

suggested that the private companies should be debarred from doing the work.

Mr. Latham: That is not so.

The PREMIER: That was the effect of the recommendation.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, that was the meaning of the recommendation.

The PREMIER: I interpret that as recommending a monopoly, so that the companies would have no chance of getting the business.

Mr. Angelo: I am in favour of the civil servants having their own provident fund, but that is not a monopoly.

Mr. Davy: What the committee suggested was not to engage in the insurance business out to cover their own risks.

The PREMIER: And that is a monopoly. No company was to undertake the work; it was to be left to the Industries Assistance Board.

Mr. Davy: Yes, to take their own risks.

The PREMIER: And take that work from the private companies. When the select committee made that recommendation they must have come to the conclusion that the Government could render a better service at less cost than that of the insurance companies. That could be the only object of such a recommendation, and that supports my contention that the Government render cheaper service than the private companies.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not necessarily.

The PREMIER: If the report of the select committee had been adopted, it would have meant since 1915 a saving of about £140,000 to the farmers throughout the State.

Mr. Sampson: It is a dangerous thing for the Government to take away one's business.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, we have a printing establishment.

The PREMIER: Why have any Government institutions at all? All work of various descriptions is done by the Government that can also be done by private enterprise. There are in the city and in the country private establishments that could carry out all the services now being performed by the Government. If there is one business the State could enter into with less risk of loss than in any other, it is insurance. It is not like embarking on the business of shipping or of implement making or of brick making, where we are subject to all the fluctuations in prices; insurance business, after all, is merely a matter of actuarial calculation and it carries less risk than, possibly, any other

business upon which the State could embark. The premiums can be fixed at an amount that will cover the risk. State insurance wherever tried has shown a substantial margin for reserve, and that at a considerably lower cost than that at which the insurance companies have been able to do it. I hope members will allow the clause to stand, for it is essential if we are going to give the cheapest possible service to the people of the State.

Mr. DAVY: I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I move an amendment—

That all words after "by," in line four, be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"deleting the words 'approved by the Minister' and adding after the word 'office' the words 'or the State Government insurance office.'"

That will leave the business free for competition in the ordinary way.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 28th September, 1926.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bills ... ..	1148
Questions: Sanatorium unfenced grounds ... ..	1148
War relief funds ... ..	1148
Papers: Repurchased estate, Cummlin ... ..	1148
Bills: State Insurance, message ... ..	1148
Traffic Act Amendment, 38 ... ..	1148
Broome Loan Validation, 28., Com. Report ... ..	1148
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 28., Com., Report ... ..	1151
Co-operative and Provident Societies Act Amendment, 28., Com. Report ... ..	1150
Shipping Ordinance Amendment, 28., Com. Report ... ..	1150
Reserves, 28., Com. ... ..	1157
Metropolitan Market, Com. ... ..	1170

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS.**

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

- 1, Supply (No. 2), £831,000.
- 2, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment.
- 3, Trust Funds Investment Act Amendment.
- 4, Wyalcatchem Rates Validation.

**QUESTION—SANATORIUM, UNFENCED GROUNDS.**

Mr. SAMPSON asked Hon. J. Cunningham (Honorary Minister): 1, Is it suggested that "certain rearrangements to tuberculous cases," mentioned by him in answer to a question on the 21st September, would affect the need for fencing the Sanatorium? 2, Will he have inquiries made whether the annoyance caused by straying horses is likely to prove prejudicial to the health of patients? 3, Is the fence to be erected, and if so, when?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM replied: 1, Yes. The proposed rearrangement will result in certain wards of the institution being unoccupied, but at present it is impossible to say which wards will be affected. 2 and 3, Stray horses are not a serious nuisance to patients. The conditions regarding fencing are identical with those which have existed since the institution was opened; the fencing referred to is desirable, but cannot be regarded as urgent, and the impending changes referred to in the answer to Question 1, indicate that the matter can be more advantageously dealt with at a later stage.

Mr. Sampson: Some of the patients complain very bitterly about it.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The conditions are just the same as when you were administering the department.

The Premier: Yes, it is one of the things you ask about after leaving office, and did not do when you were in office.

Mr. Sampson: You cannot show any reference to it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Members opposite were in office prior to that again.

**QUESTION—WAR RELIEF FUNDS.**

Mr. WILSON asked the Premier: Do the Government intend to introduce this session a Bill dealing with surplus war relief funds?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

**BILL—STATE INSURANCE.***Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

**PAPERS—REPURCHASED ESTATE, CUMMININ.**

On motion by the Minister for Lands resolved:

That the papers laid on the Table of the House on the 1st September dealing with the Cumminin Estate be discharged.

**BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.**

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—BROOME LOAN VALIDATION.***Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is similar to measures that have been introduced session after session for some years to validate the actions of road boards that have taken certain steps without strictly complying with the law. The Broome Road Board desired to raise £10,000 to instal electric lighting plant in the town. All the advertising was done in accordance with the law, and the people most concerned were well advised of the intentions of the board. The Government have lent the board £5,000, the local people have raised £2,000, and the Western Australian Bank are to advance £3,000. Owing to the board not having strictly complied with the law, the bank authorities have refused to advance the £3,000 until Parliament has passed a validating Bill. Although notice to borrow was given and advertised in the correct forms in the "Government Gazette" and the local newspaper, no special order to borrow was issued. Such a resolution should have been carried by the board and should have appeared in the minutes. Further, the board within not less than one month or more than three months should have carried a motion adopting the proposition. That was not done and it is now too late to comply with that requirement. There was a further fault

that the advertisement stated that the loan would be spread over 30 years whereas the road board are issuing 15-year debentures.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Have some of the debentures been issued for 30 years?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, all of them are 15-year debentures. The board are committed to the expenditure and the plant has been ordered, and it was only when the board called upon the bank to have their £3,000 available that this point was raised. Had it not been for the difference in the term of the debentures, I do not think the other two points would have been raised, because they are merely formal. There is no doubt that the board acted in good faith, but when they issued 15-year instead of 30-year debentures, the bank took exception.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A very important point, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Bill seems to infer that some of the debentures have been issued for 30 years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have paid over their £5,000.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: On a 30-year or a 15-year basis?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: On a 15-year basis. The local loan of £2,000 is also on a 15-year basis. They have got the £7,000, but it is in connection with the extra £3,000 they were to get from the bank that the completion of the arrangement has been held up. It cannot be argued that the position of anyone has been jeopardised, or that there is any likelihood of inflicting hardship upon anyone. It is only a question whether the local ratepayers may say that, because of the term of the loan being reduced to 15 years, they may have to pay a higher rate than they would have on a longer dated loan, and that this may mean higher taxation for them.

Hon. G. Taylor: Or else less money for working operations.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Is this for the water supply?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it is for electric light. That is the only phase of the question concerning which the interests of anyone would be likely to be jeopardised.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who made the request?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is the board's request. They urge that the Bill be passed quickly, because the work is hung up

at present. Everyone in Broome seems to be most enthusiastic about the installation of electric light.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They would be.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will be a great boon to the town to have its own electric light installation, and we are anxious that the people should be given these facilities. We have advanced our money, and the local people have raised theirs. It is now only a question of the extra £3,000 from the bank.

Hon. G. Taylor: Are they going on with the work?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, it is stopped pending the passing of this Bill. I am anxious to get the Bill through quickly so that the work may be completed. It cannot be said that anything has occurred that is prejudicial to the ratepayers. All the necessary publicity has been given to the arrangement; everyone knew what the board proposed to do, and no one has raised any objection. When I passed through Broome the local people were delighted at the prospect of having the electric light. They were looking forward to getting these conveniences, and I think we should do all we can to assist them in their endeavours. Local road boards cannot be expected to know everything connected with the law.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They cannot be expected to know more than the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Fortunately, the Minister had nothing to do with this. I am merely asking Parliament to validate the action of the board. Every session since I have been in Parliament it has been necessary to validate the action of some road board or local authority.

Hon. G. Taylor: And ever since I have been here, too.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The whole thing is quite clear. The two formal resolutions do not count for anything. It is just the point of the 15 years' term as against the 30 years for the debentures. As this arrangement seems to meet with the desires of the local authority, we should assist them in making it.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are giving them 15 years instead of 30.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Northam) [4.50]: I have no objection to offer to the passing of this Bill. I do think, however, it is a pity these mistakes are made.

The Minister for Lands: You know the old saying, that those who do something must make mistakes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad to support the Bill. I quite understand what a wonderful help it will be to the people of Broome to have their own electric lighting system, together with fans and other conveniences so necessary in a hot climate. We ought not to delay in helping Broome to get these conveniences. A period of 15 years is fairly long. We are always being asked to validate an act of some local authority. This is a slight error on the part of the Broome Road Board. I do not wonder at it. We have a habit of altering all our laws so frequently that it would be impossible for the people to know all that we pass in the Legislature. It is said that everyone is expected to know the law, lawyers excepted. If members of Parliament were asked about the laws that we have passed during the last two years, they would find some difficulty in remembering all those things the people are expected to know. It is little wonder that local authorities occasionally make mistakes.

**MR. COVERLEY** (Kimberley) [4.53]: I support the Bill. The specifications and full particulars of the proposed work were open for inspection at the office of the board. A statement of the proposed expenditure was contained in the file, although it was not specified in the public notice. There has been no query from the ratepayers of Broome, but they are all anxious to push on with the work. The plant is already ordered, and all is in readiness to proceed with the undertaking. The chairman of the road board was authorised to borrow the money, but acting on the advice of the electrician, who drew up fresh plans and specifications for the board, the debentures were made repayable in 15 years instead of 30. I do not think this makes any difference to the ratepayers. The sooner they have their obligations fulfilled, the better for them. I do not know that there is much to worry about in the Bill, which is merely one to validate a small error. We are continually passing Bills of this nature on behalf of local authorities. If people never make mistakes, they will never achieve anything.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mt. Margaret) [4.54]: The Minister has assured the House that whatever action was taken by the road board, it was not taken with a view to influencing the ratepayers in the direction of passing the necessary resolutions to put the loan on the market. The whole thing was an oversight. The Minister says the local authority did all they thought was necessary. The two mistakes that have been made are mistakes which might occur in the case of any board that was not at all fait with the road board Acts. I do think there is something rather peculiar about altering the period from 30 years to 15 years.

Mr. Latham: Without the consent of the ratepayers.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes. A long-dated loan would naturally cause people to think they would not be taxed so heavily as in the case of a short-dated loan. I accept the statement of the Minister, however, that this was done without any intention to influence the passing of the loan. If that is so, I am prepared to support the Bill. It would not be right for any local governing body, if it thought it had an unpopular proposition to put before the ratepayers, that it should gloss it over by not doing something which was absolutely necessary in accordance with the rules and regulations under which it was operating. I am satisfied, from what we have been told, that this was not so in the case of the Broome Road Board. If it were so I would oppose the Bill, because we should not permit local authorities to do that sort of thing any more than we should permit private individuals to do it. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Ratification of loan:

Mr. LATHAM: Is it Government money that is to be loaned for a period of 15 years, or bank money?

The Minister for Works: It is the Western Australian Bank money.

Mr. LATHAM: Then that was the longest period for which the bank was prepared to lend the money, and that was the reason for reducing the term?

