

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 2nd December, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Bills : Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 1r.	2958
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), 3r.	2958
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 2), 2r., personal explanation, Com.	2958, 2982
South Fremantle Oil Installations Pipe Line, 1r., 2r., remaining stages	2972
Electoral Act Amendment, 2r.	2973
Road Closure, 2r., remaining stages	2976
City of Perth Electricity and Gas Purchase, 1r.	2978
Companies Act Amendment, 3r.	2978
Land Act Amendment, (No. 1), Assembly's Message	2978
Reserves, 2r., remaining stages	2979
Traffic Act Amendment, 2r., remaining stages	2984
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	2987
Country Towns Sewerage, 2r., Com.	2990
Acts Amendment (Increase of Fees), 1r.	3001
Adjournment, special	3002

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [3.7]: The Bill which deals with the franchise of the Legislative Council has been given publicity among a small section of the people only. There has been no outcry for an extension of the franchise and I have heard no-one complain about it. As a matter of fact, owing to the present financial position, a person living in any sort of a dwelling, even a glorified fowlhouse, could qualify for the Council franchise.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is not so. A fowlhouse would not be worth 15s. a week.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Practically any sort of a building would be worth that in these days. The only people keen on this move are Labourites.

Hon. G. Fraser: This is your Government's Bill.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The question of the Legislative Council is merely a stalking horse for Labour members. They are always claiming that this House has been destructive in its dealing with legislation. How, with all the beneficial industrial legislation that is on the statute book, can this House be described as autocratic? That legislation could not have been passed but for the action of the Legislative Council? The Bill now before the House differs very slightly from that submitted last year. That measure was rejected, because the voting was three short of the requisite statutory majority. Now we have a measure that is practically similar to that dealt with on that occasion. As to the Council franchise, it would be interesting to look back a few years and consider what improvement has taken place in the enrolments for this Chamber.

I recollect a Select Committee, of which I was chairman, dealing with electoral matters and during the course of his evidence the Chief Electoral Officer stated that the then Government—it was a Labour Government that had been in office for years—had been approached by the department time and again, but it would not provide one penny-piece for the purifying of the Council rolls. On the other hand, money was found for dealing with the Legislative Assembly rolls. What an astounding thing that was! The Government spent money on the Assembly rolls, notwithstanding that it was a matter of compulsory enrolment and that penalties attached to non-enrolment, yet could not find a penny to spend on the purification of the Council rolls! Why? The Labour people do not want the Council rolls improved. They want them to remain in such a condition that they are able to say that owing to the position being such, they cannot do this and cannot do that. There are some amendments to be moved at the Committee stage and I shall have something to say about them later on.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Your party wants the Bill.

Hon. A. Thomson: How do you know?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What does the hon. member mean by that? We are in a position quite different from Mr. Gray and his Labour colleagues. We are bound to the party platform only. We are not required to attend meetings at which decisions are made controlling our actions. We have freedom of action in Parliament.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is exactly what we have.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Oh, no!

Hon. G. Fraser: Oh, yes!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member cannot put that over this House. We know that he and his colleagues are bound by the decisions of party meetings. They are bound hand and foot.

Hon. G. Fraser: You know nothing about it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, I do.

Hon. G. Fraser: We are free, too.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Mr. Williams let the cat out of the bag in this Chamber. He told us what went on and that he would not be bound in that manner. The result was that he was sacrificed by his Labour friends. Mr. Fraser and his colleagues would be sacrificed as well if they did not come to heel. The Labour Party is the one section that makes the Legislative Council a party House.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And you do not!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I have had a long parliamentary experience and I know that when I was Leader of this House, members of my own party voted against me and Labour members supported me. With the present Government, we find the Labour members supporting it as they did other Governments in the past. It is all very well to put these tales over new members who have not been here long enough to realise the position, but they will soon recognise that Labour members are bound down.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Have you not some obligation to your leader?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We have an obligation to our platform.

Hon. G. Bennetts: The same as we have.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Mr. Heenan spoke well about democracy. I must compliment that hon. member on the manner of delivery he adopted in one of the nicest speeches I have heard him make in this House—but I did not agree with his matter. When he started to talk about democracy, I was amused. The Labour Party is the last that should talk about democracy; there is not much that is democratic about that party. I shall not speak at length on the measure, for we have about 40 Bills to deal with and the session is expected to end on the 9th.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: On the ninth Bill?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, on the 9th December, although I certainly do not anticipate finishing on that date. I shall support the Bill with a view to its being amended in three directions, but if that does not happen, I shall vote against it. I will not hide my light under a bushel in that respect. One of the main objections in the past to this House by some agitators—and there are some on our own side—has been that it has no power over finance. Not a word has been said on that point since. A case has not been put up to justify the need for any drastic alteration in the franchise for the Council.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why should not women get the vote?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Women are entitled to the vote if they are property owners. What Mr. Gray would like would be the state of affairs that prevails in the Commonwealth Parliament, where the Senate is only the mouthpiece of another place. Mr. Gray wants us to follow that course, but the people have a safeguard in the Council at present. One of the greatest Labour leaders of our day once said, "Thank God for the Legislative Council." I do not hesitate to say that all the Labour members of another place, and of this Chamber also, would repeat that remark of the late Mr. Collier. We must exercise great care in dealing with the franchise for this House, otherwise it will be of little use to the people. I support the second reading on the understanding that my amendments on the notice paper will be agreed to. If not, I reserve the right to vote against the third reading of the Bill.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [3.17]: I support the second reading. I desire at this juncture to express my displeasure at the crude abuse of this Chamber by some members of another place. It is not that such abuse does this House harm; I think it does some good—as more than one person has remarked to me, “At least, you have some dignity in your Chamber.” That rather puts another place in a lower category. But such abuse by one place of another does the whole parliamentary system much harm. It lowers members in the eyes of the public and is greatly to be regretted.

I admit that the people who indulge in such crude language are men of no standing and who are held in little respect by the public. Their very language is indicative of their background and their standing in the community. The Labour Party, in my opinion, is most unwise in endeavouring to lower the prestige of this House. That party must be aware of the infiltration of Communism into its ranks, and should that prove successful and this House is abolished, we shall be close to a complete dictatorship in this State. The Communists have got into another party; that is admitted on all sides.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Who admits it?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Many members of the hon. member's own party. It has been stated in the Press from time to time that in New South Wales union secretaries and presidents of unions have admitted infiltration of Communists into their unions.

Hon. G. Fraser: There is none in the A.L.P.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Only the other day unions disobeyed the recommendations of their own officers at the dictates of a Communist element within the unions.

Hon. G. Fraser: Where did you read that?

Hon. L. CRAIG: That was the last big strike.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Where?

Hon. L. CRAIG: In Sydney; and in Melbourne the other day.

Hon. E. M. Davies: That has not happened here. You are referring to the A.C.T.U.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Labour Party is affiliated with it.

Hon. G. Fraser: No, it is a different party altogether.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The point I make is that, by lowering the prestige of parliamentary institutions, we are getting closer to the time when Parliament will have little to say in the government of the country. If we had only one House today, things would be different.

Hon. E. M. Davies: There is only one House in Queensland.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Would you take Queensland as a well-governed State?

Hon. G. Fraser: I have heard a lot of praise of Queensland.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I myself have praised Queensland; it is an enormously rich and beautiful country ruined by its Government.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you not think that the Press and the public, by ignoring this Chamber, are doing the same work in a different way as the Communist Party?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Press, as the hon. member knows, publishes stuff that is news which is avidly read by the people of lower intellect.

Hon. W. J. Mann: The minority.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. To get back to the Bill: As I have said here before, there are principles involved in the franchise for the Legislative Council. I have no quarrel with people who would say that they are wrong principles, but as long as they remain, we must stick to them. I refer particularly to the principle of a property vote. The whole franchise for the Upper House is based on a property qualification. The individual does not come into it. If anyone said that that is wrong, I would reply, “All right, that is your opinion.” But the whole franchise for this Chamber is based on property, a stake in the country. This was done in the early days for a very good reason, so that people who are here today and gone tomorrow will have no substantial say in the permanent government of the country. That is very sound indeed.

Hon. G. Fraser: From your point of view.

Hon. L. CRAIG: And it has worked. The House of Lords in England still remains and England is the best governed country in the world.

Hon. G. Fraser: The House of Lords has not the power this House has.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Perhaps that is why the Government in England is deteriorating to-

day. Members no doubt are aware that not so long ago Mr. Hawke, when in the Eastern States, boasted that Western Australia led the Commonwealth in its social legislation, in spite of the most powerful Legislative Council in the Empire. Therefore, we have not done so badly. In spite of the views of various members on the principle of the property qualification, it has worked. The Bible says, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Should we not judge the Government of this country on its fruits, on its results? Has it not worked well?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you imply that it is perfect?

Hon. L. CRAIG: No, but I say it has worked. If the franchise for this Chamber is not based on property, then the whole principle breaks down and there is no reason for this Chamber. The present system of franchise has worked well. We have had no public demand for a change. I myself have never heard the slightest demand for a change of the franchise. I believe this has all been worked up with a view to belittling the Government and the parliamentary institution, and I am afraid it will have a bad effect on the public.

Hon. G. Fraser: You go round in circles.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The least we can do is to try to establish a high regard in the public for our parliamentary institution.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What do you think of Mr. McLarty's amendments?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think one of them is good.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What are his motives?

Hon. L. CRAIG: They are always the highest. Even if Mr. McLarty's motives are not always right, they are high and he should not be abused for trying to do what in his opinion is right. This is a House of review, and it would be well for us to function in the same high way as we have done in the past. Now, to get down to the Bill. I have been floating. In my opinion, a flat is a house, and therefore we must allow residents of flats to vote for the Council. When the franchise for the Council was established, there were no such things as flats, which are a modern trend.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Give women the vote for the Council.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Why bring women into the picture? The question of sex does not arise so far as the franchise for this Chamber is concerned. Suppose only women at present had the franchise for this House, then the word "husband" would have to be included in the Bill. It is the person who owns the property who has the vote.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Or the person who rents it.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, the occupier. Members are only bringing women into the question for the same reason that they brought soldiers into it. This dragging in of soldiers is degrading. It is done for a purpose which was never intended.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Who dragged them in?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I would not like to mention names. Soldiers have been dragged in by members with tears in their eyes. It is not very elevating.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: It is the policy of the returned soldiers' own executive.

Hon. L. CRAIG: And the people who are doing it are the people who denied preference to soldiers not so long ago. With tears in their eyes, they now say, "Is not a soldier entitled to vote for his country?" The tears dropped to the floor in bucketfuls. It is all wrong. The same thing has been done in respect of widows and children. Let us try to deal with these Bills on their merits.

Personal Explanation.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: I rise to a point of order. There have not been many speakers on this Bill, and therefore I take it that Mr. Craig's remarks refer to them. I was one. If I did make any reference to soldiers, I did not do so with tears in my eyes which dropped in bucketfuls on to the floor. These extravagant innuendoes made by Mr. Craig are utterly untrue. If he has referred to me I ask for a withdrawal.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: But you did not cry, so he could not have referred to you.

The President: I take it that Mr. Craig did not refer in any way to the hon. member and I therefore accept this as a personal explanation.

Debate Resumed.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I was not in the House when Mr. Heenan made his speech and I had no idea that he had made reference to soldiers. I was not referring to speeches in this House only, but from time to time soldiers have been dragged in and used for this purpose. I think it is to be regretted. I am sorry if Mr. Heenan has taken it upon himself to think I was endeavouring to insult him in some way, because that was far from my mind. I hope the House will not break down the principle of property. If it does so, we might as well let everything go and have Legislative Council elections on the same lines as Senate elections.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Why not compulsory voting?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Either the present system is right, or it is not. Women do not come into it at all. It is a question of who is the landlord, and who the tenant. Then there is the question of whether we are to allow a man a vote for the property he owns. If it is accepted that we should, plural voting must be allowed. If we say that the vote is not necessarily a property vote we can decide that each person shall have one vote only. I think the principle of property should remain, and I support the second reading.

HON. R. M. FORREST (North) [3.37]: I support the second reading, and I think the provision dealing with flat dwellers is splendid. After seeing some of the places I have visited, and knowing that the occupants of such premises have the vote, I am convinced there is an anomaly when I realise that the occupants of some of our big modern flats, with rentals of six or seven guineas a week, are denied a vote. I cannot support any move to do away with plural voting. I am sorry the Government did not include in the measure provisions to give the ratepayers of pastoral leases a vote. It must be remembered that pastoral leases in the north are sometimes rented as high as £1,000 per year, and yet the ratepayer has no vote—

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: He has a vote.

Hon. R. M. FORREST: The leaseholder has a vote, but the ratepayer has not, whereas in other areas the ratepayer who pays 8s. per week in rent is given a vote. I am sorry the Government has not endeavoured

to rectify that anomaly. As to the question of the wives of ratepayers being given a vote—I do not think that will make any difference. The wife should have a vote if she has the qualification. There are plenty of women on the roll now, with the requisite qualifications. There is one section of opinion that wishes to do away with plural voting and another that wishes to retain it, and when the Bill is in Committee I must reserve the right to vote as I think fit.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [3.35]: I could not let this hardy annual pass without having a few words to say about it. I was surprised at the attitude of Mr. Baxter who said, during the course of his speech, that he was chairman of a certain Select Committee. That reminds me that that Select Committee recommended much of what this Bill is intended to do, and yet we have the member who was chairman of that Committee, which recommended that votes be given to certain people, opposing the Bill now before us. It is hard to understand.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am not opposing the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: When the Bill is in Committee, the hon. member is going to oppose the provisions that the Select Committee recommended.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Select Committee did not say anything about plural voting.

Hon. G. FRASER: No, but I know how the hon. member voted last year, and how he will vote on this occasion. The Select Committee recommended votes for the wives of householders.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But it did not recommend anything about plural voting.

Hon. G. FRASER: No, but the hon. member now opposes some of the recommendations of that Select Committee. It seems a peculiar attitude to adopt and savours of double dealing.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: He has seen the light.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hoped he would, but evidently he has not seen the light. Members of the Country Party at one time tacked on to themselves the word "democratic" and yet when a Bill seeking to make this Chamber more democratic is introduced they oppose it. I think many people trade

under false colours. The attitude of a lot of members is remarkable. They deny one section of the people a vote, but will give certain others as many as 10 votes. I cannot understand that attitude. One representative of the North Province will have nothing to do with abolishing plural voting, but at the same time denies the right of a vote to other people who are mentioned in the measure and who have no vote at all. All we seek to do is to give a vote to the wives of householders.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Who are "we"?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am one of them and I think the wife of a householder is entitled to a vote.

Hon. G. Bennetts: I think the housewives should cut off the tucker of those who do not support the provision.

Hon. G. FRASER: The wife has most to do with building up the home. Just because the law regards the husband as the householder, he gets the vote. There is no justification for that. If a woman does not get married but rents a house in the "red light" area; she is given a vote; whereas if she marries and rears a family, she is denied it.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think your analogy is a good one.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is, because one woman is producing and the other is not. We deny a vote to the woman who is producing and doing something good for the country but the other one, who, of course, serves a purpose, is given a vote. All the Bill seeks to do is to give the wife of a householder a vote, which is long overdue. If we keep pegging away for long enough she will eventually get it. We believe that in the end justice will prevail and that members of this Chamber will see the light and so cast their votes that the wives of householders will in turn be given the right to vote.

During his remarks, Mr. Baxter spoke of matters about which he knew nothing and said his party only signed for its platform. He then went on to say that certain other members, including myself, were bound down by other decisions. That showed his ignorance in the matter, because representatives of the Labour Party are bound by nothing but their platform. The hon. member can shake his head, but I have been a member of the Labour Party for a long

time and I challenge him to produce any facts to show the contrary to be the case. I can point to portions of the platform indicating that a member of this party is bound by the platform of the party and nothing else.

