I have indicated and which have arisen chiefly out of the close scrutiny of the Bill by auctioneering firms and others since the Bill was first brought in. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [6.0]: I have given the Bill a good deal of attention and from the number of amendments which the Leader of the House proposes to move, I am surprised that the Treasurer, when he introduced the measure in another place, did not secure the opinions of those interested in the business, to a greater extent than he did. Several amendments are to be submitted so that the Bill may be made more workable. These amendments I will not go into now, especially as they have been to some extent adverted to by the Leader of the House. But, generally, I think the Bill will be a good one by the time it is finished. Without going into further details, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

House adjourned at 6.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 24th November, 1921.

	Page
Questions: Rates, payment at mills	1903
Aboriginal prisoners, employment	1903
Water Supply, Mt. Monger	1904
Retrenchment and economy	1904
Railways—1. Shunter's death at Merredin;	
2. Coal boxes shortage	1904
Turtles, exclusive right to capture	1905
Select Committee: Hospital Bill, publication of proceedings	1905
Motion: Federation and the State, proposed National Convention	1905
Bills: Inspection of Machinery, returned	1905
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, returned	1905
Gold Buyers, returned	1905
Mining Act Amendment, returned	1905
Grain, report	1909
Dredging License, 2s.	1919
Annual Estimates: Colonial Secretary's Department; Minister for North-West, Public Utilities	1913

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

QUESTION—RATES, PAYMENT AT MILLS.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the Murray Road Board has levied rates on the occupiers of the cottages at the railway mill at Dwellingup, 2, Is it a fact that similar rates levied at Holyoake have been paid by the State Sawmills Department? 3, Is he aware that the whole of the rates levied at Pemberton and Manjimup Sawmills are paid by the State Sawmills Department? 4, As the provision of cottages and huts is a condition of employment and such rates are paid by all private sawmillers, will the Minister make the necessary provision?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, Yes. 2, No, but an agreement has been recently made to pay on cottages from which revenue is derived. 3, Yes, on cottages from which revenue is derived. 4, The provision of cottages and huts is not a condition of employment inasmuch as occupation is optional to employees. Arrangements have been made to pay the rates on cottages from which revenue is derived.

QUESTION—ABORIGINAL PRISONERS, EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is he aware that the road board at Broome is employing aboriginal prison labour for the construction of a water pipe line at Broome where there is ample white labour available? 2, Is this in accord with the Government's policy? 3, In any case, will he give instructions for discontinuance of the employment of prisoners while men are seeking employment?