The Minister for Works: It was done on the advice of the electrician.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The wording of this clause would seem to indicate that some portion of the £10,000 loan has been issued for a period of 30 years, and another portion for 15 years. It seems that the Government issue may be on the 30-years basis, and the bank issue on the 15-years basis.

Mr. MARSHALL: I read the clause to mean that some of the debentures have been issued for 15 years, and that others have not yet been issued; but that unless this Bill goes through, the people concerned will be permitted to issue debentures for 30 years instead of only 15.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## **BILL—INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 9th September.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [5.2]: This is a Bill to make perfectly plain what we thought we had made plain in the Bill of two years ago.

The Minister for Works: That is so.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There is nothing new in the Bill, nothing in it which was not intended to be in the Bill that was passed two years ago. We were badly advised on that Bill. The House believed, and I as one of the managers to discuss the measure with another place believed, that the provisions included in the present measure would not be necessary. We thought then that the horizontal base was where this Bill definitely declares it to be. Under this Bill there can be no misunderstanding on that point. I have an idea, however, that the effect of passing the Bill may be to make building more costly.

Mr. Thomson: That does not matter. It can be passed on.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: However, the measure will tend to greater safety for men engaged in building operations: and that is the object of Parliament. I am reminded, however, by the Leader of the Country Party that the extra cost can be passed on.

The Minister for Works: That was stated when last session's Bill was introduced.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And the extra cost has been passed on.

Mr. Thomson: Everything is passed on.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Everything can be passed on except in the case of one industry—gold mining. The gold mining industry cannot pass on increased costs. The cost of producing gold can be increased by raising the prices of certain commodities, but that extra cost cannot be passed on, though it is possible to do so in every other industry.

Mr. Lindsay: How can extra cost be passed on in the case of wheat?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Extra cost is invariably passed on except where a standard price is fixed, as in the case of gold. If a mine cannot produce gold at £3 17s. 6d. per ounce, or £4 2s. 6d. per fine ounce—those figures are near enough—it must go out of production. But a farmer does not go out of the wheat industry because he cannot produce wheat at the current price. Others produce it at that price, and then the market value of wheat speedily rises. If the wages sheet of a shipping company increases by, say, £1,000 per month, freights are raised; but the increase in freights will be equivalent, not to £1,000 per month, but to about £5,000 per month. The reason is that £1,000 per month spread over the cargo of a ship amounts to so little per ton as to be almost infinitesimal. Consequently, with every increase in shipping wages, freights go up, but in a much greater ratio. That, indeed, applies to every service and commodity except gold. Under this Bill the contractor will make his estimate of the expenditure required for supervision of scaffolding, an expenditure which he has not had to meet up to the present. I do not question that it will be money well spent, since it will ensure the safety of the workers. Most contractors now take care to ensure that safety. The contractor himself does not build the scaffolding. The scaffold builder is a workman, and it should be his duty to protect himself and others on the job just as the timber man in a mine has to timber it so as to safeguard not only himself but the other employees. The scaffolder should be in a similar position to the timber man, and I believe he always has been. As the Bill merely provides for what Parliament thought it had already done, the measure should pass the second reading.

**MR. THOMSON** (Katanning) [5.6]: I opposed the introduction of the original measure dealing with inspection of scaffolding, and I do not approve of what this Bill proposes. Parliament clearly expressed its desire that the principal Act should not apply to buildings of one storey. The present Bill proposes to make the ground level what is called the horizontal base. There may be a considerable fall in the ground which constitutes the site of a building, with the result that part of the scaffolding would be more than 8ft. above the horizontal base, and yet the building might be of only one storey. If the Bill passes, Government inspection of the scaffolding will be required in the case of such a building. Further, the Bill proposes to extend Government inspection to structures above a certain height outside the metropolitan area. I see no necessity for that.

**Mr. Sleeman**: Is not a man's life just as valuable outside the metropolitan area as inside it?

**Mr. THOMSON**: I happen to know just as much of this subject as the hon. member interjecting, or perhaps a little more. In my experience of nearly 40 years in the building trade I have never known a contractor who valued the lives of his workmen lightly. That is an absurd suggestion to make. Indeed, my experience both in the country districts and in the metropolitan area tells me that it is the workmen themselves who erect scaffolds, and not the employers. Frequently an employer has to take his workmen to task because they have not been sufficiently careful in the erection of scaffolding.

**Mr. George**: Does not the foreman look after that?

**Mr. Sleeman**: You do not seem as if you would take the workmen to task for not having the scaffolding safe.

**Mr. THOMSON**: "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." From practical knowledge I can testify that it does not pay any contractor to have his workmen on scaffolding which is unsafe, or which does not afford adequate protection in the handling of tools. That is particularly so in these days of high wages. It is essential to provide men with adequate facilities for working. Moreover, there is the Workers' Compensation Act, which provides that in case of accident—

The Minister for Lands: You know it is common to have makeshifts.

**Mr. THOMSON**: It may be common or not. Under this Bill, if the inspector considers it unsafe to work on a ladder 25ft. high, he can order the erection of special scaffolding. That is placing too great a power in the hands of a man who may possibly have peculiar ideas of how things should be done. To work on a ladder 25ft. high is frequently necessary when painting a building. It might happen on this very building we are in with regard to one of the down pipes. What is more natural than to get a 25ft. ladder put up for a man to paint such places? But the inspector, if this Bill passes, might say that it was unsafe for the man to work on the ladder and that a scaffold must be erected. The actual worth of the job might be 10s., but the owner might be put to an expenditure of £10 or £15 for scaffolding. The Minister, I know, will reply that the department will exercise common sense. At times, however, it is difficult to decide whether Government departments are acting with common sense or not. As to the Taxation Department the general public hold a strong opinion that the department insist on the last ounce and impose conditions detrimental as well as annoying to the taxpayer. Still, that is purely a matter of opinion. No doubt the taxation officials do their work according to their interpretation of the law. The interpretation clause of this Bill proposes to give the inspector certain powers. He is to have the right to demand the erection of scaffolding.

**Mr. George**: You cannot leave that to the employer. You must give the power to somebody.

**Mr. THOMSON**: In introducing the Bill the Minister said it had been found that buildings were erected with overhang, but in these days of concrete construction the steel work is put up first of all, and the builders build upwards, instead of building downwards from the top when the superstructure is up. It would be quite possible for men to be working on a solid concrete flooring and yet for the inspector to hold that the contractor is breaking the law. An inspection fee of one-quarter per cent. or 5s. per £100. is to be imposed. That fee will be passed on. In fact, all the provisions of the Bill will mean additional cost. The Minister says the cost of building is cheaper now than it was. I have my doubts about that.

The Minister for Works: It is cheaper than when the Bill for the original Act was introduced.

Mr. THOMSON: There has not been reduction of wages, and, on the other hand, hours have become shorter. The prices of bricks and timber have not decreased. The percentage of reduction in the cost of building would be infinitesimal, hardly worth considering. I strongly object to the powers which the Bill proposes to vest in inspectors. If a building more than 15ft. in height was being erected in the country, a Government inspector would have to come out and scaffolding would have to be provided in accordance with the conditions laid down here.

Mr. Sleeman: Are not men likely to be injured if they fall off scaffolds in the country?

Mr. THOMSON: I am not arguing from that standpoint.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A bridge fell down at Fremantle, I believe!

Mr. THOMSON: The point is that it is proposed to place an additional burden upon the people. When the principal Act was under discussion, there was a genuine desire that it should not be made applicable to one-storey buildings.

Mr. George: But it was never anticipated that we would have one-storey buildings 60 feet high or more.

Mr. THOMSON: It must be within the memory of the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George) that a residence may have a 15ft. elevation in front, but may be much deeper at the back. If the hon. member will read the Minister's introductory speech he will ascertain that the reason for the introduction of the measure is that the construction, instead of being from the outside, is from the inside, and builders and contractors have interpreted their method as representing work done from the horizontal base. The first portions of the building are constructed, and then when the first floor joists have been put in and floored with concrete or some other material, that flooring is deemed to be the horizontal base. I think that is a correct interpretation to adopt, but the Bill will mean that that system will have to be abolished. If the House accepts the basis of 15 feet regarding such buildings, those buildings will come within the scope of the Act and a fee of 5s. will have to be paid.

Mr. George: What is that compared with the safety of those concerned in the building operations?

Mr. Sleeman: "Safety first" should be the motto.

Mr. THOMSON: While it represents merely £2 10s. on a building costing £1,000, still the provision of such legislation will place an unnecessary restriction upon building operations, because we will have inspectors telling builders and contractors that they do not know anything about their business.

Mr. Sleeman: And the inspectors may be telling the truth too.

Mr. THOMSON: The inspector may consider that the scaffolding is not in accordance with what is laid down in this legislation and the scaffolding will have to be taken down and re-erected in accordance with the inspector's wishes. Not only will this mean the imposition of additional cost to be borne by the people, but it may work a hardship in the country districts. Buildings have to be erected 30 or 40 miles away from towns. Irrespective of that fact, the buildings I refer to will come within the scope of the Act and it is to be made mandatory that the erection of such buildings shall be reported. There is a provision that municipalities and road boards must notify the inspector under the Scaffolding Act that such buildings are being erected. I do not know what has been the position regarding the last two months and I do not remember the Minister quoting any accidents.

The Minister for Works: Yes, I quoted definite instances.

Mr. Sleeman: We have heard some talk about a church having been blown down!

Mr. THOMSON: It would be interesting to know where it was that this church was blown down, who built it, and how it came to be blown down. I would be really sorry to think that any church that was erected had to depend upon scaffolding to keep it up! I opposed the passing of the principal Act and I take strong exception to the amending Bill now before us. The effect of the Bill will be that fees will have to be paid on single storey buildings. I wish it to be perfectly clear that I am not arguing in favour of men working on scaffolding that is not safe. Should any contractor to-day be foolish enough not to have adequate and proper scaffolding he would be an ass indeed. Such an individual would lose money by not having the proper facilities available upon which his men could work. That is not a business proposition. We are

aware that under the Workers' Compensation Act it is compulsory for an employer to insure his employees. That applies in the country areas as well as in the city. So far £1,051 has been collected by way of fees but we must remember that the more we extend the scope of such legislation and the more stringent we make it, correspondingly it will be more costly for the people.

The Premier: It is all a question whether we are justified in going as far as is reasonable to protect those concerned, even though it means adding to the cost of work.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not arguing from that point of view. Common-sense people understand clearly that it is in the interests of contractors to have proper scaffolding at their disposal. At the same time, while the fees to-day amount to only 5s., which is a small amount, such fees have been known to creep up and costs are added in that and other directions as well. Therefore I am opposed to any further increase in the charges that will have to be borne by the people.

