

is classed A for recreation under the Permanent Reserves Act, 1899, and it is necessary to obtain Parliamentary sanction to enable the two acres to be excised and set apart for a hall site in a position to be approved by the Minister for Lands. Reserve 5183 is vested in the Subiaco Council for recreation purposes. Reserve 5690 is set apart for police quarters. Both these reserves are classed A under the Permanent Reserves Act. In order to improve the utility of the recreation reserve, it is desired that portion be excluded from the police reserve and added to the recreation reserve. To this proposal the Commissioner of Police has agreed and Parliamentary sanction is required in order that the reserve may be amended accordingly. Lake Grace lot 116 was granted to the Presbyterian Church Commissioners for hospital purposes. Owing to a mistake the hospital buildings have been erected on lot 117 and it is desired that lot 116 be surrendered and lot 117 granted in lieu. In view of the trust there is no power to surrender without Parliamentary authority. There is no objection to the proposed exchange. Reserve 5574 at Labouchere-road, South Perth, is set apart and classed A for botanical gardens. It has not been utilised for that purpose and it is desired to set it apart as a recreation ground, which is said to be badly needed in that locality. There are also two reserves adjoining, which are set apart for Zoological Gardens caretaker's quarters and municipal purposes respectively. They are not required for those purposes and it is proposed to set apart the whole block for recreation generally, exclusive, however, of a strip along Labouchere-road frontage which it is proposed to declare a Class A reserve for a parking ground for cars. This parking ground would meet the requirements of the Zoo, golf links and other recreation grounds. A strip is to be left as a road access to the recreation reserve. The area of the proposed recreation reserve will be about 19 acres 19 perches. The area of the proposed parking reserve will be about one acre, one rood, 22 perches. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [10.7]: I am acquainted with a number of reserves for which Parliamentary sanction is sought to achieve a distinct advance in the social life of the country. Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 12 provide specific instances in the South-East Province. At Dumbleyung a re-

serve was set apart for a picnic ground and for water, but it was not suitable for either purpose. There are also a racecourse on a town block and an agricultural show ground on another block. The whole tendency in the country districts nowadays is to combine the various recreation grounds and concentrate the improvements on one ground situated conveniently for the whole of the people. This is a sounder policy than having several grounds for different purposes. Wagin has also moved in this direction. That town had a recreation ground, a race course that was used only twice a year and was quite unsuitable for trotting, which took place on the agricultural show ground. The Agricultural Society, Trotting Association and sports clubs would be able to accomplish more if they combined to improve one ground, as has been done at Narrogin. Knowing how jealous Ministers are to safeguard the rights of the people before bringing forward legislation of this kind, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, feeling convinced there is ample justification for granting the authority requested.

On motion by Hon. Sir William Lathlain, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 12th October, 1926.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	1339
Questions: Labour Bureaus—1, Government Policy;	
2, Men picked up	1340
Leave of absence	1340
Bills: City of Perth Act Amendment, 1R. ...	1340
Land Tax and Income Tax, 3R. ...	1340
Stamp Act Amendment, 3R. ...	1340
Expanding Northwards Railway, 2R. ...	1340
Royup Brook-Cranbrook Railway, 2R. ...	1341
Road Districts Act Amendment, Com. ...	1342

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Forests Act Amendment.
- 2, Government Savings Bank Act Amendment
- 3, Soldier Land Settlement.

QUESTIONS (2)—LABOUR BUREAUS.*Government Policy.*

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is it the policy of the Government, when employing men for Government works, to see that they are picked up through the Labour Bureaus? 2, If so, will he see that the departments under his control carry out that policy? 3, If not, will he make a statement to that effect, so that men searching for work may know the position? 4, How many men are employed on the sewerage works at East Fremantle and the sewerage outlet to the ocean? 5, What number of men have been picked up through the bureau for the two jobs mentioned?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, 2, and 3, It is the policy of the Government to make all new engagements of unskilled workers through the Labour Bureaus, and that policy is carried out. 4, Seventy-seven inclusive of foremen, gangers, time-keepers, tradesmen, other skilled workers, and men transferred from other departmental jobs. 5, Forty-seven.

Men picked up.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Hon. J. Cunningham (Honorary Minister): 1, How many men have been picked up at the Perth bureau since 1st October, 1926? 2, How many men have been picked up at the Fremantle bureau for the same period?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM replied: 1, 80. 2, None. The foregoing refers to Government work. It is expected that there will be a pick-up at Fremantle for Government work during this week. Throughout periods when unemployment is acute, and generally, special arrangements are made to allot to Fremantle its full share of Government jobs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Millington, leave of absence for one month granted to Hon. S. W. Munsie (Hannans) on the ground of ill-health.

