

secution for the utilisation of uncertificated stallions for stud purposes. Clause 14 provides for the making of regulations in regard to the requirements of the measure. Clause 15 gives power to exempt, if it is thought necessary, any portion of the State from the operation of the Bill. Clause 16 gives power for reciprocal treatment in the case of other parts of the King's Dominions recognising certificates under this measure. Clause 17 is for the appropriation of revenue for the purpose of carrying out the necessary administration. In view of the fact that with the exception of that one particular as regards the authority that is to administer the measure—the Government having been substituted for the board—the whole of the provisions of the Bill were agreed to by this House last session, I do not think it necessary to say anything further. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.19 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 8th November, 1921.*

	Page
Obituary, Mr. John Storey, letter in reply ...	1543
Bills: Public Works Committee, 2a. ....	1543
Dredging License, 2a. ....	1557
Architects, Com. ....	1570

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

### OBITUARY—MR. JOHN STOREY.

Letter in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a letter as follows:—

Sydney, 19th October, 1921. On behalf of myself and colleagues, I desire to acknowledge with sincere thanks the receipt of your telegram of 6th instant conveying the terms of a resolution passed in the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia expressing regret at the death of our respected Leader, the late Premier, Mr. John Storey. The mark of respect accorded our late colleague by the immediate sus-

pension of the sitting of the Chamber was indeed a tribute to his memory which was much appreciated in this State. Yours faithfully, James Dooley, Premier.

### BILL—PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 25th October.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.37]: I welcome the introduction of this Bill and I trust it will be acceptable to the members of this House as well as to the members of another place. A Bill on somewhat similar lines was introduced by the Scaddan Government in 1911 and it met with defeat in another place. Also, a similar Bill was introduced in 1912 and it met with the same fate. There is a slight difference in some of the details between the Bill under review and the Bills of 1911 and 1912. Whereas the present Bill proposes to leave to the Assembly and Council entirely the election of members of the committee, the measure of 1911 provided that the chairman should be elected by the Governor-in-Council, and that three members should be elected by the Assembly and one by the Council. That provision was varied somewhat in the Bill of 1912, in that it was proposed that a member of the Executive Council—really a Minister of the Crown—should act as chairman of the committee and that three members should be elected by the Assembly and one by the Council. Although the present Bill differs from its predecessors in these respects, I have no fault to find with the differentiation. I believe it is well to leave entirely to the members of both Houses the election of the whole five members of the committee. It is well, I think, that the chairman should not be a member of the Executive Council. It is desirable that the members should be entirely free from the influence which would be associated with a Minister occupying the position of chairman of the committee. It will enable members of the committee to be more independent, entirely responsible to the House, and free from any Ministerial influence whatsoever. This Bill differs also in that the members of the committee are to perform the work without fee. I do not agree with this principle. Though there is great financial stringency, and it is incumbent upon Parliament to carefully scrutinise every avenue of expenditure, I consider that if the members who comprise this committee are worth their salt at all, if they devote the time and attention to the work and perform their duties in the manner in which they ought to be performed, the comparatively small sum involved in the payment of fees should not weigh in the balance.

Mr. Teesdale: The public would go mad.

Hon. P. COLLIER: My experience has been that when men act in an honorary capacity, generally speaking, we get honorary service in return. If the committee do their work thoroughly, they will be engaged most

of their time during the recess and a very considerable portion of the time during the session in investigating the various matters which will be brought before them, and it cannot reasonably be expected that while some members will be able to devote their recess to the furtherance of their own concerns, these five members should devote the whole of their time entirely to the public service. This would not be reasonable, and I propose to submit an amendment which, while providing for adequately recompensing members for the services rendered, will place a limit on the amount payable annually, and thus conserve the public interests as well. Perhaps the most important departure proposed by this measure, as compared with the Bills I have mentioned, is that in addition to referring to the committee new works of an estimated expenditure of £20,000 or over, it is also proposed to refer to the committee the question of the management of the railways, tramways and other public works. This is a very important departure and, in my opinion, a very desirable one. During the discussion on the Estimates particularly, we have found that members are practically helpless to take action in connection with the financial position of the State. Ministers come down to the House and make their statements in introducing their Estimates, and practically the whole of the Estimates have to be accepted by private members. But if there were in this House three members and in another place two members who, for a considerable time, had sat as members of the Public Works Committee, investigating the management of the different departments and examining witnesses on every side of the question, the House would not then be so much dependent on what I might describe as the partisan statements of Ministers. After all, when a Minister comes down with his Estimates we must remember that he is responsible for framing them and rightly or wrongly, he is going to defend them. The Estimates are largely prepared by the Government officials and influenced no doubt by the Minister, and in many instances they are doubtless reduced very considerably, but once the Estimates are printed and brought to the House, the Ministers will stand by them. The House is in possession of very little information except that which may be vouchsafed to it by the Minister. But if we have in this Chamber three members who have inquired very closely into the management of a particular department, have examined it, and are thoroughly au fait with it, their knowledge and information should be of material assistance to the Chamber as a whole in guiding it to an attitude. For my part, I think the proposed departure should at least be given a trial. I believe I shall not be out of order in briefly referring at this juncture to the finances once again. We have for last month the alarming deficit of £180,000, with a total deficit of more than half-a-million for the four months of the financial year which have expired. As has been stated so often in this Chamber, our

deficits are due mainly to the working of our Railway Department. I may mention that in the quarter just closed the tramways have also contributed very considerably to the deficit. However, members do not know where to tackle the question of the railways. There is an enormous expenditure every year, which we vote practically in globo; members are, so to speak, in the dark when considering the operations of the railway system, except as regards those minor matters which come under their notice as affecting their constituents, or which they observe on their journeyings over the railway system. Whilst there may be an appearance of the setting up of a dual control in the shape of this committee, still it must be admitted that the committee would gather information which would be of material assistance to Parliament, and which would probably enable improvements and economies to be effected in connection with the railway system. Certain it is that this House will have to take a greater control of the finances than it has done in the past. We know perfectly well that the House has no control over the finances, irrespective of what Government may be in office. Before the Estimates are finally passed, we are generally nearing the Christmas period, or the end of the first half of the financial year; and, as has been stated here so often, when the Estimates are finally dealt with, very little if any alteration can be made in them. Instead of the Minister being, as now, entirely responsible, and instead of the House depending entirely upon him, we should, if this Bill passes, create a position in which a parliamentary committee would not only investigate the proposed construction of any new public work, but would also examine into the working of existing public utilities. I entertain no doubt that the committee would do the work thoroughly and fearlessly, being responsible only to Parliament and entirely free from any Ministerial influence. In the course of its term of office, namely the life of a Parliament, the committee should be able to gather a considerable amount of information and to specialise in many directions. Thus the House would gain a more direct control over the finances, not only as regards the expenditure of public moneys on new public works, but also as regards the management of the various departments and public utilities. To-day the House has no direct control, except insofar as it controls the Ministry. If dissatisfied with the administration of any particular Minister, or with the administration of the Government as a whole, members have no alternative but to turn the Ministry out. We know that that is very rarely done, because the majority of members generally consider that it would be no remedy for the situation to turn one set of Ministers out and put another set in. I believe that it is possible to get such service from three members of this House and two members of another place as would be of material assistance to any Government. After all, it can-

not seriously be urged that all the talent existing amongst 80 members—50 here and 30 in another place—is comprised in the six members who happen for the time being to hold Ministerial portfolios. In both Houses there is any amount of talent, and that talent should be utilised in the direction indicated by this measure. The principle of delegating to a public works committee authority to inquire into existing departments is new, so far as I am aware. I do not think that particular power exists in the Acts of South Australia, Victoria, or New South Wales, or in the Commonwealth Act.

The Premier: In South Australia it is done by way of Royal Commission.

Hon. P. COLLIER: However, the principle of having standing parliamentary committees to inquire into the construction of proposed public works is not novel. It has operated in Victoria for nearly a quarter of a century. Certainly, the power there is restricted to inquiry into the construction of proposed railways. I do not believe it extends to public works of other descriptions.

Hon. T. Walker: But that is the case in New South Wales.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes; and it has existed in New South Wales for many years. The South Australian Act was passed about 1912, and the Commonwealth measure a little later. It is significant that not one of the States which have such Acts, nor the Commonwealth, suggests the repeal of the legislation. It must be presumed, therefore, that the States and the Commonwealth have found that legislation satisfactory. No one will gainsay that the establishment of a public works committee will tend at all events to eliminate political influence in the matter of construction of new public works. We know perfectly well that in regard to the construction of railways and other public works in this State—and no doubt, all of us being human, in other States as well—authority has been given for works which were not justified, and that such authority has emanated from political considerations. I do not desire to indicate any such works, but had we had in the past a standing committee such as proposed by this Bill, the measure authorising the construction of the Fremantle dock would not have been enacted, and this State would have been saved the quarter-of-a-million of public money which has been thrown into the river.

Mr. McCallum: What about the Bullfinch railway?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes; I am coming to that. A parliamentary committee would not have recommended the construction of that dock in the particular site which was selected. As regards the Bullfinch railway, a Bill authorising the construction of that line was passed within 24 hours; and at the time it was my opinion that the construction of the Bullfinch railway was wholly unjustifiable. Now the proposal is to take the railway up, I believe. There are other instances, too, which could be adduced. We know that as

regards the routes of railways authorised by this House select committees have frequently sat to inquire after, not before, the measure authorising construction has been passed by Parliament. We know that there has been endless wrangling and quarrelling, both in Parliament and out of it, on the part of those affected by the route of a proposed railway. It is well that inquiry should be made beforehand, and not afterwards. As a fact, the appointment of the proposed standing committee would merely supersede the present system of appointing from session to session either select committees or Royal Commissions to inquire into the management of existing utilities and proposals to construct new public works. In that respect I do not believe the proposed committee will prove any more costly, while it must necessarily prove immeasurably more efficient. For, while we have the services of certain members on a select committee or a Royal Commission this session or this recess to investigate some particular matter, it is quite possible, and indeed very likely, that another Royal Commission or another select committee investigating a somewhat similar proposal next year will be constituted of entirely different members; and thus there is no continuity of policy, as it were, no application of principles to the works proposed. If members of the committee are appointed for three years, the experience gained in the investigation of one particular work this session or this recess must of necessity be of great benefit to them in the consideration of a somewhat similar proposal later on. The work of the committee must prove educative to its members. Thus by the appointment of the proposed committee we shall obtain a continuity of policy and of ideas which must be of considerable value to the country. Then, too, instead of, as obtains to-day, one Minister having to justify the construction of a public work, say of a railway involving the State in an expenditure of £100,000, that work will have to be justified to Parliament by the standing committee as well as by the Minister. The Minister will have to submit his case here for the construction of the work, whatever it may be, and give an estimate of the cost and all such information as he may be able to obtain from his departmental officers; but then, instead of the House proceeding to decide in the light of the data afforded to it by the Minister, the standing committee will be called upon likewise to justify the work proposed. Even on the very law of averages, it follows that Parliament will be less likely to agree to the construction of an unjustifiable work if it acts upon the recommendation of a committee as well as upon that of a Minister. Viewed from whatever standpoint, the proposal of this Bill seems to me one that must prove beneficial to the State. I am reminded by an hon. member that no Minister can hope to examine thoroughly into the hundred and one matters which come within his purview

when controlling a department. Take the case of the Minister for Railways, who is also Minister for Mines, and, further, controls the tramways and the police, besides functioning as administrator of the Forests Department and the Department of Industries. It would be utterly absurd to expect any one man, even were he a genius, to investigate personally all the matters which necessarily demand investigation in all those departments. I myself know that half a Minister's time is taken up in doing routine work, such as signing papers—work that really an office boy could do. The time at a Minister's disposal for examining questions involving important principles is very limited indeed; and especially is that the case during the period when Parliament is sitting, when a Minister is called upon to be in the House for anything from five to seven or eight hours three or four days per week. His first two hours in his office in the morning are spent in getting rid of files and signing documents.

The Minister for Works: And seeing callers.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and seeing callers. It is utterly impossible for a Minister to give personal attention to all the matters for which he is responsible; and therefore I say Ministers are entitled to the assistance which would be given them by the appointment of a standing committee as proposed by this measure. Not only would the proposed committee prove of the most material assistance to Ministers, but it must necessarily result in considerable saving to the State, by avoiding the construction of public works which are not thoroughly justified. The House, again, would greatly benefit from having made available to it the results of the committee's inquiries and investigations. This Bill seems to me one which does not require elaboration. I only regret that we have not had such a committee in existence for some years past. It is to be hoped that another place will view the measure with an open mind and impartially. We have spoken frequently, each one of us, of our willingness to do all that lies in our power to assist the Government in getting the State out of its financial difficulties. Here, in this Bill, is one method by which Parliament will be able to render considerable aid to the Government, no matter how the standing committee may be constituted. With regard to the question of fees, I hope no member will condemn the Bill because no provision has been made in this direction. It is my intention to suggest when the Bill is in committee that fees be paid, but that those fees shall not exceed a maximum of £1,100. By that I mean that the maximum payment which members would receive would amount to that sum of money. Each member would draw not more than £200 in addition to his salary as a member of Parliament and the chairman would receive 50 per cent. ex-

tra, which would bring his payment up to £300. In this way, four ordinary members would receive up to £200 each and the chairman £300. Those amounts, however, would be drawn in full only in the event of a certain number of sittings taking place. I do not mean that each member should draw a fixed amount of £200 a year; my idea is that each member should receive £1 ls. per sitting and the chairman 50 per cent. extra, which would, in his case, involve the payment of 3ls. 6d. These fees would stand, no matter how many sittings were held in the year.