MR. GEORGE (Murray - Wellington) [5.22]: I have gone through the Bill carefully and have ascertained that there is very little for controversy in it. Apparently the principle actuating whoever brought the matter forward was the recognition, which is more clear to-day than in former years, that it is necessary to afford protection to prevent accidents to either life or limb. Although we have the Workers' Compensation Act, hon. members will agree that it is far better to adopt methods in carrying out work so that accidents may be prevented, rather than to become reconciled to the idea that compensation will be available should an accident take place. I do not altogether agree with the remarks of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson), because the effect of this legislation will be that contractors and builders, in whom we have every confidence, will get together necessary plant suitable for the carrying out of such work as they may have to do. For many years it has been the practice—I refer particularly to operations in and about Perth—for those engaged upon building operations, instead of having the proper class of poles, ropes and so forth, to rely upon makeshifts. During the course of my experience in different parts of the world I have noticed the same tendency. Many of these people are satisfied with old bits of building timber, any old clothes line and so

on, regarding these as all that are necessary when small jobs have to be done. For larger buildings of two, three or more storeys, no contractor would be such a fool nor would any builder be such an ass, as to engage upon such operations without having the tackle and plant necessary for scaffolding purposes. The necessity for guarding against accidents is demonstrated clearly in Perth and hon. members have doubtless seen that when alterations are being made to the frontages of city properties, various means are adopted for protecting the public and safeguarding them from the effects of accidents likely to be caused by anything falling from the building operations.

Mr. Thomson: But that is dealt with under the municipal by-laws.

Mr. GEORGE: So I am aware! When I was a member of the Perth City Council 30 years ago, there were no provisions of that description. It was a case of each for himself from the start. With the passing of the years, however, the trend has been to see that every reasonable protection is afforded the workers on the buildings, the passers-by in the streets below, and others who may be affected. The member for Katanning talked about the slope of the land, meaning that different elevations, back and front, would have to be dealt with. Certainly there are some houses built in the Darling Ranges under those conditions, but how many such buildings are there, in comparison with the great number of buildings erected throughout Western Australia? Clearly, most buildings are erected on comparatively level ground.

Mr. Thomson: Nonsense.

Mr. GEORGE: Certainly there may be a foot or 18 inches difference in the levels, but that would not affect the position vitally. Clause 3 provides an interpretation of the words "horizontal base" which is set out as follows:—

"Horizontal base" means ground level: Provided that where any scaffolding is erected upon permanent floors with walls on all sides not less than 3 feet higher than the working platform, then such permanent floor shall be deemed the horizontal base.

I am not quite sure whether that would apply to flooring, but it may be reasonable to expect it to do so. In some countries it is the practice to put in the steel pillars, connect them with the girders for the flooring and then proceed with the superstructure for the next floor. I remember seeing the construction of a building in New York City. It was



a sky-scraper running up to 15 or more storeys high. The superstructure was carried up without waiting for the flooring to be put in. It was perfectly safe, because the steel structure carried the building. The member for Katanning referred to the fact that this legislation would apply throughout the State. It must be realised that building operations are proceeding in all parts of Western Australia, not at the rate nor yet in the fashion of years ago. Had it been suggested in those years that building would go on at the rate it is proceeding to-day, people would have scoffed at the mere thought of it. The towns and cities of Western Australia are growing year by year and there is no reason why provisions for the protection and safety of workmen and others should not be undertaken. I say from my own experience, and my opinion is confirmed by the remarks of the member for Katanning, that any builder or contractor of decent standing will get together plant on which he can rely. When that plant has been got together, the only additional expense involved will be for shifting the plant from one job to another, and that is always taken into account when making out tenders. I am glad to see that not only have references to wells been included in the Bill—we have had some discussions about wells before—but also to excavations in connection with building operations. In Perth to-day the price of land is so very high that naturally it is necessary to make the greatest use possible of the building sites available. For that reason excavations are made for basements and so on, and it is therefore as necessary, if not much more necessary, to afford protection regarding the excavations as it is regarding the superstructure of the building itself. Particularly in a place like Perth where buildings have to be erected on sand, is this essential because we know that traffic has the effect of possibly, and even probably, making the sand slip and a great number of people may be enveloped as the result of an accident. It is quite right to include within the scope of the Bill, excavations in connection with building operations. It is also a good idea to provide for the protection of workmen from electric wires erected so near scaffolding as to be a source of danger. Throughout the metropolitan area live wires are to be seen comparatively close to buildings. It is therefore necessary that precautions should be taken to prevent any possibility of accidents arising from

this practice. The success of the Act and of this addition to it all depends on the class of man the Minister selects. If he can get a man of wide practical experience of buildings, who knows exactly how the scaffolding structure should be put together the Act can be rendered successful in its operations. I will support the Bill.

#### THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon.

A. McCallum—South Fremantle—in reply) [5.31]: The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) is consistent in respect of this Bill, if in respect of very few others. He opposed the original Bill when first it was introduced, and he still opposes any move to give effect to the intention behind the existing Act.

Hon. G. Taylor: What we all agreed upon.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When, nearly two years ago, the original Bill was introduced, the hon. member said it would add to the cost of building. Let me tell him what has been added. The aggregate fees paid for all buildings throughout the State, including huge warehouses in the city, big stores in Fremantle, all the dwellings erected from one end of the country to the other, amount to £1,065. Consider this enormous addition to the cost of building in a period of 18 months!

Mr. Thomson: But you have seven supervisors and one foreman.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It wouldn't matter if we had a hundred supervisors, or even a thousand. The fee is fixed, and the amount collected in 18 months has been £1,065. If we were to put on additional inspectors, it would add to the Government's cost, but not to the cost of the buildings.

Mr. Thomson: Yes it would, for you are extending the scope of the Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That does not matter. The fee is fixed at 5s. per cent., and if we were to employ a thousand inspectors it would not mean any increase in the fee, although we would have to pay more out of Consolidated Revenue. Only the other day I submitted figures showing that the cost of administration is just about balanced by the amount collected in fees. Yet in face of that, the hon. member talks about the increased cost of building.

Hon. G. Taylor: Have you any idea of the capital cost of those buildings?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was considerably over half a million, perhaps

nearer to a million; yet only £1,065 has been paid in fees.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Still, contractors when tendering may have to allow something in addition to that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Only if profiteering. Perhaps the member for Kataning will accuse them of that. For all the big buildings erected in the city, the hotels and picture shows in country districts, and the improvements in the main streets of Perth, only £1,065 has been added to the cost. Yet we are told the poor widow and the working man will find the cost of their homes increased.

Mr. Thomson: I did not mention either of those people.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Oh, but you have done. Another point made by the hon. member was that to allow an inspector to say to a contractor, "Instead of using a ladder, you must erect a scaffold," was to give the inspector too much responsibility. To whom would the hon. member leave it to decide? Apparently he is prepared to leave it to the builder, not to the inspector; he would leave it in the hands of the man whose financial interests are at stake, but he would not leave it to the man with nothing to gain, whose one object is to carry out his job and see that justice is done. Surely the man most likely to decide the question in a reasonable way would be the Government inspector! If he overstep the mark and do anything unreasonable, a charge is bound to be laid against him. The Bill merely gives effect to the existing Act. It does not include single-storey buildings in the country. Anything up to 15ft. in the country is exempt. That means that a wall of about 18ft. would be exempt. No cottage, no home would have 18ft. walls, but there have been erected in the country lofty picture theatres, and churches with spires. A building at Northam had a scaffolding to a height of over 30ft. from the ground, notwithstanding that it was only a single-storey building. To base the exemption on a single-storey is altogether unjust. Take His Majesty's Theatre, technically of only one storey: yet look at the height of it! It is unjust to base the exemption on a single storey; to exempt any building in the country up to 15ft. is sufficiently reasonable. The point made by the member for Kataning regarding a concrete building where a floor is put in and men are working above it, is provided for in the Bill. A permanent

floor becomes the horizontal base, and the height is calculated from that point. But mere floor joists, affording no protection to the workmen, will not count. In such an instance the height must be measured from the ground. Since I introduced the Bill, only a week or so ago, another death has occurred in the city. In the carrying out of improvements to the Great Western Hotel, in William-street, the man in charge of the job made a hole in the wall by knocking out a brick. He then inserted in the hole one end of a beam, fastening the other end to the verandah post, and laid a plank across the beam. The plank level was then counted the horizontal base. One unfortunate workman fell from the plank, fractured his skull and died. That is another death to be charged against this horizontal base argument. As the member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) has said, none of those at the conference between the two Houses thought that anything over 8ft. would be counted as coming under the Bill. This horizontal-base argument was not anticipated. Nobody dreamt that a contractor would be entitled to erect a three-storey building with no more than 8ft. of scaffolding.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But if men were inside a room, whitewashing a ceiling?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The floor would be the horizontal base, and if there were no floor, the height would be counted from the ground. I have the report of an inspector who saw a joist deflected six inches by the weight of the men on it. Apparently the joist was faulty, having gum veins. Yet the inspector could not interfere.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Has scaffolding to be erected for a roof?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not usually. When I brought in the Bill I left out all reference to height. I was then going on the experience of South Australia, where they had a definition, but ultimately repealed it. Evidently they have struck the same thing as we are up against now. Our Act has been evaded, and the contractors themselves are complaining that whereas they do everything within their power to protect the lives of the workmen, others are deliberately evading the Act.

Mr. Thomson: It cannot pay any of them to evade the Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: But they are doing so, and the contractors them-

selves have complained to the inspectors. The hon. member referred to compensation. It is impracticable to put a monetary value on human life. Take the case I have alluded to. Of what use will £600 be to the widow and five orphans? Yet those people have been orphaned and widowed through a man adopting a subterfuge to evade the Act. We require to afford proper protection to everybody.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You say the existing Act is not effective.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not. In Murray-street a three-storey building was erected with no scaffolding over 8ft. from the horizontal base as at present defined. No member would endorse that sort of thing. We all thought the horizontal base would be measured from the ground except when a floor was put in, when the floor would become the horizontal base.

Mr. Thomson: Suppose a boarded floor of a temporary nature put in?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would have to be a permanent floor.

Mr. Thomson: If they were inch floor boards it would comply with the Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The boards might be old and decayed and of insufficient strength to carry the weight. Take the case at the racecourse—however, I had better not discuss that, since it has not yet been decided whether or not proceedings shall be taken. In numerous cases where defective timber has been used, the inspector has pointed out to the contractor the dangerous condition of the scaffolding; but because it was of less than 8ft. he could not interfere. There has been nothing in the way of harassing by inspectors and no complaints have been lodged. As a matter of fact, contractors have told me that the inspectors employed are competent men who understand their work, that they have not been severe in their interference, nor has any interference been unwarranted. Contractors themselves, however, have complained that a certain section will not live up to the provisions of the Act. Members will agree that we are not going to any unreasonable extent; the Bill has not been brought in to give effect to the ideas that were held when the measure was introduced originally. The Government merely wish to carry out the ideas that were approved by both Houses, and there is no desire to go further.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 1:

Mr. THOMSON: It is proposed to insert that the Act shall have effect throughout the State whenever scaffolding exceeding 15 feet in height from the horizontal base is used. Does that mean that the height of the platform where men will be working will be 15 feet?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 2:

Mr. THOMSON: Here it is proposed to insert "or ladder exceeding 25 feet in length." As a general rule, when a ladder of that description is used, there is provision to secure it at the top, and often someone is standing at the foot of it. Then, if a ladder be 25 feet high, a man is not likely to work from the top rung. It is just possible that the restriction might work harmfully.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At the present time inspectors have no control over ladders used, and the practice has grown up of nailing battens on ladders. Ladders do not come within the definition unless used with scaffolding over 8 feet high.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But ladders have to be inspected.

Hon. G. Taylor: If they are over a certain length.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Could a ladder be inspected here and then sent to a country job, or must it be inspected on the job?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have not appointed any inspectors in the country.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But if a ladder were inspected here and were found satisfactory, would it do?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. We do not send men to the country to inspect; all country buildings are inspected by Public Works Department inspectors. The idea of the amendment is merely to bring ladders within the definition of "gear" or "scaffolding."

