

been well conducted throughout the year from the point of view of maintenance of law and order. During the period under review, three women police were enrolled and one resigned. The total number of women police is now nine and these are stationed at Perth, Fremantle and Kalgoorlie and when needed they visit other centres. Recently the first woman police to receive the distinction was appointed a police sergeant—Sergeant Scott. Only four motor-cycles have been available lately for traffic patrol work. Authority has been given for the purchase of six additional motor-cycles, and it is hoped that these will arrive very shortly. With these additional patrols, it is anticipated that a more effective check will be kept on traffic regulations and their observance and a greater effort made to minimise, as far as possible, the risks which are now so prevalent on our roads.

A feature of the work continued throughout the year has been the lectures by police officers to children attending schools in the metropolitan area. These talks were well received and the intention was to impress upon the minds of the children the principles of safety on our roads and the general observance of law and order. There were 6,161 accidents reported in the metropolitan area for the year, and a comparison with the previous year's figures discloses an increase of 2,075 accidents reported. There was an increase during the past year of 5,115 in the number of offences brought to trial as compared with the preceding year.

The percentage of offences to the mean population increased by .52 per cent. last year as compared with a decrease of .47 per cent. in 1945. The increase in offences brought to trial has been largely due to the more vigilant enforcement of the traffic regulations. The number of offences committed by juveniles during the year 1946 was 2,099 showing an increase of 81 on the preceding year. Owing to the shortage of personnel, as in the case of other departments, a considerable strain has been placed on the officers of the force. I think I should express appreciation, not only to them for the additional time they worked beyond their prescribed hours but also to the Police Union for the understanding it has extended to the department in recognising that with the personnel at his disposal the Commis-

sioner of Police could not do any better, and when he had to call upon men to work beyond their usual time it was because it was essential for the service of the public in connection with police duties.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 11th November, 1947.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1795
Bills: Plant Diseases Act Amendment 3r.	1795
Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r., passed	1793
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r., passed	1795
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amend- ment, 2r.	1796
Stallions Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1797
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com.	1802
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com.	1805
Street Photographers, Com.	1806
Industry (Advances), 2r.	1814
Child Welfare, Com.	1815

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Economic Stability Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 2, Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasors' Contribution).
- 3, Traffic Act Amendment.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Plant Diseases Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.
- 2, Land Alienation Restriction Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 3, Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance).

Passed.

BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th November.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.40]: The Bill has a number of commendable features and, because of that, I intend to support the second reading. I do, however, want to make a few observations in connection with it. The object is to protect tenants, or people who wish to be tenants, from some of the difficulties they are up against at the moment, and have been for some time. It has been reported that some prospective tenants have been compelled to pay a price for the key to gain possession of the shop, house, flat or room which they hope to rent. Another iniquitous imposition foisted on tenants is that they are sometimes compelled to purchase furniture in the premises they hope to rent, at a price much in excess of the actual value. This Bill seeks to prevent such evil practices, so far as it is possible to do so by legislation.

I always feel a tinge of pride that the Western Australian Parliament was the first of all the Australian Parliaments, after the outbreak of war, to introduce an Act to control rents effectively. Members might recall that within a few days of the commencement of the European war, this Parliament passed the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act. I think that occurred in November, 1939. It is true that a few days later the National Security Act was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament and, under that Act, regulations were framed for the purpose of controlling rents and giving protection to tenants. The Commonwealth Parliament showed some consideration for our Act by allowing the control of rents to remain under the operation of our Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act, and the portion of that Act dealing with the control of rents has been in operation over the years.

Members will call to mind that the 1939 Act froze all rents as at the 31st August, 1939. The frozen rent became the standard rent, and is referred to in the Act as the standard rent. It is the rent that operated at the 31st August, 1939, and it cannot be raised except in unusual circumstances, and then only by an appeal to the court. Some

of the circumstances in which it can be raised without an appeal to the court are as I shall indicate. If the landlord makes a structural alteration which necessitates additional capital investment, he is allowed to collect a rate of interest on that fresh capital, by way of increased rent. He can also, without application to the court, increase the rent for the purpose of making good any increase in municipal or road rates.

When the legislation was first introduced it sought to correct a real anomaly. Members may recall that when Japan entered the war there was something in the nature of a scare. Many people fled from the metropolis and from the western seaboard, and made their way inland or to the Eastern States, where some thought the position was safer. Then, as the outcome of enlistments and a general sense of insecurity, business deteriorated and, in some cases, disappeared. As a result of this set of circumstances, houses, shops and flats were rendered vacant. In many instances, landlords, to meet the exigencies of the times, reduced their rents below what was operating as at the 31st August, 1939—the standard rent.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Not too many.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT: Quite a number did. In answer to that interjection, I might say that I am today renting an office in the city at a price much below its actual value. All the offices in the particular building are let at considerably below their real rental value. That is one of many instances, and I know of it from personal experience because I am in the fortunate position of paying a rental very much below the real value.

When the Bill was first introduced in the Legislative Assembly, it made provision, by proposed new Section 6B, to correct that anomaly by allowing a landlord who had reduced the rate below the standard, to restore it to the standard rent by giving to the tenant two weeks' notice in writing of his intention. That seems to be a fair and reasonable intention on the part of the framers of the Bill. That proposed new section was amended, however, so that it now provides that it is necessary for the landlord to apply to the court for permission to restore the rent to the standard

rent of the 31st August, 1939. That seems to me to be unfair to the landlord by creating unnecessary expense and an unnecessary hindrance. I hope that when in Committee, members here will alter proposed new Section 6B so that it will read as it did when first presented to the Assembly. That seems to me to be fair, reasonable and equitable.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

BILL—STALLIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th November.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.50]: When the Honorary Minister introduced this measure he gave the House very little information, but in reply to an interjection from me he said that it would not affect very many people. That might be all right with regard to ordinary farm horses or stallions in connection with which subsidies were paid by a previous Government with the idea of building up first quality breeds for heavy work. Unfortunately in these days horses are practically back numbers in the rural districts. Owing to the shortage of labour and other difficulties confronting the farming community, they have had to purchase machinery in their own interests and today there are very few farms where six or eight-horse teams are working.

If the Honorary Minister had submitted this legislation for the purpose of releasing a few who have stallions or heavy draught horses from the provisions of the Act, I would offer no objection, but by their interjections several members are in agreement with me in taking exception to horses not in the heavy classes from being excluded from the payment of fees. One would be safe in saying that the charges levelled for servicing by those owning the lighter types of stallions would range from 35 to 100 guineas. If those horses were working on various means by which production could be increased and the assistance proposed would help to develop that type of animal, I would not object, but I think most members will agree that, while racehorses use a considerable amount of feed and the farmers who are

providing it are pleased to have that extra market, the owners of such animals should not be released from the necessity to contribute the revenue that the Government proposes to give up.

I look upon trotting and galloping as luxury pursuits, and there are plenty of people who spend far more in that direction than they can afford. That is their business, and I do not approach the matter from that point of view. We should know how much revenue the Government proposes voluntarily to give up. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there has been no request for that relief by the owners of stallions in the trotting and galloping classes, although such an application has been received from the Clydesdale Association, to which I have no objection at all. I would like some further information before I decide how I shall cast my vote on the Bill. I am certainly averse to the Government giving up revenue, small though the amount involved may be, when the payment of that revenue has inflicted no hardship upon anyone. I trust that when the Honorary Minister replies to the debate he will furnish us with additional information that will help members to decide how to vote on the Bill. As it stands, I feel I must oppose the measure unless when we deal with it in Committee, the Minister will agree to confine the relief to the heavy breeds of horses.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [4.55]: I endorse the request for more information regarding the proposals of the Government. I would like the Honorary Minister, when replying to the debate, to furnish particulars regarding the numbers affected in each of the sections—racing and utility. Seeing that the animals are registered, the information should not be difficult to obtain. With those particulars, members will be in a better position to judge how to view the legislation and will know approximately the amount the Government proposes to give away. When a Bill is introduced such as that under discussion in which the Government proposes to give something away, members should have information to let them know exactly what is suggested, which will enable them to form their own opinion as to whether the relief is comparable with the good that will be achieved. If the Honorary Minister will provide the inform-

ation desired, members will be able to decide whether to oppose the Bill or to seek amendments to it. Without more information at my disposal, I would favour an amendment to exclude the racing section from the benefits proposed. Those engaged in racing operations generally find it fairly profitable. The amount involved in the fee is only £1 a year, and they can easily afford to make that contribution. I ask the Honorary Minister to provide the information that is sought.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.57]: I have tried to get some information regarding the Bill but have not been able to obtain very much. I understand the original intention of the Act was mainly to register draught horses with a view to improving their quality and to preventing breeding from horses that had defects.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is right.