Hon. F. R. Welsh: Are you bound on this Bill?

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, because it affects the party's platform. I do not think that more than four or five Bills in a session are such that members of my party are bound with regard to them. We are the freest members in this House.

Hon. A. Thomson: Tell us some more funny stories.

Hon. G. FRASER: I recall that during the term of the previous coalition Government, legislation was discussed in the party room and members were bound when it came into the House.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Legislative Council members?

Hon. G. FRASER: Some Legislative Council members. I am satisfied from actions in the past few years that some members here are bound by nothing, not even promises they made from the platform at election time. Last night one member said that because the Government introduced last session—in keeping with its promise to the people—a Bill that was defeated, there was no need to bring such a measure down again. He said that should be the finish of it.

Hon. W. R. Hall: That is what they are going to do with this measure?

Hon. G. FRASER: That is only a confidence trick. When members promise the people that they will introduce legislation, and then make arrangements for it to be defeated, with the idea of saying then that they have carried out their promises, things have come to a pretty pass. A promise made on the platform is a solemn promise and every endeavour should be made to honour it.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: When you speak of arrangements being made for a measure to be defeated, you are simply drawing an inference.

Hon. G. FRASER: And a pretty good one, judging by the attitude of many members. During the term of the previous coal-

tion Government, almost all if not all of the legislation introduced was discussed at party meetings before its introduction.

Hon. A. Thomson: How do you know?

Hon. G. FRASER: We know. We even had the spectacle of one member of another place speaking against a Bill and saying that nevertheless he had to vote for it.

Hon. A. Thomson: That happens even in this House on occasions.

Hon. G. FRASER: It happened in another place. Members there were bound on every Bill introduced, but the only Bills on which we are bound are those that affect the party platform.

Hon. A. Thomson: I did not see you going against Bills introduced by your Government.

Hon. G. FRASER: No, because that Government introduced legislation that we believed in, and we supported it without being bound to do so.

Hon. A. Thomson: You were bound to support those measures, or you would not again have been selected.

Hon. G. FRASER: The hon. member is entirely wrong. Members of my party are bound only by the platform. No legislation introduced by any Labour Government is discussed in Caucus except that which affects the party platform.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: On a point of order, Mr. President, is it competent for a member to discuss the proceedings that ensue in party rooms with relation to a Bill which deals with an amendment to the franchise of the Legislative Council.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask Mr. Fraser to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Hon. G. FRASER: I was merely making an incidental reference, Mr. President. I have given the House my attitude on the main points of the Bill regarding the householder. The other points have been referred to in debate and I was endeavouring to put members on the right track. They were not pulled up when making long statements and I just seized the opportunity of correcting them. I hope we will not have any more wild accusations made in this Chamber regarding those particular phases.

I seriously support the Bill because it is long overdue. The section of the community that will be covered by it should have received the privilege many years ago.

If the names of electors on the roll are examined, particularly those of womenfolk, I think it will be found that there are 137,000 women on the Legislative Assembly roll of whom only 24,000 are on the roll for the Legislative Council. I cannot understand the attitude of the women's organisations and the Women's Parliament.

Hon. L. Craig: They are not concerned.

Hon. G. FRASER: They should be concerned. They seem to be concerned with the other activities of members of Parliament because they wanted a woman on the Milk Board. Here we have legislation which is attempting to give to their particular sex a say in the running of the country and not one word is heard from them. It seems astounding to me that they have neglected the interests of their sex to that extent. I believe that section of the community is well worthy to be given a vote.

If women were given a vote it would be found that there would be a large increase in the province polls. The women would not only vote but they would see that their husbands did their duty. It is the duty of a person to record his vote on every possible occasion. I do not know whether members are afraid that they might lose their seats if the Bill reaches the statute book. However, even if they do not record their vote, they should have the privilege of being on the roll and vote if they so desire. I support the second reading and I hope the Bill will be carried without amendment.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [3.50]

It seems that if we want some impassioned speeches we need only a Bill of this description. Yesterday I listened to an extremely delightful speech from my friend Mr. Heenan who kindly singled me out as a brand that might be snatched from the burning, and as one who may even be persuaded to vote for the Bill. I want to tell Mr. Heenan and other members that down the years I have consistently said that when another place sets about some reform on their own behalf. I would be a little more kindly disposed to any question of reform in this House. Consequently, I propose to vote for the second reading, as evidence of good faith in that regard.

There is not a great deal in the Bill. I think we are agreed, on the question of flats, that people have been more or less forced to live in them as a result of the

war. I suppose there are hundreds, and probably thousands of people living in flats who, if they had their own way, would be living in smaller cottage dwellings with gardens and a little more freedom. We must recognise that fact and say, "Very well, you are unable to live in the type of dwelling that you prefer and must live in a flat and therefore it is a fair thing that you should be eligible to vote." Therefore, I propose to support that portion of the Bill.

I do not view the question of plural voting in the same light. It is only a few months ago since I had the illustration of a good friend of mine in Kalgoolie who has been a stalwart of the Labour Party all his life. I have not discussed plural voting with him as he believed in its abolition. A year or two ago, however, he purchased a piece of land in a seaside town with the idea of going there one day to live. He had his own home in Kalgoolie. The people were divided on a little movement in that seaside town, and a referendum was looming. My friend wrote to me and wanted to know all the particulars of the question. He said, "I will be getting into this; my vote will be there."

That is an illustration of how men favour a plural vote. That is where arguments against plural voting fall down, because when it comes to a man's own personal interests he rightly says, "If they propose to do that down there, I want to have a say." He wants a vote where he lives, and one where he has his other interests. The same principle applies here. I do not want to repeat so many times that a man may have very big interests in one part of the State and large interests in another, and it should be quite reasonable for him to have a vote in each part. Dealing with the question of a vote for wives, Mr. Fraser gave us some figures just now which were rather interesting. I understood him to say that there were 137,000 women on the Assembly roll who could be or should be eligible to be placed on the Council roll.

Hon. L. Craig: No, that is not right.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is what I understood him to say. If he did say that, then there are 115,000 left for Labour members of this Chamber to concern themselves with if the proposal before us is carried into effect. I could visualise some of

our more glamorous members, say Mr. Hall and Mr. Heenan, becoming very busy when they returned to their province hunting up all the wives, particularly the younger ones, to ascertain whether they were enrolled. Possibly I could suggest also that Mr. Boylen and Mr. Bennetts would be watching the newspapers to see the marriage notices, getting in touch with the newly-married couples and almost quarrelling as to how they would get them to record their votes.

Hon. G. Bennetts: You may be sure I would be at the church waiting.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Mr. Fraser might also be watching to see what women could be put on the roll. Of course, I would not like to see any quarrel amongst the members concerned, but I would warn them that there are many pitfalls ahead of them if this Bill goes through with their support. On many occasions, the Government of which we are supporters, has brought down legislation with which we are not in accord. It proves the freedom of members of this Chamber that we are able to support or oppose any such legislation. That is the beauty of our side of politics; there is no compulsion. Never yet have I been told how I shall vote. If the Leader told me how I had to vote, he might have something coming to him; I am not too sure.

There is no need to worry unduly whether wives are put on the roll or not. Some two and a half years ago, when I was on my election campaign, everywhere I spoke I was careful to refer to Legislative Council affairs, particularly as to whether the abolition of this Chamber was thought by people to be desirable or not. In every case, the retort received, when I had one at all, was that the Legislative Council should be left as it is. Generally speaking, people were not interested in electoral reform, and I have never heard any complaint on that issue. There was perhaps one gentleman, I think he was a union steward, a young man who had nothing to learn about politics in this or any other country. His advice was that the Council should be abolished. I intend to vote for the second reading of the Bill and to support that portion of it dealing with flats. I will have nothing to do with the abolition of plural voting and will not support the giving of the franchise to wives other than is already set out in the Act.

HON. W. R. HALL (North-East) [3.58]: Mr. Mann has referred to me and thus brought me into the picture. I cannot allow the occasion to pass without having a few words to say on this Bill which, after all, is a hardy annual. Although I intend to support it, I feel that its fate is sealed. One has only to listen to the speeches of members and to glance at their faces to know that, whilst they will pass the second reading, they will mutilate it in Committee.

Hon. A. L. Loton: You must have been crystal-gazing.

Hon. W. R. HALL: One does not require to look very deeply into a crystal to know that. I can tell by the look on members' faces what will happen. Some members would have us believe that the Labour Party brought this Bill down. No doubt that party has brought down several such Bills in previous years, but on this occasion the Bill has been brought down by the McLarty-Watts Government. It is therefore up to members of those two parties to see that it passes into law.

Hon. G. Bennetts: What was done to one member of this House when he supported a similar Bill?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The public decided that.

Hon. W. R. HALL: The criticism that has been levelled at the Labour Party for supporting legislation of this sort is not warranted.

Sitting suspended from 4.0 to 4.15 p.m.

Hon. W. R. HALL: One would think this Bill was brought down by the Labour Party, whereas it has been introduced by the McLarty-Watts Government which is to be commended for its action. It has done the right thing by the people, and it is trying to keep the promises it made. If members in this House who belong to the Government parties give their support to the Bill, they will be doing something in the interests of the people of the State. The measure seeks to give the wives of householders a vote, and they are justly entitled to it. I know members of this House who are living in flats, and I take it the Bill will give them a vote and their wives also. Last Saturday there were municipal elections in Kalgoorlie and a

large vote was cast, according to the figures in "The Kalgoorlie Miner."

Hon. A. Thomson: Many of them must have been householders.

Hon. W. R. HALL: Yes. It is nice to see the women taking an interest in local government affairs, and also those of the country. The Bill could make the franchise much wider. Enrolment has been difficult because in some cases where a husband and wife have rented a residence, if the wife has gone to the council office to pay the rates she has automatically been put on the rate-book and so has been able to claim a vote in connection with the house. That is what happens in many instances on the Goldfields. The Bill will eliminate much of that trouble in connection with flat-dwellers and occupiers. Married couples who have been forced, through no fault of their own, to live in flats should not be debarred from having a vote as they have some sort of a stake in the country. Mr. Forrest spoke of a person not having a qualification for the vote in respect of a property he mentioned. That would be wrong. If application were made in that case, the person concerned would be entitled to be put on the Legislative Council roll.

Members have already given serious consideration to the Bill and I think their minds are made up. Each year as a similar measure is brought down, more earnest consideration should be given to it. As Mr. Fraser has said, it is becoming a hardy annual. It is time we did something about it instead of more or less making a joke of it. The Government is to be commended for introducing the Bill, and its representatives here should vote for it. I know the Labour members in the Council will support it.

HON. R. J. BOYLEN (South) [4.22]: I support the second reading. Much has been made of the property qualification for the franchise to elect a member for this House. What seems to have been forgotten is that in the case of the majority of working people who own their homes, the property is vested in either one party or the other, but actually belongs to both. Only one, however, has an opportunity to vote for this Chamber. If both husband and wife were given the vote, it would probably

encourage discussions on political matters in the home, and they would cast a much more intelligent vote than at present. Mr. Logan stated there was no popular demand for this type of legislation. That statement is incorrect.

I know that on the 'fields at every election numerous people ask, "When are we going to be permitted to be enrolled for the Legislative Council in a manner similar to what we are for the Legislative Assembly." The Legislative Council does not only legislate for people owning property. All the legislation enacted in another Chamber has to come before us, and in many instances measures are dealt with here before going to the Legislative Assembly. All sections of the community, therefore, have an interest in the Legislative Council, but very few people have an opportunity of electing its members. I intend to support the provision to give the right to vote to a husband or wife of a householder. Even then, the franchise would extend to only about 50 per cent. of adults in dwellings, because, in addition to the husband and wife, who would have the vote, many adults would be living under the same roof, but the Bill would not refer to them.

It was also stated by Mr. Logan that if there were a majority of Labour members in the Legislative Council, this House would not be warranted. Those remarks will also apply when anti-Labour forces are in the majority. We do not suggest that a reflection of that nature should be made in the event of there being a majority of Labour members in this House. Most flat-dwellers do not live in flats by choice but by force of circumstances. While some may prefer to live in flats for a start, because they think their responsibilities would not be as great as if they owned their own homes, it is usually not long before they want their own home. They should be able to elect their representative in this Chamber. I support the second reading.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [4.26]: Whatever merits the Bill possesses, it cannot be said that it has been brought down as the result of a demand by the people. In the 12 or 14 years I have been in this House I have not known the country people, or for that matter those in the metropolitan area, express a desire to have

legislation similar to this introduced. On this occasion we have listened to one or two fairly fiery speeches by Labour members, but we must remember that the abolition of this Chamber is a plank of their party's platform. So we can understand the heat with which some of them speak at times.

If there is one thing more than another that has antagonised members of this Chamber against the Legislative Assembly, it is the abuse or criticism that has been indulged in in another place. It has emanated, of course, from only a few members, and they are mainly responsible for the agitation that has existed for the liberalising of the Legislative Council franchise. We all recognise that of recent years many people have been forced to live in flats. A great number of those flats are better than some of the cottages which people occupy. I have for some time thought they were entitled to a vote. I venture the opinion that the majority of members here would have agreed to that concession years ago, but it has been difficult to deal with the matter without bringing in other amendments to which the majority of members would not agree.

It is all very well to talk about passing the second reading of the Bill, but we do not know where it will finish. While some members may agree to the clause dealing with flats, they may not be prepared to agree to the whole Bill by the time it has been finally dealt with. There might be other amendments that they do not like. There has, therefore, been a disinclination on the part of members to do much about the position in connection with flats. I think, however, that the time has arrived when we should grant this concession. I hope the second reading will be carried. A great deal has been said about the Government introducing the legislation. I cannot see anything wrong with that. We know that pressure has been brought to bear on the members of the present Government for years.

Members would make it appear that there is an outcry throughout the State for legislation of this kind. Members know as well as I do that such a state of affairs does not exist. When it is all boiled down it is nothing more than a storm in a teacup. We must realise that there are thousands of people qualified to have their

names on the roll, but they do not bother about it. Why should womenfolk be given the opportunity to vote when thousands of husbands have the qualifications but do not take the trouble to fill in cards and register their votes? There is a good deal of eye-wash about this, and I am sure that so far as the people generally are concerned they would not care two hoots if the Bill were defeated again. That is my candid opinion.

Hon. G. Fraser: You are speaking of your people, of course.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I think the hon. member's people are in the same boat except the few that have to toe the mark at Trades Hall occasionally, and that is where most of the trouble has emanated. If it were left to the Labour members of this Chamber I think there would be very little alteration in the franchise. It suits some members of another place to abuse this House and to make uncalled for accusations against members. That kind of thing does not help very much in getting legislation such as this passed. I, like other members, will vote for the second reading, but I will not pledge myself to vote for all the clauses in the Bill.

HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [4.32]: I have no intention of speaking at any length on the Bill.

Hon. H. Hearn: Hear, hear!

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I thank the hon. member for that interjection! I have listened to the debate and there have been some logical arguments as well as some illogical ones. I have always looked with a certain amount of pride upon the fact that the parliamentary system of this State follows along the lines of that of the Mother Country. I regret to say that although this House desires to still exist on the franchise that has been in existence for some considerable time, old conservative England abolished plural voting in regard to local government elections some 60 years ago.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: On a totally different franchise.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I do not think it is.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is a nominated House.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I am not talking about the House of Lords.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: But I am.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: As far as local government is concerned, plural voting was abolished over 60 years ago. It appears to me that whilst England was considered in those days to be rather conservative, it did appear to realise that a certain amount of injustice existed by giving plural votes. It has been stated in this House during the debate that only that responsible section of the community having residential qualifications, should have a vote for the election of representatives to this Chamber. We find that in some districts throughout Western Australia, particularly in the goldmining areas and in the timber areas, there are people who reside and rear their families and who have to a certain extent blazed the trail in the outback parts of the State. Because they live in small homes on timber concessions or mining concessions, their homes are not considered to have the annual rental value of £17. In some cases the organisers of the parties represented by some members of this House have made it their business to raise objections to the enrolment of some of these people.