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad to hear the Minister say there is not to be an army of inspectors. I thought workers' homes inspectors were to do this work.

The Minister for Works: We have Public Works inspectors and there are only two under the Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But you have Workers' Homes Board inspectors.

The Minister for Works: Yes, but they do not inspect.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have no objection to the clause, but I hope that, wherever possible, the Minister will simplify the working of the Act. Often trivial work has to be done to a building and it would be ridiculous if we had to keep inspectors for each small job. Much rough work is done in the country and considerable expense would be entailed if an inspector were sent out to each small job. On the other hand, some of the churches and hotels are high buildings and inspection is necessary. The measure is designed to protect passers-by as well as workmen.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 11:

Mr. THOMSON: Section 11 empowers an inspector to give directions as to scaffolding in order to prevent accidents. The clause proposes to give the inspector the additional power of enforcing the use of scaffolding on any structure at a height exceeding 8 feet from the ground level. This might result in hardship. A man might be painting a building and the inspector could insist upon the erection of scaffolding for that work.

Mr. Sleeman: You have a very poor opinion of the inspector.

Mr. THOMSON: I am stating what might happen. I am not indifferent to the safety of the workmen. A law may be administered harshly or discreetly. Some of the Minister's strongest supporters have given him and the Government considerable trouble—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: Similarly people might be harassed by the interpretation placed on an Act.

Mr. GEORGE: I have been trying to determine how far this clause will extend. An inspector should have the right to say, "You are using a stage at a height above which it is not safe for a man to work. I cannot

charge inspection fees, because the Act will not allow me, but I can exercise my power to ensure that the scaffolding or stage is safe." If an inspector saw that a stage on which bricklayers were working was unsafe, he should draw attention to it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause will refer not only to buildings under construction, but to buildings already constructed, and under it the use of a ladder for a little painting could be rendered impossible. An inspector would have power to do as he pleased with regard to work at a height of more than 8 feet from the ground. Surely the Minister would not have proposed Clause 2 if he had not been satisfied that it went far enough. Why is Clause 4 necessary, and how will it operate? While we desire effective legislation, we do not want to make conditions unnecessarily difficult. This clause will apply to every kind of structure in the State, even to the roughest shed. Of course, I admit it would be monstrous that a man on a four-storied building should slide down the iron roof and take his chance of pulling up when he reached the guttering.

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

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It seems to me that the clause overrides what has already been done in the Act. Men should not take risks merely because they are told to do so. We should not be expected to give these extraordinary powers to inspectors. I hope the Minister will reply to the member for Murray-Wellington.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is impossible to reply to the member for Murray-Wellington, as well as to the member for Katanning, because the former has already replied to the latter.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the Minister is responsible for the proposal.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause will give the inspector authority to call upon the owner or contractor to provide scaffolding on which the men may work. It is the practice in many cases to endeavour to dodge the Act when no scaffolding at all is used. The men are made to take a risk without scaffolding. If this equipment is not used the employees are outside the scope of the Act. Men have been known to paint the top of a building while standing on a little parapet not more than 4 inches wide. There is no law to compel contractors to provide

proper accommodation such as a bosun's chair or a swinging stage.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Does a swinging chair rank as scaffolding?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It ranks as gear. This clause is necessary in cases where an inspector sees men working under dangerous conditions, and the Act being flouted, and it will enable him to call upon the contractor to provide the necessary gear. Where men are working more than 8 feet from the ground the inspector will be authorised to step in. It is absurd to suggest that a workman may, without injury, fall 15 feet in the country, but may not fall more than 8 feet in the city. In view of the reports we have had that some people are doing all they can to circumvent the law, this authority should be given.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We must take it that this will be the Act unless the inspectors determine otherwise. This one clause might be the whole Bill, because it overrides the other clauses dealing with scaffolding. The dangers that these men run justify the passage of the Act, but it ought to be possible to say exactly what we mean.

The Premier: It is hard to make a law which will apply equitably in every case. That is why the inspector must have discretionary power.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is difficult to say exactly how the gear that is used in connection with a building should be controlled. Men often take unnecessary risks, because they are in the habit of doing so. I have seen a man 30 feet from the ground on a ladder, and there has been nothing at the foot of the ladder to hold it in position. We are now saying what we want, but that if it does not suit someone else he may exercise his own discretion.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: An inspector may see men working on some temporary structure, and decide that they are in danger of their lives or limbs. If he then advises the contractor to provide a more stable structure, the contractor would be wise to accept the suggestion. We do know that men take undue risks. The clause is not likely to work hardship. A rigid law is bound to create difficulties.

Mr. THOMSON: No doubt the clause has been framed to meet difficulties experienced by inspectors in the working of the parent Act. I was surprised to hear the Minister for Works say that with a view to evading the Act scaffolding, in some cases, was not

erected. I understood that building operations were subject to departmental supervision. Under this clause what I may term a vicious inspector would have excessive powers. A judge gives his decision not on what was intended by a section of an Act, but on what it actually says; and this provision might be construed as applying to every structure throughout the State. Thus fees might be imposed unnecessarily. From my experience I am unable to conceive of anyone, either employer or employee, taking undue risks. I hope the measure will be administered with discretion. The present clause could be extended to the painting of a window three or four storeys from the ground.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendment of Schedule:

Mr. THOMSON: The clause refers to marks of unfitness placed by an inspector on gear or material, and provides that such marks must not be obliterated. A plank might be considered unsafe by an inspector, and marked by him as unfit for use, and the weakness might be only in one spot, and after the cutting-off of the affected part the remainder of the plank might be perfectly sound. Would the clause prevent the use of the sound part of the plank?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: A plank 15ft. or 18ft. long, having a weak spot, might be docked so as to leave, say, 9ft. of perfectly sound timber, and on that length of 9ft. the inspector's mark might appear. I do not think the inspector would object to the use of the sound piece.

Mr. THOMSON: Would the use of such a piece be an offence under the measure?

The Minister for Works: The defective planking, if it had been cut off, would not form part of the scaffolding.

Mr. THOMSON: But would one be liable to prosecution for using the sound part of the plank?

Hon. G. Taylor: The inspector's mark of unsoundness might be on the good part.

Mr. Chesson: As a matter of common sense the inspector would tell the contractor to cut off the defective part.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

# **BILL—CO-OPERATIVE AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES' ACT AMENDMENT.**

## *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Northam) [7.59]: There is not much to oppose in this Bill. I observe, however, that while the measure changes the date for the closing of the books of societies from December to June, it does not provide for the issue of a balance sheet until June of next year. The balance would then cover a period of 18 months. That may not be a serious matter, but it should be taken into consideration. The Bill has been before another place for some time, and the people affected have not raised any objection; therefore it is hardly necessary for us to do so. In the original Act the 31st December is the date on which balancing is to be done. Now it is to be altered merely, as the Honorary Minister said, to suit the convenience of statisticians.

Hon. J. Cunningham: I said there were many other reasons. Many of the business houses are adopting the financial year as against the calendar year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is no reason for compelling the business houses to adopt this course. The Honorary Minister gave us no good reason for the change, except that the statisticians favoured the alteration. I have no objection to the Bill because the people concerned have known for some time that the Minister proposed to make this alteration, the Bill has been before the Legislative Council, and that fact has been noted in the Press. Moreover, the Bill has been on the Notice Paper here for several days, and as those mostly concerned have not indicated their objection to it, I do not oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## *In Committee, etc.*

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

# **BILL—SHIPPING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.**

## *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 21st September.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Northam) [8.4]: This proposal is not quite so simple as the last one. Parliament is being asked to alter an old custom that for 71 years has been the law of the land. It has not been found necessary since 1855 to advance the proposal made by the Minister: and it is reasonable and right that we should retain the law as it stands. The Government propose that we shall strike out the proviso to Section 3 of the Shipping and Pilotage Consolidation Ordinance, 1855, which sets out that the master of a ship coming into one of our harbours must be informed of the law of the land.

Hon. J. Cunningham: This does not apply to overseas shipping. Those ships come under the regulations of the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then why does the Honorary Minister ask us to agree to amend the law that applies to overseas shipping? Section 3 of the Shipping Ordinance reads—

That in case any person being the master or in command of any ship or vessel, or being a harbour master, or being duly licensed to act as a pilot, in any of the said ports or harbours, shall in any case violate or neglect to observe any such rules and regulations so promulgated as aforesaid, every person so offending shall, for every such offence, forfeit and pay any sum not exceeding £20 sterling.

That does not apply to a dinghy sailing about Perth waters!

Mr. Thomson: Yes, it does.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but not alone. The section goes on—

Provided that no master or commander of any ship or vessel shall be liable to a fine for any breach of such rules and regulations, unless a copy thereof shall have been previously delivered to him or left on board his ship or vessel.

All that the proviso sets out is that the captain or master of a vessel, on arrival at port, shall be warned as to what our laws are and be presented with a copy of the regulations. That is not a very difficult thing.

Hon. J. Cunningham: That is done by the representatives of the shipping company at Fremantle.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That may, or may not be done.

Hon. J. Cunningham: But it is done.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: All ships entering our harbours do not come under charter although, I suppose, each ship has an agent at the port. The volume including the Shipping Ordinance of 1855, contains all the Acts from 1832 to 1882. Thus, laws that were found necessary during 50 years are contained in one volume: at the rate we are proceeding this session we will need a similar volume for the Acts we are passing.

The Minister for Lands: We will alter that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We are dealing with all pettifogging stuff, not worth bothering about. Apart from one or two Bills, we have not been asked to deal with anything of serious importance. Perhaps it is that the Bill has been introduced because there is some little trouble attached to sending out copies of the regulations. I suppose somebody suggested that it was quite a lot of trouble, and hinted that those who came here should know the regulations governing our ports. A Japanese, an Italian or a French ship may come here. Is it reasonable to expect the master of any one of those boats to know what our laws are? The Minister has not shown us that it is difficult to supply copies of the regulations to masters of ships.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Is it difficult for the shipping people to get in touch with the officers of the Fremantle Harbour Trust? They must come here first before they can get in touch with our officials.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course they would know that we had some laws, but as this particular one has been in existence for 70 years, why is there any necessity to alter it?

The Minister for Lands: Shipping is increasing.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And so it is a little more troublesome! That is it! Please God it will become a great deal more troublesome in the future, when still more ships come to our ports. The least we should do is to let people who come to our ports know what laws they are expected to observe. Members of this Chamber could not give a list of all the laws we passed last session, and it is therefore quite impossible for all the people to know all the laws Parliament has passed. Why should we make it more difficult for shipping masters who visit our ports? Little pettifogging Bills

such as we have been dealing with are likely to be more harmful than useful. The member for Albany (Mr. A. Wansbrough) knows something about shipping; will he say that the officers at Albany have found it inconvenient to furnish copies of the regulations to masters of vessels at his port? Will the member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers) and the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willecock) sit still and allow the Bill to go through, although it may adversely affect the ports they represent?