Hon. L. CRAIG: In those days horses were being brought here from the Eastern States and sold at auction. Some of the animals were suffering from transmissible ailments.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Horses were also brought to improve the classes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Those ailments could be passed on to the progeny. The Act was passed, therefore, to eliminate that type of horse and to prevent registration. An amount of £1 per annum was charged as a nominal fee to cover administration and inspection expenses. Was that not so?

The Honorary Minister: No, that is quite wrong.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I understood that was the reason. The object was to get well-bred, clean-legged horses in Western Australia.

The Honorary Minister: That was the intention.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about horses for export, remounts, and so on?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not think thoroughbreds should be brought under the Bill at all. It would be possible to have a thoroughbred that might not be passed by an inspector and, in fact, it might be rejected yet it might have behind it a history of high breeding for fifty generations that might have been worth thousands of pounds. The intention of the Act was not to cover horses

of that description but to deal with draught horses.

Hon. A. L. Loton: They did come under the Act.

Hon. L. CRAIG: And I am surprised that there has not been considerable protest on the part of owners of thoroughbred horses because they have had to submit their animals for inspection. I can imagine that an old horse, perhaps a "Phar Lap" or a "Nightmarch" who would possibly have defective legs, may develop spavin or go at the knees when he was old. Suppose he had no registration form, he might be rejected but the racing people would accept him irrespective of what his legs might be like because of his line of breeding all down the years.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: There has never been a rejection on those grounds.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Oh yes! Some of the inspectors have not all the knowledge. This Bill is to ensure that horses which have been passed, accepted, and have had their five years annual license fee paid, shall carry on for life. The horse industry—the draught horse industry—is at its very lowest level now. Nobody wants draught horses. Horses which used to be worth £50 can now be bought for £5 or £6. They are practically unsaleable. It is wrong to ask people who have been sensible enough, or otherwise, to keep stallions to continue contributing this pound a year for an animal which has no revenue-producing capacity.

Hon. G. Fraser: I do not think anybody objects to that.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is all the Bill is for.

Hon. G. Fraser: It covers all stallions.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is so. The man who has a thoroughbred which has been accepted by the racing people and to which mares have been sent year after year, should not have to keep on contributing for that horse for no purpose whatever, irrespective of what it looks like when it gets old. This is not a revenue-producing fee.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The owner derives revenue from the stallion.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I presume that this Bill is not for the purpose of producing money—Consolidated Revenue—or anything like that.

Hon. A. Thomson: We do not know.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is to cover expenses. The horse that has been passed, got old after heving been accepted by experts, authorities and racing people, is soon rejected if the progeny is no good. People do not send mares to a stallion that has not been accepted. Why should the owners of these stallions be asked to contribute pound after pound for no purpose at all? It is not a revenue-producing charge.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you object to their paying £1 a year?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I object to their paying money for nothing. It is unreasonable that the owner should be worried by the department for this £1 a year because he has not parted with his horse. The whole idea is that he has paid fees for the inspection and the passing of that horse, and after five years surely it is enough for the department to say, "Keep going, but do not bother to pay any more license fees."

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are you suggesting that animals should not be rejected after that age?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Why should they be rejected after that age?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does not the animal become unsound?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member is talking sheer bunkum.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Could he not develop some hereditary disease?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I would go so far as to say that some of our best thoroughbreds become unsound after 20 years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I will tell you some of the diseases they get.

Hon. L. CRAIG: What diseases? They would not be rejected for that reason. I can see no evil intent, such as some members appear to find, in this Bill. I think it is a very sensible Bill, unless there is something in it I know nothing about.

Hon. G. Fraser: We do not think there is any evil in it, but we can see some of our cash going west.

Hon. L. CRAIG: This is not a revenue-spinner. We might as well say that the registration of orchards is for the purpose of producing revenue.

Hon. E. M. Davies: You have to pay 10s. for the registration of a dog.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is a matter for the local authority. One would not say that the registration of a dog was to produce revenue.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Yes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No, it is for the purpose of keeping a tag on dogs, and to stop people from having too many of them. It is not for the purpose of producing revenue for the road boards. As far as I can see, the Bill is quite all right.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. G. B. Wood—East—in reply) [5.6]: I think I can satisfy hon. members' objections to this Bill. It is not only for five years that a man pays his fees and the fee is not only £1 1s. a year. I told the House when introducing this measure that the Government would lose very little revenue. Let us take a stallion at three years old and assume that he will then be registered. The owner pays £1 1s. for inspection fee and £1 1s. for registration.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Is it necessary to register every stallion at the age of three years?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: No, but suppose he is. The owner would pay £2 2s. more if he registered him as a two-year-old, but I am suggesting that he will not be registered until he is three years old. The owner pays £2 2s. for a seasonal license and, when the horse is four years old, he pays £1 1s. for inspection and £1 1s. for registration. At five years old, he pays the same again for another season. When the stallion is five years old, the owner is allowed to get a life certificate for which he pays £1 1s. at six years of age. At seven years he pays another guinea; at eight years one more guinea; at nine years he pays another guinea; and at ten years another guinea. I think that any man who has registered his stallion for so many years has paid quite enough after paying a sum of £11. When the horse is six years old the man is not getting any service at all in the way of inspections. I do not think it is fair to take this money, and if we do not amend the Act, this iniquitous payment will not only go on for those five years and up to

ten years but for the rest of the life of the stallion.

Hon. A. Thomson: Are you referring to draught horses?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am referring to all stallions. It is not, as Mr. Craig points out, a guinea each year for five years; it is a clear two guineas for the first two years and a guinea each for the next five years.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Ten years is too long. There is no money in horses.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If I had given more thought to the matter, I might have suggested stopping after the first three years, but this Bill says the fee can go on for five years. That is enough, especially when there is no service being given.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What about the blood-stock?

The HONORARY MINISTER: After the first three years, of course, there is a service because the stallion is inspected, but after that there is no service whatever. As was pointed out, the request for this Bill came from the Clydesdale Association to the Department of Agriculture but a nominal fee of only 2s. 6d. was suggested. The Department of Agriculture and I considered that this Bill would be fair and that nobody would object to it. The question of luxury industries and luxury horses has been raised, but I think that any man who breeds a horse at present is deserving of some consideration. Racing and trotting horses are luxury animals but only a very small proportion of horses bred for trotting or racing are raced after three or four years of age. Where would we get our half-draughts for milk carts and such purposes, and our remounts?

Hon. G. Fraser: Did you say that trotters do not race after they are three or four years old?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many horses do not race after that age and many never race at all. I know breeders in the country with registered stallions, and I could go to them and buy quite a good horse for £15 and would be very lucky to get it. That horse would not be bred if those people had not been breeding for trotting. I say that such people are doing a useful service to this

State and should be given every consideration and encouragement.

Hon. A. Thomson: How many trotters and stallions are registered?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will give those figures in due course. The revenue the department is now receiving is being taken under false pretences. What it will lose, presuming these stallions are not registered every year, would be approximately 13 guineas. There are 12 trotting stallions registered, eight blood horses, four Clydesdales, one pony and one Arab. That completes the registration and members can see that there is not very much in it. At the very most all the department will lose is an amount of about 13 guineas a year which is not for revenue but to pay for inspection fees. This measure will not create any hardship to either Consolidated Revenue or to the Department of Agriculture. It is not a matter of throwing money away but making a gesture to encourage people to breed horses.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 8:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am afraid the Minister has not read the Act. Subsection (2) of Section 8 provides that—

Notwithstanding the issue of a season certificate or life certificate in respect of a stallion, the inspector, if of opinion that a stallion is affected with unsoundness, may require the owner or person in charge of the stallion to submit it for examination during the currency of the certificate and may cancel the certificate in the event of the stallion being found, on such examination, to be affected with unsoundness, or in the event of the stallion not being submitted for such examination as directed by the inspector.

That clearly indicates that when the measure was framed it was realised that a horse could be affected and would probably affect others with unsoundness. We know that horses have developed growths and it was hard to say whether they were hereditary or not. In some cases they have been, because I have seen them myself. I had some draught foals by a Clydesdale stallion

that was affected and I did not find out until I discovered that three of the foals were affected.

The Honorary Minister: What age was the stallion?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Four years.

The Honorary Minister: He would be inspected up to five years.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But he would keep on infecting others if this were abolished altogether.