If a man and his wife live in those districts and rear their family, they should not be deprived of the right to vote for a representative in this House. Those people are of great national importance to the State. The wife of a householder, who is the mother of children, is really the mother of this country. After all, the country depends on the population and the mother is the one who is called upon to rear the family, and she should have some say as to the representation in the Parliaments of this State. That also applies to some extent to people who live in flats. During the war and since that time, people have been compelled to seek shelter in what may be termed flats, but which are really only rooms in houses, but for which they have to pay considerably more than they would do for ordinary small dwellings. Those people are also responsible citizens, but they are not entitled to a vote in the election of representatives to this Chamber.

The time is long overdue when consideration should be given to those particular aspects, and I feel that there are members

of this House who are still prepared to view the future through those retrospective spectacles that their forefathers wore back in the stone age, and they are not prepared to make any progress at all. After listening to some of the debate, I am quite satisfied that some members have been travelling that long in retrospect that they have become lost in the mists of time. I intend to support the second reading because to my mind it is only right that the people mentioned in the Bill should be given an opportunity to exercise a vote. It is not a Bill to compel voting, but it does make provision for those people who so desire to record their votes and to take some interest in the country in which they live. Although it appears from the debate this afternoon that some clauses in this Bill will be defeated, I hope members, even at this late hour, will become repentant and support the Bill in toto.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [4.40]: I do not intend to take up much time in replying to the various matters that have been raised in the debate. The points that have been discussed have been answered, raised again and answered, not only this year, but also in years past. I am pleased to find that the Bill will reach the second reading stage and in Committee the various clauses may then be debated. I trust that we may be able to get far more of the Bill through than at present appears. In case I might offend those who are about to support the second reading, I will not detain them any longer.

Question put.

Mr. PRESIDENT: As the Bill must be passed by an absolute majority of members, I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority present. There being no dissentient voice, I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 15:

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in lines 5 to 7 of paragraph (b) the words "or that he or she is the householder's husband or wife" be struck out and the word "and" inserted in lieu.

This really gives a plural vote, one to the wife and one to the husband.

Hon. L. Craig: That is not plural voting.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It is giving the husband two votes.

Hon. L. Craig: You do not know some wives.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: There has been no demand for it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: All the women's organisations want it.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The women are the most aggressive people I know when legislation such as this comes before either House. I challenge the hon. member to say that he has received any letter at all from any women's organisation.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They leave it to our commonsense.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I know the Minister will endeavour to uphold the attitude adopted by another place and permit wives who possess the necessary qualifications to have the vote, but I do not think the provision in the Bill is required.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment. For many years we have endeavoured to allow wives to exercise the franchise in connection with this Chamber. It is the woman that is really the backbone of the country, and she is entitled to the vote. I feel sure the personnel of this Chamber would show a vast improvement if women were given the right to exercise the franchise. Not only did the Select Committee that dealt with electoral matters in 1944 but also other Select Committees have recommended that this provision be made. We should endeavour to keep the womenfolk interested in the political life of the country, for they can implant in their children a sense of responsibility.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The views presented by the Minister should appeal to the Committee. Mr. Baxter and I were

members of a Select Committee in 1944 that unanimously recommended that this provision should be adopted. We can accept Mr. Craig's point of view regarding the position of those who have a stake in the country, and at the same time agree to the clause in the Bill because it applies not to all wives but only to the wives of householders. It does not affect wives who are living in boarding houses, hotels and so on. As Mr. Cunningham pointed out last night, there is a good deal of misunderstanding and the facts are that the wife of every householder is entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council. However, the present position is unsatisfactory. The Bill will merely have the effect of endorsing a practice that exists at the present time whereby both husband and wife, whose position enables them to comply with the qualifications set out in the Act, can exercise the franchise.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I support the amendment. Mr. Heenan has made it quite clear that the object of the provision is to give legal effect to a practice that has grown up, as a result, I believe, of a ruling given by the Crown Law Department. I hope that some day legislation will be introduced to prevent what is happening now and to counteract the Crown Law ruling that really has no effect in law at all.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Mann is mistaken in his view. There may be a point in that one must actually go to the municipal office and pay the rates in order to comply completely with the law, but, as matters stand today, there are many anomalies. For instance, a son who might desire to take an interest in local politics, might arrange with his father to allow him to pay the rates.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: Could not he pay with someone else's cheque?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The wife is a most important member of the family unit, but she is not entitled to a vote unless she can comply with the requisite qualifications. Is that justice? I challenge any member to name a women's organisation that does not seek this right.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You are throwing challenges about! You tell us some that want it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The Labour women's organisations want it, as well as the House-

wives' Association and other organisations engaged in social work. The present situation is very unfair and is a reflection upon this House. Surely we are not afraid of the women's vote. Let us consider the thousands of women throughout the British Empire, who especially in the Old Country during the war period did such fine work for the nation.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Has that anything to do with the Bill?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is a recognition of the work of women.

Hon. W. J. Mann: There is no need to give us another lecture.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I certainly expected that Mr. Mann and Sir Charles Latham, who is an Englishman, would be prepared to show honour to the womenfolk for what they have done.

Hon. W. J. Mann: More sob stuff!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I trust the Committee will reject the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I thank the hon. member for complimenting me by saying that I am an Englishman. I am proud of it, but I am also an Australian and I have spent a much longer period in Australia than in the Old Country. I took the trouble to ascertain how many women voted for me at the recent election. Only 24 did so.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Roughly, how many were on the roll?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Close on 800, but many of them had been dead for some years. Their names had not been removed from the roll. The only body that will benefit by this is the Labour Party, which controls its members with an iron hand. I have seen members of the Labour party at polling places and have heard them say, "Go and get so-and-so; he will not vote unless you do." If the party would remove from its constitution the abolition of this House, I think it might get more converts.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would you be one?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Quite truthfully, no. On the occasion when a similar Bill was before us, only one member outside the Labour Party supported it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I wish to correct that statement. I supported it, and I got back.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to correct Sir Charles Latham's statement about the iron band. The Labour Party was defeated at the last election, which showed that it had no iron band.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	9

Majority for 9

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Cunningham	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Forrest	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. Sir C. G. Latham	Hon. H. L. Roche

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. J. Boylen	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. E. H. Gray	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: On behalf of Mr. Logan, I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (b) the following proviso be added:—"Provided that where an elector is enrolled as a ratepayer in respect of any property such person shall be deemed to be the householder."

There is a difference of opinion as to whether an occupier and a ratepayer are to be considered one person. A ruling by the department in 1923 laid down—

A ratepayer is *prima facie* the occupier of the premises rated; and where the husband and wife are living together in the same house and one of them is enrolled on a "Ratepayer's" qualification for such house, it is not competent for the other also to be enrolled on a "Householder's" qualification, as the "Householder" is the "Occupier" of the dwelling-house, and, therefore, is the ratepayer. In other words, the Ratepayer must be deemed to be the Householder.

Subsequently to that ruling, the Crown Law Department ruled that they were two different persons. Under the Road Districts Act, "Occupier" means the person by whom or on whose behalf any land is actually occupied, or, if there is no occupier, the person entitled to possession, and includes any

person in the unauthorised occupation of Crown land. Under the same Act, "Ratepayer" means the owner of the ratable land who is rated or liable to be rated in respect thereof. In the Municipal Corporations Act, "Ratepayer" includes the occupier of any ratable land and the owner. It was never intended that the occupier and the ratepayer should be one person with two votes. What happens now is that the husband gets a qualification as a ratepayer and the wife a qualification as an occupier.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: Does that mean that the wife cannot be put on the roll?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would not like to answer that question.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is too risky.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If the husband is the freeholder, I understand the wife can get on the roll as occupier.

Members: No.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think the amendment will have the effect the hon. member desires.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Just the opposite.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It only means that the ratepayer will be enrolled in the ordinary way; but, for some reason or other, for the purposes of the Act he will be called a householder. The Constitution Acts Amendment Act shows who are the ratepayers, but I think that if someone pays the rates on my house just for the purpose of obtaining a vote, that is stretching the intention of the Act.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: Some are now putting their wives up as the ratepayers.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. I do not think they are ratepayers in the strict sense of the word, though they may be paying the rates. I do not think the amendment is being made in the correct place, or that it means what is intended. The hon. member might agree that progress be reported for the time being.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Bill proposes to enlarge the franchise in some directions, but the amendment would bring in a different proposition with far-reaching effects. If I owned a vacant block of ratable land—

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You could not be the occupier of a vacant block.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I would be registered as the ratepayer and would be presumed to be the householder, though there was no house on the block.

Hon. G. Bennetts: You would go down on the enrolment card as the householder.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If I am owner and ratepayer of a house, and rent it to someone, the effect will be that I will be presumed to be the householder, and the person living in it will not. I do not think the Committee should accept the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We should look to the qualifications provided by the Act. There is no reference there to the occupier.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment would not prevent the ratepayer being enrolled.

Progress reported.

BILL—SOUTH FREMANTLE OIL INSTALLATIONS PIPE LINE.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.25] in moving the second reading said: During the war years the Commonwealth Government erected oil tanks and subsidiary installations in Douro-road, South Fremantle. These were for the purpose of fueling naval vessels, and if hon. members will refer to the plan at the back of the Bill they will observe that there are seven tanks each of a million gallons capacity. The tanks are connected by pipe line to the North Wharf and to Robbs Jetty. The dotted line in the plan is, of course, the railway line. There is no naval use at present for the installations and the Commonwealth Government propose to lease them to two oil companies, these being the Vacuum Oil Company and Caltex Ltd.

Although it was not necessary to obtain the State Parliament's approval to the establishment of the installations, this being done by the Commonwealth under its defence powers, it is necessary that the Commonwealth's action in leasing the installations be validated by this Parliament. It is essential, also, that the rights of local au-

thorities through whose districts the pipe line runs be protected. These local authorities are the Fremantle Municipal Council, the Fremantle Road Board, the Commissioner of Railways and the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

The Bill gives the operator, which means the Commonwealth or the lessees of the Commonwealth property, power to use and maintain the pipe line and to open, break up or interfere with the soil or surface of any road, street, bridge or reserve along the route of the pipe line, for the purpose of any repairs etc. to the line. Before the operator takes any such action he must, in writing, advise the Minister for Works and the local authorities at least three clear days before commencing the work and must also provide them with a plan of the proposed work. In cases of emergency due to accidents or defects in the line, the work may be carried out without notice, but the notice and the plan must be submitted later. Any work must be completed by the operator without delay and he is responsible for removal of all debris.

Provision is made for a penalty for any act of delay, neglect or omission by the operator and for the Minister or local authority to complete any work not finished properly by the operator, who would be responsible for the costs of such completion. If the pipe line is used by an operator other than the Commonwealth the operator shall be responsible for the payment of rates to the Fremantle Municipal Council and the Fremantle Road Board. These will not be assessed in the usual manner, but will be calculated as an amount equal to one-eighth per centum of the amount actually received by the operator for the sale of oil and liquid fuel conveyed through the pipe line during the 12 months ended the 31st December immediately preceding. The minimum amount payable will be £100 annually. This amount must be paid prior to the end of March in each year and will be apportioned between the council and the road board according to the length of the pipe line in each authority's district. The provisions concerning payment of rates may be varied by mutual consent. I move—

• That the Bill be now read a second time.

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 read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.53] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is of some importance and by various provisions it alters the law considerably with a view to tightening up electoral practices. It is designed to amend the Act so that the rolls to be used at an election will more nearly contain only the names of those persons who have a right to be enrolled as electors and to facilitate the work of the Chief Electoral Officer in achieving this objective. Section 7 gives authority to the Governor during the temporary incapacity of the Chief Electoral Officer or any registrar or returning officer, to appoint a substitute to discharge the duty of such officer.

This is a purely technical matter because, after all is said and done, it is the Minister who advises the Governor and he then signs, whereas the Governor will now instruct the Minister to do all the work for him. In effect, it is the same thing except that it need not now go before Cabinet. I consider it is an improvement and will facilitate matters. The Bill proposes to alter the qualification for enrolment from one month's residence in a district to three months before a person can qualify for enrolment. It has been found that the alteration of rolls as a result of persons wandering from district to district causes a considerable amount of work in the Electoral Department.

Under the provisions of the English Representation of the People's Act, the qualifying period entitling any person in England to registration as a resident in a constituency is three months. In New Zealand also, the residential qualification for enrolment for a district is the same. It is considered that this residential qualification will result in greater stability in the rolls. It will also enable a resident in a new district to become familiar with the interests

of the district before being eligible to vote for that district. After leaving a district for which he is enrolled, an elector will be entitled to vote in respect of it for a period of six months instead of three months as at present, provided, of course, he is not on another roll. A claimant for enrolment now will be required to give further information such as his place of birth and his age, in addition to the other particulars now required. The reason for this is that the Chief Electoral Officer has reported that a good deal of confusion arises with notifications of deaths inasmuch as several persons may have the same name and as a result, the wrong person is sometimes struck off the roll.

The same principle also applies with marriages and the additional information will make identification a great deal easier. These particulars are required under the electoral laws of the Commonwealth and most other States. As members know, with claimants there are always difficulties arising because of persons at the last moment claiming that their names are on the roll. A practice has been established of people placing claimants' names on the roll at the last minute. That prevents the Chief Electoral Officer from deciding whether a claim is right or wrong before the rolls close. Under the provisions of Section 47 of the Act an objection by an elector or by the Registrar to a claim for enrolment has to be determined prior to the writ for an election.

The amending Bill provides that a decision on an objection, if heard and determined at any time prior to 14 days to a polling day, shall be given effect to in the roll for the election in question. Under the Act claims for enrolment can be made at any time not less than 14 days before the issue of the writ. It has been found that large numbers of claims are lodged at the last moment, which does not give the Registrar sufficient time properly to investigate the claims and, if necessary, object to them before the issue of the writ. The amendment provided for by the Bill will extend the period for checking by enabling objections to be dealt with and finalised up to within 14 days of polling day.

At present, objections in connection with enrolment have to be determined before the issue of the writ for an election if they are to be given effect to for that election. The

Bill now extends the time in which objections have to be determined to not less than 14 days before the date fixed for the poll. The Chief Electoral Officer considers that the determination of such matters 14 days prior to polling day will give ample time for all necessary alterations and adjustments to the rolls to be made.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Will the rolls be held up pending that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The rolls must be held up until all these cards are dealt with, although they may be dealt with long before the 14 days because there is only a small number to handle. If not, the new rolls will be held up for 14 days. New Section 53 sets out the circumstances and time for altering the rolls after the issue of the writ. Rolls may be altered—

(a) where claims are received 14 days before the issue of the writ and are not objected to; and,

(b) if they are objected to and a decision is made 14 days prior to the date fixed for the poll.

Alterations may also be made pursuant to Section 50 at any time before the issue of the writ, and under Sections 51 and 52 at any time not later than 14 days next preceding the date fixed for the election. Section 70 deals with the nomination date fixed for candidates and it provides that it shall be not less than seven days or more than 30 days from the date of the writ. The Bill proposes to alter this to provide that the maximum period for nomination after the issue of the writ shall be 45 days. Similarly, the maximum time between nomination and polling date has been increased from 30 to 45 days.

Provision has been made respecting any election in the North Province or any district therein that there shall be not less than 35 days between the date for nomination and the date fixed for polling. So there cannot be an election held less than 35 days nor more than 45 days after nominations have closed. It has been found that with North-West elections insufficient time has been allowed under the Act for postal votes to reach the returning officer. A good deal of confusion has arisen in the minds of the public between the existing State system and that at present operating under the Commonwealth law relating to absentee voting.