Mr. Withers: How do you know we did not suggest the Bill?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have too high an opinion of the intelligence and fairness of the hon. member to say that he suggested it. If he tells us that he did so, I will believe him. To me it seems to be an absolutely wrong proposal that may have far-reaching results. I hope the House will not agree to it, because no good reason has been advanced for it. It was included to safeguard the interests of captains of vessels arriving at our ports, and we should continue to let them know the regulations they are supposed to observe.

MR. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [8.13]: I hope the House will not agree to the Bill. It has taken since 1855 for the officials to find it necessary to ask Parliament to agree to the deletion of a proviso that was obviously conceived in a spirit of fairplay. It was desired that masters of ships coming to our ports should be given an opportunity of knowing what our regulations were. Hon. members realise that changes are made from time to time, and shipping masters should be informed definitely as to the exact regulations they were expected to observe. I know, from my own experience—I am not a shipping master, but I have travelled with many captains of vessels—that those in charge of ships have an extensive knowledge of the regulations applying in different ports throughout the world. There is no reason why, if a vessel is a regular trader to our ports, the master should not be acquainted by his agent of any changes that had taken place in the regulations. There is another class of steamer, however, that travels round the world from port to port. Such a vessel may leave Liverpool, London or Hull and proceed overseas to a certain port, where, after discharging her cargo, she may receive orders to proceed

to another port. It may be years before she returns to British waters. Harbour Trusts control the ports of Fremantle and Bunbury and the Commissioners appointed on those bodies are actuated by the best of motives in their endeavour to improve conditions at their harbours for both ships and masters. It is their desire to have such regulations as will preserve good order and good feeling. But tramp steamers, of which there are great numbers, are not in a position to be informed, unless someone goes out to them in Gage Roads. Seeing that nearly every boat coming to Fremantle has to engage a pilot, what trouble would it give if the pilot took with him a copy of the rules and delivered it to the master of the ship? It is scarcely fair to let a master come into the port and not inform him of the regulations, particularly the new regulations. I am not aware that the Minister has produced any urgent reasons for this proposed amendment, unless it is in the interests of economy, to save the printing of a few thousand copies of regulations. With all due respect to those who have to introduce legislation, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that quite a number of Bills that have come before us during the past few sessions have been of a very small nature. I should like to hear from the Minister some good reasons for this Bill. Even the criminal has a right to know the laws before he is punished.

Hon. J. Cunningham: He has to acquaint himself with the laws.

Mr. GEORGE: I think the Bill might very well be dropped. If we are to go on considering legislation of this sort, I am afraid we shall acquire a character for being unable to rise above petty matters.

**MR. ANGELO** (Gaseoyne) [8.18]: Speaking on this Bill in another place, the Chief Secretary pointed out that the Ordinance was passed in 1855, and went on to say he did not think a single prosecution had ever been taken under that Ordinance. In other words, that Ordinance has existed for three score years and ten without mutilation or change. Surely, then, it would be more creditable to allow it to continue until it reaches a century without performing any operation on it. I agree with previous speakers that it is a waste of time trying to amend an Ordinance that, up to the present, has not been required at all. I will oppose the second reading.

**MR. THOMSON** (Katanning) [8.19]: From the remarks made by the Minister when moving the second reading, I gathered that the chief object of the Government in asking for this amendment was to secure control of small craft on the Swan River. The Minister said that people built small craft and launched them on the river at Maylands or at Guildford, and the first thing officially known of those small craft was, perhaps, when an accident occurred. He went on to say there were dozens of small craft on the river, and that it was very desirable that their owners should make themselves acquainted with the regulations governing river traffic. I do not know much about the small river craft. Is it possible for any person to run a motor launch, which might be dangerous to others on the river, and not be aware of the existing rules and regulations?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not think this applies to small craft at all.

Mr. THOMSON: According to the Minister's speech it does. It would be very wrong to delete this proviso as it applies to ship masters coming from foreign countries, for the proviso is very wise in its application to visiting vessels from overseas. But from a perusal of the Ordinance it does not seem to me that when it was introduced in 1855 it was intended to be applied to small craft on the river.

Mr. George: It deals only with sea-going vessels.

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, it deals with deep-sea ships. Nevertheless, the tenor of the Minister's speech was that it was intended through the Bill to get control of small craft on the river. If the department has not in existence regulations giving control over small craft on the river, those regulations should be introduced forthwith. I will vote against the second reading.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mt. Margaret) [8.25]: According to the Minister, when moving the second reading, undoubtedly the purpose of this amendment is to get control of the small river craft.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It does not apply to the river craft.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Apparently the Ordinance we are asked to amend applies, not only to river craft, but to all shipping, coastal and overseas. The Minister said that people along the river above Maylands and towards Guildford built and launched small craft, and that the first official know-



ledge of the existence of those craft was when an accident occurred, when it was very difficult to secure a conviction. The Minister distinctly said the purpose of the Bill was to enable convictions to be procured, which was not at present possible because copies of the Ordinance had not been served on the people responsible for small river craft causing accidents. We require to be very careful about amending an ordinance that has been in existence for 71 years. We know it has not operated harshly. The Minister said his sole object was to reach the small craft on the river. The Bill goes further than that, and reaches all classes of shipping coming to our ports. Masters of visiting ships, naturally, want to know the regulations of the port at which they are calling. The Minister said the Harbour Trust served ships with copies of the regulations. But at some of our ports there is neither harbour trust nor harbour board. It would be advisable for the Minister to have the debate adjourned, and consider whether it would not be possible to so modify his amendment as to restrict it to the small craft on the river. I am anxious to help the Minister to secure control over those craft, but I really think he should review this proposed amendment.

**MR. LATHAM** (York) [8.28]: The Bill proposes to take away what was intended to provide for a fair deal to masters of foreign vessels.

Hon. J. Cunningham: I have already said it has nothing to do with overseas shipping.

**MR. LATHAM**: Let us examine the existing Act. Section 11 deals with harbour masters' boarding boats. That cannot apply to small craft on the river. The first schedule deals with the draught of boats. Section 3 is a very important section, dealing with the whole of the measure. The regulations must be published in the "Government Gazette." Regulations are always being published, but the masters of foreign vessels have no chance of keeping in touch with the requirements of each port unless a notice is served upon them. You, Mr. Speaker, and I know how difficult it is, coming from our farms to Perth, to be sure whether we are not violating some of the traffic laws. It is most difficult even for people living in the country to be at fault with all the Acts and regulations, and how much more difficult is it for the masters of foreign vessels visiting our ports? The deletion of the proviso will occasion great

difficulty to foreign vessels coming here. I hope the Minister will accept the suggestion of the member for Mt. Margaret and agree to an adjournment until he ascertains exactly how the amendment will apply. The main thing is not to be unfair to the masters of foreign vessels.

The Minister for Lands: A lot of people have more sympathy for the foreigner than for our own people.

**MR. LATHAM**: Our own people may be affected. The Minister would not describe as foreign a boat trading between London and Fremantle, although it may be foreign to this country.

The Minister for Lands: It is not.

**MR. LATHAM**: It is not an alien.

The Minister for Lands: I have not called you a foreigner yet.

**MR. LATHAM**: But I have heard men from Cornwall referred to as foreigners. When vessels visit our ports we do not want them to experience greater difficulties than they do elsewhere.

Hon. J. Cunningham: We are not proposing that they should.

**MR. LATHAM**: As the law stands, masters of vessels must be served with a copy of the regulations, and this is necessary in order that they may know the laws with which they have to comply. Let the Government introduce a small Bill to deal specifically with the Swan River boats. I hope the Minister will agree to adjourn the debate until he satisfies himself and us that this Bill does not apply to the big vessels.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [8.33]: Does this Bill refer to small craft such as rowing boats?

Hon. J. Cunningham: Of course it does.

**MR. PANTON**: It ought to refer to the tin canoes.

**MR. SAMPSON**: Then the Minister should adopt the suggestion of the member for Mt. Margaret. The title of the parent measure is, "An ordinance to consolidate and amend the laws for the regulation of shipping and of pilotage and other dues in the harbours of Western Australia." The Navigation Act defines "ship" as "every description of vessel used in navigation not propelled by oars." The proviso that the Bill seeks to delete reads, "Provided that no master or commander of any ship or vessel shall be liable to a fine for any breach of such rules and regulations, unless a copy thereof shall have

been previously delivered to him or left on board his ship or vessel." The proviso does not refer to craft propelled by oars. There is no question that the opponents of the Bill have made out a complete case. The title of the Bill does not agree with that of the parent Act. There is need to control the small boats on the river, and it is impracticable to hand to the commander of such boats copies of the rules and regulations prior to launching proceedings against them. Adequate control is necessary. No doubt the Honorary Minister has had this little bantling placed on his doorstep and has had to look after it, but it cannot possibly be reared.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM** (Honorary Minister—Kalgoorlie—in reply) [8.36]: The member for Swan said that this small measure had not met with a kindly reception. The reason is that members on the Opposition side have not seen fit to give it just the small amount of study necessary to acquaint themselves with its purpose.

Mr. Sampson: It was questioned severely in another place.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: In moving the second reading I pointed out that the port regulations and the Swan River regulations are framed under the Shipping and Pilotage Consolidation Ordinance of 1855, and it is necessary to have power to amend the regulations in order to secure better supervision and control of river craft. The Leader of the Opposition said there had not been a great number of prosecutions. It has been found impossible for the officers of the department to place a copy of the regulations with the owners of craft, as many small craft have been built up the river and do not become registered to ply for hire.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you mean canoes?

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: I mean small craft. A number of small craft using the waters of the Swan at times neglect to carry lights or to observe the rules of the river, and, as a result of these breaches of the regulations, accidents have occurred. The proviso sets out that a copy of the regulations must be served on the commander of a vessel, and as this could not be done, prosecutions have not been launched because they would not have been successful. Consequently there is no control over navigation on the river. The Leader of the Opposition

referred to oversea shipping, but such shipping comes directly into touch with the Fremantle, Bunbury, and Albany harbour authorities. There are constituted authorities at Fremantle and Bunbury to see that the rules and regulations framed under the ordinance are given effect to. Rarely does a vessel blow into our ports that is not a chartered vessel.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They steam in; they do not blow in.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: Disabled ships have blown in—ships that have lost their way.

Mr. Sampson: And have they been proceeded against for violating the ordinance?

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: When such a misfortune overtakes the commander of a vessel the laws of the country are administered sympathetically.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We have heard that before.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: Representatives of the ships trading to our ports regard it as their responsibility—as it is—to serve upon the commanders copies of the rules and regulations governing navigation and shipping within the ports of the State. That demolishes the argument advanced against the Bill by the Opposition. The bulk of the argument has arisen through members of the Opposition having neglected to study the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Sampson: That is not quite fair.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have no right to say it.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: There is no doubt about it. The member for Swan proved that he was not acquainted with the provisions of the measure.

Mr. Sampson: I proved that you were wrong.

**HON. J. CUNNINGHAM**: He had not looked into the Ordinance. The Leader of the Opposition has also displayed a want of close acquaintance with the ordinance. He regarded the Bill as a small measure, hardly worthy of consideration, and treated it as such. So also did the member for York; he, too, knows nothing about it. He rose out of a sense of loyalty to his leader for the sake of uttering a few loosely-strung words in opposition to the measure, and did not touch upon the principle contained in the Bill.

Mr. Sampson: Then why be so concerned about his remarks?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: This is an important amendment, because it will mean a great improvement in the control of navigation on the Swan River.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It does not touch that.