The Honorary Minister: We are not abolishing it altogether.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It may easily happen at six years or seven years. Age does not alter the position.

Hon. L. Craig: If it is transmissible, it is hereditary.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is perfectly true. It is what I have tried to persuade the Minister to realise. These things do not stop when a beast is five years of age. A horse will develop cancer.

Hon. L. Craig: That is not transmissible.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is hard to say whether that is so or not. Dr. Hislop may disagree that cancer is transmissible to human beings, but we have known that cattle have developed cancer and their offspring have shown signs of it. The Minister said that horses did not require to be registered until three years of age.

The Honorary Minister: I only suggested that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Under the interpretation section a stallion requires to be registered at two years of age. In the first instance £1 is paid and the certificate costs a guinea a year.

The Honorary Minister: From what age?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: From two years of age.

The Honorary Minister: You are wrong!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am willing to be corrected; but Section 3 of the Act says that the application shall be accompanied by a fee of £1. After that the owner pays £1 1s. a year, according to Subsection (3) of Section 8. Section 10 provides that no uncertificated stallion shall be used for stud purposes except on mares the property of the owner or one of the owners of the stallion, and that no person shall stand or

travel or permit or be party or privy to the standing or travelling of any uncertificated stallion for stud purposes. The owner of the horse is the only one that can use an uncertificated stallion for stud purposes. If other stallions are being used for such purposes they should be registered and certified under the Act. I can hardly credit that the department is carrying out the law today if there are only eight stud horses registered.

The Honorary Minister: That is not in the Bill.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Honorary Minister said there were only eight.

The Honorary Minister: The question is not whether the department is carrying out the law or not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If it is not carrying out the law, why worry about an alteration? When Parliament passes a law, one expects the department concerned to give effect to that law.

Hon. A. L. Loton: It does in some instances!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Some are over-zealous in that respect. If we are going to pass laws, let us see they are observed. If not, let us repeal them.

The Honorary Minister: Now you are talking sense! This should be repealed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then why did the Minister not bring down a Bill to repeal it?

The Honorary Minister: It would not have been passed.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am not sure about that. I maintain this is good legislation. I am a little older than the Honorary Minister and my advice to him is that he leave well alone. If he does, we will have a better type of horse. This is to encourage breeding from good, reputable stock. We want clean, healthy animals and have provided for that in this measure. If we want to encourage draught horses let us do so, but let us also maintain a high quality of horse if we can. The only way to do that is by periodical examinations.

The Honorary Minister: What are you going to examine?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the Honorary Minister take his turn after Mr. Latham has resumed his seat.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I understand the Minister wants to know what we are going to examine. There are veterinary surgeons available for this purpose and the Act provides that when they are not available the services of two qualified men with a knowledge of horses should be obtained. I am of the same opinion as I was when the Minister introduced the Bill. We may exclude draught horses, and I am not very keen on that, if we are going to maintain our draught horses. But I do not see why these highly qualified blood horses should not be paid for at the rate of £1 a year. I think that the owners will be quite willing to pay because it will prevent an inferior class of horse being bred.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I consider that Mr. Latham made out a very poor case in trying to put the department and myself in the wrong in this matter. I can assure him I know all about the parent Act. I know that a man with stallions on his own property does not have to register them. What is the use of the hon. member talking about maintaining this provision with a view to breeding draught horses? There are only three in the State and they are likely to go out of existence. The hon. member knows perfectly well that the breeding of draught horses is finished in Western Australia and in Australia, too. That is not the question we are debating. What evidence has the hon. member that the department is not doing its duty? What evidence has he given that there are more stallions in Western Australia than I mentioned? He has given none whatever!

I know that there are plenty of stallions that stay on farms but they are not subject to this registration fee. He said something about inspection after a certain age. Mr. McKenzie Clark, the Chief Inspector of Stock, told me that no inspections are made after six years. They take it for granted that when a horse has been given a life certificate it is all right for the rest of its life. What does it matter if a horse goes in the leg? It can still breed. As for leaving this measure on the statute-book to encourage breeding—it will do nothing of the sort! It will discourage certain people from doing their duty and registering horses.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Minister could have cleared this up quickly if he had told the Committee that the Act had

never been administered and was not likely to be.

The Honorary Minister: Who said that? I did not say it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Honorary Minister said there were only a few stallions registered. But one has only to take up the morning paper to see the names of a large number of stallions used in trotting and galloping. If they are not registered, the Act has never operated.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out that there is no amendment on the notice paper and that if this clause is deleted there will be nothing left in the Bill except the title.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I move an amendment—

That in the proposed proviso to Subsection (3) of Section 8 the words "and five consecutive annual fees of one guinea have been so paid the life certificate shall continue in force during the life of the stallion and" be struck out.

This will mean that when a stallion has been registered and inspected and given a life certificate, no further fees shall be paid. The Minister said that the owner gets nothing for the subsequent guineas he pays, not even an inspection of any sort. Therefore let us finish the fees when the inspections finish. The effect of the amendment will be that, having given the stallion a life certificate, when he has passed five inspections he shall be free of all further contributions.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think this is a wise amendment, and I have already said that had I given the matter more thought such a provision would have been contained in the Bill. I agree that after a stallion receives a life certificate no further service is rendered by the department.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th November.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (East) [5.33]: I think Mr. Gray described the Bill fairly fully, but I am still concerned about the provision that, if the main is within 100 yards of the building, an occupier may ask the local authority to see that the current is connected to the house. The owner is interested in the wiring of the house, and nothing else. If we wanted to do what Mr. Gray desires, it should be provided that, where the local authority is requested by the occupier to see that current is connected to the house, the owner should be compelled to wire the building. I do not see how the owner can do anything about it unless the supplier of electricity is willing to run the current the 100 yards from the main.

Before the Bill is passed I would like to know what is meant by "main." Is it merely that the current is passing within 100 yards of the building, or does it mean a main as members understand the word? Evidently it is any cable that passes the building. I hope Mr. Gray will tell the House how the owner of the building could compel the supplier of current to connect the supply to the house. I would point out that such work is expensive today and in country towns it sometimes costs up to £60 to have a dwelling wired. It is not merely a matter of £2 per point, as a member said the other evening by interjection. I think the reasons for the high cost are the short supply of insulated copper wire and the fact that labour is difficult to get. The contractors charge practically what they like. I know of a six-roomed house, within a reasonable distance from the main, where the price quoted was £60.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is extortionate.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, but that was the price asked. Where there is a concession given for electric light in country towns, the concession holder is generally the one who does all the wiring, and he can charge what he likes. In such areas current costs 1s. 3d. or 1s. 4d. per unit. We should be careful in dealing with legislation that will compel an owner to find a large sum of money to have wired a house that may be let for perhaps 10s. a week. It is difficult to know whether such a position would be covered under the legislation dealing with the restriction of rents, though of course the occupier would

have to pay for the current. In the interests of those residing in country districts, I hope consideration will be given to that angle.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.40]: There is a principle involved in this Bill. When a tenant agrees to take a house he knows whether it is lit by electricity or perhaps kerosene. If he takes a dwelling lit with kerosene he probably does not pay as much rent as if electric light had been installed, and I think it is wrong for a tenant to be able to tell the owner that he must install electric light, whether he wishes to do so or not. That is what the Bill, in its present form, would permit him to do. I agree with Mr. Latham that the installation of electric light in dwellings is very expensive today, and in country districts it is difficult to get the work done. The material is both dear and scarce, and labour is hard to get.

Under various Acts local authorities already have sufficient power to tell property owners what they must do, and I feel that this measure is going a little too far. In any case, it is premature, because at present it is often impossible to get such work done and, when it can be done, it is very costly. That applies particularly to country districts. There is also the fact that in country areas current often costs 1s. or more per unit for lighting and 8d. per unit for power.

Hon. G. Fraser: That would not affect the owner.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: There is nothing in the Bill to provide that if an owner spends £40 or £50 on installing electric light, he can then make an increase in the rent charged for the dwelling. There is a great difference between the value of a house with six or seven electric lights and one with none at all, and the owner, if he installs electricity, should be entitled to make some increase in the rent charged. At present I am inclined to vote against the Bill.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.42]: Most of the discussion on the Bill so far seems to have revolved around the cost of installing the wiring in the house property itself. If the liability of the landlord had been limited to that,

the Bill might have had considerable merit, because, if electricity is available, it should be the right of the tenant to enjoy that modern amenity. The Bill provides that if the main runs within 100 yards of the dwelling the landlord shall be compelled to install electric light. One hundred yards is 300 feet, and if the landlord is compelled to carry the wires for that distance he will be faced with the expense of putting up two or three poles.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He would not have to do that.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: He would.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The supply authority would put up the poles.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I do not think the supply authority could be compelled to erect the poles, as the Bill states that the landlord shall do it. The supply authority could say "That is the end of my supply line, and if you wish to take the current 300 feet to your house, that is up to you."