As members are aware, under the Commonwealth law an elector can vote for any district at any polling booth. Of course, in a general election for the Senate every part of the country has a polling booth. I have never yet heard of a walkover in the Senate elections, and I suppose I never will. However, under the State law an elector can only vote at present at a polling booth situated in his own district or province, as the case may be. Under the existing State law an elector who is seven miles from his own district during polling day often finds it extremely inconvenient to vote and if he does vote, he may have considerable difficulty in locating a postal vote officer. Even if he does find him, quite often his vote is not forwarded by that officer in time to reach the returning officer before the poll closes.

It might be pointed out that the polling day is invariably a Saturday and postal vote officers are difficult to find on that day. The Bill proposes to adopt a system of absentee voting similar to the Commonwealth system, and an elector will be able to vote at any polling booth, irrespective of the province or district on which roll he is registered. Should there be any district in which an election is not taking place on polling day, provision is made for the setting up of polling booths to enable voting to take place in respect of other districts or provinces. If, for instance, there was a walkover at Kalgoorlie, there would still be a polling booth at Kalgoorlie where absentees might cast their votes for any district or province.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: And booths at Katanning, York and Bruce Rock?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The idea is to have them everywhere. Obviously, in small places where there was no election and not likely to be any absentee voters, the provision would be unnecessary, but every town of any size would have a booth. This will be a convenience to absentees. Should an elector have reason to believe that he will be more than seven miles from any polling booth on the day of the election, or should he be more than seven miles from any polling booth on such day, he will still be able to register a postal vote under the existing system. There has been no alteration in the law relating to the taking of sick or infirm votes.

A good deal of annoyance has been caused to electors who have claimed that their names should be on the roll, but have been taken off. Provision has been made for starring such names. If a person claims that his name was on the roll and has been taken off, or has made a claim and his name is not on the roll, he may make a declaration and his vote will be set aside and checked. If it is found that his name had been wrongly removed from the roll or that he had lodged a claim and had not been enrolled, the vote will be counted. However, it will not be counted unless there has been a claim card. This will overcome the difficulty members have experienced of people claiming that they have been wrongly taken off the roll or have not been enrolled.

All absentee votes—those cast in a polling booth outside the voter's particular district or province—will be forwarded to the Chief Electoral Officer for counting, and the count will be notified to the respective returning officers. If there is an election in Geraldton and a man votes in Kalgoorlie, the vote will be sent to the Chief Electoral Officer, who will notify the returning officer at Geraldton that so many votes have been received. A provision similar to that in the Federal Act has been inserted to enable the returning officer, when he is satisfied that the votes—

(a) on ballot papers issued at a remote polling place which have not been received by him; or,

(b) that any absent voters' ballot papers used by persons claiming to be entitled to enrolment under the proposed Section 122A have not been received by him.

cannot, having regard to the number of those ballot papers, affect the result, subject to the concurrence of the Chief Electoral Officer, to declare the poll without awaiting the receipt of such ballot papers. That is to say, he will not hold up the result of an election for the sake of getting in a few votes from, say, Wyndham if those votes cannot possibly affect the result.

Hon. G. Fraser: Will this not delay the declaration of the poll?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It might do so, until the outstanding votes are received, but it could not have that effect if one candidate had a large majority.

Hon. G. Fraser: But a province election could not be declared on the night of the election.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Probably not. Another provision copied from the Federal law will empower the Chief Electoral Officer to impose a fine not exceeding 10s. for a first offence or £2 for any subsequent offence where an elector has failed to vote at an Assembly election. The reason is that the issuing of a summons and the taking of an offender to court entails costs out of all proportion to the offence committed. However, if any offender so desires, he need not submit to the jurisdiction of the Chief Electoral Officer, but may go before the court in the ordinary way. We consider that it would be cheaper to the individual if he were fined summarily instead of being put to the expense, as well as the trouble and anxiety, of having to appear before the court.

Provisions are included to govern disputed returns. I shall deal with them in Committee. Section 192, which deals with the prohibition of canvassing near polling booths, does not clearly define the spot from which the distance referred to is to be measured. There is always an argument as to where the 50 yards should be measured from, whether from the point where the vote is taken, from the door of the booth or from the gate. The amendment in the Bill will make it clear that canvassing and soliciting for votes must not take place within 50 yards from the entrance to a polling booth from the nearest street or way; in other words, from the gate.

Hon. G. Bennetts: What would happen if a polling booth were half-a-mile away from the road?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I trust that no Minister would ever consent to having a polling booth half-a-mile from the road.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I think you should specify the door, not the gate.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment specifies the entrance from the nearest street or way. Other small amendments of an administrative nature are included, but they also can be more conveniently dealt with in Committee. I feel sure that the Bill will materially assist in clearing up the confusion that now exists in the minds of the public resulting from the differences between the Federal and State system, and will enable the rolls to contain more nearly

only the names of those persons who have a right to be enrolled. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.53] in moving the second reading said: This is a hardy annual, because it is necessary every year to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the closing of certain roads. If members will follow their copies of the Bill, they will more readily understand the proposals.

Malcolm Smith and Sons, with the concurrence of the Forests Department, propose erecting a saw mill at Boyup Brook on the land shown coloured blue on the attached plan. The land comprises portion of Road No. 8666, which it is necessary to close before a lease of the area can be granted for saw-milling purposes. The State Housing Commission has acquired an area at Bunbury as bordered green on the plan. A re-subdivision of the land has been made on more attractive lines, and this involves slight alteration to the street system. The portion of Nuytsia-avenue shown coloured blue on the plan requires to be closed. New streets will be provided in the immediate vicinity as shown outlined in red on the plan. The State Housing Commission has made a re-subdivision of original Daglish Lots 373 to 377, inclusive, and Lots 381 to 383, inclusive, involving the closure of portion of the right-of-way shown coloured blue on the plan. Access has been provided for the holder of Lot 380 by leaving the small triangular portion indicated on the plan.

At the request of the Kalgoorlie Road Board, authority is sought to close a narrow right-of-way, nine links wide, between Salisbury-road and Palmerston-street, Kalgoorlie, as shown coloured red on the plan. It is proposed to add the contained land to the adjoining lots in equal proportions. The Perth Road Board desires that portion of Kirkham Hill-terrace, Maylands, as shown coloured blue on the plan be closed consequent on action to truncate the corner

on the opposite side of the road where a sharp turn occurs. The ultimate result will be the re-establishment of a standard width road of 66 feet with an easier turn. It is desired to vest the whole of the closed portion of the road in the owner of Lots 96 and 97 on Land Titles Office Plan 2610 (Sheet 2) as shown bordered green on the plan.

The Forests Department has acquired freehold land at Portagabra adjoining the Mundaring Forestry Station and comprising portions of Swan Locations 964, 992, and 2621, as shown coloured green on the plan. Separating the acquired area from the adjoining forestry station is a road as shown coloured red on the plan, which it is desired shall be closed to the intent that the contained land will be also added to the State forest. In Section 14 of the Road Closure Act, 1947, certain streets in Narrogin were closed to consolidate an area required as a reserve for a park and swimming pool. Through inadvertence, Grant-street was incorrectly described in the Bill as Graham-street and, to rectify the error, parliamentary authority is sought to close portion of Grant-street as shown coloured blue on the plan. Portion of Fox-street was closed in last year's Act, but, although it was desired to also close the portion coloured yellow on the attached plan, this could not be done at the time as the Narrogin Municipal Council had not then acquired Lots 730 and 731 which have since been resumed by the Public Works Department and vested in the Narrogin municipality. The closure of the further portion of Fox-street can now be proceeded with.

Stewart and Lloyds (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. propose establishing a factory at North Fremantle and have already acquired from the University of Western Australia the land bordered red on the plan. To square up the area, the company desires to acquire portion of Reserve 2021 as shown bordered green on the plan, together with the land contained in Thompson-road, which is shown coloured blue on the plan and which it is necessary should be closed. The total area of the land coloured blue and that bordered green is 2 acres and 27 perches, and it is proposed to dispose of this area to the company for the sum of £850. The necessary provision has been made in the Reserves Bill to obtain parliamentary

authority to dispose of portion of Reserve 2021 for the sum of £610. The proportion of the price for that portion of Thompson-road referred is £240.

I now come to the closure of portion of East-parade in the City of Perth. In April, 1947, at the request of the City of Perth, an extension of East-parade between Gardiner and Zebina-streets, East Perth, was dedicated as a public highway. Subsequent investigation by the Town Clerk revealed that two brick houses, the property of the council, existed on portion of the land so dedicated, while, in addition, a portion of the land was never intended to be included in the road. Request has been made that the road in question be closed and that the land be granted to the City of Perth, in which name the fee simple of the land was registered prior to the dedication of the road. A bitumen road has been constructed and it is not intended to close this portion to traffic, but when the existing houses have been demolished, a move will be made to re-dedicate the correct area for the road.

The next clause deals with the closure of Arcadia, Arcadia West, Arcadia South-roads, and the Esplanade at Safety Bay. The Rockingham Road Board desires that the foreshore at Safety Bay be created a Class A reserve for recreation purposes and vested in the board. The lands comprising the foreshore are dedicated roads under the Road Districts Act, 1919-1947. Provision has been made in the Bill to close the remainder of the aforesaid roads after allowing for the retention of a road one chain wide along the frontage of the subdivided lots.

Clause 12 deals with the vesting in adjoining holders of land formerly portion of Anstey-street, South Perth. Portion of Anstey-street, South Perth, as shown coloured blue on the plan was closed by notice published in the "Government Gazette" on the 10th January, 1947. Under Section 151, Subsection (3), of the Road Districts Act, 1919-1947, it is provided that upon closure of a road the land contained therein shall vest in the owner for the time being of the land fronting such part and if the lands on the opposite side of any such part of the closed road are owned by different owners, the contiguous half of such part to the middle thereof shall vest in each owner, and for the purpose of this subsec-

tion the term "owner" shall include the Crown.

The wording of the subsection referred to has been very literally interpreted to mean that the Crown as owner of the remaining portion—in this case, of Anstey-street—is entitled to participate in the apportionment of the land comprised in the closed portion of the road. It was not the general intention, nor is it the desire in this case, that the Crown claim any portion of the land in question, and it is the intention of this Bill to authorise and direct the Registrar of Titles to include the said land in the relative certificate of title to the lots fronting the said closed road. The object of the closure, which was to straighten the eastern alignment of Anstey-street, would be defeated if part of the closed portion were again vested in the Crown. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [6.2]: I was wondering whether the approval of the local governing bodies had been obtained for these closures, particularly the one mentioned in Clause 2 at Boyup Brook. I understand, in respect to Clause 11, that the Rockingham Road Board desires the closure of certain roads.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [6.3]: If the Chief Secretary will adjourn the debate until after the tea suspension, we could see the plan and would then have a clear indication of the position.

The Chief Secretary: Might I suggest you inspect it before we go into Committee?

HON. G. FRASER (West) [6.4]: I would like to know who is going to get the money resulting from the closure of streets and the sale of the land. Is the Government going to keep it or pass it on to the local authority concerned? The closure I am particularly interested in is that at North Fremantle, dealt with in Clause 9, and for which the Chief Secretary mentioned the sum of £240. Where is that £240 going? At one time the procedure was that money received from the sale of roads was given to the local governing body concerned, but I think when Sir Charles Latham was Minister, that policy was altered and the Government retained the money.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [6.6]: The two closures mentioned in Clause 8 are in order. I spoke to the Town Clerk, Narrogin, by phone this morning and I understand there are no objections at all. There will be further closures at a later date because the land has been resumed for a swimming area.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH ELECTRICITY AND GAS PURCHASE.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT. (No. 1).

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the Council's amendment.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 3: Add after the word "Act" at the end of the clause the words "Nothing in this section shall apply north of the twenty-sixth parallel of latitude."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

It is not considered that natives should be allowed land only south of the 26th parallel of latitude in cases where the native is suitable, the grant of land being subject to ministerial approval.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

I cannot see why a native north of the 26th parallel should not be allowed to hold land, providing he is suitable, just as a native can south of the 26th parallel.

Hon. G. Fraser: Is there any land there for him to hold?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know. It is absurd to draw a line of demarcation in

this way. The arguments put up by the members for the North Province were not altogether applicable.

Hon. R. M. FORREST: It is obvious that whoever introduced the Bill knows very little about the North-West and the natives there. I thought the position was dangerous and that is why I moved the amendment. I have discussed this matter with my colleague, Mr. Welsh, and we do not intend to press it.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Since the suspension I have made inquiries and I find that in every instance these matters are discussed with the local authorities concerned and they have agreed in each and every instance.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Closure of portion of Thompson-road at North Fremantle:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is the road that Mr. Fraser asked about. The £240 is paid to revenue but as I stated these matters have been discussed with and agreed to by the local authorities.

Hon. G. FRASER: I know the matters have been discussed but I desired some information regarding payment and what was the general policy. It appears that the policy is for the money to be taken into revenue.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The money goes into general revenue in every instance.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It had been the custom through an oversight, that some of the money obtained from the selling of roads was passed to the local authorities. The Crown Law Department advised that all moneys from the sale of Govern-

ment properties had to be put back into Consolidated Revenue and the municipalities would have to make application for grants.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 12, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—RESERVES.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.38] in moving the second reading said: This is another Bill that comes down at this stage of the session each year and is for the purpose of dealing with various reserves that require legislation to put them in legal order. I have plans which, if members desire to see, I will lay on the Table of the House.

Clause 2 deals with Brown Hill Suburban Area Lot 207, as shown coloured red on plan, which was reserved in 1903 for a mechanics' institute. In 1910 a lease for 999 years was granted to James Edward Dodd, Thomas James Alford and Charles Cressy in trust for the purpose of a mechanics' institute. The three trustees tendered written resignations as such trustees in the year 1913 and the Under Secretary for Public Works then requested that action be taken to vest the lot in the Minister for Works, a matter which was not dealt with at the time as the original lease instrument was not produced for the purpose of preparing a surrender. To clear up the case, it is now proposed to revest the land in His Majesty with the intention of again reserving the lot for the purpose of a hall site to be vested in the Minister for Works, the building having been subsidised by the Public Works Department.

The next clause deals with Bunbury Lot 366 shown coloured red on Plan B and this was, by Act 1 of 1911, constituted a public reserve and numbered A 13077 and dedicated to the purpose of a site for the Eastern Goldfields Fresh Air League Central Committee (Incorporated). The Crown grant of the lot was issued and registered in the aforesaid corporation for an es-

tate in fee simple. In 1946, the league abandoned its activities at Bunbury and disposed of the buildings on the reserve to the National Fitness Council which is now conducting a hostel primarily for the use of country boys attending Bunbury High School and otherwise for national fitness during school vacations. Parliamentary authority is sought to revest the land in His Majesty in order that the Crown may again reserve the land as of Class A and vest it in the Minister for Education for the purpose of national fitness.

Esperance Lots 222, 223 and 224, containing one acre, twenty-two perches, as shown coloured red on Plan C, were reserved in the year 1897 for a municipal endowment as Reserve 4608. A lease of the reserve for 99 years was granted in 1904 to the mayor and councillors of the municipality of Esperance for municipal endowment purposes solely. The Esperance municipality was dissolved in 1908 and was absorbed in the Esperance Road District and by virtue of Section 17 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906-1938, the lease became vested in the Esperance Road Board. The road board has now surrendered the lease for the purpose of obtaining a grant in fee simple, free of trust, with the object of disposing of the land and utilising the proceeds of the sale for the road board's purposes.

The next clause of the Bill concerns Kalgoorlie Lot 1887, shown coloured red on the plan, which was set apart as Class A Reserve No. 7683 in the year 1901 and in 1904 was vested in the Kalgoorlie Road Board in trust for the purpose of recreation. The land has not been used for the purpose, and the Kalgoorlie Road Board has requested that it be subdivided into building allotments. It is desired to cancel the reserve and subdivide the land into 14 lots for disposal under the Land Act, 1933-1946, in such manner as the Governor may direct. Parliamentary authority is required to cancel the Class A reserve.