The Minister for Works: They could not possibly sit more than 200 times in the year.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If five members of this Parliament did not prove themselves to be worth more than £1,100 a year, then I should be sorry for the calibre and capacity of the gentlemen who might be elected to sit on the committee. My opinion however, is that they will easily save that amount and a great deal more to the State. If the amendment I suggest be made, we shall know then what the cost of the proposed committee will be to the State. That was one of the arguments which was used against the Bills introduced in 1911 and 1912. One member in another place allowed his imagination to run riot when he stated that such a committee would cost the country £50,000. My idea in fixing the fees is that we shall know exactly what the committee will cost. I venture to say there are very few works which are likely to be carried out in the State during the next few years upon which the committee will not be able to indicate where a saving can be effected, and a saving which will be considerably more than the committee itself will cost. I consider the amendment will be a fair compromise and I hope the House will endorse it. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, because I feel confident that the appointment of such a committee will result in rendering valuable assistance to Parliament.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [55]: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, because I consider it will be the means of doing a great deal of good to the State. If, as the Leader of the Opposition stated, such a measure had been in existence in past years, the State would have benefited considerably by reason of the fact that a number of works which have been carried out and which have since been proved to be unsatisfactory, would not have been constructed. Railways have been built in certain directions which have not been in the best interests of the country, and which have not been the means of opening up and developing areas, and the result is that it is essential now that the State shall take in hand the construction of lines in other directions to serve people who for a long time have been without means of communication and transport. The proposed committee will not only do good in connection with works that may be projected, but it will be invaluable in connection with undertakings that are already being handled. As

a matter of fact, there will be quite a good deal of business for the committee to investigate in this direction as soon as it is appointed, in the hope of ascertaining whether the State is receiving effective benefit from what is in hand. There are many matters which require to be investigated, and we want to see whether the people to whom facilities have in the past been given are receiving the maximum advantage. In the metropolitan area quite a number of works are being supervised by the Government, and if these were under direct control, we should get higher efficiency. I support the Bill because I am confident that it will result in considerable saving to the public purse and also because of the fact that the appointment of such a committee will relieve to a considerable extent the work now being performed by select committees. In the past a considerable amount of time has been devoted to investigations by select committees and Royal Commissions. The Wheat Commission, for instance, performed valuable work gratuitously, and I am satisfied that the wheat growers of the State and Parliament have not even now realised the benefits which have resulted from the investigations made by that Commission. So far as the fees for the proposed committee are concerned, in view of the financial position of the State, I believe there are members here who would be willing to act in an honorary capacity. At the same time, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is not a fair thing to ask members to give up their time week after week to carry out investigations such as those which will be involved if the Bill becomes law. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill, because it will be in the interests of the State to have the questions that will be submitted to the committee thoroughly sifted before we are asked to vote on them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.8]: I am glad indeed that the passing of time has brought about a feeling, not only on the part of members in this House, but also the public, that a committee of this sort will be of great assistance to the State. As a Minister I have had a few years' experience, and I say unhesitatingly that if such a committee had been appointed in the past, and had been doing the work indicated in the Bill, my life would have been considerably more enjoyable, and perhaps the work I have been able to do for the State would have been of more value. I know of a number of cases during the last five years which might have been investigated, which investigation would have been of assistance to the Minister and would have enabled this House to form and to express views which would have commanded the respect not only of the people of the State but also the critical Press. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that in his opinion fees should be paid. I refer to this matter with some diffidence, because on my right I

have a most tyrannical Treasurer who keeps his eye not only on every penny, but on every farthing, and I do not know how he will receive the idea of fees being paid. I would like to express my opinion with regard to the scale of fees mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. That scale cannot be considered otherwise than reasonable. It is certainly not likely to add very much to the indebtedness of the State. As I interjected when the hon. member was speaking, the committee could not possibly hold more than 200 meetings. As a matter of fact it would not be practicable for that number to be held per annum, so that on that score I do not think the House need have any apprehension. But whether my friend the Treasurer will favourably or otherwise view the proposal that fees should be paid, is for him to say. One good that I think will result from the appointment of the committee will be that if the Minister finds, in the carrying out of his work, that there is a line of investigation which, owing to the duties of his office, will not allow him full time to thoroughly inquire into, he can apply to the Premier to permit the matter to be referred to the public works committee. The investigation by the committee would disclose whether the views of the Minister were supported or otherwise, and if supported the matter could then without question be brought before the House, and the Minister would have at his back a force which would command respect. I am sure that ex-Ministers have felt, and present Ministers sometimes feel, that their views are not receiving that whole-hearted support which they should receive from the members of their staffs with whom they have to deal. In such cases those officers who might be recalcitrant would be brought to their bearings at once, whilst the effect upon Ministers themselves would be good. A Minister in administering a department would know that unless he had been careful in the direction he had given, that he would stand a good chance of having his mistakes exposed. Therefore I think Ministers will be particularly careful in that regard too. The Leader of the Opposition referred to political influence. I do not know that we have had any glaring instances in this State of political abuse such as he named. The cases to which the hon. member referred are debatable. He spoke of the Fremantle dock and the Bullfinch railway. I know more about the Fremantle dock than about the Bullfinch railway, and I should say that the dock was one of those risks which any Government worthy of the name had to take in the interests of the progress of the State. It does not follow that all the undertakings of a Government will be successful. If we, as a Government or as individuals, waited to obtain a guarantee of success before doing anything, we should be of very little value to the State or to ourselves, and should stagnate and drift into inanition. But putting that on one side as a debatable subject, I feel sanguine that the passing of the Bill will be of

benefit to the State. I trust that those who will have to deal with it, both in this Chamber and in another place, will keep in view that if ever there was need for a committee of this sort it is right now, at a time when we have to put our finances in order. For the Premier and his Ministers to have at their call a committee of a practical nature such as it is proposed to appoint, can only be to the benefit of the State, and the Government have a right to ask for every assistance which, in their opinion is needed in the present state of affairs.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [5.16]: I desire to support the Bill. I vividly remember that I supported a similar Bill a few years ago, when it met with a most hostile reception on this side. However, times change, and so too, do men. The need for this measure has perhaps been forced upon our administrators during recent years while the finances have been steadily going to leeward. The appointment of the proposed committee will be following on lines already adopted by the Eastern States, whose Parliaments are equally well equipped with ours, and who have a fair knowledge of what is required. In the Eastern States they look upon such a committee as a check on public extravagance. If proposals for the expenditure of public money have to be submitted to this committee, it goes without saying that the closest analytical scrutiny of such expenditure will be a certain result. Personally, I could wish it were proposed that the committee should consist entirely of members of this Chamber. I refuse to believe that the members of another place represent the producers of the State. They represent, not men and women, but rather bricks and mortar; and where the expenditure of money is concerned, the people's House is the one which should indicate to the Government where economy can be effected.

Mr. Johnston: The House with the control of the purse.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Seeing that another place has no control over the finances, I can only say that the proposal to appoint the committee partly from another place should not be met with favour. I expect the object the Premier had in proposing that two members of another place should be on the committee was to gather to the measure a certain element of support which otherwise would not have been accorded it.

Mr. Teesdale: To give it a tone!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It is not tone, but economy which we require just now. The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) puts his hand to his ear at the word "economy." I realise that for the next three months the hon. member is likely to be regarded as a hero by certain sections of the community, and will probably shine as the only member who was game to tackle the financial problem. Unfortunately the public, as a rule, is satisfied with but a superficial

knowledge of the case. No thinking member could have supported the proposals of the member for Katanning, at all events not in the shape in which he submitted them. Yet had the member put them to the vote I would have supported him although, as I say, there was in them but very little to justify support for such rule of thumb motions.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing any action of the House.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, but the Bill contemplates the appointment of a committee which will certainly afford a check on extravagance. The financial position is becoming worse. Something has to be done, but it must be very different from the course advocated by the member for Katanning. For instance, it would be ridiculous for me or for you, Sir, to go into an emporium like Boans, and say "There is to be a 10 per cent. reduction effected on this staff," without the slightest knowledge of where it could best be effected. So, too, in Parliament we have no knowledge of the inner workings of the Government departments; we cannot indicate where economy could be profitably effected. If the member for Katanning knows of certain items in the Estimates where a reduction could properly be effected, I am sure hon. members will support him. The difficulty is that we are not masters of the situation, we have not that intimate knowledge of the workings of the departments which would justify us in attempting to effect a reduction which would be defensible on a study of the details. I take it the work of this proposed committee will include the reviewing of public expenditure and the making of suggestions to Parliament. It may be that at times the members of the committee will clash with the Minister, but after all it might be a good thing to have such a clash occasionally; it would serve to keep Ministers up to the collar, and would put a check on that irresponsibility which seems to get hold of them so frequently. I have no hesitation in saying that in the Education Department there is no sense of responsibility whatever in regard to the finances. Such an enthusiast is the Minister at the head of that department that he is not prepared to put on a check of any sort. When the late member for Perth (Mr. Pilkington) moved a reduction in the Estimates of the Education Department, the House would not support him. I believe that the motion of the late member for Perth having been defeated, the Minister in another place took it as an authority to him to go right ahead. I, too, would like to go right ahead in respect of education, if only we could afford it; but there are lots of desirable things which we must cut out, and I think the Premier realises that.

The Premier: I could not attempt to reduce the deficit by cutting down education.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Still, something has to be cut down, unpopular as it may be. The electors may annihilate the Government

which seeks to apply the pruning knife, but nevertheless that knife has to be applied. The position cannot continue. It is very noticeable that during the last month or two the public have been waking up to the facts and are becoming alarmed. The Premier's forecast for the coming year—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit the hon. member to discuss the finances, except so far as they relate to the Bill.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am supporting the Bill because I think it will be the means of saving the Government a good deal of money.

The Premier: It is intended primarily that the committee shall inquire into railway matters.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Yes, and there are other departments as well. Certainly the railways afford the biggest scope for the activities of the proposed committee. The railways to-day constitute a white elephant, and apparently there is no appeal whatever from the decision of the railway officers. Whatever they may resolve upon we can only endorse it. There is no alternative, unless it be by the appointment of the proposed committee, which will have access to the department and will be able to probe into all questions and see whether expenditure can be cut down and extra revenue gained. A collective body has always more authority in submitting a recommendation than has any individual. A private member may put up a dozen different propositions, but usually it is said of him, "Oh, he has a bee in his bonnet." Such a charge is never urged against any three or four men banded together. They can apply themselves to the various problems and give Parliament the benefit of the information they secure. It is in some quarters suggested that the Forests Act might well be amended with the object of taking from the Conservator the control of expenditure. Personally I am not in favour of doing that, although I am entirely dissatisfied with the Conservator's policy. But should it happen that Parliament took away from him the control of expenditure, there will be ample work for the committee in inquiring whether the expenditure already committed and the expenditure proposed, are justified. I believe that a great deal of money already spent has been wasted. It will be the function of the proposed committee to inquire into that expenditure and, if they find any channels of wastage, to cut them off. There is always a possibility of big leakages in Government departments. Unfortunately there is not that co-ordination and control which Ministers would like. The departments are scattered about all over the place, under different roofs, and in inter-departmental activities there is, I believe, considerable leakage. No doubt the Premier, in proposing the appointment of this committee, had in mind the desirability of pulling up such of the railways as are hopelessly unprofitable and transferring them to other parts of the State. It is, of course, a most

unpopular task for a Minister to deprive an isolated community of the railway facilities they possess.

Mr. Teesdale: It was done in my electorate, yet nobody squeaked.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then the hon. member must have been away. I do not recollect the incident, but neither can I understand the hon. member not having squeaked. Had he been here his squeak would have been like the roar of an African lion if anybody proposed to tear up and remove a railway from his district. No doubt the Premier, when deciding upon the Bill, had at the back of his mind the removal of those railways. Expenditure has been incurred in various places which have since suffered a depression. In consequence the railway lines in those districts are no longer profitable, and therefore should be moved. I venture to say that will be the first proposition put forward by the proposed committee. Again, it would have been a distinct advantage if we had had this committee before the State enterprises were started. Personally I am in favour of State enterprises. If the launching of the State enterprises had been based on a recommendation by a committee such as that proposed, the responsibility would have rested on the committee, and we should not have had the sordid party squabbles we have had over this question for years past. Members on this side have been kept continually on the defensive over the question of the State trading concerns. Time and attention has been taken up in maintaining a defence of those institutions, and votes of censure built up of sheer partisanship have been launched against those responsible for the initiation of the State trading concerns.

Mr. Pickering: You are getting in a lot of useful defence now.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If we had a committee of this kind to make recommendations the party spirit would not be so evident when we are discussing State enterprises. Again, I am reminded of the very useful work such a committee could do when it is proposed to build a new railway. Of course we are not likely to have any such proposition for some little time to come, but in the meantime a great deal of developmental work could be effected by the medium of tramlines. I believe that rails for tramlines are frequently procurable when heavy metals are unobtainable. Much can be done with a 2-ft. tramlane. When the Margaret River railway was authorised, Parliament committed a bad blunder in fixing the route. The railway will run parallel with the finest roadway in the State on the one side, and the sea coast on the other. I do not think Parliament would have agreed to that route had Parliament known the facts. The Minister introduced the Bill on the advice of his engineers, and Parliament knew nothing whatever about it. If we had such a committee, Parliament would be well informed before being asked to vote on any proposal in which the committee was concerned.

Mr. Johnston: That railway can get traffic only on one side.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: And that only by robbing the transport facilities already there. With a committee like this in existence, that railway would have gone along some other route.

Mr. Willcock: It is not too late now.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: No, but Parliament has decided, and it is difficult to alter such a decision. The committee, I hope, will have power to review increased railway and tramway fares and show Parliament and the Country what the effect of such increases will be on production. To-day the Commissioner of Railways gazettes new rates calculated to crush production. Protests are made in Parliament, but there the matter ends.

The Premier: We have to meet the losses on the railways.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I am not so sure that the Commissioner for Railways is such a genius for the job after all. If he imposes freights and fares which lead to a diminution of traffic, to empty trains running over the lines and to production being retarded, such things should be subject to review. To-day Parliament is helpless. We have no power or control. It is not expected that this committee will be an inquisitorial body, or that it will interfere with the policy of ministers, but if there are men upon it who will apply themselves to their task, there is a very useful field of employment for them. Savings have to be effected in many directions. I hope the Bill will be passed, and I should like to see the committee composed of members of this House only. The Assembly is the only Chamber interested in finance. Finance is the only thing which concerns Western Australia at present. We have to get money and see that it is well spent. Side by side with finance we have to consider the development of the country, and that development cannot be effected without money. We should see that every penny the State has to spend in the future is well spent, notwithstanding the waste that may have occurred in the past. If the committee will go some distance in this direction the Bill will have my support.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [5.32]: Sufficient reasons have been advanced in favour of the Bill to justify the House in carrying it into effect, but there are one or two points on which I should like to speak. The experience of the other States is responsible for the introduction of this Bill. The fact that similar committees elsewhere in Australia are still in existence and meet with the approval of the Parliaments concerned, is certainly some justification for their existence. In our Railway Advisory Board we have a committee of much the same description as other committees elsewhere. Every railway project, which has to be brought before the House, is generally first reported upon by this advisory board, and the Margaret River railway men-

tioned by the member for Forrest should have come within the scope of that board. The Bill now before us indicates that the proposed committee will be of a somewhat different character from that existing elsewhere in Australia. The committee, apparently, will form the administration of the country.

Hon. T. Walker: That is its danger.

Mr. WILLCOCK: We should not appoint a committee of this description for the purpose of administering the affairs of the country. We have put a Government in power and the party behind the Government has selected its representatives to form that Government, and, this being so, the Government should be responsible for the administration of the country. I agree that a public works committee should be formed for the purpose of dealing with public works and the expenditure of loan moneys. When loan moneys are available to be spent it depends very much on the predilections of Ministers as to how it is spent. It may be that within the next three or four years we shall have some loan money to spend, and it may be desired by some Minister to spend it in a particular direction. It should be within the province of the committee in such a case to take a broad view of the whole State, and decide where, in the interests of the whole State, such money could most suitably be spent. It is absurd to suggest that this committee can get down to the details of the administration of each department, or interfere with the finances of the State generally. That would be akin to the manager of a big company paying the salaries of the staff and appointing the paymaster or office boy to run the business. That is not what Parliament is constituted for.

The Minister for Works: You do not regard members of Parliament as office boys.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I say that private members who have no responsibility of Ministerial position do not come within the same category as Ministers.

The Minister for Works: That is quite right.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It would be ridiculous to give this committee such powers as are now held by Ministers, for that would be altogether too big a job to give to it. I could understand the Government going to the country and saying they have tried to square the ledger, to right the finances, to restore public confidence and bring the State back to a solvent condition, but admitting their failure and then saddling the responsibility upon an irresponsible body appointed by this House. This is what that would mean. Such a committee would be irresponsible so far as the Government of the country is concerned. That responsibility lies with members of Cabinet and no one else. If they cannot carry out their responsibility, it is time they made room for someone else. They should not hand this job over to a committee composed of private members, admitting that they cannot do the job themselves and practically asking the com-



mittee to show them some way of doing it. If the Ministry cannot run the country properly, then they should get out of office.

The Premier: You are opposing the Bill?