Mr. Latham: And it interferes with foreign vessels.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It is necessary that the commanders of small craft should accept responsibility under the regulations. Why is the Leader of the Opposition not prepared to suggest an amendment to our Criminal Code requiring the police authorities to serve every man and woman in the State with a copy of the Code?

Hon. G. Taylor: In view of all the crimes committed, it would not be a bad scheme.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It is becoming increasingly difficult to deal with the owners or commanders of boats using our waterways.

Mr. Sampson: The commander of a rowing boat?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Even the hon. member may at times get into a rowing boat and attempt to row. I think I have cleaned up the Opposition.

Mr. Latham: You have not.

Hon. G. Taylor: He missed the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson).

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: There is no intelligent opposition to the Bill. Foreign shipping comes under the provisions of our harbour boards.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are not amending anything to do with the river.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The position has been made clear. If the Opposition are too dense to understand it, that is not my fault. My advice to members opposite is, when a measure like this comes before them, that they should occupy themselves for a few minutes in trying to understand it, and should at least read the information that has been supplied to them. In this way they may be able to put up an intelligent opposition.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	22
Noes	..	..	..	16
				—
Majority for	..	..	..	6

## AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Miss Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Latham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	

(Teller.)

## PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Munsie	Mr. Maley
Mr. Willcock	Mr. Brown

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Panton in the Chair; Hon. J. Cunningham (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Mr. THOMSON: The Honorary Minister says it is intended only to deal with craft on the river. May I suggest that instead of deleting the proviso in the section, he add the following words:—

But this proviso shall not apply to craft plying in the Swan River and its tributaries.

The Act lays down the fee that may be charged for navigation in the Princess Royal Harbour, Oyster Harbour, Port Gregory, Gage Roads, etc. The Ordinance is intended to apply to all shipping from overseas.

The Minister for Lands: They had only the roadsteads wherein to anchor when the Ordinance was passed.

Mr. THOMSON: Ships could come straight into King George's Sound in those days. It is provided in the Ordinance that there is no penalty in cases where the regulations have not been presented to the persons concerned. The master of a vessel is,

however, subject to a penalty of £50 if he allows to be thrown out of his vessel, while in a harbour or anchorage, any ballast or rubbish, or allows to be removed any sand, stone or ballast without first having obtained the consent of the harbour master, but in this case, too, he must have been supplied with a copy of the regulations or he cannot be fined. The master of every foreign vessel should be made acquainted with the local conditions. It is also right that users of the river should adhere to the rule of the road, and carry lights. It is, however, going too far to delete this proviso from the section.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We must apologise to the Honorary Minister for our lack of understanding of this extensive proposal. No one but the Honorary Minister could be expected to understand it. The Act itself is quite clear. If we take the Honorary Minister's advice we shall be amending a section that applies only to harbours and shipping, and not to river vessels such as canoes, dinghies, rafts, and other things that float about.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Is it not important to control properly all dinghies and rafts?

Mr. Latham: This does not do it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause does not deal with the river. We know we have no right to question anything proposed by the Honorary Minister. He should look up the Act himself instead of merely taking the information that has been supplied to him from another place. The Ordinance says that the master or commander of a vessel entering any port in the State shall be given a copy of the regulations, but the Honorary Minister says it is no longer necessary to do this. He also claimed that the member for York did not understand the Bill. On the river at York there are canoes made of iron. Fancy applying to the owners of such little craft the provisions of the Act in the same way as they are applied to the masters of P. and O. vessels calling at Fremantle!

Mr. ANGELO: Opposition members are sympathetic towards the Honorary Minister's objective, but consider that he is going the wrong way to attain it. The best course would be for him to report progress and consult the Crown Law Department again.

Mr. GEORGE: The Honorary Minister's speeches do not fit in with the Bill. To deal with river craft he brings in a measure

which does not contain a single clause enabling him to do so. The Ordinance of 1855 deals with vessels and with boats belonging to vessels, the vessels in view being those whose place of origin is not Western Australia. The only reason for amending the Ordinance as suggested would be to enable the courts to impose penalties on masters of oversea ships at Fremantle in the event of certain troubles. Harbour Trust regulations are liable to alteration day by day, and new regulations may be promulgated and gazetted while a ship is on her way from Colombo to Fremantle. The fact that there have been no prosecutions under the Ordinance shows that masters of vessels are acquainted with the port regulations, or else that they are law-abiding people who carry out their duties so as not to offend against either the statutes or common sense. The proper way to achieve the Government's object is to bring in a Bill specifically dealing with river traffic. I hope the clause will not pass.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Honorary Minister desires to reach people who float about the river in small boats which are a danger to those in them and a nuisance to others, but he goes about the matter in a clumsy way. The reason why the Government cannot secure convictions against people in small craft is that they cannot place copies of the regulations in the hands of such people, not knowing of their existence. For that reason the Honorary Minister seeks to nullify something that for 71 years has applied to oversea vessels. In fact, the Bill proposes to nullify something that the Minister does not wish to nullify. The clause as drafted is absurd.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	21
Noes	..	..	..	..	15

Majority for .. 6

# AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Miss Holman	Mr. Withers
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Kennedy	

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Davy	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Latham	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Maun	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

**BILL—RESERVES.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 22nd September.

**MR. LATHAM** (York) [9.14]: This is one of those little Bills which all Governments bring down, intended to change the purposes of reserves.

**Mr. Marshall**: Who told you all about the Bill?

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order!

**Mr. LATHAM**: These Bills have one great advantage—that of enabling country people to secure some little financial assistance from the Government. Measures of this kind enable them to sell blocks of land that they have acquired in one way or another, and to use the money for the purpose of building halls or offices. The Bill can be dealt with better in Committee, as it refers to a number of reserves. I would like the Minister to give us some more information regarding the Fremantle reserve mentioned in Clause 7. The Minister did not tell us how that reserve was acquired, whether it is still a reserve or whether a building is erected upon it. Does that refer to the old Trades Hall site?

**The Minister for Lands**: Yes.

**Mr. LATHAM**: Then there is already a building on that reserve and that, of course, makes a difference. I see no objection to the Bill.

**MR. E. B. JOHNSTON** (Williams-Narrogin) [9.20]: I support the second reading of the Bill. The various provisions are included for the purpose of helping people concerned and have the approval of the local authorities. In some instances halls have been erected on unsuitable or non-central

sites. The Bill will permit the Government to arrange with local governing bodies to grant permission for the sale of the unsuitable sites, on condition that the money so raised is put to better advantage on behalf of the several communities. The Bill is a machinery measure and I am glad it has been introduced by the Government. Regarding Clause 4, the object of which is to assist the people of Kulin, I would point out to the Minister that since the Bill was framed, the name of the Roe Road Board has been changed to that of the Kulin Road Board. That is a detail that can be dealt with by the Minister in Committee.

**The Minister for Lands**: That will not make any difference.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON**: Except that the district has been cut into two, now controlled by the Kondinin Road Board and the Kulin Road Board respectively. There has been some controversy regarding the South Perth reserve. Has the Minister furnished the House with a plan showing what is proposed regarding that reserve?

**The Minister for Lands**: The plans are on the Table.

**Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON**: I know it is the desire of the people of South Perth to have a good recreation ground, just as other parts of the metropolitan area have sports grounds available for the citizens. If that is the object, I commend the Government for including that proposal in the Bill. At one time another institution desired to get hold of this land, but the proposal did not then appeal to the ratepayers, and I am strongly of the opinion that a good recreation ground is necessary for that most important suburb.

**HON. G. TAYLOR** (Mt. Margaret) [9.21]: The Minister when moving the second reading of the Bill said that the various requests were all supported by the local governing authorities concerned. If that be so, it is only right that we should agree to the second reading and secure any information desired from the Minister during the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Kulin Lot 15, etc.:

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I suggest that we amend the clause by altering the word "Roe" in lines 3 and 8 to "Kulin." The change in name of the Roe Road Board occurred after the Bill was drafted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That does not apply. If I find that it affects the position, I will have the matter dealt with in the Legislative Council.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Cue Town Lot 14:

Mr. CHESSEON: If the clause be agreed to it will mean the surrender to the Cue-Day Dawn Road Board of the town lot upon which the old Miners' Institute at Cue is built. The trustees of the Miners' Institute left Cue over 25 years ago and there has been no one in control of the building, which has been used for some years as a chaff house. The local road board took up the matter and the trustees are forwarding their resignations with a request that the road board be granted the block in fee simple. The intention is to use the building in connection with the installing of an electric lighting system for Cue.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Fremantle Town Lots 1511 and 1512:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"The proceeds of sale shall be applied to the erection of a hall for the purposes of the said association on Fremantle Town Lot 380, or other land to be approved by the Minister for Lands."

Many years ago the present Trades Hall building was erected in what was then a busy part of Fremantle. To-day that part of the town is almost deserted. The trustees of the Trades Hall considered it advisable to secure a more central site where a new Trades Hall could be erected. They purchased a block near the Fremantle Town Hall, where the old Oddfellows' Hall used to be. They desire to sell the hall and to erect a new building with the proceeds. It is necessary to set out in the Bill that the money received from the sale of the building must be applied for the purposes of the new hall. Hence the necessity for the amendment.

HON. G. TAYLOR: I am glad the Minister noticed the necessity for the amendment before the Bill was allowed to pass. It is a wise provision.

The Minister for Lands: The omission of the provision arose out of an error. The trustees asked for the inclusion of such a clause.

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

Clauses 8 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11—Reserve A5690:

Mr. LATHAM: It is proposed to excise portion of the reserve held by the police, and I understand it is part of the ground on which the police buildings stand. Has the matter been submitted to the Commissioner of Police, and has he any objection to it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It has been referred to the Commissioner, and he has agreed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will still be a reserve; it will not be built upon?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is to improve the utility of the recreation green.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Reserve A5574:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is the third time we have endeavoured to deal with this reserve at South Perth. I do not disapprove of the proposal, but I should like to see the straight length of Labouchere-road artistically broken. At present it spoils the magnificent view from King's Park. At the point where Labouchere-road runs between the Zoo and the reserve under consideration, trees could be planted where the road now is, and the road deviated around the plantation.

Mr. Clydesdale: How could you do it?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Zoo grounds and the reserve are opposite to each other, and both belong to the Government. Therefore the road could be diverted there, and its unsightly length broken.

Mr. Clydesdale: Both the Zoo and the reserve are too small now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The deviation would not take up much of the area.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then there are the golf links adjoining the reserve.

Mr. Clydesdale: The golf links are too small now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In no other part of the metropolitan area is there so much land reserved to the people for recreation purposes as at South Perth.

Mr. Clydesdale: Yet there is in South Perth no recreation reserve for the kiddies that is large enough for the purpose.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: No football ground, no cricket ground?

Mr. Clydesdale: Not of the requisite size.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It will be a good thing when the unfortunate animals leave the Zoo, and it is converted into a beautiful park. It is a mighty cruel thing to keep those animals in such confinement as they are kept in now. If we cannot have animals kept in captivity under better conditions than exist at the Zoo, we ought not to have them at all. Does the Minister know how small the cages and enclosures are?

Mr. Clydesdale: It would cost about £4,000 to increase the size of the cages.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members will deal with the clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suggest that the beauty of South Perth, as seen from King's Park, would be greatly improved by the breaking of the straight length of Labouchere road. It could easily be altered.