Regarding Kulikup Lot 36, being Reserve No. 14575, this was set aside as a site for the Kulikup Agricultural Hall, as shown coloured blue on the plan. A lease for 999 years was approved in 1920 to certain trustees, namely, Thomas Walker, Cecil James Turkey, Alfred How Whittaker and Wilfred James Orr. One of the trustees is now deceased and another has left the district. The present hall committee desires

that the reserve be vested in the Upper Blackwood Road Board. Messrs. A. H. Whittaker, W. J. Orr and C. J. Tuekey have given written concurrence in the proposed transfer of the control of the hall to the road board. It is proposed to revest Lot 36 in His Majesty and add Lot 35 to the reserve, and then vest the reserve in the Upper Blackwood Road Board.

As to Meckering Lots 358 and 359, these were granted in the year 1910 to the then trustees for the Meckering Hall, with power to sell, provided that the proceeds of such sale be devoted to the improvement of the hall which was built on Lot 360 adjoining. The lots were re-subdivided into seven smaller lots, and of these four were disposed of but the land, the subject of the Bill, comprising portion of Meckering Lot 358 and being Lots 4, 5 and 6 on Land Titles Office Diagram 3038, remain in the names of Charles Samuel Rhodes and Robert Balmain Blyth—both deceased—as trustees for the Meckering Hall. The Meckering Hall Reserve—Lot 360—adjoining is now vested in the Cunderdin Road Board, which desires that Lots 4, 5 and 6 referred to, be vested and reserved for a road board depot to be vested in the board.

The next portion to be dealt with is that concerning the Moora Road Board. The board proposes establishing a greater sports ground at Miling in the position hachured blue on Plan "G." The land comprises about 100 acres, and is owned at present by Mr. Henry Seymour, whose holdings are shown coloured yellow on the same plan. To assist in financing the purchase, the board applied for a grant of the land contained within Reserves Nos. 12140—125 acres two roods—and 16956—three acres—as shown coloured red on the plan, and proposed to effect an exchange with Mr. Seymour. Owing to opposition by Mr. H. A. J. Hopkinson, who holds the land coloured green on the plan, it was decided that, if the reserves were cancelled, the land would be granted to the board, subject to the condition that its disposal would be by public auction or sale by tender, or by calling of applications at a fixed price. The foregoing conditions were imposed to give all interested parties equal opportunity to acquire the land in the reserves. The conditions will provide further that the proceeds of such sale shall be applied by the road board for the purpose

of acquiring other land for a recreation ground.

With regard to the proposition at Pemberton, on the recommendation of the Town Planning Commissioner, it is proposed to provide sites for public and other buildings of institutional character, together with necessary road access, at Pemberton, on an area which it is desired to exclude from Class A Reserve No. 21116 as shown hachured blue on the plan "H" attached. Five lots (Pemberton Lots 201 to 205 inclusive) and roads have been surveyed in the position indicated on the plan. It is proposed later to reserve Lot 205 for the Pemberton Infant Health Clinic. The Pemberton branch of the Returned Soldiers' League is also desirous of acquiring one of lots, but no concrete proposals have been submitted.

Dealing next with the reserve at Rockingham, the Commonwealth of Australia erected during the late war a new jetty at Rockingham in the position shown on the attached plan. The Commonwealth Government now requires a lease of the land on which the shore end of the jetty is based, and this includes portion of Class A Reserve 22779 for recreation, from which the land must be excised before a lease could be granted. The balance of the jetty is in the waters of Mangles Bay and action is being taken to exclude the relevant portion from the Fremantle Harbour Trust boundaries by proclamation.

Regarding Reserve No. 2021, Stewarts & Lloyds (Australia) Pty. Ltd. propose establishing a factory at North Fremantle, and have acquired already from the University of Western Australia the land bordered red on the plan. To square up the area, the company desires to acquire portion of Reserve 2021 as shown bordered green on the plan, together with that portion of Thompson-road as shown coloured blue on the plan. The total area of the land bordered green and coloured blue is 2 acres and 27 perches, and it is proposed to dispose of this area to the company for the total sum of £850 which has been apportioned as follows:—

(1) For the portion of Reserve 2021	610
(2) For the portion of Thompson-road	240

£850

Provision has been made in the Road Closure Bill regarding the closure of portion of Thompson-road and disposal of the contained land. Action herein is to obtain parliamentary sanction to the disposal of the portion of the reserve.

The last one refers to the Karrakatta Cemetery reserve. An urgent necessity has arisen for the provision of additional school facilities in the Hollywood district, more particularly the area extending north from Stirling-highway to the southern boundary of the Karrakatta Cemetery. The Education Department has been seeking a site for a school in this area without success, and is reluctantly compelled to seek intrusion on the Karrakatta Cemetery reserve, which is the only available land in the vicinity from which the area required for a school site can be obtained. The Cemetery Reserve, No. 745, comprises Swan Location 1668, and contains 261 acres 1 rood 10 perches, for which a grant in fee simple was issued on the 6th November, 1899, to the under-mentioned trustees.

Alexander Forrest, Mayor of the City of Perth.

John Veryard, Mayor of the Municipality of Leederville.

Charles Hart, Mayor of the Municipality of Subiaco.

John Winthrop Hackett.

John Joseph Talbot Hobbs.

Thomas George Molloy, and

Joseph Wood Langsford.

All of these, except Mr. Langsford, are now deceased. The matter has been dealt with exhaustively on Education File No. 567/42 by the Minister for Education, the Director of Education, the Town Planning Commissioner and the School Sites Committee, all of whom can see no alternative to the excision of the school site from the cemetery reserve. The deliberations particularly stressed that a school must be provided north of Stirling-highway to remove the danger of young children having to cross the highway on their way to and from school.

It is proposed to excise from the cemetery reserve an area of five acres at the corner of Carrington-street and Dalkeith-road, as shown coloured blue on the plan, and to revest the land in His Majesty as of his former estate to the intent that the land excised shall be reserved for a

school site. The Karrakatta Cemetery Board, on being notified of the proposed excision, wrote on the 15th October advising that the board viewed with disfavour the prospective loss of the area, especially as it is portion of the Anglican section in which there are more burials than in other sections, and that the loss of the area would naturally reduce the life of the cemetery for burials. The opposition by the Cemetery Board was anticipated and the Town Planning Commissioner, in his memorandum dated the 29th December, 1947, on page 139 of Education Department's File No. 429/43, wrote—

Whilst considerable opposition would be received from the Cemetery Trustees, it must be borne in mind that the excision of this area from the cemetery would not unduly accelerate nor adversely affect the future of the cemetery because of the quick rate at which it is now filling up . . . The Government has appointed a special committee to advise on the future general cemetery site in view of the urgency of acquiring more land for cemetery purposes in the metropolitan area.

This matter is being dealt with in Lands and Surveys File No. 3810/30. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. L. LOTON (South-East) [7.50]:

I raise a query as to the advisability of taking from the cemetery grounds a site for a school. I do not know anything about the proposal, but it seems most unusual to contemplate such a proposal. The school site will be bounded on two sides by the cemetery, and we know that increasing accommodation is necessary for burials. I appreciate that cremation has eased the position, but the time is not far distant when more ground will be necessary for ordinary burials. I know from what the Minister has said that investigations have been made, but I would like to know why it is necessary to take this particular land. I do not think it can be regarded favourably as a school site, despite the report of the Town Planning Commissioner. I do not know the locality well, but I should think it would be possible to secure an area of privately-owned land. I voice my opposition to this proposed excision.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [7.52]: I can only stress the fact,

in reply to Mr. Loton, that the Minister for Education, the Director of Education, the Town Planning Commissioner and the School Sites Committee have investigated the position and say that there is no alternative to the excision of the site from the cemetery reserve.

Hon. A. L. Loton: What will be the position in fifty years' time?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There will be a beautiful school erected there.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Will you be able to cater for all the pupils in 50 years' time?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am afraid the hon. member does not understand the position about schools.

Hon. A. L. Loton: I know a good deal about it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then it is unnecessary for me to tell the hon. member anything.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to:

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I agree that this is a most extraordinary proposal in that it seeks to take part of a cemetery as a school site. Is this very far away from the Hollywood School? I assume that the authorities have looked into the matter carefully to ascertain if it is not possible to secure land elsewhere.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They have done everything possible. I agree that the cemetery cannot continue very much longer considering the rate at which it is filling up. When I was Minister for Lands inquiries were made with reference to the provision of another site. In view of all the circumstances, however, I shall not offer any objection to the excision.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I raise my protest against the excision for two reasons. The Chief Secretary introduced the Bill a few minutes ago. I have not had an opportunity of looking at the plan and it is useless looking at it now. I am very interested in the matter and would like to inspect the locality. I protest against the introduction of legislation in this manner.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am extremely sorry that I have annoyed a member representing a country province. Metropolitan members are quite happy about it and also the leader of the political party of which Mr. Loton is a member. It seems strange to me that he should get so upset about the matter seeing that the experts have all agreed that the site is suitable. The member for the district has raised no objection, nor has the Town Planning Commissioner, who jealously guards the taking away of land from any institution. The population in the district is increasing and has now reached the borders of the cemetery. I think the hon. member can rest assured that the matter is in order, in view of the fact that there are so many members in another place, besides six members in this Chamber, who are quite capable of looking after the metropolitan population.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not doubt what the Chief Secretary has said, but I still maintain that we are dealing with legislation which is to be passed by this Chamber and I must take my share of the responsibility for it. For that reason, I express my opposition.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2).

In Committee.

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting. Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2 to which Sir Charles Latham had moved an amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—“(d) After the word ‘person’ in line one, page 6, Section 15, add the words ‘is entitled to and’.”

I think that will meet the opposition that members raised.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: This is a question for legal members to decide. I think the amendment unnecessary, as it will cause confusion. A person not eligible to be on the electoral roll would not be entitled to vote for any province election.

The Chief Secretary: Personally, I see no objection to the amendment.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We have been directing our attention to the Bill before us and to the amendments appearing on the notice paper. Sir Charles Latham has not, in my opinion, given a valid reason for submitting this amendment, which I am sure very few members have been able to align in the Act. To my mind the amendment is utterly unnecessary and will only add confusion to a position which already is by no means clear. The local authorities are the ones to say whether a person should be on the municipal roll. Why not leave it at that? The Act has stood the test of years and now Sir Charles wishes to insert words that are entirely divorced from the Bill, and that I believe are unnecessary.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They will not do any harm.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If my name is on a municipal roll, the local authority is the body to determine whether it should be there or not. The hon. member seems now to be making use of this opportunity to amend the Constitution Act in a way that members have not had time to consider. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: When the Act was passed in 1899 it had application to the Municipal Corporations Act and the Road Districts Act of that time. Under the law at present a man may have his name on the road board or municipal electoral list long after he has sold his property in that area. It is frequently found that two or three persons have their names on the roll, using the one property qualification, and I think that should be eliminated, as far as possible.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The purpose of the amendment seems to be to provide against people being wrongfully on the Legislative Council roll, but the Electoral Act pro-

vides that in such a case the Chief Electoral Officer or any citizen can object.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have to buy the lists from the local authorities in my province and when I see names there I take it they are entitled to be there, and consequently are entitled to be on the Legislative Council roll. I am endeavouring to make it easier for the roll to be kept up to date.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I cannot see any great merit in the amendment. The Chief Electoral Officer is concerned as to whether a person's name is on the electoral list, and not as to whether it is entitled to be there.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) be struck out.

Mr. Fraser wishes two people to be given a vote for the one house and does not recognise the right of a person with property in different districts to have more than one vote. Much has been said about persons having ten votes, but that is ridiculous.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are entitled only to one.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: A man may have a farm in the country, a station in the North-West and a home in Perth. He is producing the real wealth of the country.

Hon. E. H. Gray: His manager and employees do that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That man is entitled to consideration. As this House is constituted on a property qualification, property owners are entitled to the votes they have always had.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Baxter spoke of progress. In the name of progress, I ask the Committee to defeat this amendment. No-one can submit an argument that plural voting is progressive. It is a relic and progressive thinkers would not entertain this idea.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	9
	—
Majority for .. .	7
	—

AYES.

Hon. L. Craig
 Hon. J. M. Cunningham
 Hon. H. A. C. Daffen
 Hon. R. M. Forrest
 Hon. Sir F. E. Gibson
 Hon. H. Hearn
 Hon. Sir C. G. Latham
 Hon. A. L. Loton

Hon. W. J. Mann
 Hon. G. W. Miles
 Hon. C. H. Simpson
 Hon. A. Thomson
 Hon. H. Tuckey
 Hon. H. K. Watson
 Hon. F. R. Welsh
 Hon. O. F. Baxter
 (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts
 Hon. R. J. Boylen
 Hon. E. M. Davies
 Hon. G. Fraser
 Hon. E. H. Gray

Hon. W. R. Hall
 Hon. H. S. W. Parker
 Hon. G. B. Wood
 Hon. E. M. Heenan
 (Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.36] in moving the second reading said: Members who are motorists will fully appreciate the need for this Bill. During the war, when the petrol ration was reduced to such an extent that there was little or no motoring, power was given to reduce the license fees and the Government subsequently restored them to the amounts previously fixed by proclamation. Thus, the license fees were brought back to the amount prescribed by statute. Since then there have been large reductions in the permitted petrol ration for motorcars.

Representations have now been made to have the license fees again reduced as a result of the cuts in the petrol ration. Of course, there is a counter to that, namely, that if the license fees are reduced the local governing bodies will not obtain as much revenue as they require. Therefore, we must, as far as possible, strike a happy medium. This short Bill provides, notwithstanding the Traffic Act, that where the quantity of motor spirit available or allowed for use in any or certain vehicles shall be reduced, the Governor, by Order in Council made prior to the 1st day of July, 1949, and published in the "Government Gazette," may reduce by a certain percentage not exceeding 25 per centum the amount of any license fee payable.

In 1942 the gallonage allowed for motorists up to and including 8 h.p. vehicles was

1½ gallons and now it is 4½ gallons; for 12 h.p. vehicles it was 2½ gallons, now it is 6½. For 14 h.p. vehicles it was 2½ gallons and now seven, and for 20 h.p. vehicles it was three gallons and it is now eight gallons. In October last, Senator Ashley announced that there would be further reductions in the petrol allowances and it is anticipated that these will be put into effect. It is desired that the Governor be given power by an Order in Council published in the "Government Gazette" to revoke and vary any Order in Council dealing with the amount of license fees.

Therefore, it rests with the Government to reduce the license fees as occasion demands in view of the proposed reduction in the petrol allowance. Otherwise, it would mean approaching both Houses of Parliament from time to time to do that. Members will agree that it is only correct and proper to reduce the license fee when motorists cannot obtain sufficient petrol reasonably to run their cars.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Can the Government increase the fees?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It can vary the order to put them up or down but not beyond the amount fixed by Parliament. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [8.42]: I hope the Government will handle this matter very carefully indeed. Although I agree with what the Chief Secretary has said regarding the petrol allowance, that is not likely to apply to some extent to those in the country. Petrol allowances to farmers have been generous indeed compared with the allowance granted to city motorists. Naturally, they need petrol for business purposes, so it is anticipated that there will not be great reductions. Also, road boards today depend on the revenue obtained from license fees to a greater extent than ever before.

The revenue obtained from such fees is more than that obtained from rates, and if the license fees are reduced this will affect the revenue of the road boards tremendously. Farmers have never been so prosperous and can well afford the present-day license fees. Many of them have no cars but have runabouts on which they pay only half the license fee; so it can be realised

that a further reduction on that fee is not warranted. From time to time my board has passed resolutions that the rates on runabouts should be restored to the same rates applicable to motorcars. These runabouts are granted a petrol allowance of up to 20 or 30 gallons and they are used for all purposes, including pleasure. They are therefore used relatively much more than are motorcars.