Mr. WILLCOCK: No, not in its entirety. I say it should be confined to public works and to the expenditure of loan moneys. The title of the Bill is a misnomer, especially if it is intended that this committee should go into all the ramifications of the service and of the finances of the State. The portion of the Bill with which I agree is that portion referring to public works of a certain magnitude and to the spending of loan moneys. Such matters should come within the purview of the committee. If we do have loan moneys to spend directly, the whole House should be afforded some idea as to the best means of spending it. If the committee can collect evidence from various sources and make a recommendation to Parliament, such a recommendation might well have some effect. One of the matters which might be inquired into by the committee is that connected with the drainage of the South-West. We know that it will cost a lot of money. There may be some means by which the amount that it would cost to effect this drainage could be spent elsewhere with better advantage to the State. The member for Irwin might say that half a million or a quarter of a million pounds could be spent with greater advantage in the northern portion of the State. That would be a matter of opinion, but it would come within the purview of this committee. When such committee had gone into the practicability of both schemes and had looked at the matter from all sides, a report could be furnished to the House. I do not agree that the committee should have to do with anything else but public works and such matters. I cannot support the appointment of a committee that will criticise the finances and go into the ramifications of the different departments.

The Premier: It would only inquire into those things that were specially referred to it.

Mr. WILLCOCK: It is apparently intended that it should go into the ramifications of the service and to the question of the finances. It would be a very easy way out for the Government, in the event of its being necessary to pull up any railways, to allow the committee to take the full responsibility of such a course. No Government would like to be saddled with the responsibility of such an unpopular action as the pulling up of a railway that was already serving a number of people.

The Premier: The people concerned should have the right to give evidence before some tribunal.

Mr. WILLCOCK: That is so, and this is one of the matters which might be considered by the committee.

The Premier: The people should have some opportunity of stating their views.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I do not object to that, but this is one of the reasons perhaps why

the Government are in favour of the appointment of such a committee. It would certainly relieve them of a good deal of unpopularity. I cannot agree to the whole administration of the country being referred to the committee, although I intend to support the Bill so far as it relates to public works. I do not think two or three members of Parliament, who may receive £40 or £50 a year for their labours, are the people who should have to do with such matters as the administration of the country, and perhaps it would be possible to eliminate that portion of the Bill in Committee. If it is to be a Public Works Committee Bill it should be one that gives to the Committee power to deal with public works only.

The Premier: There may be referred to it such things under special Acts as the House may decide to refer to it.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I would prefer to eliminate from this Bill anything in the way of administration.

The Premier: Parliament passes a Railway Act and appoints a Commissioner to be in charge of the railways. The House can then inquire into the administration of the railways.

Mr. WILLCOCK: If the House is going to set up a committee that will inquire into the running of the railways that is quite a different matter. This would require the appointment of a business committee. I take it this public works committee is to be appointed to guide the House in the matter of expenditure on public works, whether from revenue or loan funds, and also to inquire into any method by which the production of the State may be increased, and as to where it is most advisable money should be spent. So far as other matters are concerned they would require the appointment of a business committee. There will be plenty of work for the public works committee to inquire into during the next two or three years. Loan money has to be spent in developing the country, and new railways may be authorised or public utilities may be moved from one centre to another. All these matters can be dealt with by the committee. We all know that the railways are losing money. They are carrying the products of the State at a loss. I do not quarrel with that. In order to build up the agricultural and pastoral industries, Parliament is justified in permitting the railways to carry the products at a loss for the time being. But it is not justified in doing it through the Railway Department. That is the way we are losing money. We were told by the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) the other night that the Government railways are carrying pyritic ore hundreds of miles at  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per ton per mile, while the average rate for ordinary traffic is over 1d. per ton per mile. Superphosphate is carried at a considerable loss, but I do not object to this assistance to the agricultural areas. At the same time, I desire to point out that that is where we are losing money on the railways.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think I can allow the hon. member to discuss that aspect under this Bill.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I was objecting to matters of that kind coming within the scope of the Bill. I think we should have a committee appointed to go into matters of administration, if such a decision is deemed desirable by a vote of this House, but that would be an entirely different matter. It would be entirely different with a public works committee and I consider that such a committee should deal exclusively with public works and the manner in which loan moneys should be expended throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [5.46]: I do not intend to take up the time of the House for any considerable period and would not have done so now but for the remarks of the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen). I think with the member for Forrest that the committee should be selected from this Chamber and I trust the Premier will be guided in that direction. The member for Forrest, however, went on to pass certain comments regarding the Margaret River railway. I take it that he intends that that railway should be referred to this committee.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Not now, it is too late.

Hon. P. Collier: The Bill prevents that. It refers to railways authorised after the passing of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill only refers to future matters.

Mr. PICKERING: I would regret if that were the object of the Bill.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I only quoted that railway as an instance.

Mr. PICKERING: The hon. member referred to the railway and I would hesitate—

Mr. O'Loughlen: I quoted it as a shocking example.

Mr. PICKERING: I would object to such a proposal to refer the question of the construction of the railway to the committee, more particularly on account of the settlement that is proceeding apace there. The Bill has my support because it will be of considerable service to this House. It will save a great deal of discussion and I hope that when the reports of the committee are considered in this Chamber, and subsequently endorsed by Parliament, the recommendations of the committee will not be subject to review by, for instance, the Commissioner of Railways. I trust it will not lie within the power of the Commissioner of Railways to turn down a decision of this Chamber. I trust that when the committee comes into being, the decisions, which will be arrived at under businesslike methods and endorsed by the House, will not be subject to review by the head of any department in the Public Service. I trust there will be finality in that direction. Regarding the scope of the Bill as referred to by the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willecock), I do not think it is the in-

tention of the Premier to make it as wide as that hon. member suggested.

The Premier: No, it is not my intention to do that.

Mr. PICKERING: If it were I would—

Mr. O'Loughlen: It may strike terror into some of these people and make them come up to the collar.

Mr. PICKERING: It was not my intention to speak but for the remarks of the member for Forrest.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I am sorry.

Mr. PICKERING: I trust the Premier, however, will consider the position regarding the members appointed on the committee and amend it in the direction suggested, if necessary.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [5.50]: Time works many changes and it is strange to find the Premier introducing a Bill in which, during the many years he sat on the Opposition side of the House, he could see no virtue.

The Premier: I thought I would hear of that.

Mr. McCALLUM: At the same time, he is one of those who sit on the Ministerial side of the House who accuse the Labour Party of utilising its position in Parliament for party political purposes. Members on the Ministerial side of the House are continually stalking the country pointing out to the public that they do not desire to use their positions in the House for party purposes. They profess to sink party politics, or to advocate the sinking of party politics, but while the Premier was sitting in opposition he could see no good in the principle contained in this Bill. When he got to the Ministerial side of the House, however, he introduced a Bill and asked for the blessings of members of Parliament. I remind members of the difference in the reception this Bill received from the present Leader of the Opposition compared with the reception it received from former Opposition members. Is there any difference in the principle as introduced now, compared with the principle as introduced by the Labour Government?

Member: There are differences.

Mr. McCALLUM: There are one or two alterations, I admit. But I want to quote the Premier's remarks on the occasion when a Bill was introduced embodying the principle now suggested. It is rank hypocrisy for members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House to take up the stand that we are the only one section who take into account party considerations. We have been accused of all the political crimes in the calendar, including disloyalty.

The Premier: Who said that?

Mr. McCALLUM: The member for Leederville (Capt. Carter) said that the decision in his election was on a question of loyalty or disloyalty.

Mr. SPEAKER: He did not say that on this Bill. The hon. member will confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier, when introducing—

Capt. Carter: On a point of order, I ask for a withdrawal of the remark by the member for South Fremantle. It is not only untrue but unfair to make such a statement.

Mr. McCALLUM: If the member for Leederville denies the statement, I can produce the newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Leederville takes exception to the remark—

Mr. McCALLUM: Am I not to have any chance of proving that the statement was accurate?

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. member takes exception to a remark made by another hon. member, and asks for a withdrawal, the statement must be withdrawn.

Mr. Troy: There must be some reason. No reason has been given.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Leederville has taken exception to a remark by the member for South Fremantle. I ask the member for South Fremantle to withdraw.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. Troy: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. Troy: I desire to ask what Standing Order gives you the right to demand the withdrawal of a statement because some member asks for a withdrawal? Before a withdrawal of a statement can be demanded, it must be proved that the remark was offensive. The member for Leederville has not stated that the remark was offensive. He said it was untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member resume his seat?

Mr. Troy: An hon. member has to state his point of order. I cannot rise to a point of order without stating what it is, as the Speaker knows. The member for Leederville has asked for a withdrawal of a statement but he cannot ask for a withdrawal unless the statement complained of is personally offensive. The member for Leederville has not stated that he regarded it as offensive.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has stated his question.

Mr. Troy: Will the Speaker give me an opportunity to state my point of order? Mr. Speaker is out of order in preventing me from doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member resume his seat?

Mr. Troy: The member for Leederville has not said that the statement was offensive. As a matter of fact, the statement by the member for Leederville himself is offensive, because he said that what the member for South Fremantle said was untrue. Such a statement is not in order. In these circumstances, I ask, Mr. Speaker, under what Standing Order you ask the member for South Fremantle to withdraw the statement

to which exception has been taken by the member for Leederville?

Mr. SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. member's point of order, no member in the House is in order in making a statement which is offensive to any other member. The member for Leederville takes exception to the statement made by the member for South Fremantle as being offensive. He said it was unfair. I understand the member for Mount Magnet says the member for Leederville said it was untrue.

Mr. O'Loghlin: He said it was untrue and unfair.

Mr. Troy: No hon. member is allowed to say another hon. member's statement is untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Leederville has taken exception to that statement and I ask the member for South Fremantle to withdraw it.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will withdraw. I will produce the proof later on. At the same time, I ask that the member for Leederville withdraw his remark that my statement was untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member brings forward his proof, it will be time to take action.

Mr. Troy: No, do it now!

Mr. McCALLUM: I understand the member for Leederville said my statement was untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member takes exception to that statement, I will ask the member for Leederville to withdraw.

Capt. Carter: On a point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member proceeds, the member for South Fremantle has taken exception to the statement that his remarks were untrue. I understood the member for Leederville to say they were unfair. I ask the member for Leederville to withdraw that statement.

Capt. Carter: Am I in order—

Mr. Troy: On a point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot proceed. He must withdraw the statement to which exception has been taken.

Capt. Carter: I withdraw and say that the statement was incorrect.

Mr. Troy: On a point of order. No hon. member can withdraw one statement and substitute other words. He must withdraw unreservedly.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has withdrawn unreservedly.

Capt. Carter: Yes.

Mr. Troy: He has not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the member for Leederville withdrawn unreservedly?

Capt. Carter: Sir—

Mr. SPEAKER: I want no equivocation. Does the hon. member withdraw unreservedly?

Capt. Carter: Yes. In that case we have both won. It is a case of fifty-fifty.

Mr. McCALLUM: Members on the Ministerial side are constantly, both inside and outside Parliament, saying that no Labour

men should be supported because they stand for party politics.

The Premier: Well, do you not stand for them?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am in favour of party politics.

The Premier: Why object, then?

Mr. McCALLUM: I say the Premier is one of the members sitting on the Ministerial side who go out and—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know that that has anything to do with the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: It has a lot to do with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see it.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier introduces the Bill now, whereas, when he was sitting on the Opposition side of the House, he objected to the principle.

The Premier: What is the date of the "Hansard" you have?

Mr. McCALLUM: The 31st October, 1912.

The Premier: How many years ago is that?

Mr. O'Loughlen: The principle of the Bill is the same.

Mr. McCALLUM: Perhaps the problem in mental arithmetic imposes too great a strain on the Premier, but he will understand that the principle is the same.

Mr. Troy: That was before the war. The world is upside down now.

Mr. McCALLUM: The war has accounted for a lot of things but it cannot account for the continuance of the principle.

Mr. Mann: The war has accounted for the shortage of money.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will give the House the benefit of the Premier's statement to show the bearing it has on the financial position.

Mr. Munsie: The Premier does not like it.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier, in 1912, said—

The arguments used by the Minister who introduced this Bill do not find much favour with me. The Minister said that the expenditure would be limited; I think if the members sit on the board and receive only a guinea a day, the expenses will be limited, but I think the remuneration fixed is not adequate, if we are to have such a committee.

In the Bill before the House the Premier adds to the functions of the committee. He wants to refer to the committee all sorts of inquiries where he wants inquiries made in connection with Government departments, after a resolution of the House has been secured. In 1912 he said a guinea per day was not sufficient for a committee doing all this extra work. Now the Premier brings down a Bill which will take the control of government out of the hands of Ministers and does not want to pay the committee for the work they do.

Mr. Latham: They have their £100 a year extra.

Mr. McCALLUM: That does not matter. It does not make any difference whatever. The Premier proposes to heap this extra work upon this committee but does not intend to pay them anything for it. He went on to say—

The Minister says that the experience of the past convinced the Government that this Public Works Committee was necessary; if it is necessary he should have produced stronger arguments in favour of the Bill; he should have provided also for a much bigger fee for those who are to give up their time to this work.

A much bigger fee! That did not suit the Premier with the limited work the committee were to do then. But the Premier now wants to extend the labours and he asks the committee to do the work for nothing! If the sponsors of this Bill are right in saying that the work should be done by members, every member of the committee will be a busier man than any of the Ministers and will have far more to do than the Premier himself. Members of the committee will find their time almost fully occupied and they will have no time to give to their own affairs. Yet, in spite of this, the Premier says he is not prepared to pay them anything. In 1912 the Premier went on to say—

It is true that if the Ministry have to refer all works of an important character to the Public Works Committee, the Ministry may be prevented from bringing their measures down to Parliament, or prevented from putting their ideas into operation.

What has become of the ideas held by the Minister then? He said it would prevent the Minister giving effect to his own ideas. Does he hold that opinion now? Is he bringing this Bill down to prevent himself from giving effect to his own ideas or has he changed his opinion since then? Members of the Labour Party are not the will-o'-wisp that members opposite are, for the latter are prepared to support a Bill introduced by their own Government, notwithstanding that they opposed a similar measure when it was introduced by a Labour Government. Perhaps another quotation from the Premier's remarks in 1912 will provide the crux of the situation. I merely wish to remind the House that, if there is any party in politics who stand for principle and are not here to play the game of in to-day and out to-morrow, but who are here to give effect to definite principles, they are the Labour Party. We stand to-day as we stood in 1911 supporting this Bill, and we will help to get the measure through. But I want to remind hon. members sitting behind the Government where they stand to-day and where they stood in 1912. Perhaps this quotation from the Premier's speech in 1912 will provide the real reason for the introduction of the Bill—

I realise that the Bill will absolve the Ministry of responsibility; it will make it impossible for outside influence to be brought to bear on the Ministers to any great extent. I am well aware, of course,

that "Premier" McCallum will not have the influence that he has to-day and I am aware that Ministers will be glad indeed to be relieved of pressure from outside, and will be glad to exercise, through this committee, an absolutely free hand. • I am going to oppose the Bill because I think it is unnecessary.

Perhaps that is the reason for the introduction of the Bill.

The Premier: You are removed now, you see.

Mr. Munsie: It is Premier Monger now.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, instead of the Trades Hall it is St. George's-terrace

The Premier: You have been promoted, you know.

Mr. McCALLUM: Does the Premier hold to-day the views which he held when he made that speech? Does this account for the introduction of the Bill, that the Premier is anxious to get away from outside influence, secret juntas, the caucus of the Terrace and the executive he is called upon to attend in order to get his instructions, and the conference he consults before he consults this House? Is this the influence the Premier spoke of in 1912 and from which he wishes to escape now? Is this the real reason for the introduction of the Bill?

The Premier: I wish you would stick to facts. I am never invited to any meeting to receive instructions from anyone.