Hon. F. E. Gibson: The Bill deals only with supplying current to the house.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: It states that the landlord shall connect the current to the dwelling if the main passes within 300 feet. The principal cost is being entirely overlooked and unless it is considered, we will mulct the landlord in an expense that is entirely outside his responsibility. If the supply were brought right to the house by the supplying authority we could then compel the landlord to do the rest, but I do not think we should compel him to bring the current that 300 feet to the house, which under the Bill he could be forced to do.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [5.44]: I cannot see much wrong with the Bill. To install electric light in a building that an owner desires to let is only to provide an amenity on all fours with water supply, sanitation or cooking facilities. I am surprised at the opposition to the measure. A local authority takes the water main to the boundary of a property and the owner is responsible for the extension necessary to connect it up with a building. If we view the Bill from that angle, we can only regard the provision as a reasonable one. I support the second reading.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: But the Water Supply Department takes the water to the property.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.45]: I cannot understand the opposition to the measure. Certainly the question of running a line 100 yards has been included, but that will be governed by the statute under which the supply authority would act and, speaking from memory, I should say that the supply authority would be compelled to supply current in the area covered by it. If that is so, the provision in the Bill will mean that a house shall be wired so that the current may be used. The cost of wiring the house would be the sole expense to the owner. I cannot understand any owner not having his house connected up if the electric lines were available, if only from the point of view of safety. Would it not be better to have tenants using electric light than kerosene lamps and candles? I was astounded to hear that even in Perth there are rented homes that are not connected and where the occupants have to use lamps and candles for lighting. That is a short-sighted policy on the part of the owner because of the risk from fire. I see no objection to the Bill and hope it will be passed.

HON. F. E. GIBSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.47]: My reading of the Bill is that it concerns the house only and I agree with the proposal. The supply authority would have to be consulted because a home might be situated 100 yards from the main and the cost of connecting with the main might be more expensive than the wiring of the house itself.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Would the supply authority be compelled to take the current to the house?

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: No. The practice of the Fremantle undertaking is that the supply authority is prepared to extend its lines to seven or eight homes and the owners have to pay the cost and, when another consumer comes on that line, the cost is shared. I could not imagine any supply authority erecting 100 yards of main to supply only one house.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Then the landlord would have to pay it.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: The Bill provides that the house must be wired if an electricity

supply from the main is available. If it were not available, there would be no compulsion on the owner to wire the house.

Hon. G. Fraser: Is not there any compulsion on the supply authority to extend its mains?

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: So far as I am aware, the Fremantle undertaking is under no such compulsion.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West—in reply) [5.50]: The objections raised to the Bill are likely to create a false impression. Mr. Thomson asked for information about the cost of wiring a house and I have obtained figures applying to the metropolitan districts. I got into touch with a highly reputable firm, who assured me that it had been done as low as 22s. 6d. a point, though this firm would not do it for that amount, and that the average was 25s. to 27s. 6d. a point, while for an ordinary four or five-roomed house, it was 25s. a point.

The Minister for Mines: In pre-war days it was 30s.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Those figures apply to the metropolitan area. I obtained them this afternoon.

Hon. A. Thomson: What is the cost in the country?

Hon. G. Fraser: Up to £4.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: My inquiry related to the metropolitan area. The Bill is designed to deal with unreasonable landlords and the proposed power is to be vested in the local authorities. If a house were situated within 100 yards of the main and the supply authorities said it could not carry the lines nearer, no order would be made. The local authority would exercise discretion and the administration could be left to its good sense. The measure is merely to deal with obstinate landlords of premises that people are compelled to rent owing to the present shortage of houses. If a landlord refused to wire a house when the electricity supply was available, he should be compelled to do so, but it would be neither reasonable nor fair to compel him to do so if the supply was not within 100 yards of the house.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The Bill provides that, if the house is within 100 yards of the main, it must be wired.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If the current can be supplied, the local authority may issue an order.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That might be the existing law, but you are bringing in something new.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The Bill merely proposes to give an added power to municipal councils and road boards.

Hon. G. Bennetts: All of the electricity supplies are not under municipal councils or road boards.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That is so. I cannot imagine any local authority issuing an order if to do so would be unjust and unreasonable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; Hon. E. H. Gray in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Insertion of new Section 300A:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The only difficulty is that an owner might be compelled to incur the expense of installing wiring in a house and the supply authority might not be prepared to connect the premises. To meet this difficulty I move an amendment—

That in line 10 of proposed new Section 300A, after the word 'months' the words 'providing the supply authority has made current available to the building' be inserted.

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

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th November.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [5.58]: This Bill is similar to the measure, with which we have just dealt and, if it is similarly amended in Committee, it will meet requirements. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; Hon. E. H. Gray in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Insertion of new Section 208B:

Hon. SIR HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 11 of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 208B after the word "months" the words "providing the supply authority has made current available to the building" be inserted.

I think the amendment more necessary to this measure than to the measure dealing with municipalities.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. L. LOTON: Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 208B provides for the imposition of penalties. If a person is found guilty of an offence he may be fined £10 and a further penalty not exceeding £2 for every day such offence continues. From what date will the £2 per day commence, the date of the conviction or the date of the charge?

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Minister for Mines could reply to this legal question.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The point is always open to argument and the decision rests with the Bench.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Thank you!

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—STREET PHOTOGRAPHERS.*In Committee.*

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; Hon. C. G. Latham in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Definitions:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of the definition of "street photographer" the words "or street restricted to one-way traffic" be inserted.

I am by no means sure that the amendment will overcome the difficulty I have in mind, but it must be overcome in some way or

other. A street photographer is defined and then we have a definition of public thoroughfare, but excluded from it is any street in the City of Perth which is restricted to one-way vehicular traffic. A person taking photographs in such streets would not be a street photographer. Personally, I would prefer that the words "for the purposes of this Act, include any street in the City of Perth which is restricted to one-way vehicular traffic" in the definition of "public thoroughfare" be struck out. The local governing authority should have the right to say where photographers may carry on their business. I am sure it is not the intention of the Bill that people should be allowed to do things which constitute a street photographer in Hay-st. or Murray-st. merely because those streets for the purposes of this Bill are not public thoroughfares.

The Minister for Mines: Might I suggest that Sir Hal Colebatch amend the definition of "public thoroughfare?"

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: That would be the better course. Perhaps the Minister would move the necessary amendment.

The Minister for Mines: It will first be necessary for Sir Hal Colebatch to withdraw his amendment.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of the definition of "public thoroughfare" after the word "thoroughfare" the word "or" be inserted and that the words "or place open to or used by the public, but shall not, for the purposes of this Act, include any street in the City of Perth which is restricted to one-way vehicular traffic" be struck out.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I oppose the amendment. I spoke to the Parliamentary Draftsman on this point and he informed me that "public place" included public gardens.

The Minister for Mines: The street photographers are operating in the public gardens.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In future they will require a license to do so.

The Minister for Mines: What about the Royal Show?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is not a public place; people must pay a charge to obtain admittance there. The definition is not intended to apply to hotels, private houses, stores or shops.

The Minister for Mines: They are open to and are used by the public.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That may be so, but street photographers would not be allowed in such places without the consent of the owners. I think the Minister is trying to be facetious.

The Minister for Mines: I am not.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I hope in the circumstances that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Hon. G. FRASER: I also oppose the amendment. Street photographers should be allowed to ply their trade on the Esplanade and in public gardens. This amendment would prevent them from doing so.

The Minister for Mines: Quite true.

Hon. G. FRASER: There is less objection to their operating in Government gardens than on the streets.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the suggested deletion is agreed to, street photographers will be able to carry on their trade in public gardens, on the foreshore and other public places.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am sorry to differ with the Minister. If the suggested words are struck out, the Minister knows that all other places will be excluded also. If a place is not specifically mentioned, the law will exclude it.

The Minister for Mines: I am afraid I do not follow that reasoning.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Parts of Hay-st., as well as parts of Murray-st. are to be excluded because of the congestion there.

Hon. A. Thomson: You can add Wellington-street.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is not a one-way street.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The congestion is worse in Wellington-st., which has a foot-path on one side only.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But there is not the same amount of traffic in Wellington-st. as there is in the parts of Hay-st. and

Murray-st. which are restricted to one-way traffic.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of the definition of "street photographer" after the word "thoroughfare" the words "or street restricted to one-way traffic" be inserted.