If the Government suggests that further reductions are to be made in the license fee, it should give the matter great consideration before that is done. Any reduction will seriously affect the revenue of road boards whose costs are mounting at a terrific rate, and it will give a further advantage to people who really do not need it. Farmers today are very prosperous and can well afford the license fees which they are now paying. I hope that the Government will not treat the matter lightly. Cabinet should make full inquiries in the country districts before any action is taken that will greatly reduce the revenue of road boards. I support the second reading.

HON. W. B. HALL (North-East) [8.46]: I support the second reading. I consider that those motorists who are on Class 2 licenses should receive a reduction of license fees because of the petrol restriction imposed upon them. They are restricted to a distance of 180 to 200 miles per month, which is a very small mileage to allow, considering what must be paid for the licensing of a car and for third-party insurance. Whatever consideration can be given them should be granted, and I do not think the loss would be greatly felt by road boards.

As to those who are using motors in their business and are receiving a ration of 16 to 20 gallons a month, it is quite a different matter. In their case I think the license fee should be allowed to stand, but I have sympathy for the owners of private cars. Perhaps local authorities could be permitted to allow a reduction where warranted. However, I am speaking mainly for the private motorists because the treatment meted out to them has been fairly harsh.

Local authorities must also receive consideration because of the loss of revenue they will sustain. Some of them are working on a very small revenue, a matter of a few thousand pounds a year, and after ad-

ministration costs have been paid, there is not much money left to spend on roads. This is a point that should be borne in mind. I cannot see how effect could be given to the measure in municipalities and road districts, except at the end of the licensing period, though it might be more easily brought into operation where licenses are staggered.

HON. G. BENNETTS (South) [8.50]: I am pleased that the Bill has been introduced and support the second reading. We on the Goldfields are not so fortunately placed as are Mr. Craig's constituents because the goldmining industry is lagging a little. Since the latest increase in the price of petrol, I have been requested by ratepayers to advocate a reduction of these license fees in the area of the Kalgoortie Municipal Council, of which I am a member. There is every reason why the fees should be reduced since the ration of petrol has been cut so low.

The cheapest car that may be purchased today would cost about £550 and by the time it was licensed and insured and ready to be put on the road—£400 of insurance costs us £17 10s. a year—the total would be about £600. When the owner is allowed petrol equivalent to only 200 miles a month, it becomes fairly costly and he is not getting much benefit for the outlay on the car. At Kalgoorlie the price of petrol is 3s. 7d. a gallon and as Esperance 4s., so that to run a car nowadays is very costly. I cannot see that a reduction in the license fee would amount to very much. I should prefer a reduction in the price of petrol, if that were possible.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It is more likely to go up.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: That seems to be the tendency. I do not see how people will manage to carry on, especially those who have to use cars for essential work. A few months ago I visited a little place where the people have to motor their children to school and motor in to the nearest centre to do their shopping. They asked me to request an extra supply of petrol. They were so short of spirit that they could not motor into the centre at week-ends to take their families to the pictures. When people are isolated as these are, miles away from any centre, it is hard that they should be allowed such a small ration, a ration equal to that allowed a person living in the

city who has other means of transport that he may avail himself of. Certainly it is a hardship on people in the backblocks. I consider that the small amount of revenue of which local authorities will be deprived will be of assistance to motorists.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [8.53]: I have received a number of letters from local authorities in my province asking whether, if the Bill be passed, the Government could make up the loss of revenue by way of a grant. I wish to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that during the present summer a large number of vehicles will receive special licenses for the cartage of wheat and that the wear and tear on country roads will be fairly heavy.

This will involve the local authorities in considerable expense for maintaining roads—except of course, main roads—where trucks are carting from sidings. Probably the mileage that will be covered by such trucks will be considerably more than would be represented by a normal season's work. Some time ago the Honorary Minister supplied information showing, if I remember rightly, that £48,000 had been paid last year for wheat carting by road. This indicates that a considerable mileage must have been traversed by those trucks.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It will be more this year, but we shall try to get some reconp from the Australian Wheat Board.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Which means that the farmers will pay.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It would come out of the general fund.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not know whether there is any provision in the Bill to enable the Minister to differentiate, but some people will be granted a considerable quantity of petrol for essential work.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [8.55]: There is no question that the revenue from license fees plays a very important part in road board finance. Nevertheless, I do not think that anyone can say this legislation is not justified. We hear complaints everywhere about the cost of maintaining cars, and owners feel that it is not just to

have to pay a high license fee when they have not the petrol to enable them to use their vehicles. As has been pointed out, some people, particularly farmers, are doing well at present, but they are few in proportion to the large number of owners of private cars and those who use their vehicles for business purposes.

The Bill proposes to empower the Governor to reduce or increase the fees. We do not know how long the present petrol ration will be adhered to; there might be some relief in the near future. However, it is hard when people who have to keep their motorcars on blocks are called upon to pay the full license fee each year. Admittedly there are arguments for and against the Bill, but summed up I think the measure is justified.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [8.57]: The Bill provides that the Governor may grant a reduction not exceeding 25 per cent. and may fix different percentages and periods for and in relation to different vehicles and different classes or types of vehicle. Members may rest assured that as far as possible justice will be done to all parties.

The problem is a difficult one, but the Minister is fully alive to the fact that any reduction in license fees will have a detrimental effect upon the financial position of local governing bodies. If a local authority cannot pay its way, there is a call on the Treasury, so the Government fully realises what it would mean to interfere more than can possibly be helped with the finances of local authorities. The Government felt that motorists should not be charged as much for their license fees as when they were in receipt of their full ration of petrol, and hence the Bill has been introduced.

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 read a third time and passed.

**BILL—STATE TRANSPORT
CO-ORDINATION ACT
AMENDMENT.**

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [9.3]:

I congratulate the Minister on placing the Government omnibuses, trams and trolley-buses on a similar footing to private industry. It was grossly unfair for the Government to be able to run its omnibuses, etc., without contributing anything towards the cost of maintenance of roads. It is wise to allow a period of seven years for the licensing of these omnibuses. They cost a considerable sum of money. Most members were surprised to find the enormous amount required for the allegedly cheap Landliner purchased by the Railway Department, which is now being converted to make it serviceable.

At the same time, I think it is rather unfair that no transfer of a license for an omnibus shall be granted unless and until the board is satisfied that no money by way of premium or otherwise is to be given for what might be termed goodwill. Many private companies started their services in the interests of the public, though certainly in the hope that they would benefit themselves later, and they have created what might be termed a useful service to the people and something of value in respect to goodwill. I would like to see that portion struck out. The measure is long overdue. No doubt the position can be improved. Perhaps after 12 months the Government may consider the position and, if necessary, do something further. I support the second reading.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [9.5]:

I also congratulate the Government on the introduction of this measure. It is a move in the right direction to grant a license for seven years. This applies particularly to the small man or the person just beginning a motor-bus business, because large sums of money are involved in these concerns. I agree with Mr. Thomson on the question of goodwill. I have a little knowledge of this subject. It has taken quite a while to build up many of these businesses, and if the owners desire to sell, they should be entitled to get something for the time and

money they have spent. I know of one bus service that was conducted for some years at a considerable loss. Finally, a company offered the owner a premium for the route, and it was accepted. If that premium had not been forthcoming, the owner would not have sold. The transfer of the business resulted in great benefit to the district and the people generally, because the owners were able to increase the service. Something should be done in regard to this matter, but there is not much time to move amendments. It is wrong to cut out the possibility of goodwill.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [9.8]: I have a strong objection to the granting of the seven years' license for an omnibus. That is actually selling the people's birthright. It is obvious in the metropolitan area that in order to bring about the quick conveyance of people between Perth and Fremantle the Tramway Department will ultimately have to extend the trolleybuses to Fremantle.

Hon. Sir Frank Gibson: The department will lose more money then than now.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We must consider the interests of the public. I have nothing to say about the Metro Bus Co.; it has done a good job. Every bus company knows when it commences business that the Government has the prior right to run traffic anywhere, either by the railways, the tramways or buses.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Do you not think the companies can do a better job if they have security?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I think the people's organisation can give a far better service than the private companies, because the latter have to make a profit. It is now looked upon as the function of Governments to run transport. We have to consider the people, not the bus companies or the shareholders.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are not the companies providing facilities for the people?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, and the people are paying for them. It would be better if, ultimately, Government transport was provided. With regard to the second part of Clause 9, it would be a retrograde step for this Government to show such a conservative spirit as to be prepared to sell the people's birthright to private companies. I shall support the second reading with reservations.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [9.12]: The reason for proposed new Subsection (2) in Clause 9 is really because of proposed new Subsection (1) of the same clause. It is a franchise given by the Government to provide an essential service. If we permitted goodwill to be added to the cost of that service, then obviously the purchaser who paid for goodwill would have to increase his price to cover the additional amount paid. We had an excellent example of that earlier in the year when, members may recall, we had the milk trouble. The milk vendors were saying that they could not get enough for their milk, but they were paying enormous amounts for rounds. Of course, the consumer had to pay for that goodwill.

The milk vendors said, "Any accountant can come along and he will see that we are not making anything." Some, of course, were losing because they had paid such tremendous sums for goodwill. We do not want that here. If a person sells route X, we do not want the purchaser saying that he cannot make it pay because of his capital outlay and interest when, in fact, he has paid a lot for goodwill. Again, why should a person acquire goodwill from the franchise? If we did not have Subsection (2), there would be a lot of argument against the seven years' franchise. Members will agree that such a franchise for the carrying of people means a large amount to the companies. These concerns deal only with the carriage of passengers and we want them to have the minimum overheads possible so that they can charge as small a fare as is practicable.

Hon. A. Thomson: What do you estimate is the average life of a bus?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That would all be taken into consideration in the depreciation. Members may recall the enormous sums paid by taxi-owners during the war just for the plates. I do not think they got their money back from the local residents, but they did in another way.

Hon. A. Thomson: They got it from the Yanks.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And I think that is the reason for the clause which members will agree has a laudable objective.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Repeal and re-enactment of Section 29:

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I would like to know whether this clause has been put in at the request of the bus companies. I have never heard anyone complain about the present system of licensing and if this clause is agreed to it will not be fair to the public. There would be an outcry in the Chief Secretary's province because everyone is looking forward to the day when they will be running a trolleybus service to Fremantle. By passing this clause we will be interfering with that objective. I intend to vote against it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know, but I have no doubt that the bus companies have asked for a much longer period than seven years. The reason it has been extended from the 12 months to a period of seven years is because large sums of money have to be expended to acquire vehicles. It cannot be expected that anybody who has a license for 12 months only would buy new vehicles because their licenses may be cancelled. The extra period will allow bus companies to join with local authorities in erecting bus shelters and various other necessary appurtenances to their business. It would be foolish for any company to go to great expense and acquire new buses when they had a license for 12 months only.

Hon. A. Thomson: The cost of a bus these days is about £6,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I know it is very high and that is one of the reasons for the clause.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (2) all words after the word "satisfied" in line two be struck out and the words "that the transferee is financially qualified to carry out the terms in accordance with the license" inserted in lieu.

I have no interest in or brief for any private company nor do I own any shares. Mr. Gray says that we are selling the birthright of the public by increasing the term of a license to seven years. Those who are provided with a license for seven years will still have to supply up-to-date vehicles and

first-class travelling facilities but in view of the enormous cost of new vehicles the term of 12 months, as it stands at the moment, is foolish. Many bus companies have been instrumental in opening up new areas in the metropolitan area as well as in country districts and they should be entitled to some monetary consideration when they dispose of their license to some other persons, if they decide to sell out before the term of their licenses has expired.

It might also be that the owner of a bus company might die and his estate has to be wound up. It would be most unjust if no monetary consideration could be given for that license especially if the man had built the company up by his own efforts. If a man has established a business surely it is worthy of some payment for goodwill. Where a man starts off a small business and builds it up he does not have to sell it for the cost of the goods and fixtures. He is entitled to goodwill.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: You cannot include the public highways in goodwill.

Hon. A. THOMSON: These people pay heavy traffic fees.

The CHAIRMAN: It is difficult for the clerks as well as the Chairman of Committees to deal with amendments of which we have no notice and where no copies have been supplied. If possible members should make out three copies of amendments one of which will be for the Chairman of Committees, one for the Clerk for his minutes and the other for the Clerk Assistant.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The hon. member's objection can be overcome by defeating the clause and the Bill can then be re-committed to bring back Section 28 which deals with licenses for 12 months. I think it is impossible to agree to the amendment because that subclause is a safeguard for the giving of this franchise of seven years. If the clause is passed as it stands, or as it is proposed to be amended, the proprietors of bus companies will be able to do as they like. Bus owners in the country districts are doing a wonderful job and I do not want to do anything that would adversely affect them. In other parts like the metropolitan area where settlement is likely to increase very rapidly, tramways can do the job far better as is proved at Fremantle. We should seriously consider the position before making

such a handsome present to private enterprise.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Transport is a serious matter and we should not be asked to deal with such an important question in five minutes. Amendments should be placed on the notice paper and if the Minister were agreeable to postpone the further consideration of the Bill we would have the week-end to enable that to be done.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not wish unduly to hurry business through, but it is desired to conclude the work of the session within the next week. I suggest that members allow the Bill to go through and when I move the third reading at the next sitting it can be recommitted and further amendments considered.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Amendment of First Schedule to exclude commercial goods vehicles operated by the Crown or a local authority and to include furniture carrying vehicles:

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That a new paragraph be inserted after paragraph (a) as follows:—

(b) Adding after paragraph three a paragraph as follows:—

3A. The carriage of bees, bee hives, honey, bees wax and beekeepers' requisites and appliances in the course of the production of honey in a vehicle owned by the producer thereof.

Paragraph 3 of the First Schedule deals with commodities that can be carried from place to place without the necessity for a special transport license. It was thought that that paragraph would cover bee farming, but the Transport Board has ruled otherwise. It is necessary to transport bees from one part of the country to another in search of nectar, hence the necessity for the amendment. It could possibly be covered by regulation but the trouble is that the regulation might be repealed and the bee farmers would be in the same position as at present.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You have made out a good case.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—COUNTRY TOWNS SEWERAGE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I suggest that the second reading be adjourned till the next sitting of the House.

The Chief Secretary: No.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [9.40]: I suggested the adjournment of the debate because the Bill was only introduced last week and I understand that many local authorities are desirous of considering its provisions. This is an important matter and the Government is to be congratulated upon the introduction of the legislation which will enable sewerage systems to be installed in country towns. Much is involved and the local governing authorities should have an opportunity to consider the Bill. It is all very well to say that it is quite all right, but those who will be directly affected should know all about it.

The representatives of two municipalities have asked me to get the Committee stage delayed so that some consideration may be given to the proposal. If the adjournment of the debate were agreed to, it would make that possible. I understand other members have despatched copies of the Bill to various local governing bodies but there has been no time for any replies to be received. The Bill sets out that the Minister can go into a district and undertake work whether it meets with the approval of the local authority there or not. That does not seem quite right. The Minister said that this matter was talked about last year but until legislation is introduced, we can do nothing about it. Apparently the Minister wants to get the legislation through and I presume we will have to let it go at that.

Much comment has been expressed regarding the desirability of establishing sewerage systems in various districts and we all agree that that is a very desirable objective. We must remember, however, that country districts have their financial limitations and already rates have been increased and people are paying heavily for their water supplies. In some cases the establishment of sewerage

systems will be more difficult than in others. Towns adjacent to the sea coast can dispose of the effluent quite easily whereas it is a different proposition in rural areas. We have been told that no effluent should be permitted to be discharged into the sea. I do not agree with that. We have been informed that the filter beds were removed because they encouraged the growth of algae in the Swan River. The effluent from the Perth sewerage system has nothing at all to do with that nuisance. I have read many letters in connection with this matter and also the advice of experts.