Mr. McCALLUM: We have read in the official journal of the party what has happened, and we have had it quoted in this House time after time that the Executive committee "for the Minister's information have sent him along a copy of the Bill."

Mr. O'Loughlen: What about the conference over the Lunacy commission?

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no doubt about the guiding hand being St. George's-terrace. Perhaps, after all, if that outside pressure is being brought to bear, if there is someone outside Parliament who is shaping the legislation of the country, or if someone set in Emanuel Buildings is dictating the policy of the Government, it is perhaps well to have a committee of members who will take control from Ministers. If Ministers are not strong enough to stand up against this influence, if they are compelled to bow the knee to these outside juntas, it will be well to take the power from them and give it to a committee.

Hon. P. Collier: The only way we can circumvent them.

Mr. McCALLUM: If only to relieve the Premier from this outside influence, to protect the Premier from Mr. Monger and to save the Premier from the pressure to which he referred in 1912, I will support the Bill and help him to pass the second reading.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [6.5]: I support the Bill, not for the reasons given by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum), but chiefly because of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition

and the member for Forrest (Mr. O'Loughlen).

Mr. Munsie: The funny thing is you did not think of that when it was introduced before.

Mr. A. THOMSON: Perhaps I was not in the House at that time.

Hon. P. Collier: Fortunately for you.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I favour the Bill, because it will accomplish a certain amount of good. It was gratifying to hear the statement of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Forrest that the finances of the State require a watch dog. I do not know whether the Government are anxious that the functions of this committee should develop into making that body a watch dog over the expenditure. The Bill states distinctly that the duty of the committee will be to investigate works involving an estimated expenditure of £20,000. From that it does not seem to be the intention of the Government to have the whole of the departments and their administration inquired into.

Mr. Munsie: That refers to new works. Under this Bill the Minister can refer any matter to the committee.

Mr. A. THOMSON: But the consent of the House must first be secured. It was gratifying to hear the Leader of the Opposition state that the appointment of such a committee would be of very great assistance in connection with the finances, because once a Minister introduces his Estimates he stands to them.

Hon. P. Collier: That is how you came to be stranded the other night.

Mr. A. THOMSON: That is why the hon. member did not support me as I had expected he would do after his speech in support of economy.

Hon. P. Collier: I preferred the Minister.

Mr. A. THOMSON: No doubt. I believe that the committee will be able to accomplish an enormous amount of good. I doubt whether the remuneration they are to receive will compensate them for the time they will be expected to devote to the work, and I feel inclined to agree with the member for South Fremantle that the duties which will devolve upon the committee will be greater than those of Ministers. I do not suggest that the committee should receive extraordinary fees, but if we expect to get adequate service from them, we must pay them more than is suggested in this Bill. It is not reasonable to expect members to devote the whole of their time to going through the various Bills and works and making inspections for the small remuneration indicated.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no remuneration indicated.

Mr. A. THOMSON: Yes, there is.

Mr. Mann: Expenses only.

Mr. A. THOMSON: That is the remuneration. The committee are to be permitted to overhaul the whole of the finances of the State, to analyse the statements put forward by engineers and those responsible for framing public works proposals, weigh the evidence, and advise the House whether certain

works should be carried out. Doubtless, in nine cases out of ten the recommendations of the committee will carry great weight with this House and will be the determining factor when the House proceeds to vote. I think greater remuneration should be specified in the Bill. The member for Forrest stated that the measure would give members an opportunity to inquire into the administration of the Railway Department. We recognise that the Railway Department is one of the greatest spending departments. The hon. member also stated that members were not in a position to dissect the Estimates. He objected to the motion I moved the other night and characterised it as a rule of thumb. I do not know whether the committee, after inquiring into the administration of the Railway Department, would be able to override the Commissioner of Railways.

The Premier: No; they would report to the House.

Mr. A. THOMSON: We have vested the railways in the Commissioner. Outside of matters of policy, the whole of the control of the railways is in the hands of the Commissioner, and the committee would not be able to override him in that respect.

The Premier: You are wrong.

Mr. A. THOMSON: We have a Commissioner who is paid £2,000 a year, and who should be able to administer the affairs of the department. The member for Geraldton (Mr. Willecock) said he would not be in favour of putting the administration of the finances into the hands of the committee. If the committee could give us better results than we have had in the last five or six years and could square the ledger, I would be inclined to support a proposal to give them control of the finances. We have been told that one of the functions of the committee would be to consider the question of drainage in the South-West. It seems that great power will be vested in the committee if they are to be the deciding factor as to the system of drainage to be adopted. The committee should be able to analyse a scheme submitted by the engineers, but I have in view one of the blunders of the department, namely the Torbay drainage scheme.

Hon. P. Collier: Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been squandered in this country through incompetent engineers.

The Minister for Works: That is correct.

Mr. Latham: Will the appointment of the committee avoid that?

Hon. P. Collier: It will tend that way.

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

Mr. A. THOMSON: Before tea I was dealing with remarks made by the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willecock) as to the proposed committee having within its purview questions of water supply. Members have been discussing various existing public works with regard to which the Leader of the Opposition has stated that probably many thousands of

pounds would have been saved had this committee existed at the time of their being proposed and constructed. I am constrained to mention one serious blunder of the Public Works Department, a drainage scheme with regard to which the departmental officers claim that it is an absolute success, and with regard to which the settlers concerned declare that it is an absolute success from a damming point of view, because its construction has resulted in the flooding of numerous blocks which formerly were free from water. The House might direct the proposed committee to inquire into such cases as this. I believe that the committee will have a deal of work to do, and I believe that it will do excellent work for the State provided it is given a little more encouragement than the Bill, as it now stands, proposes. Certainly the corresponding committee appointed by the Commonwealth Parliament has done excellent work. Unfortunately it is a fact that considerable sums of money have been wasted by inefficient Commonwealth officers. To me it seems strange that the Commonwealth committee should be able to go over engineering works and point out serious mistakes made by the engineers. The chairman of that committee has informed me that some of the blunders discovered are of an appalling nature. Probably errors of similar magnitude have been committed in this State, involving Western Australia in serious loss. For example, there is the dock at Fremantle, to which reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition. If I were not in favour of the principle of the Bill, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Forrest would determine me to support the measure. In any case, as the appointment of the committee seems likely to result in this House obtaining a little more control of the finances and securing more economical administration, I whole-heartedly support the second reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam—in reply) [7.35]: There are only a few words I desire to say in reply, but I feel that I must briefly explain why since 1912 my views on this subject have changed somewhat. At that time we had not the experience which we have to-day. Nine years have elapsed since then, and I have had, in particular, the benefit of the experience of Mr. Gregory, one of my old colleagues, who has served on the corresponding committee appointed by the Federal Parliament. Mr. Gregory has convinced me that the legislation in question has resulted in considerable good, has saved a great deal of money, and means more efficient work, and the carrying out only of works that are necessary, and thus the preventing of the construction of works that are unnecessary. Apart from that aspect, any man can go before the Federal committee and give evidence in support of his views regarding any work. A good point about the method of inquiry proposed by this Bill is that any man will be able to go be-

fore the committee and tender his evidence. That cannot be done in the case of a Minister.

Mr. Lutey: You are satisfied now that the Labour Party were right in 1912, and that you were wrong then?

The PREMIER: I do not mind saying that I am satisfied the House will now be right in passing this Bill. Ministerial offices are not equipped for the purpose of taking evidence. Let me point out also that the committee's inquiries will apply only to public works costing £20,000 or more, and to such activities as the railways, the control of which is, by Act of Parliament, vested in commissioners, or away from Ministers. It is not intended that the proposed committee should be asked or authorised to inquire into the work of the ordinary departments. As regards the Railway Department, the House is aware that the Commissioner of Railways has control of all officers paid up to £400 per annum. We know also that the Commissioner has certain other considerable powers. Further, we are aware that to-day it is contended that railway freights on stock are too high, with the result that stock, instead of being shipped over the railways, are travelled by road. Again, we know that a great many of our people are users of the railways; and they should have the opportunity of going before a committee such as proposed by the Bill, for the purpose of stating any grievances they may have. It is quite true that in connection with the carrying out of public works engineers have made blunders. The best of men can do that. Undoubtedly an engineer should always be very careful. It falls to engineers largely to design works, but it does not always fall to them to carry out those works. An engineer may be a very excellent designer, but when it comes to carrying out the work designed there may be a different tale to tell. Since in connection with the vast undertakings of a water supply for Perth and water supplies for other centres throughout the State, huge expenditure will be involved, it is well that the people mainly concerned, the people who will have to pay for the works when constructed, should be given the right to go before some body such as this committee to discuss matters concerning them so vitally. I do not wish the House to be under the impression for one moment that it is intended that the proposed committee should go into the various departments and determine what is to be done there. It is for Ministers to take the responsibility of that. As regards paying fees to members of the committee, it seems to be the general wish of the House that fees should be paid. I admit that in every other State which has this legislation it is the practice to pay fees. As I do not desire that any private member should be under the necessity of bringing down the amendment which is required, I am getting an amendment drafted on the lines suggested.

Hon. P. Collier: As a fact, it is not competent for a private member, under the Stand-

ing Orders, to move such an amendment. It must be done by a Minister.

The PREMIER: I am referring to what is apparently the general wish of the House. I will have the necessary amendment drafted, as well as such other amendments as may be necessary in order to prevent the activities of the committee from being extended to other matters than those I have mentioned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Message.

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

## BILL—DREDGING LICENSE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.43]: This is apparently a harmless little Bill, similar to one which was introduced into and passed through this House in 1916. I do not know why it should be so, but it does seem to me that the present session is being devoted mainly to granting exclusive licenses or exclusive rights to individuals, corporations, and companies. We have a Bill conferring certain rights and privileges on architects, and similar measures relating to land agents, auctioneers, and nurses. Then there is a Bill conferring special privileges upon a grain elevator company.

Mr. Wilcock: And there is the Wheat Marketing Bill.

The Premier: We want to set up industries.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but with the safeguard that the industry is going to have free play, and is not going to suffer from monopolistic power such as there seems to be an inclination to confer upon various quarters during this session of Parliament. Now, the present Bill proposes to grant an exclusive right to dredge for shell over an area of 65 acres in the Perth waters for a period of 21 years. Before the House agrees to the passing of the measure, we should be in possession of much more information regarding what is proposed to be done. All the information we have been given so far is that it is proposed to confer this exclusive privilege upon one man, Mr. Moss.

The Premier: To burn lime.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And to manufacture cement, probably. The Bill says that, although the Premier did not refer to it in his second reading speech. I think the House should know whether this exclusive right is to be conferred upon Mr. Moss as an individual, or as the representative of a company. We should have further information in that regard. Is Mr. Moss acting for himself, a syndicate, a company, or any financial institution which may later on acquire the

right which this Parliament might confer upon him? We should have information on all these points; we should know exactly what is the capital proposed to be expended. Although the Bill provides for an expenditure of £2,000 within the first six months and an additional £3,000 within the next six months, we should know whether that is the total capital that is to be invested in the business. If it is so, it falls far short of the amount considered necessary when the exclusive right was granted to Mr. Scott in 1916. At that time the capital expenditure was to be £20,000, and if it required £20,000 on the part of Mr. Scott to satisfactorily establish his business, it seems rather difficult to understand why Mr. Moss is able to do it with an expenditure of £5,000. It appears to me that the Bill does not sufficiently safeguard the public interests. Whilst I would not for a moment stand in the way of the establishment of secondary industries in this State—we have all realised the necessity for providing employment in that direction and providing for our own requirements at the same time—where it is proposed that Parliament should confer a special and exclusive right upon any individual, we cannot be too careful in seeing that the rights of the people are adequately protected. I should like to know whether Mr. Moss proposes to erect these works and carry them on, or whether he proposes to do what so often happens when a man obtains from Parliament monopolistic rights and special privileges. It happens in many cases that without expending one penny upon the rights so conferred, the individual immediately proceeds to hawk the right which has a cash value, either by way of the formation of a company or the disposal to someone else. There is provision in the Bill that with the approval of the Governor-in-Council the right may be transferred to any other body or company. Will the Premier say whether the licensee under the Bill proposes to go ahead himself with the erection of these works? We should be assured of that. Even if we know that, then I say any right or license to any person to a certain area of the Perth water should at least conserve the public interests to the extent that the Government should not be excluded from that area if at any time it was found necessary to enter upon it.

The Premier: That is provided for.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not.

The Premier: Read Subclause 10 of Clause 2.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That says, "That the rights shall be reserved to the Crown to raise shell or silt from the said areas so far as required for public purposes." There is that limit upon it. There should be no limit whatever in any privilege granted to any individual upon the right of the Crown to enter and take shell or any other deposit from that area. The State, it seems to me, should have some say when it confers a special privilege upon an individual, in the price at which the commodity shall be disposed of to the

public. When the special concession was granted to the people who control the Lake Clifton lime deposit, it was laid down in the Bill, or it was made a condition of the agreement, that lime should be supplied to the farmers at a certain price; I think it was 12s.

Mr. Mann: It was 6s.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I understand that the company have not complied with that condition.

Mr. Mann: It was found that the lime was not suitable.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We see what need there is for the House to be careful. The House at that time was influenced to a considerable extent in granting the concession because members were under the belief that a necessary commodity was going to be delivered to the farmers at a low price. Now we find that hon. members are in possession of knowledge which at that time was not available. I do not know how the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) allowed such a joke to be played on hon. members. It was probably an oversight on his part when he allowed us to be misled into the belief that the lime produced at Lake Clifton would be suitable for farming purposes.

The Minister for Works: Is it not?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for Perth says it is not.

Mr. Mann: They are not able to dry it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It would appear that the company had no desire to make lime available. They could produce lime that would be suitable for farming purposes, but they have no desire to do so.

The Premier: The difficulty is that they cannot dry it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The suggestion is that it could be dried if the company so desired, but they have found that it would be too costly, and they cannot supply it at the price they originally stipulated.

The Minister for Works: It must be dried by sun and wind.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We have both sun and wind in that estimable portion of the State represented by the hon. member, and rain occasionally as well. I do not know that we would be justified in granting the exclusive right set out in the Bill before us. I would hesitate to disfigure a portion of our foreshore by the erection of buildings for manufacturing purposes. The Bill proposes to allow the licensee to erect the necessary works on the foreshore on the site selected by himself. I would not agree to any proposal of that kind. Mr. Moss may purchase a site anywhere along the foreshore and without reference to the Government of the day or to anybody else proceed to erect unsightly buildings, the work in which might result in the pollution of the river to a considerable extent. At any rate before any such exclusive right or license is granted, the site for the erection of the building on the foreshore should be submitted to the Governor-in-Council for approval.



**The Premier:** A man who owns a block of land can do what he likes with it.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** That is so, but we could make it a condition of the granting of this license that the licensee should submit the site for the approval of the Governor-in-Council. It is not right that we should allow any site to be selected. We know of course that a person who owns land running to the foreshore can do anything he likes with it; but that is a matter over which we have no control.

**Mr. Willcock:** So long as a public nuisance does not arise. This might become a public nuisance.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** We could make it a condition of the granting of the license that the site should be approved by the Governor-in-Council. I should like to make sure that any building erected for this purpose should be erected some distance from the water's edge. I do not want to see a condition of things spring up along our beautiful river front similar to what exists in some of the Eastern States.

**The Premier:** Subclause 6 of Clause 2 provides against that.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** I am afraid it does not. Subclause 6 reads—

That the buildings and plant for the treatment and conversion of the shell and silt into lime and cement shall be erected on the foreshore, on the site to be provided by the licensee.