Mr. Clydesdale: How?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: By planting it with trees along the frontage of this reserve and deviating the road around the plantation.

The Minister for Lands: What about the houses?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There are no houses there. The view from King's Park over South Perth is beautiful, except that it is spoilt by the unbroken length of Labouchere Road.

Mr. Clydesdale: The necessary roads are all made. Where would you get the money for the new road that would be required?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would cost very little.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The break between Adelaide Terrace and St. George's Terrace is not an improvement.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suppose the hon. member has not enjoyed the view of South Perth from King's Park. If he has been up to the park, probably he went there at night.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: The hon. member's suggestion is a good one, if it were practicable. But if the road were to be deviated

through the Zoo there would be the difficulty of the hot water baths, which cost £3,000; the road would have to go either round them or through them. If, on the other hand, the road were to be deviated through the reserve, it would be cutting into what is insufficient now. For at about 10 chains from the frontage there is a widespread depression of from 6 to 8 feet, the filling in of which would cost thousands of pounds. It would have to be filled if any part of the level area were to be given up to the proposed road. Again, the tramline has just been laid along that length of Labouchere Road, so to deviate the road would mean tearing up the tramline as well. It must be remembered that a portion of this reserve is to be given over to the parking of motor cars bringing people to the Zoo or alternatively to the reserve. If the hon. member's suggestion were carried out and the deviated road taken through the reserve, unless the depression in the reserve were filled in at the cost of some thousands of pounds, the reserve would be no more effective for recreation purposes than is the existing reserve behind the road board chambers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There are 19 acres of land in this reserve.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: But only about 10 acres of it is level ground.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Part of the reserve is to be used for parking cars. Now that the tram runs there, the parking reserve will not be required.

Mr. Clydesdale: Yes, it will.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Well what about the street between the golf links and this reserve? Is that not wide enough for the parking of cars? Why cannot the cars park there? There are no houses to interfere.

Mr. Clydesdale: In that way you would get only one chain.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: How many cars does the hon. member desire to provide for?

Mr. Clydesdale: There will be hundreds of cars.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I thought this was to be a recreation ground for South Perth. I did not know that the residents would travel a few hundred yards in motor cars. It is a good thing to have recreation grounds, because people walk so little except when engaged in sport. It is quite possible to do as I suggest without interfering with the mineral baths or any consider-

able part of the parking reserve. The land will not pass out of the control of the Crown, although we change the purpose of the reserve. In addition to the large reserve used only in part for golf and not exclusively for golf, we are setting aside 20 acres. I am glad of that, but there will be quite sufficient to allow of the break in the road that I suggest. In the Zoological Gardens are a large number of tennis courts besides other grounds used for recreation purposes.

Mr. Clydesdale: Though there are many tennis courts you cannot get one on a Saturday or Sunday.

The Minister for Lands: One objection I have to the Zoological Gardens is that they are being turned into a Sunday playground.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A good thing, too.

The Minister for Lands: I do not see much in fancy-dress dances.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think they have fancy-dress dances.

The Premier: It would merely be reviving a fine old English custom if they did dance on the green on Sunday afternoon.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is no suburb of the metropolitan area with anything like the reserves that South Perth has. Still, it has not an acre too much, but we should adopt every means in our power to beautify Perth. We should not spoil its beauty by cutting long, straight, ribbon roads.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The proposal apparently is not understood. Portion of the reserve was in the first place vested in the local authority; the other portion has been reserved for botanical gardens. The Zoo is used as botanical gardens, and it is not likely that other botanical gardens will be established on this reserve. Portion of the reserve was granted to the Zoo for the purpose of building caretaker's quarters. As it was not required for that purpose, arrangements were made with the road board to give up portion of their reserve facing Labouchere-road for parking purposes and the Zoo would give up any claim it had to the portion set aside for caretaker's quarters, thus providing a nice square for recreation. All we ask is that the purpose be altered from botanical gardens to recreation, and provision is made that a portion of the reserve set apart for municipal purposes shall be used for parking.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is the duty of the local authority to provide for parking.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: They cannot do so unless they have the land. It is not advisable to have motors parked in the streets; they should be kept clear of the roads. The trams will shortly be running on this road from Mends-street to the Zoo.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And will spoil it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not at all. The planting of trees would hardly beautify the spot unless the road were cut in two. At present there are beautiful trees on both sides of the street. The only recreation ground available at present is that near the hall. It is not every person who can afford to pay 10s. per day to play tennis at the Zoo.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not object to adding to reserves; I am merely making a suggestion for the improvement of the road. When dealing with a question of this kind we should endeavour to beautify the place.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

## **BILL—METROPOLITAN MARKET.**

### *In Committee.*

Resumed from the 14th September; Mr. Panton in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3—The Metropolitan Market Trust:

Mr. Sampson had moved an amendment as follows:—

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

Mr. SAMPSON: The object is to give the primary producers two representatives on the trust. The Bill makes provision for what amounts to two representatives of the consumers. There is to be one representative of the consumers and a representative nominated by the Perth City Council.

The Minister for Lands: Will not the Government be responsible for the money?

Mr. SAMPSON: Rent will be paid by the stallholders. A wish has been expressed that the primary producers should have two representatives. There are really two varieties of produce—the produce of orchards and gardens and the produce of farms—and the



Government might reasonably agree to give one representative to each.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** I have already opposed the amendment. We discussed it for some hours the other evening, and I do not propose to depart from the attitude I then took up. In giving the producers one representative on the trust, we are affording them fair representation, and one which cannot be cavilled at. If it had been suggested that all the representatives on the trust should be producers, no doubt the member for Swan would have agreed.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** He was quite justified in moving an amendment.

**The Minister for Lands:** Those who are responsible for the payment of the money ought to have at least two representatives on the trust.

**THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE:** The Bill gives fair representation to all concerned. The Government will have to back the trust, and should be adequately represented on it.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** The member for Swan is justified in saying there should be two representatives of the producers on the trust. Two other persons will also be appointed by the Government.

**Hon. W. D. Johnson:** Who will they be?

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** One may be a producer, but there is no reason to suppose he will be. These will be Government markets, and will be established out of Government money. It is better that the City Council should find the money and do the work.

**The Minister for Lands:** Then the producers would not be represented at all.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** Members of the trust will have to be carefully selected, for they will be able to do what they like with the funds at their command. The markets would be useless unless the producers supplied the wherewithal to make them into markets. Were it not that the Government are finding the money, I would not hesitate to let the producers and consumers manage the whole business. Too often men go on these trusts for the pay they receive, and not for their ability.

**Mr. LAMBERT:** It is apparent that the member for Swan has moved this amendment in order to find favour with his electors.

**Hon. Sir James Mitchell:** That is not right.

**Mr. LAMBERT:** The main thing is to secure a proper and businesslike control of the markets. The principle of giving sectional representation to different interests is wrong. The Government should be allowed the untrammelled selection of five good, sound business men. Why in the name of Heaven should the Perth City Council have a representative on a trust like this, financed by the Government?

**Hon. W. D. Johnson:** Would not three representatives do instead of five?

**Mr. LAMBERT:** Possibly three could do the work. I hope the amendment will not be carried.

**Mr. E. B. Johnston:** Why not have three producers as a trust?

**Mr. LAMBERT:** The producers are not the only people concerned in marketing. There are, for instance, the consumers in the metropolitan area.

**Mr. THOMSON:** Some members seem to forget that the occasion for markets arises from the need for selling the commodities of producers. As the producers will bear the whole cost of construction and working of the markets, they are well entitled to two representatives on the trust. The chief object of the markets is to eliminate the middleman as far as possible. Figures quoted at the recent Bathurst conference, showing what the producer gets and what the consumer has to pay, are simply astounding. The Bill provides that all produce must go to the proposed markets, and therefore the amendment of the member for Swan is reasonable. A conference hurriedly called in Perth appointed representatives of the various producing interests a deputation to wait upon the Minister.

**The Minister for Lands:** You want all the five seats on the trust while other people are to find the money.

**Mr. THOMSON:** That is not so. The producers are prepared to pay for the markets.

**The Minister for Lands:** Nonsense!

**Mr. Chesson:** It is the consumers who will pay.

**Mr. THOMSON:** That is not correct. The whole of the costs, including salaries of members of the trust and interest and sinking fund, will be met out of fees levied on the produce going into the markets.

**The Premier:** The fees levied will be added to the prices charged to the consumers.

**Mr. THOMSON:** I do not agree with the Premier there. When the producer sends his products to market, all the charges

have to be deducted from the prices received for those commodities.

Mr. Chesson: Does the consumer get the goods any cheaper?

Mr. THOMSON: We hope that will follow with the inauguration of the trust. If the producer and the consumer do not alike benefit, it will be a pity that the Bill was ever introduced.

Mr. Lambert: Will that be effected by means of representation on the trust?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, because those who are responsible, directly and indirectly, for the payment of the whole of the money involved are the producers. It has been suggested that the Government, who will have the right to appoint members of the trust, will select producers, but, judging by other precedents, we find that this has not been so. There is no producers' representative on the Fremantle Harbour Trust, and now there is a vacancy on the Bunbury Harbour Board—

The CHAIRMAN: Again I will bring the hon. member back to the amendment, and I hope he will stick there this time.

The Minister for Agriculture: Tell us how two representatives of the producers will be better than one?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Government nominees may be producers.

Mr. THOMSON: If two producers' representatives are appointed it will be their duty to safeguard the interests of the producers. The chairman, who will be appointed by the Government, will act as an umpire holding the scales of justice evenly. He will see that the charges levied are the lowest possible consistent with the payment of interest, sinking fund and other necessary charges. Unless the producers have adequate representation on the trust, it may be possible for the trust to decide on going in for profit making so as to contribute to Consolidated Revenue. The producers' revenue would be a safeguard against that being done.

Mr. Lambert: The Fremantle Harbour Trust contributes to Consolidated Revenue, but the producers do not pay anything on account of that.

Mr. THOMSON: They do. I am prepared to discuss that point with the hon. member.

Mr. Millington: All night, no doubt!

Mr. THOMSON: The producers create the necessity for the Fremantle harbour,

but that question is not under discussion. In this instance we are voicing the desires of the producers of this State.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are not!

Mr. Marshall: What did you ever produce? You have not produced a grain of wheat.

Mr. THOMSON: I would have a short reply to make to that interjection, if I were permitted.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The hon. member has a very nice farm. The member for Murchison is quite wrong.

Mr. THOMSON: A conference of growers and producers requested the Minister to appoint two representatives of the producers, but he would not agree to it. We, as the representatives in this House of the producers—

The Minister for Agriculture: When you say "we," to whom do you refer?

Mr. THOMSON: We are voicing the producers' views.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are not!

Mr. Marshall: Never in your life.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You have no organisation to direct you in these things.

Mr. THOMSON: That is a most amazing statement to be made by the member for Guildford.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You have none.

Mr. Marshall: You get your directions from St. George's-terrace, from the moneyed people!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You represent the parasites.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Katanning must speak to the amendment.

Mr. THOMSON: I claim we do represent the producers and they are entitled to two representatives on the trust.

Mr. Mann: You have spoken of only two interests, the Government and the producers; what about the consumers?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The member for Katanning referred to the consumers.