The removal of the filter beds from the Swan River was not responsible for reducing or cleaning out the algae from the river. It was the Town Planning Board that made provision for the water front. The Town Planning Commissioner, by his scheme of deepening the river and eliminating the shallow water, prevented the collection of algae on the shallow banks in summer. It is not the effluent that is the trouble; it is a weed known in most places as the blanket weed. I have heard fishermen call it by another name. When the water dries up the weed becomes exposed to the sun; and, particularly where the river bed is muddy, it emits a bad odour.

Most people wonder what is the cause; it is nothing but the heat of the sun on this weed and on slime that forms in the river bed. I am quite sure that Mr. Davidson could do more in the way of clearing out the remainder of the algae in the Swan River. I can show members hundreds of acres of land affected many miles from any sewerage system. No-one likes to think that effluent is being discharged into any river or place close to populated districts. However, I am quite sure that after the effluent has been treated through filter beds and has passed into salt water, no trace of bacteria or microbes will be found within 100 yards of it.

The Bill is an important one. It will do much for the larger country towns; but I feel that, if people have to pay for these schemes, they should have some voice in their control. I do not approve of someone in Perth having full control of a scheme at Albany, where there is a local authority and where the people have to pay for it. Local governing bodies are just as competent to carry out their duties as are Government

departments in Perth. They undertake onerous and responsible duties and probably could conduct the schemes cheaper than they could be administered in Perth. We are told that the Government will pay the cost of the scheme; it may advance the money, but that will have to be repaid by the rate-payers in the district concerned. I support the second reading of the Bill.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [9.49]: I have no desire to rush this Bill through the House. I refute the statement that it is being rushed through by a Minister. The first reading was passed on the 10th November in another place and the second reading on the 16th of that month. I introduced it in this House last week, and Mr. Bennetts and Mr. Loton have had sufficient time to prepare a number of amendments between them, I think about 120. I take it they got these amendments from the local authorities in their Provinces. If local authorities in places as far away as Kalgoorlie and the Great Southern district could do that, I see no reason for complaining of rushing the measure through.

I should like to proceed as far as possible tonight with the measure: and, if it is so desired by members, the Bill could be recommitted on Tuesday to consider any clause which a member might wish to debate again. I think that proposal is fair and hope members will agree to it. I have not much to say in reply. I think the House agrees with the principle of the Bill. It will be a fine thing for country districts if this scheme is installed at their command, and they will be able to implement it. Mr. Loton said that the scheme must be proceeded with apace. Of course it will be, but that will be determined by the quantity of pipes and other materials which will be available. We have a Minister who is constantly endeavouring to secure supplies from all over Australia, as well as from Europe, Japan and elsewhere. I assure the hon. member that the supply of pipes will be speeded up as much as possible. A vast scheme of this nature will take many years to complete, but not only are we dependent on supplies of materials, we also need water supplies.

The only scheme that can be proceeded with at present is the one at Albany. Mr. Loton criticised the sewerage rate and said

that the Treasury should accept the financial responsibility for this work. After all, the Treasury is really the people. Why should people at Wickiepin or Nyabing be called upon to contribute to the cost of a sewerage scheme at Albany or Katanning? That would be neither equitable nor just. The people who will receive the benefit of the scheme should pay for it. I do not think that country people would be pleased to contribute towards the cost of the sewerage system in the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. L. Loton: In some places they pay twice as much as the people in the metropolitan area.

THE HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Loton also referred to the question of making bylaws with respect to various matters, including the prescribing and defining of the financial year for any particular district. It is most desirable that all financial years for State undertakings should not end in June, as this would place an unbearable burden on the accounts sections of the various departments concerned. At present, the Goldfields Water Supply's financial year commences on the 1st January. The rating in drainage districts also commences on the 1st January, while irrigation rating is from the 1st July. The rating of various town water supplies controlled by the Minister under the Water Boards Act varies, some dating from the 1st July, but in the case of Albany, for example, from the 1st November. It was found necessary some time ago to vary the financial years of various undertakings and no inconvenience has resulted therefrom.

It is highly desirable that the financial year for a sewerage scheme under this legislation should coincide with the water supply financial year for the particular town concerned, because by inference under Clause 104, provision is made for the water supply and sewerage rate notice to be on one and the same form, as is the case with the Metropolitan Water Supply Department. As regards the penalty provisions of the Bill, Mr. Loton was also very concerned. The necessity for penalties must surely be obvious. They should be severe, as otherwise they would not act as a deterrent to persons interfering with these works. I think Sir Charles Latham said that he could not put a washer on his tap at home without incurring a penalty. That is so, but this matter

is of much greater importance. A person interfering with pipes belonging to or destroying any portion of sewerage works is guilty of a serious offence and should be severely punished.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Do you believe in two penalties for the one crime?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. The Bill does not provide for two penalties for one crime. A person may be fined up to £200, or may be imprisoned for any term not exceeding 12 months. Mr. Loton also complained that any officer of the Minister could, without warrant, arrest a person found committing an offence against the Act or any bylaw, if he refused to give his name and address. Any person who would refuse to furnish his name and address on demand should be put where he belongs. Mr. Loton also mentioned the case of an owner who might take up a pipe in order to see where a break had occurred in the sewerage system. I have had occasion to do that on my own farm, but that is a different matter from interfering with a public system like this, which is beyond the capacity of ordinary people to deal with. The hon. member also mentioned that lands and works vested in the Minister would be exempt from rating by local authorities. *

Crown lands are already exempt from rating under local authority statutes. Although that is so, it is invariably the case that when the State is asked to carry out improvements for the extermination of vermin, noxious weeds, etc., on Crown lands, the request is dealt with, but there would be no justification for authorising the assessing of charges for the extermination of such vermin or noxious weeds. Local authorities cannot expect to have it in their favour both ways, that is, to be able to assess rates against the Crown and yet claim immunity in respect to their own land and reserves. Mr. Mann spoke about the volume of water that would be consumed by the scheme. In the metropolitan area, it is not generally recognised that water consumption would double itself with sewerage installation. Much more water is used on gardens and lawns than is used for sewerage purposes.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Where water is scarce in country districts, I think it would be advisable to limit the supply.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have gone into that question, and I have to thank Mr. Cunningham for bringing it before the House, so that we can make investigations. He said that the regulations stipulate that a two-gallon flush is the minimum allowed for a normal pedestal. That applies in the metropolitan area and is likely to operate in country districts. The matter will be the subject of examination by experts to see whether a one and a half gallon flush could be successfully used in sewerage schemes in country districts where water may be short. Mr. Fraser said the Bill should provide for the work to be done at the request of the local authorities.

In all cases where the Government considers sewerage should be provided in country areas the local authority will be brought into the picture. I believe—as do the experts—that the local authorities will make the demand. I think they will be coming to the Government to have the scheme installed. The work now in progress at Albany was initiated under the Public Works Act with the full endorsement of the Albany Council. It must be remembered that the Government will finance the work.

Hon. A. Thomson: But the ratepayers will pay for it.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, in the end, but the Government is advancing the money. Mr. Fraser suggested that the Government should grant loans to residents, but there is already provision made for that and for six years in which repayment is to be made. Mr. Bennetts has given notice of an amendment to extend that time. It has been computed that the average installation will cost about £70. Surely six years is long enough in which to pay that sum.

Hon. G. Bennetts: On the Goldfields 15 years is provided.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: People there may not be so well off as they are in many of the country districts. In view of the prosperity of the country generally I think six years is sufficient.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The period could be extended in any case, if there were justification.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think many people would pay the £70 outright.

Hon. G. Fraser: Six years was provided when the cost was only half of what it is now.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am advised that the cost of sewerage a five-roomed house will be about £70.

Hon. R. M. Forrest: You will not get it much cheaper than that.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think it will be generally considered that a six-year period is long enough. I am not prepared to alter that provision. Mr. Bennetts said the Bill was a dictatorial measure and he referred to the fact that Clause 21 provides a penalty not exceeding £50 for the local authority. Failure of a local authority to notify the Minister of the intention to alter the level of a street might involve serious consequences and even lead to an epidemic. Hence the penalty is necessary, although I do not think it would ever be imposed. A similar penalty, provided in other statutes, has never had to be imposed and I think that will apply in this case. Mr. Bennetts also said that the payment of 4d. per folio for the copy of the rate-book was insufficient. Perhaps 6d. would be a fair thing, if Mr. Bennetts presses the point. I think Mr. Thomson misunderstood me when he said that the ratepayers would have to pay a minimum rate of 3s. That is the maximum, not the minimum.

Hon. A. Thomson: Up to 3s.?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, that is the maximum. Mr. Thomson also objected to country road boards not having been given notification of this legislation. It is a Government measure that has been mooted for a long time and I do not think it is the responsibility of the Government to notify local authorities in a case such as this. Members of another place, where the measure was introduced nearly three weeks ago, represent country districts and if they did not notify the local authorities perhaps they have fallen down on their job. It should not be for members of this Chamber, a fortnight later, to bear that responsibility, as apparently they have.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Not one of the local authorities knew about the measure.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We cannot hold up legislation of this kind indefinitely because the local authorities do not know about it. The Kalgoorlie Council has apparently sent along a few amendments, as have also other local authorities on the Great Southern. Mr. Thomson said emphatically that the Bill was drastic. It is based on three or four other Acts and it was considered preferable to have all the relevant provisions contained in one measure instead of those concerned having to consult four or five Acts. The Bill is bulky, but that is desirable, as it allows all the provisions to be consolidated in one piece of legislation. I do not agree that the measure is at all drastic. It is well-known that there is insufficient water in many country districts for the purposes of this scheme but, as water, material and labour become available, I feel sure the job will go on.

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I would like to know why, in the definition of "owner," the Crown should not be included as an owner. It receives rent for properties that are leased or hired to individuals or associations and I fail to see why it should not be classed as an owner.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: In many other statutes the Crown is not considered to be an owner.

Hon. G. Bennetts called attention to the state of the Committee.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Government provides homes for many of its employees in country districts. Why should it be exempt in this regard?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I see no object in the Crown being considered an

owner. Why should the Crown pay itself? The Crown does not tax itself. I feel sure that the Public Works Department in Perth pays no sewerage rate.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The explanation given is not satisfactory. If an ordinary householder must pay a sewerage rate, surely a Government department should pay a similar rate. This is embracing small country towns and is a point that has been raised.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Country towns which have a pan system have to pay for that service.

The Chief Secretary: Yes, they pay for the service.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am wondering what is the position as far as the rating is concerned.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Title of this Bill is the Country Towns Sewerage Act, 1948, and I am referring to the definition applying to this Bill, not as applying to other Acts. I fail to see why the Crown should not share the responsibility in other systems.

The Chief Secretary: The Crown is doing the whole thing; it is sewerage the whole place.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Who is paying for it?

The Chief Secretary: Everybody.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Minister's explanation is different from that given by the Honorary Minister for Agriculture. I would like the point cleared up.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government is advancing money and it will be paid back by the people using the scheme. It has always been the custom that the Crown cannot charge the Crown. Mr. Thomson is quite right. I have been on road boards and have been annoyed when certain people have been exempted from paying rates. It is not unreasonable that the Crown should pay something.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: In Kalgoorlie, the railways have a septic tank system and, although the sewerage scheme was installed, they would not link up because they would have had to pay the sewerage rates.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If members will read Clause 47, they will find that certain land is exempt from rates.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Minister may construct works:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (1) the following proviso be added:—"Provided that the Minister shall not exercise any of such powers in any sewerage area where the local authority in whose district such sewerage area is situate is itself desirous of undertaking such works."

I did criticise this measure as being somewhat dictatorial and I do not withdraw that statement because the powers in the Bill give the Public Works Department the right to say, "We are going to sewer this particular district." Many of the country towns are in what might be termed a static condition. The metropolitan area is expanding every year and what is applicable there is not quite suitable to a small country town or a town which may decide that it would be more economical in the long run to undertake the construction of its own sewerage scheme. It would, of course, require to have authority and the plans approved by the Public Works Department.

Realising that the Government will do the work according to the Bill, it is the ratepayers in these towns who must face the expense, not the department or the Government. As the ratepayers are liable to be taxed up to the rate of 3s. in the pound that may mean a considerable load on the people. However, if the ratepayers are willing to accept that responsibility, that is all right. While the Minister has said he could not believe the department would step in and say, "We are going to sewer this district" it has the power, but I assume it would discuss the matter with the road board or the municipality. Local authorities generally can administer the affairs of a country town much more economically than can the head of a department. I hope the Committee will pass the amendment.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: This amendment will suit the Kalgoorlie district because half the town is already sewered. If we have to sewer the other part we will be able to do so by virtue of this amendment. I think it is a good one.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not see much harm in this amendment. Later on there is a provision for the local authority to object if it does not want a scheme. There is no provision for the local authority to undertake the work if it so desires. While there is no harm in the amendment, I cannot visualise a local authority taking such work on when the department has all the experts and material available to do the job.

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

Clause 12—Preliminaries to construction:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That after the word "Minister" in line 9 of paragraph (a) the words "and of the local authorities" be inserted.

Anyone interested should be able to view the plans, etc., at the office of the local authority instead of having to go to the office of the Minister.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Clause 13—Plans, etc., open to inspection.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the words "on payment of the prescribed fee" be struck out, and the words "free of charge" inserted in lieu.

Why should a fee be demanded of anyone wishing to see the plans? Such an impost is quite unnecessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the amendment which, I suppose, is in order, seeing that it will affect the revenue.

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

Clause 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Governor may authorise construction of works:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I do not like the wording of paragraph (d), which would give the Minister supreme power, but in view of the amendment already agreed to, there is probably sufficient safeguard for those who might legitimately object to a scheme.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Seemingly the Minister would receive objections and there would be no appeal to a higher authority.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Minister would not be likely to undertake work to which the local people would object. The position is well safeguarded.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—Powers of Minister:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (f) after the word "land" the words "and recondition" be inserted.

There seems to be no provision for reconditioning streets after they have been broken up. Local authorities should not have to bear the cost.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment is quite unnecessary as Clause 20 makes full provision for the reinstatement without delay of streets that have been broken up.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That after the word "discharged" in line 1 of paragraph (g) the words "after effective treatment of sewage" be inserted.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This amendment also is unnecessary as provision is made for it elsewhere in the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 to 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Local authorities to give particulars as to levels:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (4) be struck out.

The penalty of £50 is rather severe. The Minister said this is in the metropolitan Act, but as far as we know it has never been applied.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is only a safeguard against a careless road board. After all it is a maximum. As far as I know it has never been applied.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 and 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Minister to keep sewer cleansed:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause (2) after the word "but" the word "not" be inserted.

It is unfair that a water board should do work at the request of the Minister, at its own expense.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I can assure Mr. Loton that if the responsibility is taken from the water board there will be no sewerage scheme in the particular town concerned.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Maps of sewerage districts:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 9 after the word "Minister" the words "and local authority" be inserted.

This follows on a previous amendment of mine.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is not the same, by any means, as the other amendment. The previous one dealt with the position before any works were carried out, but this deals with it after sewerage works have been established. It would not be in the best interests of every one to have the plans at the local authority's office. There would be a copy at the office of the local water board which would look after this sort of work. The amendment is unnecessary.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not think the Honorary Minister has considered Mr. Thomson's amendment by which works can be undertaken by a local authority.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: In that case it is the local authority's pigeon.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: My amendment is in order in those circumstances.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is not necessary!

Hon. A. THOMSON: The amendment is quite reasonable. Why should we have to come to Perth to see these maps?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: You would not.