**The Premier:** Now read Subclause 6.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** That reads:—

That the licensee shall not permit any accumulation or deposit, except with the approval of the Minister for Lands, of shell or silt upon the foreshore, and shall not damage or disfigure the foreshore, or by his operations pollute the river otherwise than with silt.

I do not think it could be contended in a court that the erection of necessary buildings would damage or disfigure the foreshore. The House can grant the license subject to any condition it likes to impose, and for my part we should be sure that we do not permit, so far as it is possible to prevent it, the erection of unsightly buildings, or works which might tend to pollute the river.

**Mr. Mann:** Which would you call unsightly, the buildings or the machinery?

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** The buildings. The machinery will be covered by the necessary buildings. And then, too, I think we should conserve the rights of the local governing bodies whose boundaries run down to the river. A considerable portion of the foreshore of South Perth has been reclaimed with, and excellent roads and footpaths constructed of, the shell dredged from the river; and if we are to afford to some person an exclusive right to the shell, possibly we shall be depriving the municipality of South Perth, and other local governing bodies, of the opportunity to obtain this very excellent material for road-making.

**Mr. Mann:** Only a very small area of the deposit is involved.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** Yes, 65 acres, in the most economical spot. One can rest assured that when a man applies for an exclusive right to an area, he has carefully selected that portion of the river where the shell is most plentiful and can be most cheaply obtained.

**Mr. Johnston:** How will you confine his dredges to that area of 65 acres?

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** That should be easy enough. The area will be surveyed and marked off, and there should be no difficulty about confining his operations to that area. But the question is whether the House ought to confer this exclusive right. It is proposed that 20,000 tons of shell per annum shall be taken from the river; at least the licensee will pay a royalty of 3d. per ton on a minimum tonnage of 20,000 tons per annum, so we may reasonably assume that he proposes to take that quantity each year. But I am not sure that any license of this kind will not interfere with the rights of the public who use that river for any purpose whatever. We cannot be too careful before allowing dredges and machinery to be planted right in the water-way and works erected on the foreshore; we cannot be too careful in safeguarding the rights of the public. Then there is the question of reclamation by the Government. Part of this proposed exclusive license lies above the Causeway, one part below and another above, the filter beds.

**Mr. Mann:** An area of 65 acres would not reach that far.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** But the plan shows that it starts below the Causeway and that there are two areas above the Causeway, one being below the filter beds and the other above the filter beds. That is the portion of the river in greatest need of reclamation. In the years to come some Government will have to carry out a great deal of dredging in that part of the river. It is from that locality our mosquito troubles chiefly arise. The only way to solve the difficulty of the mosquitoes is to narrow and deepen the channel and so increase the flow of the water. That can only be done by extensive reclamation works.

**Mr. Mann:** But if 20,000 tons of material be removed each year it must serve to deepen the channel.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** It may not be taken from the channel, it may be taken from alongside the channel. In any case it will not go towards reclaiming the foreshore and filling up the marshy lands which are the breeding grounds for mosquitoes, but will go into the works for the manufacture of lime and cement. In point of fact, if the channel be deepened to that extent, then later on, when the Government have to reclaim the foreshore, the cost will be largely increased in consequence of the premature deepening of the channel.

Mr. Mann: But if the channel be deepened and widened by this proposed dredging, the reclamation will not be so necessary.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course it will. I am surprised at the hon. member. So long as those marshy swamps remain along the river side, so long will they be a breeding ground for mosquitoes, no matter how much the river itself may be deepened. I am sorry that successive Governments have not been able to reclaim that area in bygone years. I know of no more beautiful drive than that which could be extended from the Esplanade away up past the Causeway and on as far as the railway bridge. Such a drive would greatly beautify that portion of East Perth which is at present an eyesore and a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Parliament has had some experience of granting these special licenses, these monopolistic rights to persons over a long period of years. Although the State is supposed to be safeguarded in the agreement drawn up in pursuance of the passage of the Bill, the concessionaire generally manages to discover in the agreement a loophole which enables him to do precisely that which Parliament never intended that he should do. Frequently has that been the experience of Parliament. And so I say we ought not to pass the Bill without being supplied with the fullest possible information. I should like to know whether Mr. Moss is in any way associated with the company now manufacturing cement in the State, whether he is not himself a shareholder in that company, whether this proposed new company is to be a subsidiary company, or whether it is proposed to set up in direct competition with the company now manufacturing cement. That is information which the House ought to have. We do not want to find ourselves in this position in the course of a year or two: that the company now manufacturing cement have not directly approached the House for this exclusive license because they fear that Parliament, having experience of concessions granted to the company at Lake Clifton, would not agree to the passage of such a Bill, and that Mr. Moss is merely put up as a person apparently having no association whatever with the cement company but, having acquired the exclusive right to the concession, merely disposes of it later on to this particular company, who thus secure the essential license. I should like to know whether there is a genuine desire on the part of Mr. Moss to give the consuming public the benefits of a keen competition and rivalry in the manufacture and sale of cement with the company now operating at Belmont. If I know Mr. Moss very well, there will not be so much competition. He is not going to set up in competition with this company, although we know it is the creed and policy of Mr. Moss and those who think with him to believe in the inexorable law of supply and demand. That is their policy, so they say. No special rights, but competition so that the law of supply and demand may have full and free

play. I am afraid the law of supply and demand is occasionally repealed. I am reminded of a candidate standing for Parliament four years ago and speaking from a lorry in Hannan-street, Kalgoorlie. He was asked about the high prices obtaining in certain directions. He said, "Oh well, that will be all regulated by the law of supply and demand." The questioner asked him, "How is it that the law of supply and demand did not regulate it two years ago?" Prompt came his answer, "It was only last year that Mr. Hughes passed the law of supply and demand." I should like to know whether Mr. Moss is going to give us the benefit of the law of supply and demand, and whether he is desirous of establishing these works with a view of undercutting or underselling the company now operating in Belmont and at Lake Clifton.

Mr. Pickering: Do you know what that company has spent in machinery?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No.

Mr. Pickering: About a quarter of a million.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that the original capital consisted of 50,000 shares at £1 each, whereas Mr. Moss is to get the whole business established for £5,000. Is it merely to supply to this cement company some essential of which they are short?

The Premier: No.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The gentleman who applied for this concession in 1916 undertook to expend no less a sum than £20,000 in the establishment of these works, and I am doubtful if the present applicant for the license will succeed in getting the works going for the comparatively small sum of £5,000.

The Premier: That is the minimum. He must spend that amount.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And the minimum will become the maximum; because, if he anticipated spending more than £5,000 he would readily agree to putting it in the Bill as a special inducement for the passage of the measure. The amount inserted in the Bill as the lowest to be spent is, I suggest, the greatest that will be spent. Mr. Moss is a very shrewd gentleman.

The Premier: He has spent plenty of money in this country.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Not half so much as he has made in this country. It is true he has spent money in this country, but this country has been very good to Mr. Moss, and the money he has spent he has made in it, and a good deal more. I remember the days when, in Kalgoorlie, he was not in a very flourishing condition, when he was carrying on in a small way with a public crushing plant. However, good luck to him. He has been an enterprising citizen.

Mr. Teesdale: And he has stopped here.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because it has paid him to stop here. He has not succeeded in discovering any other part of the world where he could do half so well.

Mr. Angelo: He has not been a rolling-stone.

Mr. Heron: But he has gathered some moss.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not know that it is any great virtue for a man to remain in a country which has enabled him to make £150,000 in 10 or 12 years. I myself should be content to remain here for the rest of my life if I could be assured of making that sum in twice the number of years.

The Premier: You are thinking of Mr. Frank Moss. This is a brother.

Hon. P. COLLIER: A brother, and they are partners in business. I have rather more confidence in Mr. Frank Moss than in the other Mr. Moss. It makes me a little more critical.

Mr. Munsie: And a little more suspicious.

Hon. P. COLLIER: A little more sceptical as to the public benefit it is proposed to confer by the exclusive right contained in the Bill. I am going to oppose these monopolistic rights for 21 years.

The Premier: You oppose all these licenses in connection with the river.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We are giving away sites at Fremantle for grain elevators on long leases. There is this lease on the Swan River, and the next proposal may be to lease King's Park for grazing purposes for 21 years! The result will be that the public in the city will soon be confined to the highways and byways for their recreation grounds.

The Premier: Surely it is possible that great good may come to the State out of the establishment of another industry.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Premier has given no indication as to what that good may be, or as to what the expenditure on the works may be, or as to the number of men who may be employed in the concern. He has given no information at all except to say, "Here is a Bill which is to confer a special and exclusive right upon Mr. Moss for 21 years, to give him 65 acres of the river, the royalty to be 3d. per ton. Now pass the Bill."

The Premier: Twenty thousand tons has to be raised annually.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How is the Premier to keep a check upon the tonnage raised? I think a quarterly statement has to be put in as to the tonnage raised. I would prefer to make a rough estimate of the quantity that would be raised each year, based on 3d. a ton royalty, and upon that estimate fix the annual sum that has to be paid to the Government by way of royalty. By that means the Government would gain some advantage. The Bill of 1916 did not propose to give any sole right for any long period, but provided for an annual license. The Bill was amended in another place to give the sole right to get this shell. One can always depend upon another place to make some amendment to confer the exclusive right upon some person, so that he may be sure of making money out of it. That was not the case in this House. We were content to say that the license should be renewed annually. In this proposal we should reserve that right too. Under the Bill as it stands Mr. Moss may do as he likes for 21 years so long as he does not pollute the river.

Apparently silt is not detrimental to the beauty of the river.

The Premier: There are dredges working every day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Not to the extent that would be done under this Bill. Furthermore, we shall have unsightly works dumped down on the foreshore, and we shall have material taken away from the river which would be required by the Government for reclamation and for other purposes, for the paltry sum of £350 a year.

The Premier: And for an industry.

Mr. Latham: And for the farmer.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The farmer has been the dupe of this country. There is no guarantee in the Bill that lime will be produced at all. The licensee may confine himself to the manufacture of cement.

The Premier: That would be splendid.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Where would the farmer be without his lime?

The Premier: There is plenty of other lime.

Mr. Munsie: Give some other person an exclusive right somewhere else.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That will be a way out of the difficulty, so that the farmer might eventually obtain the lime which is so essential to his land.

The Premier: At the south end of the Boulder we are going to give an exclusive right to mine for gold, if we get the chance.

Hon. P. COLLIER: A man who gets that exclusive right will not be able to dispose of it unless he puts up a large amount of capital, or employs a large amount of labour in order to develop the ground. In the case under review there is nothing to prevent Mr. Moss from immediately handing the whole thing over to someone else, with the consent of the Government, a week after the lease is granted. I propose to endeavour to amend the Bill in Committee in order to protect the public interests. I object to the 21 years' lease. I want to protect the interests of the Government, so that they may obtain material from the area concerned at any time and for any purpose. I want to protect the interests of the South Perth Municipal Council and the Belmont Road Board, or any other local governing body which may require material for road or footpath making within their boundaries. I also want to protect the interests of the public who use the river for recreation or health purposes, so that dredges may not be operating in the fairways and interfering with people who desire to make use of the river. Subject to these safeguards we might perhaps agree to grant the lease, but not in the form as provided in the Bill. We should not permit any individual to dump down on the foreshore unsightly buildings upon any site selected by himself.

The Premier: Provided by himself, not selected.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is the same thing. There is no clear and specific power in the Bill to enable the Government to select or approve the site upon which the buildings are to be erected. It will be entirely in the hands

of Mr. Moss. At any rate it will not be many years before the river will be covered with unsightly smoking factories and other works, to the general detriment of the beauty and surroundings of the place.

The Minister for Works: I do not think there is very much nuisance at Belmont.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Belmont and East Perth seem to be the dumping grounds for every kind of nuisance. One of the Government engineers selected East Perth as the site for the septic tank. That suburb seems to be looked upon as the right place to dump down any nuisance that comes along.

The Minister for Works: It is the healthiest part of Perth.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister would not desire to have any property there if he wanted to realise upon it, for property has depreciated very much because of the surroundings that have grown up in the suburb. There are many sites available away from the foreshore of the river. We should endeavour to confine these factories, workshops, and secondary industries to parts away from the city, and should not repeat the mistakes which have been made in the older capitals of the Eastern States. Subject to these safeguards and to the Premier being able to give us more information about the matter, the Bill might be considered, but I hope it will not be passed in its present form.

Mr. RICHARDSON (Subiaco) [8.25]: When the second reading of this Bill was moved I felt somewhat concerned in the matter. I have in my electorate some two or three miles of river frontage. Knowing that this proposal might be conducive to spoiling the river, I made full inquiries. It is our duty to preserve for coming generations the present attractions of the river. I made due inquiries, however, and to-night I unhesitatingly support the second reading of the Bill. I am rather disappointed with the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Ever since Parliament has been open we have been told that we should do what we could to assist primary and secondary industries. Immediately an opportunity comes along certain members, because some person is likely to make a little out of the project, oppose it. If this grant is made to Mr. Moss it will not necessarily be a monopoly. Certain reservations are made in the Bill to do away with any possibility of a monopoly. One provision distinctly states that the Government are free to enter into the area, and take all necessary shell or silt that is required for public purposes. It must appeal to every member who recently went through the South-West, that much of the country we saw requires more than brains and muscle to develop, and that its chief requirement is lime. The greater part of the heavy land in the South-West is known to be sour, and nothing will bring that land more quickly into production than lime. In the river we have exactly the material that is being looked for, in the shape of oyster shells which can be made into lime. The peculiarity about this

class of lime is that when treated it is rendered into powdered form, and the farmer can use it economically. Furthermore, it is 30 per cent. better than any other class of lime.

Mr. Munsie: What is it going to cost the farmer for shell lime? Will it not cost more than other lime?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Possibly Mr. Moss will have to compete with other lime burners in this respect, but it will certainly not be a monopoly. Experts who from time to time have investigated the river beds have said that the river is teeming with oyster shell. A gentleman named Scott was actually granted a license to remove about one million tons of oyster shell from the Canning River. That work has never been proceeded with.

Mr. Clydesdale: Some of it was of very inferior quality.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Scott was prepared to take it at the time, and if there is that quantity available in the Canning River, we are quite justified in granting this particular license to Mr. Moss. The area proposed to be given is 65 acres, and it is situated between Burswood and the Causeway and Barrack-street and Coope-street. We are informed that there is sufficient oyster shell near Coope-street to provide for public requirements for the next 50 years. It will not be necessary, therefore, for the Government to go into Mr. Moss's area for some considerable time. Because of that fact, it is hardly necessary to bother about public utilities for the present.

Mr. Clydesdale: That is very doubtful.

Mr. Pickering: In any case, 50 years is a very short period.

Mr. RICHARDSON: While it is claimed that we are giving a monopoly to Mr. Moss, the same objection might be raised regarding the leasing of any land. There are no reservations made regarding the leasing of land, and if the House is satisfied that this is a fair proposition, members should look upon it in the same light as the granting of a lease to any person to remove timber from land. I am in favour of the reservation provided in the Bill, because we are not certain what our requirements may be within the next 25 years. We do not know how the State will develop, nor do we know how the population will increase. Immediately consideration is given to the leasing of a portion of the river, it is thrown up against Parliament that a monopoly is being granted. Why should not the same argument apply to the man who desires a lease of some land?

Mr. Lutey: That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. Clydesdale: The public do not want to use private land.

Hon. P. Collier: It is the universal practice to reserve waterways all over the world.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Leader of the Opposition has compared the Lake Clifton proposition with that contemplated by Mr. Moss. There is one salient feature that the

hon. member has not inquired into. These cement works were started with the object of supplying not only the requirements of Western Australia, but of other countries as well. The works are capitalised so that when the requirements of the State are fulfilled, cement can be exported. Mr. Moss's venture is clearly laid down, and he will make lime and cement. The first consideration in his mind is the making of lime.