Without these words, anyone could take photographs in Hay-street and Murray-street.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is illegal to do it today, and it would be even if the amendment were passed. The only people who can be licensed will be those who conform to the provisions already set out. If we pass the amendment people will be entitled to ask for a license to take photographs in the one-way streets. It is because of the congestion in those streets that they have been excluded from the Bill.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: It is not illegal today for people to take photographs anywhere. The Bill is not for the purpose of allowing people to take photographs in certain places, but to prohibit them from taking photographs without a license.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Method of obtaining a license and effect thereof:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Sub-clause (1) the word "shall" be struck out and the word "may" inserted in lieu.

It is wrong to tell local authorities that they shall issue a certain number of licenses, no more and no less. The local authorities should be allowed to say how many licenses are to be issued.

Hon. G. Bennetts: They may not issue any.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The amendment is a good one. I would like to see Clause 6 struck out. If we agree to its remaining it should provide for a license for every 10,000 or part thereof. The municipality

of Subiaco has a population of about 18,000, and so has that of Fremantle. Those municipalities, under this measure, would be entitled to only one license each.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with Clause 4. The hon. member is speaking on Clause 6.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I am, but this affects Clause 6.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well!

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think the number of licenses should be unrestricted. These matters solve themselves. If there were too many street photographers, those who were not making a living would probably fade out of the picture. Perth has a population of about 90,000, and at certain times of the year it may be increased by 50 per cent., or even doubled. As Dr. Hislop pointed out, street photographers are a feature of every town, and tourists expect them.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would ask Sir Hal Colebatch what is his intention. The amendment means quite a lot to me. Is it his intention to leave the whole matter of the issuing of licenses to the discretion of local authorities? If that is so, it is useless to pass the Bill. The object of the measure is to ensure that Parliament will decide that street photographers should be licensed. If we alter this word "shall" to "may," the local authorities can refuse to grant licenses.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: Why should they not?

Hon. G. FRASER: That would destroy the Bill. Mr. Gibson is a member of a local governing authority, and he no doubt wants that power. Parliament is supreme. If we say that street photographers are carrying on a legitimate business which should be licensed, we should not say that local authorities may decide that there shall be none at all. If we permit this amendment we may as well throw out the Bill.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I am of the same opinion as Mr. Fraser. This amendment would destroy the Bill altogether. I would sooner see the next seven words "subject to section six of this Act," cut out.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I understand that the measure was introduced to deal with a situation brought about by the at-

titude of the Perth City Council when it used a section of the Health Act, which was never intended to apply to street photographers, to prosecute what I regard as a section of the community that is doing no harm but which, in fact, may be said to be supplying a public need. If we agree to the amendment the whole purpose of the Bill will be defeated. We will simply pass the position back to the local governing bodies, and they may or may not grant any licenses. That is not our intention. We did not want to legislate in this matter, but our hands have been more or less forced by the unreasonable attitude of the Perth City Council. We have to put forward the best piece of legislation we can. I agree that the word "shall" should remain and that the next half dozen words should be taken out, and that later we should strike out Clause 6. The proviso to Clause 4, in my opinion, gives the local governing bodies plenty of safeguard to ensure that only reputable and decent people get these licenses. This is about all the protection the public requires. As Mr. Simpson pointed out, the demand for the work of these men will solve the problem as to the number that will follow the calling. If they cannot make a decent living, they will drop out. To fix an arbitrary number, such as one for every 10,000 of the population, does not seem wise.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: I support the amendment. Without expressing any opinion as to whether or not there should be street photographers, the authority that should have the final say is the local governing body, which should be in a better position to determine whether these men should have an opportunity to carry on their business than are members of Parliament. Assuming a local authority will not license any street photographer in its district, how could Parliament enforce the licensing?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: You do not suggest a local governing authority would break the law?

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: The local authority might not find it convenient to grant a license at all. The matter should be left entirely in the hands of the municipal council or road board concerned.

Hon. G. FRASER: If Mr. Gibson will peruse the notice paper, he will see that I have framed an amendment that overcomes

the difficulty he has mentioned. It will give the right to an applicant, if refused a license, to appeal to the Minister.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I support the amendment. I think this matter should be left to the local governing bodies concerned. For many years I have heard successive Governments eulogise the work of local authorities, and surely those bodies should have discretionary power in a matter of this description. If they refuse licenses, they will have good reasons for so doing.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot accept the amendment. Local authorities function under powers delegated to them by Parliament and if they act in excess of their powers, their actions are ultra vires the law. When one local authority has made use of a bylaw framed for some other purpose in order to prevent men from taking photographs in the street, and we desire to effect an alteration, it would be absolute stupidity on the part of Parliament merely to say in the Act that that local authority may do something. The object of the Bill is to instruct local authorities that they must do it. Some of these men have bought expensive cameras.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is nonsense.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Is it right for the hon. member to tell me that what I say is nonsense? We cannot close our eyes to the fact that these men, who are returned soldiers, have bought cameras and have established themselves in the business.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Contrary to the by-laws.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But they have established themselves.

Hon. G. Bennetts: And are rendering good service to the public.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Otherwise they would not be able to earn a living. The fact is that the professional photographers waited on the City Council and asked that body to stop these street photographers. If we agree to the amendment, we shall defeat the object of the Bill, which is to allow these men to operate. They established themselves in the business thinking they were not acting in violation of the law, and now they ask Parliament to enable them to carry on. I have seen some of the photographs taken by these men and, while they are

cheap productions, they are useful souvenirs. I have been in cities in various parts of the world, and everywhere street photographers are allowed to operate. No exception was taken here until the professional photographers raised a complaint.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: If the adoption of the amendment will, as Mr. Latham says, defeat the object of the Bill, I hope it will be agreed to. Parliament is wasting valuable time when such measures are brought forward for consideration. This matter should be dealt with by the local governing authority. Mr. Latham is doing his best to bring before members the fact that the men concerned are returned soldiers. I am anxious to do everything possible to assist returned men, but what about those who are in the industry today and whose livelihood is likely to be affected?

Hon. E. H. Gray: This will not affect them at all.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Why not?

Hon. G. Bennetts: These men deal with a different section altogether.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I know one professional photographer who employs five returned soldiers. Will they not be affected?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I hope the amendment will be agreed to because at present a local governing body is not a governing body at all but merely a licensing authority to grant licenses to the first people who come along. The Bill says that they shall issue licenses at the rate of one to every 10,000 of population. What is the population of the City of Perth?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Round about 90,000.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then the first nine people who go to the City Council will automatically be issued with licenses.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is not so. Read the Bill!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I will go further and refer to the first discharged soldiers to apply for licenses—

Hon. G. Fraser: Who were operating on the 1st April of this year.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: How many were operating? Say there were under nine. Then the number, whatever it might be, would apply for licenses, which would be automatically issued, and

then the others would dash in to get what remained. The City Council has no option but to issue the licenses.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: At present it will not do anything.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Whether we agree with that attitude or not, the people of the City of Perth are those who should decide and, as there is a municipal election to be held soon, the ratepayers will be able to indicate their wishes on this question.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the municipal election will not affect the position.

Hon. H. L. Roche: This is not the nationalisation of banking!

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

Ayes	7
Noes	14

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. F. E. Gibson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. R. Walsh
Hon. C. G. Latham	Hon. G. Fraser
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line (5) of Subclause (1) after the word "district," the words "and may define the part of its district to which such license shall apply" be added.

I hope the Committee will leave local authorities some measure of control. We have decided to compel them to grant a certain number of licenses. Surely we will allow them to say in what area such license shall apply!

Hon. G. FRASER: I feel like giving local authorities some power in this regard, but the amendment is too sweeping. It would be possible to defeat the purpose of the Bill if it were carried. The Perth City Council, for instance, could say that all of the nine photographers should operate only on the Esplanade. What would be

the use of that? Again, in my own district, it would be possible for the municipal council to say that the photographers should operate only at South Beach. I must oppose the amendment.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Surely this Committee is not entitled to say that the local authorities will defeat the purpose of an Act that has been passed by Parliament! Surely they can be trusted to give an honest interpretation of the measure and implement it in the way Parliament desires! I think it is a grossly unfair reflection on them to suggest that they will, by some devious means, set aside the desires of Parliament.