Hon. E. H. Gray: There would be a copy of the plan in the district.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am assuming there is a local sewerage board and that plans have been prepared at the request of the local authority, and the work done by the Sewerage Department. On completion, the work should be handed over to the local sewerage board. All that is being asked is that a copy of the map shall be kept at the office of the local authority. Why there should be any objection to this passes my comprehension.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There are two types of sewerage works as a result of Mr. Thomson's amendment. The orthodox type will prevail in ninety-nine per cent. of cases and the other one per cent. will be done by the local authority, if there will be that one per cent. In the case of sewerage works carried out by the local authority, I have no objection to the plans being at the office of that local authority. But we are now dealing with the general set-up. The hon. member can provide for plans to be at the office of the local authority where the local authority carries out the work. He can consider moving an amendment to that effect when the Bill is recommitted. I will agree to that for the time being. What another place will think about it, I do not know.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	13
Majority against				5

AYES.

Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. Sir C. G. Latham	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. H. L. Roche	Hon. W. J. Mann (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. Sir F. E. Gibson
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. M. Cunningham	Hon. G. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. E. H. Gray (Teller.)
Hon. G. Fraser	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 27 to 36—agreed to.

Clause 37—Persons liable for payment for compulsory drainage may agree to pay by deferred payments.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I move an amendment—

That in line 9 of Subclause (1) the words "twenty-four" be struck out and the word "forty" inserted in lieu.

My board has asked me to put forward this amendment because it considers that 24 quarterly instalments do not allow sufficient time and it is desired to extend the period to 10 years or 40 quarterly instalments.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot agree to the amendment. There is plenty of money about today and to alter this to 10 years would be ridiculous. It will only be a sum of about £70.

Hon. A. Thomson: It may be £100.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What is £10 a year when a person has facilities such as these. I am sure that 90 per cent. of the people would sooner pay the amount borrowed quickly than have it dragging over 10 years. This provision is similar to that operating in the metropolitan area and it has been estimated that for a five-roomed house the present-day cost for sewerage would be about £70.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I do not think the Minister's statement is correct. Sewerage installations on the Goldfields for three and four-roomed houses cost about £60 pre-war. Since then the cost has jumped about 50 per cent. and I would say that the cost of installing sewerage in a five-roomed house would be about £80 or £90. Under the scheme on the Goldfields, people were allowed to pay for these facilities over 15 years and I think reducing it to 10 years is quite a reasonable proposal.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We must remember that we are dealing with people who are not able to pay cash for everything they get and it is essential that such people have due consideration. Houses which pre-war could be rented for 15s. a week are now costing 35s. and 37s. 6d. When a man is on the basic wage and you add that cost to his yearly commitments it becomes a serious problem. I know that in a small house in which my wife was interested it cost about £60 to have the sewerage installed to the bath; it was already connected to the w.c. That was some time ago and with the cost of materials going up the cost today would be at least £70 and probably more. I ask the Minister to accept the amendment

because it provides for people who are not in a position to pay cash. A lot of these people may not wish to continue paying over such a long period but it will at least give them an opportunity of doing so if they wish.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: One would think to hear the remarks of Mr. Thomson that provision is not being made for extended payments. For repayment over six years it will cost about £3 a year.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: How do you mean?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: With 24 payments it means less than £3 a year.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Honorary Minister means £3 per quarter.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, £3 a year.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is £12 a year or £3 a quarter.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is correct but in any case what are they going to save by having the extended period?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not know where the Minister got his figures from but I know that ten or 12 years ago the cost of connecting up with an existing system at Nedlands was £60. The Honorary Minister considers that the six-year period is reasonable but, of course, those who can will pay cash, otherwise interest charges will have to be paid that will probably represent 4 per cent or 5 per cent. As to people who have large families, they may require a more extended period, and I do not think the department would press them unduly. The cost will be £12 a year with, of course, a rebate of £5 that will be saved on the pan system, which means that £7 a year has to be met, plus interest.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I question the Minister's figures and point out to him that at Kalgoorlie the charge for the pan system is 3s. 6d. a month and that includes the rubbish service.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: My figures were supplied by the Public Works Department, and I do not think it would supply me with inaccurate details.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	8

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. J. M. Cunningham	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. H. Hearn	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir F. E. Gibson	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. Sir C. G. Latham	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. C. H. Simpson
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause (2) after the word "such" the word "lesser" be inserted. The Government may decide to impose a smaller rate, but there is no provision for that to be done.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think the amendment is necessary but, as the purpose is evidently to provide that the interest shall not be greater than 5 per cent., I raise no objection to it.

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

Clauses 38 to 47—agreed to.

Clause 48—Rate books:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the word "ratable" be struck out.

If the amendment be agreed to, the rate book will disclose all the land in the district. Later on provision is made for the local authorities to forward to the Minister particulars of all land that becomes ratable. My object is to save a lot of work at a later stage.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot understand the reason for the amendment. Why clutter up the rate book with a lot of land that is not ratable?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: And never will be.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This will cover ceme-

teries, railway reserves and so on. I certainly do not think the Committee will accept this amendment, which will impose a lot of work on local authorities that will be absolutely useless.

Hon. H. K. Watson: This threatens to become nearly as silly as motor control!

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 49 to 51—agreed to.

Clause 52—Rate book to be made up in each financial year and open to inspection:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I want to query the inclusion of the words "as early as may be." Why cannot we stipulate that the rate book shall be made up within a stipulated number of days after the end of the financial year, instead of merely "as early as may be?"

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is no amendment before the Committee. I see no objection to the clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 53 to 62—agreed to.

Clause 63—Appeals to the Minister:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Under the Municipal Corporations Act, on an appeal against rates, only one-quarter of the amount of rates is payable on lodging the notice of appeal. The clause provides that half the rates shall be paid.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: One moiety is payable under the Municipal Corporations Act.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause (3) the word "one-half" be struck out, and the word "one-quarter" inserted in lieu.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Mr. Loton's only argument is that under the Act only one-quarter of the rates has to be paid on lodging the appeal. Under both the Country Areas Water Supply Act and the Metropolitan Water Supply Act, provision is made that one-half the rates shall be paid. The amendment is not justified.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 64—agreed to.

Clause 65—Hearing of appeal:

Hon. A. THOMSON: This clause is rather stringent. It provides that the decision of the local court on any appeal shall be final. In order to test the feeling of the Committee I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think it most unlikely that an appeal would be taken to the Supreme Court, the Full Court or the High Court on a matter of rates. There may have been such appeals, but I have not heard of them.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 66 and 67—agreed to.

Clause 68—Amount of rate:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: This clause, so far as I am concerned, is the main clause of the Bill, because it seeks to differentiate between town and country. Under the Metropolitan Water Supply Act, sewerage and storm-water rates together in one year shall not exceed 1s. 6d., and 3d. in the £ on the capital unimproved value of the land rated where the valuation is based on the capital unimproved value of the land. That was in 1909 and it was amended in 1925 to give a maximum sewerage rate of 1s. 6d. on the annual ratable value of land rated, or 3d. in the £ on the capital unimproved value of the land and a storm water rate not exceeding 5d. The Bill provides for a maximum rate of 3s. in the £, which is double what people in the metropolitan area have been compelled by legislation to pay. I take exception to that provision. I can quite understand the view that seems to be taken that country people must carry the financial burden in almost every instance, but I do not agree that the country is flourishing. Although there is a lot of money in circulation its value is diminishing. I wish to quote the remarks of the member for Williams-Narrogin, the present Minister for Works, who in the Assembly in 1945 is reported in "Hansard" to have said:—

I remind members that Mr. Dunstan, in his last Budget, required uniformity in the price of electric current in all and every part of the State where it is being or may be distributed. That is a most inspiring policy, and the time is not far distant when much more will be said in favour of having uniform prices for quite a number of commodities more or less of the type of electricity.

I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) of Subclause (1) the words "three shillings" be struck out, and the words "one shilling and sixpence" inserted in lieu.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I support the amendment. The Kalgoorlie council at present has a rate of 1s. in the £ for sewerage, 1s. 9d. general and 6d. health rate. The maximum permissible under the Act is 2s. 6d.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment, if carried, would deprive certain country towns of a sewerage scheme as it would make its financing impossible. The Minister would not agree to the work being undertaken if the maximum rate was 1s. 6d. in the £.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I am surprised at the explanation given and am surprised also at the Minister for Works not taking the local authorities into consideration in the proposal. Anything wanted in the country must apparently be paid for at an excess rate. In the case of nearly all public works the maximum charge becomes the minimum.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The 3s. is to be the maximum, and not the minimum charge. In Kalgoorlie, where the maximum is 1s. 9d., the actual charge is 1s. I do not desire to see the Bill ruined by this amendment and I hope the Committee will reject it.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:

Ayes	7
Noes	10

Majority against 3

AYES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Cunningham	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. H. L. Roche	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. Sir C. G. Latham
Hon. J. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir F. E. Gibson	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. K. Watson
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 69 to 82—agreed to.

Clause 83—Land may be sold for arrears of rates, etc., remaining unpaid for five years:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (a) of Subclause (2) the words "private contract" be

struck out and the words "public tender" inserted in lieu.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member has put up no argument in favour of the amendment. I do not know whether he thinks there might be some improper practices.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Make your own decisions.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is a proviso that the land shall not be sold by private contract until it has first been offered for sale by public auction.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 84 to 88—agreed to.

Clause 89—Power to transfer or convey land:

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 29 after the word "Commonwealth" the words "or State" be inserted.

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

Clause 90 to 92—agreed to.

Clause 93—Application of purchase money:

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That the paragraphs "Thirdly" and "Fourthly" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

Thirdly—In payment of all unpaid moneys owing for rates and taxes and any costs or other moneys due to or imposed by the Crown in the right of the State or any Department, Agency, Instrumentality or Branch of His Majesty's Government of the State including the Government Agency Department of the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia and also in payment of all moneys for unpaid rates due to or imposed by the Municipal Council or Road Board and the Local Authority under the Health Act, 1911-1944 in respect of the land at the time of the sale.

Provided that where the moneys remaining after the payments provided for firstly and secondly herein have been made are not sufficient for the payment in full of all the rates, taxes and other moneys mentioned and provided for in this paragraph such moneys shall be distributed between the Crown, the Department, the Agency, the Branch, the Municipal Council or Road Board and the Local Health Authority pro rata with the amounts of their claims respectively.

The object of this amendment is to ensure that the State has first priority on all money. It will bring the local authority, the bank

and the State all into line with respect to the sale of land. They will all share the payment of the money pro rata.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I agree with the amendment as the Kalgoorlie Road Board had requested me to move an amendment respecting the paragraphs. The board decided to have those moneys divided between the Water Supply Department, the bank and the municipality.

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of the proviso after the word "provided" the word "also" be inserted.

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

Clauses 94 to 110—agreed to.

Clause 111—Penalty for refusing to give up possession of works:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: The clause provides for a pecuniary penalty as well as imprisonment. Surely it should be one or the other! I move an amendment—

That in line 7 the word "and" be struck out and the word "or" inserted in lieu.

Hon. G. FRASER: If the amendment were passed, the penalty could be fine or imprisonment, and I do not think I have seen any measure that has not included both.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If Mr. Loton read the Criminal Code, he would see that an offender is liable to both fine and imprisonment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 112—Offenders may be arrested:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Under the clause, any officer may, without warrant, arrest any person found committing an offence if the offender refuses to give his name and address. The clause is too drastic, and should be struck out.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I agree that the clause should be struck out. If the officer had not a warrant, it is questionable whether he would have the right to effect an arrest.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Does Mr. Loton think that any person strolling in the vicinity of sewerage works would be grabbed? The clause relates to a person who is found committing an offence and refuses to give his name and address. This Chamber should stand for the protection of public property, not of wrongdoers.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Seemingly, a citizen could be arrested by a workman. To me the clause appears to be too drastic.

Hon. H. HEARN: I agree that the clause should be struck out. There is something to be said for the sanctity of property, but there is more to be said for the liberty of the individual.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If a man were committing an offence in King's Park, the controller would arrest him without asking his name and hand him over to the nearest policeman. What would Mr. Hearn do if he found a man committing an offence on his premises? Should a vandal be allowed deliberately to damage public property without being apprehended?

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: It is very arbitrary to provide that a public servant employed by the Minister may demand a man's name and address and have power to arrest him for refusing, while at the same time we have a Police Force.

The Chief Secretary: This clause is copied from other Acts.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If Mr. Roche saw a man setting fire to his property, he would stop him and put him where he ought to be. The clause is only commonsense.

Hon. G. FRASER: No man would permit another man to destroy his property. In this case, the man would only be arrested if he refused to give his name and address.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Would you be prepared to give your name and address to any Tom, Dick or Harry who asked for it?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow these conversations across the Chamber. Each member is entitled to speak not once, but many times. A member should be allowed to speak without interruption.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I am sorry I transgressed, Mr. Chairman. I ask Mr. Fraser, through you, whether he would be disposed to give his name and address to any person if he were not breaking the law.

Hon. G. Fraser: I am not ashamed of my name and address and will give them to anybody who wants to know them.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I am not prepared to give my name and address to a P.W.D. officer.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: Why make a policeman of employees? That is not done in the case of shoplifting.

Hon. L. Craig: It is.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: One would have to be careful in arresting a person, as it might lead to trouble.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am surprised at the opposition to the clause. The authority is given to arrest a person only if that person is committing an offence.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Why not report him?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Suppose this happened at Bruce Rock and the policeman was away serving a summons!

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: It would be easier to warn the man than to arrest him.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I, too, am surprised at the attitude of some members to this clause. A shopwalker would speedily arrest a shoplifter who was stealing goods and hold him until the police arrived. Anybody damaging public property should be apprehended.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	6
Majority for				8

AYES.

Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir F. E. Gibson	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. Sir C. G. Latham	Hon. H. Tuckey (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Cunningham	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. G. Bennetts (Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 113 to 120, Schedules 1 to 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ACTS AMENDMENT (INCREASE OF FEES).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday the 7th December, at 3 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.37 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 2nd December, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Midland Junction Workshops, as to costing system	3002
Milk, as to contributions to compensation fund	3002
Superphosphate, as to freight haulage	3003
Select Committee : Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill (No. 1), extension of time	3003
Bills : South Fremantle Oil Installations	
Pipe Line, 8r.	3003
Wheat Industry Stabilisation, Message	3003
Land Act Amendment (No. 1), Council's amendment	3003
Health Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's amendments	3005
City of Perth Electricity and Gas Purchase, Message 2r., remaining stages	3005
South Fremantle Oil Installations Pipe Line, returned	3023
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	3023
Companies Act Amendment, 1r.	3030
Land Act Amendment (No. 1), Council's message	3030
Road Closure, returned	3030
Reserves, returned	3030
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2r.	3030
Government Employees' Pensions, Message 2r.	3032
Traffic Act Amendment, returned	3036
Marketing of Apples and Pears, 2r.	3036
Acts Amendment (Increase of Fees), 2r., remaining stages	3042
Bush Fires Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com.	3047
Cattle Industry Compensation, Com.	3049
Adjournment, special	3051

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS.

As to Costing System.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many meetings have been arranged between the C.M.E. branch Government workshops and shop stewards to discuss the new costing system?

(2) Did the C.M.E. promise to discuss the new system monthly, and fail to carry out this promise?

(3) Is it the intention of the C.M.E. to call any further meetings?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) One.

(2) At the meeting, held in March, the Chief Mechanical Engineer promised to hold a further meeting towards the end of April if such could be arranged. However, the exigencies of the service prevented this, and with the smooth working of production control, with which costing is allied, a further meeting was considered unnecessary.

(3) Yes, if the joint union executive desires it, or the Chief Mechanical Engineer considers a further meeting desirable.

MILK.

As to Contributions to Compensation Fund.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) What persons or firms holding vendors' or treatment licenses have not contributed to the Compensation Fund the assessed amounts required as contributions from them under the Milk Act?

(2) What amounts are outstanding in each case?

(3) What action, if any, is it proposed to take to adjust matters equitably between licensees who have paid contributions to the Compensation Fund and those who have not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) The following persons and firms holding vendors' and treatment licenses