Mr. Underwood: Can you make lime?

The Premier: Bird-lime?

Mr. RICHARDSON: The member for Pilbara knows more about political bird-lime than I do. Evidently Mr. Moss has set his mind on burning lime for the purpose of selling the product to the farmers, who are looking for supplies of lime for agricultural purposes. As to the expenditure of £5,000 in connection with these works, I have made inquiries to see how far that amount will go. I am given to understand that £5,000 is not a sufficient sum with which to begin these works. I am told that £8,000 is to be spent immediately the lease is granted, and that £8,000 will be spent in Western Australia, because the whole of the machinery can be bought here and the material for the buildings can be produced in Western Australia as well. The question has arisen as to the kind of buildings to be erected. I have had considerable experience in connection with municipal councils and I know that the Municipalities Act provides for all such eventualities. Whatever buildings Mr. Moss desires to erect, he has to get over the local authorities before he can erect them. He has to deal with the local board of health, and in all such matters, particularly where the river is concerned, the local health authorities in Perth are strict and active.

Mr. Clydesdale: The council have no control over the foreshore.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Someone must have control.

Mr. Clydesdale: The Government have that control.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There are no buildings immediately on the foreshore.

Mr. Clydesdale: Yes, there are.

Mr. McCallum: This man says he must erect the buildings on the foreshore.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There is portion of the foreshore reserved by the Government, and no building can be erected on the foreshore without the consent of the Government.

Hon. P. Collier: Under this Bill he can do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is not so.

Mr. McCallum: Read Subclause 5 of Clause 2.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The subclause may provide that the building has to be erected on the foreshore. The Government, however, are in control of the foreshore and no building can be erected there until the consent of the Government is obtained.

Hon. P. Collier: The Government cannot break down an Act of Parliament. If an Act

gives a man that power, the Government cannot interfere.

Mr. RICHARDSON: According to the Leader of the Opposition, if the Bill is passed, Mr. Moss can erect his buildings anywhere along the foreshore between Midland Junction and Fremantle.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, so he can.

Mr. RICHARDSON: The Bill says that Mr. Moss shall provide a site, but how can he do that without the consent of the Government?

Mr. Marshall: The Bill says he shall provide the site.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Unless Mr. Moss gets the consent of the Government, it is an impossible proposition for him, seeing that he will not be able to provide the site. The Leader of the Opposition knows that provision is there.

Hon. P. Collier: I know you are reading into the Bill something which is not there.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am not doing that, but I am reading something out of the Bill which the member for Boulder is attempting to read into it.

Mr. Underwood: The position is described in the schedule.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Mr. Moss has to—

Hon. P. Collier: You have a remarkable knowledge of Mr. Moss's intentions.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have not, and I resent the inference to be drawn from the remark of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: Your whole speech shows a remarkable knowledge of the intentions of Mr. Moss.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have been told by different authorities, not by Mr. Moss, that it will be necessary to spend £8,000.

Hon. P. Collier: You have given the House ten times as much information about Mr. Moss's intentions as the Premier did in introducing the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I told the House I was interested in this matter, because I have a river foreshore to protect. I made various investigations and I discovered that fact at the Public Works Department.

Hon. P. Collier: How does the Public Works Department know that Mr. Moss will spend £8,000?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I did not say that.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, you did.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I said that I had discovered that £5,000 would be insufficient to start with and that it would require £8,000.

Mr. McCallum: Is this Mr. Moss, the President of the National Federation?

Mr. Troy: No, a brother.

Mr. RICHARDSON: According to the Bill, 20,000 tons of shell will be removed from the river each year as a minimum. Apart from the £100 rental, this will bring in some income. There is a very large quantity of shell lying in the river at the present time. Is it intended to allow it to lie there rotting,

when it can be recovered and used in connection with the farms?

Hon. P. Collier: Good old farmers!

Mr. Clydesdale: Would you like to have this work along the foreshore at Subiaco?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have discovered, not from Mr. Moss—

Mr. Marshall: We require that assurance.

Mr. RICHARDSON: It would take a lot of assurance to satisfy the member for Murchison.

Mr. Marshall: You could not do it.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I should be sorry to try to do so. A conference was held at which Mr. Lawson, of the Sewerage Department, Mr. Carlin, of the Public Works Department, Capt. Winzar, of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, and Mr. Morris, the Under Secretary for Lands, were present. Considerable discussion took place as to whether, in view of the proposal now before the House, there would be any pollution of the river or any damage to the foreshore or the river itself. These four gentlemen agreed that, according to the plans laid before them, as embodied in the Bill, there was no possible chance of any such pollution or damage.

Hon. P. Collier: That is all information that should have been given by the Premier in introducing the measure.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I investigated this matter, because I did not think the Premier gave all the information that he should have furnished to the House.

Hon. P. Collier: It is extraordinary for a private member to come along with information to assist in the passage of a measure of this kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I have already stated to the House that I was interested directly in this Bill, and that if I found it would be injurious to the best interests of the river, I would not assist in the passage of the Bill. I am convinced, on the other hand, that the measure will be a useful one, that the works will not pollute the river and that they will employ a considerable number of men.

Mr. Marshall: Can you say how many?

Mr. RICHARDSON: I cannot say how many, but if a company raise 20,000 tons of shell in a year and burn it for lime, if the member for Murchison will think for a few moments, he will see that such work will necessitate the employment of a considerable number of men.

Mr. Marshall: Have you had any experience in connection with dredging?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, I have.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Marshall: How many men are employed in connection with dredging? You have never seen a dredge.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Murchison must keep order.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In conclusion, I trust members will take this aspect into consideration. We are anxious to foster secondary industries—

Hon. P. Collier: Not under any circumstances.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I am pointing out that this is of advantage—

Mr. Marshall: To Mr. Moss.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I hesitate to take any notice of the member for Murchison.

Mr. Munsie: Where is Mr. Moss going to erect the works? You say they are not to be on the foreshore.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Members should not allow a herring to be drawn across the train in this matter. Lime is required in Western Australia to-day. It is very badly needed by the farmers. Here we have the means of supplying cheap lime, for competition will keep the price down to a fair and reasonable figure. I am told that Mr. Moss is an energetic man and that being so, we can expect to see a very fine industry growing up in our midst.

Mr. CLYDESDALE (Canning) [8.45]: I hope members will give very serious consideration to be Bill before passing it. We have previous experience to go upon. I want to refer to the position at Burswood at the present time. What has taken place there? Half a dozen writs are being issued against the company for having destroyed private property. All the flowers in Mr. Newman's nursery are being killed. In all the houses around, doors and windows have to be kept shut to prevent the smoke from the stack ruining pictures, furniture, and everything else.

Mr. Latham: That can easily be overcome.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: It is being overcome by the company buying up the surrounding properties. There are about the local cement some peculiarities necessitating the use of dry coal, with the result that everything within a wide radius is damaged by smoke. Suppose this concession be granted to Mr. Moss and he erects his buildings in South Perth; what will happen? Judging by the experience at Burswood, the surrounding property will be destroyed. There is one benefit to be derived from the works at Burswood, in that I am told they will result in the killing of all the mosquitoes within a mile and a half of Perth. Personally I hope that others besides mosquitoes will be killed in the process. If the Government grant this further concession we can confidently rely on so much increased damage. It is pretty certain that wherever Mr. Moss's works are erected, all the trees and gardens within a mile of the place will be destroyed.

The Minister for Works: Then it is worse than the septic tanks.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Yes, even worse than your old septic tanks. All the trees within a mile of the works are losing their colour and dying off.

Mr. Money: It is an improvement on the septic tanks.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: I do not know about the improvement, but I understand that all the people out that way are leaving their houses, and the company are buying the properties to avoid being sued.

The Minister for Works: How far are these houses from the works?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: A quarter of a mile. Suppose this concession be granted to Mr. Moss and he decides to erect his buildings at Coode-street, right alongside the jetty. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent him from doing so. He can erect them there or anywhere else.

The Minister for Works: The qualification being that he must buy the land.

Mr. CLYDESDALE: Well I do not suppose he will attempt to put them up in the air. It is certain he will not go far from his 40-acre concession, and, as I say, under the Bill he can erect his works alongside the Coode-street jetty. Judging from the experience at Burswood, if the proposed new works are put at Coode-street, there will not be a property worth £10 within a mile of the place. I hope the House will see to it that the nuisance at Burswood is not repeated elsewhere. Again, what is to prevent Mr. Moss from digging down 100 feet, sinking a shaft, on his exclusive area and so making it a dangerous spot for bathers, yachtsmen and others using the river? Moreover, there is nothing in the Bill to prevent Mr. Moss from digging out the whole of the shell within five years, and so precluding the municipality of South Perth from getting shell for their footpaths. At present the municipality require 1,000 tons of shell per annum. It is all very well to say there are millions of tons of the material, but it must be remembered that there are several grades of shell. Plenty of poor stuff is available at all times but there is not much of the higher grade stuff to be had within a reasonable distance. At present the South Perth municipality is paying 5s. 6d. to 6s. per load for the shell. What will be the cost to the council if Mr. Moss uses up all the good shell?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Cannot you get plenty of gravel?

Mr. CLYDESDALE: No, gravel costs 12s. 6d. a load, whereas this shell costs only 6s. I will not say that it is as good as gravel, but certainly it makes very fine footpaths. If Mr. Moss digs a shaft 40 acres in area and 100 feet deep, will that be said to be improving the river? The House should have the fullest information from Mr. Moss or his company before passing the Bill. I hope to see inserted in the Bill a provision under which property holders within a certain distance of the buildings to be erected by Mr. Moss will be at least protected.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [8.52]: It is curious that a large part of this session has been taken up by the Government asking Parliament to grant monopolies, while in nearly every other country on earth Governments are puzzling their brains to devise some means of getting rid of monopolies. Here in a new country, where we should be benefiting by the experience gained elsewhere, we are being asked to grant monopolies in every direction. If Mr. Moss desires

to dredge the river for shell for the manufacture of cement, why should he require a monopoly? Why should he not be content with the mere right to dredge? If, as we are told, there is so much shell available, why should an exclusive concession be required? The argument in support of monopolies always seems to come from those people who preach that competition is the life of all industry.

The Minister for Works: Where in the Bill is it provided that no one else shall dredge?

Mr. McCALLUM: All over the Bill. If this is not to be a monopoly, why the Bill?

Hon. P. Collier: There is nothing else in the Bill. It is for an exclusive license.

Mr. McCALLUM: If it is not intended that the concessionaire shall have a monopoly, the Bill is of no possible use; because the Government, without an Act of Parliament, could give to any man the right to dredge. The Bill is to provide a monopoly, to prevent everybody else from dredging on that particular area.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Well, you could not have two or three dredges working in the same area.

Mr. McCALLUM: Why not? If the job is a good one, and if competition is good, why not let them all come?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: Why not apply that argument to gold mining?

Mr. McCALLUM: Of course, you could not have two men delving in the same mine. But where is the analogy between granting a right over a waterway, over a public thoroughfare, over the reserve of the people, and granting rights over broad acres in the back-blocks? If a suggestion were made to come in and tear up Hay-street for the purpose of mining, the member for North Perth (Mr. MacCallum Smith) would at once want to regulate it. It has been contended that the proposition put up in the interests of Mr. Moss will mean competition with the company already established at Burswood. But how can that be, when we are told that a quarter of a million pounds has been spent on the existing works erected for the production of cement, and we know that all the Bill asks for is the expenditure of £5,000. Yet we are expected to believe that there is to be genuine competition between the two companies! I can imagine how keenly they will compete against each other; how we shall have each of them cutting prices and placarding Hay-street with their commodities for sale!

Hon. P. Collier: Until they both go bankrupt.

Mr. Marshall: Moss will win easily, on the capital expenditure.

Mr. McCALLUM: These men who all the time preach against trade unionism want a monopoly. They declare that trades unionism is against progress, against the development of industry and against the provision of employment. Yet they themselves will not go ahead without a monopoly, will not spend even £5,000 without full assurance. How timid they are! Why are they so afraid to

invest a mere £5,000 in competition with another company operating on a capital of a quarter of a million? If I correctly read the first clause in the Bill, I do not think the proposed new company is called upon to manufacture cement at all. They are given the right to dredge for shell; in fact they have to dredge for shell, but they need not make cement. This man Moss may or may not do it.

Mr. Underwood: If he does not, the other fellow will.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is so. Mr. Moss will bring along a couple of dirty old barges belching black smoke, and he will raise the shell, but the manufacture of cement will be for someone else. How can Mr. Moss do it with a capital of £5,000? In my opinion this is to be merely a company subsidiary to the one at Burswood.

Mr. Underwood: What does it matter?

Hon. P. Collier: It matters this: that the House should have the fullest information about it.

Mr. McCALLUM: In my opinion this is the company operating at Belmont. First they come to Parliament and get certain concessions. Why are they afraid to come and ask for further concessions? Why do they send someone else in their place?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: You are assuming that.

Mr. McCALLUM: No assumption is needed. It is plain from the reading of the Bill what is intended. If the existing company are going to make the cement, why are not they named in the Bill, why do not they come and ask for the concession?

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What grounds have you for saying that?

Mr. McCALLUM: There can be no doubt about it.

The Premier: You are quite wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: Well, I want to know how this man is going to operate on £5,000, since the other company requires a quarter of a million.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: It is all nonsense about the quarter of a million.

Mr. McCALLUM: No it is not. I have been there, and I know what the directors say they have expended. There is nothing in the clause which will compel Mr. Moss to manufacture lime or cement.

The Premier: He must use 20,000 tons of shell per annum.

Mr. McCALLUM: He must pay royalty on 20,000 tons.

The Premier: And use it.

Mr. McCALLUM: And let someone else use it. He can pay the Government the royalty and pass it on to someone else to do the work. It is patent to me that this is a subsidiary proposition to the one operating at Burswood now. Why not let everyone come in?

The Premier: Yes, let them all come.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will help the Premier to do that.

The Premier: And then no one will come. Mr. McCALLUM: Why is the Premier afraid of a little competition? We are told there is an unlimited quantity of shell.

The Premier: So there is.

Mr. McCALLUM: Then why not give a score of men the opportunity?

The Premier: I would do so.

Mr. McCALLUM: Why give this man the exclusive right?

Hon. P. Collier: I might want to start.

The Premier: I will mark off a bit for you.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is about time Parliament called a halt to granting monopolies of this kind. Ever since I have been here, we have been engaged in granting exclusive rights to someone or other. Everyone but the workers can get exclusive rights, and when they ask for some protection the same people are up in arms at once. If the workers ask for a little protection to make their position a little assured, we are told they are asking for something altogether unreasonable, but these people who preach to others that they should not limit competition, and that no country can thrive or prosper without it come here and say, "We cannot possibly go on with the work unless we get a monopoly." Are we going to benefit from the experience of older countries of the world? Are we going to continue to build up monopolies and combines by giving exclusive rights over the resources of this country? Is there to be no limit to this sort of thing? If this State makes any progress in the next 15 or 20 years, anyone who comes here and wants to engage in enterprise will be unable to get a footing.

The Premier: What about gold mining?

Mr. McCALLUM: There is no similarity between gold mining or timber leases and the granting of monopolies for working the waterways of the country. If our industries develop and the State's activities expand, we will not be in a position to permit anyone else to engage in these industries, because of the monopolies which have been granted to others. As one who has taken a keen interest in the preservation of the foreshores of the river around the city, I object to the Bill. On more than one occasion I have engaged in agitation against the erection of buildings on the foreshore. I oppose the proposition that this building be erected on the foreshore. The river and the foreshore constitute the finest asset the city has, and we should conserve it at all costs. I fought against the buildings which now exist on the foreshore. The State Government granted the Commonwealth the right to erect the repatriation buildings.