Hon. G. Fraser: There will be nothing devious about it.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I do not think it serves any good purpose for Sir Hal to be indignant because we wish to have this Bill remain reasonably clear in intention. There is not much doubt that the Perth City Council is not in favour of its provisions and it seems to me that both this amendment and the previous one moved by Sir Hal were designed to enable that council, and possibly other local authorities, to destroy the purpose that those responsible for the measure had in mind. I cannot see that this Committee would be fair even to itself to consider seriously an amendment drafted along those lines. If the purpose were to limit the number operating in any particular area, there has been time to draft an amendment which would be fair to the purpose the Bill is intended to serve.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot accept the amendment. The local authorities will have power, by making bylaws, more or less to govern what they want to govern. It is perfectly clear that if they want to defeat the object of the Bill, all they need to do is put the men in one spot.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The amendment strikes out an important part of the Bill, in that it tends to operate against those who have already been bona fide carrying on as street photographers. Surely we should not depart from the usual practice of this Parliament to give protection to those already engaged in earning a living in an occupation!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The amendment seems to me to be absolutely essential. Otherwise we might have the spectacle of nine photographers in Perth obstructing the traffic in one particular spot, and competing with one another, so that people would be pestered to death dodging them in a busy thoroughfare.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I agree with Mr. Roche. The amendment would give the Perth City Council an opportunity to carry out its policy to abolish street photographers. It would almost have the effect of the previous amendment—that is, to defeat the main purpose of the Bill. The Minister made an absolutely absurd statement when he said that nine photographers would probably congregate in one place and cause obstruction. If that is the best argument that can be advanced in its favour, the amendment cannot be supported.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause (1) after the word "district" the following proviso be inserted:—"Provided that not more than one license shall be granted to any street photographer, but if such street photographer be a person, firm or corporation employing any person to carry out the actual photographing, then such license may be used by such employee for the purpose of compliance with subsection four of section three of this Act."

I gave an undertaking to Mr. Mann that I would make perfectly sure that one person could not get the whole of the licenses. It was not the intention of the sponsor of the Bill that that should be so. So I arranged with the Parliamentary Draftsman to make it perfectly clear that only one license could be issued to any firm, corporation or person who would have power to hand that license to any employee, so that there would be only one person photographing at one time.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move an amendment—

That in line 8 of Subclause (1) after the word "authority" the word "two" be inserted.

The amendment is self-explanatory. Whereas the proviso to Subclause (1) merely stipulates that testimonials shall be delivered, the amendment sets out the number to be submitted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I move an amendment—

That after the proviso to Subclause (1) a further proviso be added, as follows:—"Provided further that the local authority may refuse to grant such license to any applicant therefor unless he be a discharged member of the Forces who is incapacitated and in receipt of a war pension of an amount not less than fifty per centum of the maximum war pension payable for total incapacitation."

This is an industry—if it may be termed such—that is in the nature of street peddling, and if Parliament is to give authority for photographs to be taken in the streets, preference should be given to ex-Servicemen who have lost their health or portion of their anatomy. The occupation would then augment whatever pension they were receiving, and the local authority could decide to grant licenses to such people if it so desired. While visiting the Royal Show I was struck by the agility displayed by young people engaged in photographing pedestrians and I have wondered whether they could not be better employed in some more productive industry.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I am in favour of the amendment to a certain extent, but on the Goldfields there is a number of men who are in the early stages of silicosis and therefore unable to carry on underground mining work. There is no other work available for them on the Goldfields with the exception of railway work, and they are debarred from that occupation if they are suffering from silicosis. I would therefore like to see provision in the Bill to cover, besides returned Servicemen, those suffering from the early stages of silicosis.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The proposal is not practicable, because we would have to discuss the measure of incapacitation. The occupation of a street photographer calls for agility and an incapacitated man might not be able to do the job.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The amendment is commendable but difficulty will arise in giving effect to it. As Mr. Simpson has pointed out, incapacitated returned Servicemen might not be sufficiently agile for this occupation. I therefore think it should be left to the local authority to decide which of such men are best suited to the work. It takes a considerable time to train a man to photograph moving persons, as there is only one chance to take each photograph—when the pedestrian is ap-

proaching the photographer—and I therefore think local authorities should have power to make the decision. I ask Mr. Davies to withdraw his amendment. Most members of this House are associated with local authorities and would agree that a man capable of doing this work should be granted a license if it would help him, but the amendment might merely mean months of training for a man who in the end would find that he was unable to do the work.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move an amendment—

That after the proviso to Subclause (1) a further proviso be added as follows:—“Provided further that any applicant whose application for a license has been refused by the local authority shall have the right of appeal to the Minister for Local Government against such decision.”

The power given in the first proviso, regarding testimonials, allows the local authority to refuse to accept the testimonials put forward, and there is no redress for the applicant. I think the right of appeal should be provided.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: It would be a matter of whether the quota had been filled or not.

Hon. G. FRASER: The applicant should have the right of appeal if his application is refused. If there is right of appeal there will be no cause for complaint.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill already provides that the local authority shall give the applicant a license. There must be two testimonials, but it does not matter whether they are any good or not.

Hon. G. Bennetts: To the limit of nine.

Hon. G. Fraser: There is a proviso. The Minister has not read the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Applicants will go round until they get someone to give them testimonials showing that they are first-class.

Hon. H. L. Roche: It depends on the opinion of the local authority.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course, the testimonial will show that the applicant is a fit and proper person.

Hon. G. Fraser: The person writing the testimonial is not the judge of whether it will satisfy the local authority.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill only says the applicant must have the testimonials. Then he has the legal right to force the local governing body to give him a license. The amendment would simply place the responsibility on the Minister.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to call the Minister's bluff and move that the whole of the proviso be struck out.

The Minister for Mines: You can move to have the whole Bill thrown out.

Hon. G. FRASER: Seeing that the proviso is there, while it remains I want a further protection to ensure that if the application is refused the applicant shall have right of appeal to the Minister.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I accept the amendment, as I think it will give satisfaction to people who think they have a grievance, and the very existence of the provision will make the local authorities more careful.

The Minister for Mines: They have no authority.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: All the statutes that I know of provide some sort of appeal.

The Minister for Mines: Have you seen statutes that stated “shall” instead of “may”?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I heard of it on one occasion when the Minister and I were in another place.

The Minister for Mines: Is that why it is set out in the Interpretation Act?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I will accept the amendment.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I urge the House to accept the amendment. I am convinced that without the proviso a local governing authority could, on the flimsiest pretext, throw out an application. With the proviso, no harm could be done to anyone. If a local authority adopted an unreasonable attitude, the applicant should have the right of appeal to the Minister.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I believe that local authorities would appreciate this provision. A photographer might consider that he had been victimised by the local authority on account of having been previously prosecuted and, if he could appeal to the Minister, he might feel sure that there had been no victimisation.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Have members no confidence at all in local authorities? They are instructed to license these men and may refuse an application if the testimonials do not show that the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a license.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: If applicants knew that they had the right of appeal they would feel that they were getting a fair deal. I believe that in 99 cases out of a 100 the decision of the council would be upheld.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I move an amendment—

That the following new subclause be inserted:—

(3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act to the contrary, the local authority may limit the operation of any license issued under the provisions of this Act to any public park, public garden, reserve or beach within its district.

I am moving my amendment because of my experience in the Eastern States. Quite a lot of the street photography there became a nuisance on account of the obstruction to pedestrian traffic.

Hon. G. FRASER: On a point of order, is not the amendment out of order seeing that the subject matter has already been discussed and a vote taken?

The CHAIRMAN: To what is the hon. member referring?

Hon. G. FRASER: I am referring to the amendment moved by Sir Hal Colebatch that a council may define part of its districts to which such a license may apply.

The CHAIRMAN: I would not suggest that the amendment is out of order.

Hon. G. FRASER: Perhaps it would be as well to let it go to the vote.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Under the amendment, street photographers could be relegated to the area between the river and Riverside-drive where there was no pedestrian traffic. I hope the amendment will not be pressed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Number of licenses to be limited:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: How many licenses would a local authority be compelled to issue if the number of people in the area was 19,900?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The reply is "two."