Mr. THOMSON: Of course I did.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are talking politics, that is all.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not talking politics. There are some people who cannot get away from the idea that when an hon. member deals with some subject in all sincerity, he is talking politics.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We have the confidence of the producers; that is more than you can say.

Mr. THOMSON: That comes well from the hon. member! There are some people more concerned about others than about the producers.

The Premier: When are we to deal with the clause again?

Mr. THOMSON: I trust that even now the Government will agree to the request for two representatives of the producers on the trust.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is amendments of this kind that discount the prestige of the producers, who are not selfish, narrow, suspicious individuals such as some would represent them to be. The producers recognise that in the Bill the Government are earnestly endeavouring to provide for them that which they have been wanting for many years. They never have asked for a monopoly. They had a conference and agreed to the Bill.

Mr. Thomson: Did they ask for two representatives?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The conference adopted the Bill. Why? Because they were big enough to recognise that the Government are giving them fair representation on the board, and a Bill that can be administered by a well-balanced board. To put in two representatives of the producers, it should be obvious to anyone but a party hack, would upset the balance of the board. The only way to improve this board would be to have three members, one representing the Government, one representing the producer, and a third representing the consumer. But that would mean deleting the representative of the City Council, which would be unfair, for the City Council are called upon to play an active and important part in respect of these markets. It is possible that the two representatives of the Government will be wholly sympathetic to the producers, in which event the producers will actually have three voices on the board. As one constantly associated with the producers and recognising their difficulties, I strongly resent the idea that the producer is a narrow, bigoted, selfish individual thinking of nothing but his own advancement. The producers of this country, as represented by those who take an interest in marketing and study marketing, are bigger than that. They are above party hacks, and they want to assist the Government in providing that which is necessary to the success of the producing industry, namely a central market. The administration proposed in the

Bill is just the administration the producers are looking for.

Mr. THOMSON: The hon. member has talked a good deal about party hacks. Whilst he was speaking I asked him whether the conference had not requested two representatives. He carefully omitted any reply. I have here a copy of the letter sent by the producers to the Minister, in which they submitted for his consideration that the proposed constitution of the trust should be amended to five members, with two representing the producers and to be elected by the producers. Yet the hon. member talks about party hacks and boasts that he represents the producers. I say he does not when he makes a speech such as that he has just delivered. I repeat that the conference asked for two representatives on the trust.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I was invited to attend that conference of producers, which was not the first to be held in respect of the establishment of a central market. I know that those producers are not particularly interested in election blather; they are more interested in the establishment of a central market than in personal gain. They did not stress the representation, although certainly they asked for two representatives.

Mr. Thomson: That is all I said they did.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I arranged the deputation that waited on the Minister, who said it was necessary to have a board of five, and that the producers would not only be given representation on that board, but also that their interests would be conserved by the board. The important thing is that there should be proper representation on the board, and that the Government's money should be properly looked after and administered. That is what is important; not the making of election cries.

Mr. Thomson: Who is talking of election cries?

Mr. MILLINGTON: Every time the hon. member rises he seeks to show that he represents the only people. They are not the only people who realise the necessity for a central market. There are many others equally anxious. I presume that those to be appointed by the Government to the board will be quite capable of administering the market. The financial interests have to be attended to. One representative producer told me he realised that even if there were five producers on the board they would have to administer the market so that it

would be a profitable proposition. The market will not be there to make money.

Mr. Thomson: You have the example of what is happening on the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Everyone will be satisfied if the market is a paying proposition. I think the trust will become merely landlords and that outlets will be found for produce much as at the present time. Apparently the producers did not attach great importance to their request for increased representation.

Mr. Thomson: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Their chief concern is to get a market established. They are not risking the loss of the scheme by standing out for two representatives. When the Minister had explained the reason for the constitution of the trust, the deputation thanked him and expressed satisfaction with the Bill.

Mr. Thomson: I received this request after the deputation.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is Booth's letter.

Mr. Thomson: You are wrong.

The Minister for Agriculture: The very letter you quoted I have on my file.

Mr. MILLINGTON: Representatives of the primary producers have suggested that the City Council's representative should be cut out. The City Council are entitled to representation, and if it is not granted, there will be serious opposition to the measure. If the City Council found the money for the metropolitan market, they would object to giving other interests representation on the board.

Mr. Thomson: That is not correct.

Mr. MILLINGTON: They told the metropolitan members so.

Mr. Sampson: They said they were willing to accept the Bill in its entirety if the City Council were substituted for the trust.

Mr. Thomson: And give the primary producers two representatives.

Mr. MILLINGTON: If the City Council were substituted for the trust, it could only mean that the City Council would find the money and run the market. Not long ago the member for Swan argued that it was the function of the City Council to run the market. Now he is posing as the champion of the primary producers and asking for two representatives. After the deputation heard the Minister's reply they expressed themselves satisfied.

Mr. Thomson: And after that they wrote and asked for two members.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who wrote?

Mr. Thomson: Not the gentleman you quoted.

The Minister for Agriculture: Then it was Mr. Beacher.

Mr. Thomson: No.

The Minister for Agriculture: Then it was Booth. The very words you quoted are on my file.

Mr. Thomson: You have a copy of the letter and you know the signature on it.

The Minister for Agriculture: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. Thomson: The 6th September.

The Minister for Agriculture: That was before the deputation.

Mr. Thomson: But the letter reached me afterwards.

*[Mr. Lambert took the Chair.]*

Mr. MILLINGTON: The member for Katanning's sole contribution to the discussion has been so much bluff.

Mr. THOMSON: It is interesting to hear the imputation that this proposal is submitted for political purposes. If the Government are not prepared to accede to this request, I would favour the City Council's proposition. The member for Leederville does not know everything. The City Council are prepared, provided they have control of the market, to give the primary producers two representatives.

Mr. Millington: And how many representatives would the City Council have?

Mr. THOMSON: It is all very well for members to talk about political blather. It is remarkable that members on this side should have been asked to endeavour to have two producers appointed to the trust.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should adhere to the subclause.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with the point at issue.

The Premier: You have said it three or four times.

Mr. THOMSON: I will speak as often as I please. This is an important question to the producers, and it is the right time to bring it forward.

The Premier: The only thing I am astonished at is the way you bring it forward.

Mr. THOMSON: If the Government will not give the producers two representatives I will support the City Council's scheme.

The Premier: The City Council can have the whole lot.

Mr. THOMSON: I have it on good authority that they are prepared to give producers representation on the trust. Members opposite have endeavored to hold us up to ridicule.

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the question before the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON: I will vote for the deletion of the clause.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret the attitude of the member for Leederville. When he said that the City Council were not prepared to do a certain thing, I drew attention to what had occurred at the meeting which we both attended.

The CHAIRMAN: This line of argument has been too long debated. The hon. member must adhere to the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am sure the Chairman, with his characteristic fairness, will enable me to reply.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must adhere to his amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member discuss his amendment?

Mr. SAMPSON: The amendment is a popular one.

The Premier: Otherwise you would not be fathering it.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is popular because it is fair, and it is fair because it is popular. The Bill enunciates the principle of sectional representation. The producers, therefore, should be given more equitable representation than is here provided. At present the balance is against them.

The Premier: That point has been stated fifteen times.

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for Leederville should withdraw his statement that this is merely some kind of electioneering blather.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the positions on this trust were filled without fee we could more easily settle the matter. We should be told what the fees will be.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. Marshall: Can you, Mr. Chairman, accept a motion to report progress when there is a question before the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I support the amendment, but regret that the members for Swan and Katanning think they represent all the producers in the State. I represent some producers. Does the Minister think he is fair in giving the producers only one representative? Seventy per cent. of the producers are situated in the metropolitan area, as well as practically all the consumers. I suggest giving the consumers one representative and the producers two. Who is to appoint or select the one representative offered to the producers? Probably the Westralian Farmers would claim that they should appoint him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is not how the producers' representative shall be elected or appointed, but whether there shall be one representative of the producers or two.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister, in view of his knowledge of the producers and of the conditions of marketing, will no doubt see his way to accept the amendment.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH: I, too, represent a section of the producers, and the section in question have asked that the producers generally, should have two representatives on the trust. I am not prepared to agree that the Government should have only one representative, seeing that they will find the money; neither do I wish to see the representative of the consumers wiped out. Again, the organisations in my district desire that the Perth City Council should also be represented on the trust. Therefore, I am between the devil and the deep sea. The City Council representative would represent the producers as well as the consumers.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	21

Majority against	..	10
------------------	----	----

# AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Taylor
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Thomson
Mr. North	Mr. Latham
Mr. Sampson	

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mann
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Miss Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lamond	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.***Legislative Assembly,***Wednesday, 29th September, 1926.*

	Page
Questions: Main Roads Board	1176
Bunbury Harbour—1, Dredging; 2, Improved scheme	1176
Wubin-Mt. Magnet Road	1177
Police Benefit Fund Select Committee, extension of time	1177
Motions: P. F. Gemmell's file	1177
Wroth bankruptcy case	1177
Bills: Reserves, Report	1177
Broome Loan Validation, 3a.	1177
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 3a.	1177
Co-operative and Provident Societies Act Amendment, 3a.	1177
Shipping Ordinance Amendment, 3a.	1177
Police Act Amendment, discharged	1177
State Insurance, Com.	1177
Metropolitan Market, Com.	1182
Weights and Measures Act Amendment, 2a.	1189

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

**QUESTION—MAIN ROADS BOARD.**

Mr. RICHARDSON (for Mr. Latham) asked the Minister for Works: 1, On what date did the members of the Main Roads Board take up their duties? 2, What amount of money from the petrol tax, stood to the credit of the Board on the 30th June, 1926? 3, What amount of money appropriated from the land tax, stood to the credit of the Board on the 30th June, 1926? 4, What

were the total credits, including the moneys provided under the Federal Aid Roads Act agreement, standing to the credit of the credit of the Board on the 31st August, 1926? 5, What work has been undertaken by the Main Roads Board since its inception—(a) new works; (b) reconstruction of main roads?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, 7th June, 1926. 2, £22,795 18s. 11d. 3, Nil. 4, £47,112 10s. 5, (a) Work has been carried on on some 98 developmental roads; (b) continuation of work on sections of Perth-Armadale and Perth-Northam roads and reconstruction of Upper Swan bridge.

**QUESTIONS (2)—BUNBURY HARBOUR.***Dredging.*

Mr. WITHERS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware of the extent of the silting up that has taken place in the Bunbury harbour during the past winter? 2, Is it the intention of the Government to recommence dredging at Bunbury as a temporary expedient? 3, If so, when?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Investigations are now being carried out to ascertain extent of silting since last dredging. 2, Yes, where investigations now in hand show it to be necessary. 3, November next.

*Improved Scheme.*

Mr. WITHERS asked the Minister for Works: What progress has been made in connection with the improved harbour scheme for Bunbury that was promised to a representative deputation of the South-West?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: Investigations have been made to enable the Engineer-in-Chief to estimate the quantity of water flowing past Point McLeod during floods, and the direction of the flow through the harbour. A survey of the foreshore work from the wreck of the Carbet Castle to the mouth of estuary has been made, and soundings have been taken to determine the siltage over the area dredged by the "Sir William Matthews." Current readings under varying conditions outside the mole from one mile of the harbour, and a quarter and half miles of the foreshore, and also up to two miles north have been made, and these