The Premier: This is near the racecourse; you have not seen the plan.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is on the foreshore, and the right extends to Coode-street. These works, with their dirty, belching, smoking chimneys, may be erected right up to Coode-street. The great bulk of the land is privately held, and the people behind this Bill would have the right to erect buildings up



to Coode-street if they liked to purchase property.

The Premier: I assure you this will be a great country some day.

Mr. McCALLUM: If so, why is the Premier now asking that people should be warned off, while others are given exclusive rights? People who wish to engage in industry here will not be able to get a footing if we go on granting these exclusive rights. There will be no opportunity for others to come in. All the natural rights and good propositions will have been handed over to monopolies. Why does the Premier argue in this way if he thinks the State is going to prosper? If we were going to continue as at present, there might be some force in his argument. The proposal is to shut out further enterprise and to close the channels against all new industry, and to provide that those who are lucky enough to get in now shall be the only ones to engage in this class of work. They are to be immune from competition. What has become of all the arguments about competition being the life of trade? Will the Premier continue to give rights for the erection of factories and smoke stacks on the river frontages surrounding the city?

The Premier: As many as we can get and as much work as we can get.

Mr. McCALLUM: To be provided on the foreshore? It is well that we should know just how far the Premier intends to go. If it is his policy to disfigure the beauty spots of our river—

The Premier: As much work as I can get, and as many factories as I can get.

Mr. McCALLUM: But this measure will have the effect of limiting the number of factories.

The Minister for Works: You do not understand it.

Mr. McCALLUM: I can read English, but I cannot read into the Bill something which is not there. If, as the Minister for Works says, this Bill does not give any exclusive rights, the measure should never have been introduced. The only excuse for introducing it is that it shuts out anyone else from engaging in this industry. The South Perth municipality is not the only local authority interested in this question. Right down the river the different municipalities are interested in the dredging of shell for the making of footpaths. They have looked to the Government in the past for sites to dredge. This Bill provides that the only event in which the Government will permit shell to be taken from these areas is when required for public purposes.

Mr. Money: The rights remain over all the other areas.

Mr. McCALLUM: But it is easy to see that the richest part of the supplies is being handed over to this individual. That is clear from the statement of the member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale). That portion of the river where the big supplies exist is to be handed over. Are the Government going to shut out all the municipalities?

The Premier: There are millions of tons of shell.

Mr. McCALLUM: We have had information from one who should be able to speak with authority—the member for Canning, who is mayor of South Perth—and he says he has been informed by the Works Department that it is very difficult to obtain decent shell, and that this is about the only spot where it can be obtained.

The Minister for Works: That is not correct.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not suppose the member for Canning made that statement without authority. He got the information from the Works Department.

The Minister for Works: I am not sure about that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope the Bill will not be passed. I hope we shall stop this granting of exclusive rights, and that we will put our foot down against creating any more monopolies in this State.

The Premier: Or industries either?

Mr. McCALLUM: Or monopolies, unless the monopolies go to the people. I am opposed to monopolies and no vote of mine will assist to pass a measure giving a monopoly to any individual or company. Monopolies are good things for those who are in them, and I want all the people to be in them, not a handful of men and not one man, who, as is quite evident here, is dummifying for others. I want monopolies for the whole of the people. The principle of monopolies is being opposed by all the countries in the world. The older countries are trying to dissolve them. The Premier is occupying considerable time in asking us to grant monopolies in all directions. He will be sorry for it some day and this House will be sorry for it. Members will live to regret that they passed legislation having the effect of shutting out other people by granting exclusive rights to a few individuals. I am opposed to the Bill entirely; I hope it will be fought clause by clause and that it will not be allowed to go through.

Mr. Teesdale: You would not develop the industry at all.

Mr. McCALLUM: I would, and I would encourage as many men as possible to engage in it.

Mr. Teesdale: No one has been refused.

Mr. McCALLUM: This Bill asks us to refuse every one but Mr. Moss.

Mrs. Cowan: Only in respect to 40 acres.

Mr. McCALLUM: Over an area of 60 odd acres—from Coode-street to the other side of the bridge.

Mr. Underwood: There is nearly 6,000 acres there.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have read a number of works on the harmful effects of monopolies and I will bring the library for the Premier to study if he will only hold up the Bill. I want him to realise how harmful monopolies are.

The Minister for Works: We have had experience in Western Australia of monopolies over employment.

Mr. McCALLUM: I defy the Minister for Works to show where any monopoly has existed in the interests of the workers. In any country where a monopoly has existed, it has proved detrimental to the people as a whole as well as to the workers engaged in the industry. There is not a monopoly on earth which has proved beneficial to the interests of the country where it exists. History proves, conclusively that monopolies have operated detrimentally to the people and to the countries which have granted the monopolies. Yet here we are asked to grant a monopoly at the door of the city and give exclusive rights over material in which the local governing authorities are keenly interested. We are asked to vote away any chance of their operating in this particular area. Instead of encouraging private enterprise, the Government are shutting out private enterprise, warning it off for all time, for they are stipulating that from now forward Mr. Moss and no one else is to have the right to operate there. Mr. Moss is to have the big shell supply. He is to have the best site on the river where the shell can be most economically worked. He is asked to expend £5,000 against someone else's quarter of a million. He is to be given a site right alongside the train and the tramways and the highways, where transport is easy, and no one else can possibly operate on that site.

Mr. Mann: There are plenty of other sites.

Mr. McCALLUM: We know that this is the site where the big supplies exist. I will not allow the Bill to go through without opposition.

Hon. P. Collier: Moss would be sure to select the site where there was the least shell!

Mr. McCALLUM: The name indicates that he is not likely to overlook the best position.

Mr. Mann: Do not judge him by his name.

Mr. McCALLUM: The name indicates the genius of the individual. If the Premier is going to get the Bill through, it will not be without opposition from me. I will oppose it clause by clause and will take every opportunity to do so.

The Minister for Works: Why threaten?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not threatening. I wish to state candidly where I stand.

The Premier: You say that all enterprise and all development—

Mr. McCALLUM: Enterprise! This Bill will strangle enterprise. If the Premier favours enterprise, why does he grant monopolies? Why protect Moss and not allow anyone else to compete with him? Why surround him with a wall and let no one else trespass on this area? If Mr. Moss is a man of grit and is not afraid of competition and is a man of enterprise, why does he want a monopoly? Why does he not invite competition and stand up to his principles?

The Premier: Let it go without all that.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier is cross because hon. members choose to express their opinions. I am opposed to monopolies of all

descriptions being granted to private individuals. This lease is asked for in the name of only one man. It does not require much examination to know who and what are behind it.

The Minister for Works: You said Mr. Moss was a dummy for another company.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes.

The Minister for Works: You had no right to say that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I can only express my own opinion. It is plain enough. I do not think there is any doubt about it. I am expressing my own views.

The Minister for Works: You have no right to say that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have a right to say what I think.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Works can express his opinion later on.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister for Works need not be alarmed. I am not afraid that the views I have expressed are not correct and will not prove to be right later on. If he said what he believed in his heart to be correct, he would agree with me and say that I have spoken the truth.

The Minister for Works: I will say what I think. Don't you worry.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not care whose feelings I hurt or whom I offend or whom I please. I say what I believe to be right.

The Minister for Works: You have no right to say what you did.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have as much right to say what I believe as any other member. Any Bill that comes before the House to grant a monopoly to any individual or private concern will be opposed by me. Let that be understood. I will not agree to the passage of a Bill like this without strenuous opposition. If the Premier thinks he can come along with Bill after Bill, hemming people in with guarantees against opposition, assuring them that Parliament will guarantee that they will have sole rights to do certain things and that no one can interfere with them, no matter how much capital they can put up or how much labour they can employ, and also telling them that they will have absolute protection from everybody else—

The Premier: You assume too much.

Mr. McCALLUM: And that no one else will have the right to go on these areas for 21 years, he is very much mistaken. That is the attitude the Premier adopts and this is what Parliament is asked to agree to.

The Premier: Oh, no!

Mr. McCALLUM: It is a principle which no democratic country would tolerate. He should not ask Parliament in this age to grant such a monopoly.

Mr. Mann: It is a very small area.

Mr. McCALLUM: No other country would pass a Bill like this. Just because we are a young country the Premier seizes the opportunity of granting these monopolies. America with all her developed resources and her experience of monopolies is spending a great amount of money in trying to get rid of such

monopolies. Why is it that people require to be protected against competition?

The Premier: Let it go at that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will not let it go. Why is there any necessity for the Bill?

The Premier: You do not want industries; you want starving people and unemployed.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier wants to say to this man, "I will protect you against any competition." He wants to put a ring round him and say that no one shall trespass upon his preserves for 21 years. Is that the attitude of an enterprising man who wants to see employment created? Is that the attitude of the Government who say they want to see works established and industries developed?

Mr. Mann: There is nothing to prevent any other company from taking the next 65 acres.

Hon. P. Collier: We are referring to this particular 65 acres.

Mr. Mann: It is a very small area.

Mr. McCALLUM: There is nothing to prevent any man from starting a company, and there is nothing to prevent Mr. Moss from going on with the job to-morrow. Why is he asking Parliament for a monopoly?

Mr. Mann: Would you invest capital unless you had some rights?

Mr. McCALLUM: I have no capital to invest. My name is not Moss. I am here to protect the rights of the people from these commercial cormorants who want to stifle trade, prevent enterprise and create monopolies. They want to be protected so that they may be allowed to go on with their business without anyone else being allowed to trespass on their territory. That is what the Government are asking Parliament to grant. No Bill which embodies such principles as these will have my support. I hope the Government will not persist in their attitude of endeavouring to induce Parliament to create more monopolies.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What is the difference between this Bill and the Lake Clifton Bill?

Mr. McCALLUM: I was not here when that passed through Parliament.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Was it a wise thing in the light of subsequent events? The farmers have not had a bag of lime yet from that source.

Mr. Mann: Yes, it was. You can get cement at 21s. a bag to-day.

Mr. McCALLUM: Parliament agrees that a mistake was made when that Bill was passed. Many complaints have been heard to the effect that Parliament was misled, and it is stated that if the facts were before Parliament, that are now known, an alteration would have been made in that Bill. We know what has happened in past history.

Mr. Mann: Would you not rather see a quarter of a million spent on the cement works than have the lime remain in the lake?

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, but that does not alter my opinion against preventing any one

else having the right to compete upon these reserves.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Perth must keep order.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the whole position so far as this Bill is concerned. I want to encourage industry. I mentioned this particular industry when I was electioneering. I referred to the shell in the river and to the possibility of industries being developed as a result of it. I stated clearly my opposition to any monopolistic right being granted to any individual. I have taken the same stand to-night as I have taken on every occasion on these matters. If we pass this legislation, later Parliaments will be sorry for it. The Premier will live to rue the day when he asked Parliament to grant these monopolistic rights to this individual. The history of all countries has shown that no matter how good the intentions at the time may have been when monopolies have been granted, such things have grown up as to be a detriment to the country concerned, and everyone interested in the industry except those immediately and financially concerned has suffered. There is no excuse for giving this control to this man. Any number of people could develop the industry and work in it. I hope the Premier will not endeavour to force this Bill through but will withdraw it, and admit that it is not fitting for Parliament to be asked to protect this individual against competition. Let him stand on his own resources. If he is worthy let him invite competition. Why should he be asking for protection for such a small investment of £5,000? Why should he be afraid that someone else will engage in the industry alongside him, and employ more labour than he can afford to do? I hope the Bill will not pass the second reading, so that we may show the public our attitude on the question of these monopolistic ventures.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Capt. CARTER (Leederville) [9.27]: Like the last speaker I am naturally opposed to monopolies, that form of monopoly about which we have heard so much, that is operating in countries like America and elsewhere to the detriment of society in general, and to the destruction of those ideals for which the hon. member stands and which lie in the heart of every man who is a true socialist. But we are rather begging the question and looking at it from an incorrect angle. We are speaking as if this particular 65 acres was the only area in which shell is found. We are speaking as if the granting of this license were giving away the total sum of our resources in this regard. If this were the only argument used against the Bill it would not carry much weight, but there has been another argument put forward which I think has been manifestly an unfair one. The individual referred to, whom I have never seen, appears to be of a particular faith and this has brought forth one or two remarks

of an unworthy nature as between one speaker and another. For that reason I feel it my duty to look into this question from a common sense point of view and from every conceivable angle. The nationality, religion or wealth of the individual should not enter into the discussion. It should be conducted on sound, common business principles. If these principles are not found in the Bill, then it is our duty to throw it out and not proceed any further with it. So far as my reading of the Bill carries me, I fail to see that the measure grants anybody anything that can be regarded as in the nature of an unfair advantage. Certainly, it is proposed to grant a monopoly over 65 acres of the river bed; but I ask the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) and the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) have they not a monopoly somewhere in this State? Has not each of them a monopoly over the block of land on which his house stands? If they are to be consistent, how far will their argument carry them as regards preventing freehold monopolies of that nature? If we are to be absolutely consistent, we must go the whole hog and cut out freehold and every other kind of monopoly. There is about 20 miles of river bed, and in that river bed—so I am told, I am no authority on the subject—there are millions of tons of shell of more or less value. The member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale) has told us that the shell is of value to him in the paving of the streets and footpaths of South Perth. If the Bill proposed to place in the hands of any individual or company the whole of the shell resources, I would vote against it solidly with every member of the Opposition. But it seems to me that even if this particular monopoly, as it has been termed, should be granted, there would still be plenty of shell available for use by the Government and by municipalities.

Mr. Clydesdale: That is why people are digging six feet deep for the shell now.

Capt. CARTER: That is news to me.

Mr. Clydesdale: I said so when speaking on the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. P. Collier: The millions of tons of reserve of shell are mere supposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Capt. CARTER: From my slight knowledge of the river, though I may say I know it pretty well in most parts, and fairly well from Guildford to Fremantle—

Hon. P. Collier: But you do not know the bed of it.

Capt. CARTER:—there are plenty of places where shell is to be found. In fact, shell seems to be the foundation on which the river runs. If that is so, and if what various members have told us regarding the quantities of shell available—and I must believe those hon. members just as freely as I believe other members who say that there is no more shell beyond that contained in the area to which this Bill refers—then in passing this Bill we shall be granting no monopoly, or no monopoly in the true sense of that word. As

regards protection against competition, the Bill protects the licensee only in respect of the special part of the river bed here in question. The man is putting up capital. The question has been asked whether he is doing it for himself, or for a company. Other questions of the same nature have been put. I am not interested in those matters. What I am interested in is the establishment of another secondary industry. There being in this Bill the guarantee of the establishment of such an industry, the measure deserves support. I have no interest whatever in the matter except the establishment of a secondary industry which will represent another avenue of employment, and absorption of our unemployed, and eventually the creation of wealth. On those lines at least the Bill deserves our support. A point has been made about the fairway of the river. Neither from the Bill, nor from the discussion which has taken place here to-night, nor from the Premier's introduction of the measure, have I been able to gather any idea as to how the fairway is going to be interfered with if the Bill passes. I know that part of the river, and I know that an ordinary sixteen-footer yacht wanting to come up from the Causeway has the beating of about 40 feet of channel.

Hon. P. Collier: We have been told by one member that the shell is in the channel.