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: There would be fewer than 10,000 in excess of the first 10,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It means 10,000 or any part of 10,000.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Preference to established street photographers:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Why should preference to soldiers be limited to those who were in this occupation at a certain date? There should be absolute preference and the only qualification should be the suitability of the applicants. I move an amendment—

That in lines 6 to 8 the words "prior to the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and forty-seven he had been bona fide operating as or carrying on the business of a street photographer" be struck out and the words "he is a suitable person to hold such license" inserted in lieu.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot accept the amendment. The people we are legislating for are those already established in the business. For that reason we should do what is always done in these cases, and that is give preference to the people already engaged in the business. Mr. Baxter has clearly explained this point. These street photographers are carrying on their legitimate business.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Illegitimate business.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Perhaps so, but when this Bill is passed the business will be legitimate, as the hon. member knows. The Bill will give returned soldiers an opportunity to earn a living, and I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Bylaws:

Hon. SIR HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That the words "prior to the first day of words be added:— "including the prescribing of the part of the district to which the license

shall apply and the days of the week and hours during which street photography may be permitted."

Possibly the clause as it stands gives this power, but I think it should be definitely so stated.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot agree to the amendment because, by making a bylaw, the local authority could stipulate that street photographers could operate only at night. I agree with Sir Hal Colebatch that the clause as it stands gives all necessary power and I hope he will not insist on his amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 and 12, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—INDUSTRY (ADVANCES).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.50] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill to clarify what is thought to be the law, but questions have been raised and, to avoid any possibility of a mistake, it is deemed advisable to pass this measure. The Industries Assistance Act of 1915, by Section 24, provided that assistance could be given to mining and other industries. That section was repealed by the Rural and Industries Bank Act. It was thought that sufficient power was given under that Act to carry on all that Section 24 of the Industries Assistance Act had permitted in the past. However, that power and authority have been questioned and the Crown Law Department advises, as I have said, that it would be advisable to introduce this Bill, which will authorise the Treasurer to grant financial assistance, either directly or through the Rural and Industries Bank, to persons engaged in mining or other industries, and which will validate certain past financial transactions.

As members are aware, previous Governments made advances to persons engaged in the mining and other industries, sometimes to the extent of large sums. At times a direct loan has been made; at other times the Government has guaranteed accounts with banks. Under the Industries Assistance Act it was provided that the interest on a

direct loan should be 6 per cent.; but that was in 1915 and the position has now changed. The present Bill gives power to the Treasurer to make advances as he shall think fit in the ordinary way. I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee this evening, and should any member desire information which I am able to give I shall be only too happy to supply it. I assure members that the Bill is purely and simply to re-enact in another way Section 24 of the Industries Assistance Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. L. Loton, debate adjourned.

BILL—CHILD WELFARE.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 5th November. Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 20 had been agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 46—agreed to.

Clause 47—Governor may release ward:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of the second proviso after the word "parent" the words "or the matron or manager of the institution" be inserted.

This clause enables the Minister to order the release of a child from an institution and provides that the parents may, if they object to the order, appeal to the court against the Minister's decision. It is far more important that the persons in charge of the institution should have the right of appeal. I know that the institutions are extremely anxious to have this right, not in their own interests but in those of the children. Their desire is not based on something that may happen, but on something that has happened more than once. The Minister has ordered the release of a child, with the consent of the parents but contrary to the wishes of the matron or officer in charge of the institution, who has pointed out to the Minister that it was a dangerous thing to do and that the child was likely to relapse, and the child has relapsed and been sent back to the institution. What I am saying is not intended as a reflection on the present or the previous Minister, but is to give some security to the

children. I agree it is right that the parents should have the right to appeal to the Court, but surely the matron or the officer in charge of the institution has more knowledge of the child and is able to appreciate better even than the parents the dangers that may result from its discharge. I cannot see any objection to the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I must oppose the amendment. I do not believe this is in the interests of the security of the child. After all, the child is a ward of the State. Accordingly the State, or the Child Welfare Department, is acting in loco parentis. There is a committee set up of the managers of the institutions to which these children are sent. That committee advises the Child Welfare Department which, in turn advises the Minister. The Child Welfare Department has the interests of the children at heart much more than has the institution to which they are committed. Some institutions might be quite hard. I am acting on advice from the department.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Would not the committee get information from the matron of the institution?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. To give this right is going too far. I believe there are sufficient safeguards now regarding the welfare of the child. Some of these institutions wish to keep the children longer than is necessary.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: The institutions to which I refer have no quarrel with the Child Welfare Department. I am informed that the department opposed the liberation of a child in one of the cases which turned out badly. These children are sent to the institutions by the court. I do not think the Minister should over-ride the decisions of the court. If he does, there should be a right of appeal to the court. The institutions would be quite satisfied if there were a provision inserted in the Bill that the Minister would not act without, or against, the advice of that committee. Would the Minister agree to that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot see how the Minister could agree to the amendment. The word "institution" includes any Government institution established under the Act. It would mean that the matron or

manager would be able to appeal to a magistrate, over the head of the Minister. There would be no discipline.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think the position is well safeguarded in the paragraph preceding the one Sir Hal Colebatch is seeking to amend.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Would the Minister agree to an amendment to provide that the Minister shall not act without the advice of the committee? There is some difficulty in that, because I understand it is not a statutory committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is correct; it is not statutory. I am not anxious to agree to any such amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 48 to 61—agreed to.

Clause 62—Penalty for ill-treating ward apprenticed, etc.:

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I would like some elucidation of the words "the Court may discharge the child from the apprenticeship or license, and order him to be sent to an institution." That would place a ward of the State in a position we should endeavour to avoid. It is bad enough for any such ward, who starts off in life with a greater handicap than a child with parents to look after him, but when the child is apprenticed and the employer does not continue the apprenticeship, that employer is bound by the Industrial Arbitration Act to transfer the apprentice to some other employer, but here the Court may discharge the child from the apprenticeship and order him to be sent to an institution. There is nothing to say that any endeavour shall be made to permit him to finish his apprenticeship.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The court, having arranged for the child to be apprenticed, would naturally order him, after being temporarily in an institution, to another apprenticeship. The court would not order him to stay at the institution.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Mr. Davies need not have any worries over this. I cannot see any use in the clause being retained. No apprenticeship can be cancelled without the order of the Arbitration Court. We have had wards who have been appren-

ticed, and they have been taken to the court and the court has refused to break the apprenticeship.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: The clause provides that the child shall be sent back to an institution, but does not give any indication of whether the Child Welfare Department will make any endeavour to have the apprenticeship of the lad transferred to any other employer. Will the Honorary Minister look into the point and advise members at the next sitting?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Why should the apprenticeship be transferred?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not want the Committee stage delayed, and I suggest the clause be agreed to and Mr. Davies can move later on for recommitment of the Bill in order further to consider the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better to postpone the clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think Mr. Davies need be worried on this point. I am not satisfied with Mr. Bolton's explanation. A person may be accused of ill-treating a child and may be sent to prison for six months. What becomes of the child's apprenticeship then? How could the child continue to be apprenticed to a person who was in gaol?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You are not going to throw him on the street because of that?

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Honorary Minister will postpone the clause. That course is just as easy as recommitting the Bill later on.

The Honorary Minister: I will agree to that.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Minister will make inquiries as to why the latter part of the clause was inserted at all. The marginal note refers to penalty for ill-treating a ward, and then, dovetailed into the clause, is reference to what can be done with regard to a child against whom an offence has been committed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I suggest that Mr. Fraser or Mr. Davies frame an amendment to meet their wishes and I will postpone consideration of the clause in the meantime. A child will not be put in the institution indefinitely but will be put to another apprenticeship.

The CHAIRMAN: The effect of postponing the clause would simply be that after we had considered the remainder of the Bill we would then deal with the postponed clause. The Honorary Minister will have no opportunity of gaining the desired information during the sitting, and the better course would be to pass the Bill and recommit it later on for further consideration of Clause 62.

Hon. G. FRASER: My suggestion was that we postpone the clause and then, after dealing with the rest of the Bill, progress could be reported and at the next sitting the postponed clause could be considered.

The CHAIRMAN: No advantage is to be gained by doing it that way.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Will the clause as it is worded mean that if the court discharges a child from his apprenticeship, it must order him to be sent to an institution?

The Honorary Minister: It says "may."

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: But then it goes on to say that a child shall be sent to an institution. I suggest that the word "may" should be inserted between the words "and" and "order." The effect of that would be that the court would not be compelled to take that course.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If Sir Hal desires, he may move that amendment now and I will agree to it. The clause can be put through, and later the Bill could be recommitted for further consideration of this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I again suggest that we go through with the Bill and recommit it later, when the amendments will be on the notice paper.

The Honorary Minister: That is what I have suggested.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot understand why the clause has been included in the Bill, inasmuch as the foster parent is the one to be dealt with by the court. It refers to accommodation regarding the apprenticeship and not to penalising.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Yes, it is all wrong.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot understand the intention of the clause, but there must be some reason for it, and this provision was included in the old Act.

The Honorary Minister: We could get over that on recommittal.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I disagree with Mr. Bolton, inasmuch as, if we agree to this measure, it will over-ride any decision of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Not on your life!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That has been laid down by the courts.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: But that does not apply to the Arbitration Court.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This will supersede any previous law on the point. That has been laid down for a long time.

Hon. G. Fraser: This gives the court power to discharge.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. There must be some reason for the provision and the Honorary Minister has promised to look into the matter.

The Honorary Minister: That is so.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 63 to 105—agreed to.

Clause 106—Issue of licenses:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause (1) the word "fourteen" be struck out and the word "twelve" inserted in lieu.

My concern is solely on account of the children themselves. I feel that the passing of this clause would occasion a great deal of hardship to many families that are now helped very considerably by street trading. When the Royal Commission on child delinquency was sitting, the police authorities assured the members most positively that not a single case of child delinquency could be traced to the selling of papers by children. My feeling is that children over the age of 14 should be discouraged from selling papers. I would not go so far as to say that they should be prohibited, but they should be discouraged because from the age of 14 onwards a boy should be in some occupation that would lead somewhere.

The demand for such children is very great and cannot be supplied. The few hours that a boy under 14 will spend in selling papers are not likely to do any harm. Moreover, the license to sell is granted only on the Child Welfare Department's being thoroughly satisfied on half a

dozen different things—such as, that it is not going to interfere with the child's education, that the money is needed by his family, and that it is for the benefit of the child. I would be quite content for the issuing of a license to boys between 12 and 14 to be subject to review, and cancellation, by the Child Council recently set up, but that council is not a statutory body and therefore we cannot include in this Bill any reference to it.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I want to emphasise Sir Hal's suggestion that it would be much better for these lads between 12 and 14 to be engaged in selling papers than for them to be allowed to run the streets, as they would be. Today there is ample employment offering for youths from 14 years of age upwards, and that is the age at which most employers desire lads to commence work. Such boys turn out better tradesmen than those who begin at 16. I will give members a few figures regarding apprentices in the years 1940 and 1947. I am speaking of my own firm, which I think is a fair indication, because we have several branches in our industry and positions are well sought after. In 1940, with an adult staff of 97, we had 27 apprentices and 13 junior workers. In January, 1947, with an adult staff of 100, we had eight ordinary apprentices, 18 returned apprentices—that is, apprentices who are completing their apprenticeship after having served with the Forces, and who are over 21—five junior workers, and—in order to assist returned men to learn some trade—an additional 13 re-established trainees.

In 1940, we always had a waiting list of anything from 30 to 40 lads who required positions with a view to apprenticeship. Today we spend weeks and weeks endeavouring to get a lad either for the store, the office or the factory, and it is almost impossible to do so. I think that every employer of labour appreciates that. If the age is extended for lads to commence selling papers, and it is made from 14 to 16, that will interfere very much with industry, and it will mean much less help for parents who require the money that lads can earn at that age. I appeal to the Committee to support the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I oppose the amendment. Sir Hal said the Child Welfare Department had to find out cer-

tain things about these children, when they applied for a license. I think the hon. member has been misinformed. I purposely did not reply to the debate at the second reading because I sensed there would be considerable discussion on the matter in Committee, and I thought I would save time by speaking now. All that the department is concerned about is the age of the applicant, the securing of the parents' consent and also a report from the school regarding satisfactory attendance.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is sufficient, is it not?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think Sir Hal mentioned a few more things, and spoke of the department choosing these boys. The department does not choose them. Anybody can obtain a license provided the requirements I have mentioned are met.

Hon. G. Fraser: Those are the main things.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Sir Hal said that the department chose the boys, but it does not. I consider that a child between the ages of 12 and 14 is losing a great opportunity by being unable to participate in sport as a result of having to sell papers from 3 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. I have been told that these children leave school before the closing time in order to get to the Terrace to secure their papers, and I do not think that is desirable. I have also been told that the practice interferes with their education. It is significant that the Minister for Education in the previous Government last session had the Bill that was then before another place amended to provide for the minimum age to be raised from 14 to 15, and we find that in this Parliament the present Minister for Education introduced the Bill now under discussion.

Hon. G. Fraser: He may be in the same position as you. Your opinions were different two years ago.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The age on that occasion was 15 when the Bill reached this place, not 14. We were told that papers could not be sold if the age were made 14. I wonder how they fare in other States. In New South Wales the age is 15 and, in special circumstances, 14. In Victoria it is 12, the same as here. In South

Australia it is 13 in the suburbs, and 12 in the city. They seem to get rid of their papers all right. In Queensland, the age is 12 and in Tasmania it is 15. And I find that even in Tasmania with the minimum at 15 years, papers are distributed quite adequately. Mr. Bolton said a lot about apprentices. The minimum age of apprenticeship at the Midland Junction Workshops is 15. It is not considered desirable to have apprentices at 14. I think that is quite right.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You want to give them permission to sell papers until they are 16. That would be too late for them to become apprenticed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know where the hon. member gets that idea.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The Bill provides for 14 years onwards.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. I should say there were plenty of boys between 14 and 15 to distribute papers in the city and suburbs. When I was at school I took part in all kinds of sport, which I learnt as a young fellow under 12, and I think other boys should be given that opportunity. Somebody said that these young boys would be taught the value of money by being allowed to sell papers. Nobody can tell me that a boy working 18 hours a week and earning about £4 will learn the value of money. What chance has such a boy of being contented afterwards? I do not think that earning so large a sum at 12 or 14 years of age would teach a lad thrift. When I was 16 years of age I earned 15s. per week and my keep.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Probably that is all you were worth.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Perhaps it taught me more thrift than it would teach these lads. No-one has suggested that selling newspapers contributes to child delinquency and, as Sir Hal has said, the police said it did not contribute to delinquency. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: How things change! Two years ago, when this same principle was being discussed, the Honorary Minister was with us, but tonight he is fighting weakly in opposition to it. The Honorary Minister has said that selling papers prevents the lads indulging in sport, but in this regard there is no better em-

ployer than the newspaper most concerned. The "Daily News" sees to it that the lads belong to the Y.M.C.A., and that they are taught swimming. They are also provided with cricket and football outfits in the appropriate seasons, and in any other circumstances 90 per cent. of the boys would not have so much opportunity for sport. In 1945 I made it my business to interview the headmasters of various schools attended by newsboys. Those I interviewed said that the occupation brightens the lads up and improves them.

My own experience—which I related during the debate on the second reading—was that it brightened up the lad that I was looking after and who afterwards reached such a high position in life. Had he not been occupied in selling papers both morning and afternoon, I feel sure that during those hours he would have been with undesirable associates and would have been mixed up in all sorts of vice and trouble. It is in the age from 12 to 14 years that the minds of lads turn to vice of various kinds. The Honorary Minister mentioned lads earning £4 per week, but they only earn as much as that in certain areas where they receive tips of an extra penny here and there from customers, and I think that makes them value money. The great majority of them take their earnings into the home or use it to secure education which in most cases their parents could not afford for them. Today industry is searching vainly for lads of 14 years and over. They are simply not available. If we brought such lads into this occupation it would ruin them for later on when they could not get a comparatively high wage in industry. Surely members will not alter their decision of two years ago.

The Honorary Minister: I am glad I am not on your side.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Honorary Minister would be much happier if he were. He is not the first man to be placed in such a position. I hope the Committee will stand up to the opinion it expressed in 1945 and agree to the amendment moved by Sir Hal Colebatch.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Reference has been made to the raising of the school age. I hope it will be done quickly as I know the difficulties that stand in the way and fear that it may be a long time before

it is brought into force. When the school-leaving age is raised to 15 years I will be prepared to see the street trading age raised to 13 years. The Honorary Minister has suggested that the Child Welfare Department inquires into only one or two matters. If that is so, the department is not doing its job. Licenses are granted entirely at the discretion of the department, and it must be shown that the moral and material welfare of the child will not suffer through such trading. Under the provision as it stands, it is the duty of the department to satisfy itself that it is in the interests of the child that the license be issued.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am concerned about the opportunities for sport that are said to be provided by the "Daily News," but, as far as I can see, the only time available for sport is on Sundays.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And Saturday mornings and holidays.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is not sufficient. I cannot find evidence that the "Daily News" has done anything along the lines suggested, or has provided a gymnasium or a canteen for the use of newsboys.

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

Clause 107—Penalty for employing child in contravention of Act:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (c) the word "fourteen" be struck out and the word "twelve" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 108 to 149, Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.