Capt. CARTER: If the area which the Bill proposes to grant is to be confined merely to that channel, it will interfere with the fairway.

Hon. P. Collier: The member for Subiaco (Mr. Richardson) said so.

Mr. Richardson: I said nothing of the sort.

Capt. CARTER: I take it the shell lies all over the river bed. That shell represents the avenue of a big industry; and as the granting of the area referred to in the Bill will not interfere with the main portion of the river which is to-day used for recreation purposes, I support the measure.

On motion by the Minister for Works debate adjourned.

## BILL—ARCHITECTS.

### In Committee.

Resumed from the 19th October; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 11—Effect of summons by the board (partly considered):

Hon. P. COLLIER: This clause requires careful consideration. It seems to be intended to grant exceptional powers to the board to be created under the Bill. A summons issued by the board requiring the attendance of any person, and signed by the chairman, is to have the same effect as a subpoena issued out of the Supreme Court in a civil action, and is to carry the same penalties. Here is another instance of Parliament being engaged in conferring exceptional and extraordinary powers upon boards and other bodies which are being

created week after week. Shortly one will not be able to walk across the street without first obtaining the authority of some statutory board or other. Does the Minister in charge of the Bill consider the power under this clause necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the measure by the board? Is the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am pleased, because I know that the Minister does not desire to set up self-governmental authorities with extraordinary powers.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: At first sight the clause may appear very strong. I do not think it is likely to be required often, but since it may be required we ought to inquire into its incidence. The previous clause gives power to the board to examine persons on oath, and the present clause is a machinery provision designed to enable the board to take such proceedings as will be necessary to facilitate their inquiries. This clause cannot become an instrument of tyranny, since the latter portion of it protects the person summoned by the board inasmuch as it provides that failure to obey the board's summons shall be punished by a judge of the Supreme Court, and not by the board. The main question is, whether there is necessity for a board? The necessity has been granted by the Committee. This clause is merely a working machinery clause.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH: Why should not the board apply to the Supreme Court for a subpoena?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That would only be complicating matters, and involving expense and loss of time.

Mr. Money: Has any other board the power practically to issue subpoenas in the same way as the Supreme Court?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member can answer that question better than I can. I see nothing in the clause which would interfere with the civil rights of any person coming under the jurisdiction of the board.

Mr. Munsie: How is the judge in chambers to be moved under this clause?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot say. The question is one for a lawyer.

Hon. P. Collier: A person failing to obey a summons from the board could be arrested, I suppose?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot advise hon. members as to the law. Surely the Bill would not have been approved by the Crown Solicitor if it represented in any shape or form an attempt to interfere with the liberty of the subject.

Hon. P. Collier: It is an extraordinary power to give to such a board.

Mr. MONEY: I take strong exception to powers being given to a board equalling those of the Supreme Court. We are asked to say that the powers to be conferred will have the validity of a summons by the Supreme Court. I do not think the clause was intended to

reach the House in such a form. It appeals to me as suggestive of the ingenuity of an amateur lawyer.

Hon. P. Collier: Or of an architect practising as an amateur lawyer.

Mr. MONEY: It would be creating a wrong precedent if we agreed to the clause. I do not know that the architect's board will be any more important than the engineers' board.

Mr. Pickering: Or the Barristers' Board.

Mr. MONEY: If it referred to the Barristers' Board, it would be different, because the members of that board are officers of the Supreme Court and as such are liable to be struck off the rolls by a Judge of the Supreme Court. It will be seen, therefore, that it would be a totally different thing if it applied to the Barristers' Board. I oppose the clause.

Mr. PICKERING: Similar provisions will be found in the Licensed Surveyors Act, 1909, the Medical Practitioners Act of 1894, the Legal Practitioners Act of 1893, and the Dentist Act of 1894. I do not desire to stress the necessity for this provision. The reflection cast upon the individual responsible for the framing of this Act calls for comment because the provision was drafted by the Parliamentary draftsman, Mr. Sayer, and no one would regard him as an amateur lawyer.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In view of what the member for Bunbury has said I must attach due weight to his comments, seeing that he is a trained lawyer. In view of his objections, I am quite willing to allow the clause to be postponed, so that I may see if the Board can be given the necessary power in a form less objectionable, from the point of view of the member for Bunbury. I move—

That consideration of the clause be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clause 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Protection from liability:

Mr. A. THOMSON: Will the Minister explain this clause?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To my mind, it does not require any explanation at all.

Mr. Mann: Do you not think the powers are too wide?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. I take it that those in whom the operation of the Bill will be centred, will have sufficient "savvy" to do what is right without the necessity for the fears actuating the hon. members.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Here we are again with another clause of importance. On one hand, we have the clause we have just been discussing, conferring extraordinary powers on the board, equal to those exercised to-day by a judge of the Supreme Court. Yet the succeeding clause proposes to exempt the

board from any liability for actions taken by that body. The board may ruin a man professionally and strike him off the roll, yet that man may be entirely innocent; he will have to suffer through lack of judgment on the part of the board. Although such an action might be taken by the board, they would be entirely exempt from any liability in the matter. If any body of men accept a position of authority, such as is contemplated in the creation of the board, they should be prepared to accept responsibility for their actions.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Does a judge of a Supreme Court do that?

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** The Minister does not surely see any analogy between a board set up under the Bill and the position of a judge, who is administering the laws of the country. It has been stated that the Bill has been drafted by the Crown Solicitor, but we know that he drafts Bills in accordance with instructions. It is no reflection upon the Crown Solicitor to comment upon or criticise any clause in the Bill; the responsibility rests with Ministers who issue the instructions to him. Behind it all, however, may be seen the power and influence of the architects' association or union. They were the advising party.

**Mr. Angelo:** Thank goodness it is not the Primary Producers' Association this time!

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** In saying that, I do not make any reflections upon architects, because we know that when any legislation of this character is brought forward, it is only introduced after requests are made by persons concerned. It is only natural that such persons would advise the Minister and the draftsman as to the lines upon which the Bill should be drawn. Whenever it is a question of giving powers to a board such as that contemplated under the Bill, we always find them going to the extreme limit of power even to equalling that of a Supreme Court Judge. When it comes to a question of responsibility, however, we find they claim exemption from responsibility, and actions cannot lie against the board. The board have power to frame by-laws and interpret what they may consider misconduct. An architect may decide to charge lower fees than those determined by the board, and the result may be that the board would find him guilty of misconduct and strike him off the rolls, resulting in his professional ruin. Yet that man would not have a chance of any redress.

**The Minister for Works:** I do not see how you can read that into the Bill.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** I can, in various clauses of the Bill.

**Mr. Mungie:** There is no appeal from the board's decision.

**Mr. Pickering:** There is provision for an appeal.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** It is of little use an architect appealing to the Supreme Court, after his profession has been taken away by the board.

**The Minister for Works:** An architect cannot be struck off without an application being made to the Supreme Court.

**Hon. P. COLLIER:** Yes, he can. I admit that the Supreme Court has the final say. The committee should strike the whole clause out, because it is impossible to amend it so as to make the whole clause workable. I have never before known the House with the State drifting financially to ruin, when the agricultural, pastoral and mining interests are waiting for the Government to give a lead and assist in the development of those industries, fritter away so much time upon Bills granting concessions to land agents, architects and auctioneers, while there is far more important work to do. It is time the people rose and kicked us out. Should 50 members of Parliament sit here night after night discussing the question of conferring a privilege upon a little section here and a little section there, while the big things that affect the future welfare of the State are to be excluded and ignored? Those are the things we ought to give attention to, and we should put these twopenny-halfpenny things down at the bottom of the Notice Paper. Then, when we have given attention to the things that matter, if at the end of the session we want to pass an inconsequential sitting or two, let us give attention to those little things, or, better still, let them go by the board.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The hon. member was quite wrong in the statement he made. The board may hold an inquiry and express an opinion, but cannot deprive a man of the right of earning his living unless it first satisfies the Supreme Court of his guilt.

**Mr. Mann:** No power is given to take action in the event of malicious prosecution.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** How can there be malicious prosecution in a matter of this sort? Provision is made that the board may hold an inquiry. If the person charged proves his innocence, the matter ends. If the board finds that the person charged has been guilty of misconduct—

**Mr. Mann:** Or that he has not offended.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Oh stop it! We are not in the police court now. Behave yourself! The hon. member has spent his whole life in the police court, and so he forgets his manners. If it is proved that the person charged has misconducted himself, the board can say so, but before any action can be taken there must be an application to the Supreme Court. If hon. members feel that the board would maliciously attempt to ruin a man, then I say they should throw out the Bill.

**Mr. TROY:** I should like to take the Minister at his word and throw out the Bill. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we should not waste time with these little Bills conferring certain privileges on a section of the community. The House is continually being asked to confer petty rights. Suppose a member on this side were to ask for special privileges for a trades union, what would be the fate of such a motion or

Bill? During a time of political or national excitement, when people are being charged with pro-Germanism, the board could deprive a man of his livelihood. In this city a well known reputable citizen was blackballed in a club because someone said he was disloyal, notwithstanding that his son had been killed at the Front a few days before.

Mrs. Cowan interjected.

Mr. TROY: I do not dispute that. The interjection justifies my statement that it is unwise to give such power to a board.

The Minister for Works: I have known a man hounded out of his employment because he was once a nationalist worker on the wharf.

Mr. TROY: I met a man yesterday who cannot get work in any of our mines because his name is passed along from mine manager to mine manager.

The Minister for Works: It is wrong on either side.

Mr. TROY: Then do not give this proposed board the right to do wrong. These people may be guilty of conspiracy and may escape punishment.

Mrs. Cowan: That is a matter for the Supreme Court.

Mr. TROY: This measure sets out clearly the offences. If a member of the architects' society refuses to carry out any of the injunctions of the board, even though they be unjust, he can be convicted.

The Minister for Works: Unless there is some discipline, what is the use of having the society?

Mr. TROY: Why does the Minister, as an alleged democrat, father this Bill giving special and peculiar privileges which would not be given to the great body of citizens? Why do not the architects form a union and safeguard their interests as other unions do under the existing laws? Why should they receive special consideration? I am surprised at the House passing such a measure.

Mr. Pickering: You demand a certain rate of wages for your people.

Mr. TROY: The same law is open to the architects, but they want a special law. They might conspire against any man's livelihood and they cannot be taken to court. I ask the Minister not to have the Bill on his mind.

The Minister for Works: I shall be very glad when it is off my mind.

Mr. TROY: Then throw it out! It should never have been introduced.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: What about protecting the public against jerry architects and builders?

Mr. TROY: There is no reason why architects should receive special privileges. If they are not getting a fair remuneration, let them organise a trade union under the existing law. If I asked for special privileges for the A.W.U., what chance would I have of getting them?

Mr. Pickering: There is no occasion to do so.

Mr. TROY: And there is no occasion for the architects. The same law is available to

them. If we continue to pass measures giving special privileges to certain classes, there will be no individual rights in the community. I appeal to the Minister to throw the Bill out of the Chamber.

Mr. A. THOMSON: I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 13 be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clause 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Applications to provisional board for registration:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Any person who applies to the provisional board within six months after the passing of a measure may be registered provided he is a member of the Royal Institute of Architects of Western Australia or some other society of equal standing. What are the qualifications for membership of the Royal Institute of Architects?

Mr. PICKERING: One has to be indentured for four years, during which time he has to take up certain studies accepted by the Institute of British Architects, which is the highest in the world. At the expiration of that period, he has to pass an examination in the practice and theory of the profession and satisfy a board of examiners that he is qualified in all the different branches. Then he may become an associate of the Royal Institute of Architects.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Sufficient qualification seems to be provided for there, but paragraph (b) provides that if a man has been practising for 12 months or engaged as an assistant and has had seven years' experience, he may be registered. This will open the door to the registration of men who may not be qualified.

Mrs. Cowan: The same applied to the nurses.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Because it was conceded in the case of the nurses, is that a reason why it should be urged in all future legislation? At present any person can set up as an architect without possessing any qualification. If he can get enough business to keep him going he can continue practising. If he has been doing this for 12 months it would be possible under the Bill for him to be registered as an architect, and stand before the public on the same basis as a fully qualified man. We are told that the Bill is wanted for the protection of the public, but when it comes to a question of a clash of interests the public go by the board.

Mrs. Cowan: This operates in an entirely different way to the Bill in connection with nurses. I have noticed that in this House.

Hon. P. COLLIER: After this Bill becomes law and six months have passed, the door will be completely closed and the public will be fully safeguarded. There is no consistency about the Bill. In all legislation of this kind a provision is generally inserted to permit of men who have been following a par-

ticular occupation continuing to do so. I do not propose to bother about moving any amendment, but merely enter my protest against this sort of thing. If the Committee wants the Bill let them have it.

Mr. Pickering: I do not know of any person who would be affected in the way suggested.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is open to anyone without any architectural knowledge to practise as an architect and to become registered under paragraph (b).

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Paragraph (b) of Subclause 2, to which the Leader of the Opposition objects, fixes a period of 12 months instead of, as elsewhere, three or four or five years. Had the period here been made a lengthy one, the Committee might reasonably have objected that the object of the provision was the exclusion of certain persons.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But 12 months is a very short period.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is open to the Committee to lengthen the period. I ask hon. members to assist me to improve the Bill. As to assistants to architects becoming registered, to urge that an assistant may have been the office boy is to carry the argument too far. After the provisional board contemplated by the Bill ceases to exist, no person will become registered except under the main conditions laid down by the Bill. The measure appeals to me because I have known quite a large number of defective buildings put up in this State by men who posed as architects, but who, though good decent men, had not had the opportunity to learn the profession of architecture as it should be learned. Nowadays a man taking upon his shoulders the responsibility of practising as an architect should be able to carry that responsibility, and be able to put up a dwelling house not only pleasant to the eye, but convenient and safe to the occupants. I have known instances where a framework designed to carry galvanised iron has been used to carry such material as tiles, for which it was not strong enough. Again, a roof which will carry tiles when they are dry may not carry them when they are saturated with water, as they are highly absorbent. The result occasionally has been collapse. Persons employing a registered architect should have some guarantee of his competency. Another matter frequently neglected by architects who are not sufficiently skilled is air space under the floors; if this is neglected, the occupants of the house suffer from ill health. That has been the experience of many residents of houses the floors of which rest immediately on the sand. Septic tanks are another source of danger if constructed by unqualified men. The object of the Bill is to ensure that men who undertake the duties of an architect shall know the first principles of the profession.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—Registration by the board:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Paragraph (b) of Subclause 1 makes reference to "associate, licentiate, or fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects of London, or the Royal Institute of the Architects of Western Australia." Why does not the paragraph make mention of the institute of architects of any other State of the Commonwealth? I take it that the qualifications demanded by the institutes in the Eastern States would be as high as those in Western Australia.

Mr. Pickering: The reason why the British institute is mentioned is that they are all affiliated with that institute, and the remaining words "or of some other institute or society of architects" cover the ones you refer to.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In that case the Western Australian institute would be covered as well.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move an amendment—

That in line 6 of paragraph (b) after "architects," the words "of equal standing" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. PICKERING: Regarding paragraph (c) the member for North-East Fremantle, when discussing the Bill, took exception to the inclusion of the words "in the opinion of the board." I propose to move to amend the paragraph by striking out the word "and" in line 3 and the words "as in the opinion of the" in lines 4 and 5, inserting in lieu the words "and pass the examination set by" and deleting all the words after "board" in line 5. If the paragraph were amended in that direction, it would meet the objection raised by the member for North-East Fremantle and it would simply mean that if an architect passed the examination set by the board, that would meet all requirements. I move an amendment—

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

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.*