**BILL—CITY OF PERTH ACT
AMENDMENT.**

Introduced by the Minister for Lands, and read a first time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Land Tax and Income Tax.
- 2, Stamp Act Amendment.

[Transmitted to the Council.]

**BILL—EJANDING-NORTHWARDS
RAILWAY.***Second Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: The object of the proposed railway is to serve the country east of the Wongan Hills and up to Mullewa. The original proposal was to construct the line eastward from Pithara to Lake Mollerin. It was found, however, that such a route would leave the very substantial area of 280,000 acres unserved by a railway. Accordingly the Government decided to have the whole matter investigated afresh. The greater part of the 280,000 acres in question is scrub plain country with a good subsoil, and is interspersed with small patches of forest. All the local settlers considered that this country should have railway communication, and experienced farmers of the district also advocated that view, holding that the land could grow wheat in conjunction with oats and grazing. In view of the evidence submitted as to the value of the land, which moreover is situated in an area of assured rainfall, the Railway Advisory Board were therefore instructed to make a further report. A line running eastward from Pithara for a distance of 45 miles would serve 662,590 acres, of which 218,685 acres have been alienated, the total area, including most of the Mollerin settlement, providing for about 287 holdings. A line running northward from Ejanding to a point about due east of Pithara, and with a length of about 55 miles, would serve about 723,000 acres, of which about 285,000 acres have been alienated, the total area providing for about 312 holdings. This route, however, would not serve the Mollerin settlers; but by the construction of a branch line of about 15 miles, making a total mileage of 70 miles from Ejanding, an aggregate area, including the Mollerin settlement, of about 734,130 acres would be served, of which 354,339 acres have been alienated. In this way about 400 holdings would be provided for. The advantages of the starting point for the proposed railway being at Ejanding instead of at Pith-

ara are as follows:—First, the forest country east of Pithara would be served just as well as if the starting point were at Pithara, and at the same time about 280,000 acres of additional land with good rainfall would be served. Second, the Ejanding Northwards route will provide a much shorter railage to Fremantle for the wheat-growers, the distance being 178 miles from Mollerin via Ejanding, as against 219 miles via Pithara, which is an important consideration. Third, in the event of the country east of Lake Monger and towards Warriedar proving suitable for mixed farming, the line will form the first stage of a railway to open up that country. The Bill asks for the usual limit of five miles for deviation. Plans of the proposed line have been laid on the Table, and the map hanging on the wall indicates the approximate position. The grade will be one in 60. The line will serve 400 settlers. The mileage is 70, and the estimated cost £151,900. At 6 per cent. interest this cost means an annual charge of £9,100. The outward tonnage is estimated at 40,000, representing a revenue of £26,000. The working expenses are estimated at £18,200. That will leave a credit balance of £7,800. But the interest bill of £9,100 means a loss of £1,300. However, it is estimated that the inward revenue will amount to £3 per head per settler, or £1,200, and so it is expected that the line will show a loss of only £100 in the first year. That is a most favourable proposition, a line coming within £100 of paying for itself during the first year. Since that line will open up an enormous area of country, it will be agreed that it is well worth while constructing. Although, as is frequently stated, we have already a greater mileage of railway per head of population than has any other country in the world, yet if we are to open up our lands and proceed with their settlement we still have to go on building railways. We cannot rely solely on road construction, particularly where wheat and stock have to be dealt with. I have recited the main points of the proposition. I do not think there can be any question that the building of the line is warranted. The report of the Advisory Board strongly recommends the route contained in the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—BOYUP BROOK-CRANBROOK RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.48] in moving the second reading said: The railway, the subject of the Bill, is part of the scheme to open up that huge belt of country extending from Boyup Brook down to Bridgetown, over to the Great Southern railway, and through to the coast. The Advisory Board were asked to recommend the best scheme of railway communication to meet the needs of settlement there and to open up areas of country at present not tapped at all. It is found that for about 20 miles south-east of Boyup Brook the country is well settled, with very little Crown land still available. The same thing obtains for about 30 miles west of Cranbrook and for 12 or 15 miles west of Mt. Barker. The remainder of the area is sparsely settled, in consequence no doubt of its remoteness from railway facilities. The maps on the wall of the Chamber will give members an excellent idea of the country proposed to be served. The Advisory Board were very favourably impressed with the class of country travelled over by them. I may say they went over the great bulk of the territory to be served. Whilst they admit that a considerable portion of the large area between the Bridgetown and Great Southern railways, and the Kojonup and Denmark railways must be looked upon as second class, they are satisfied, not only from an inspection of departmental plans, but also from personal observation, that there is available a very large area of first class land, which in conjunction with the second class country is admirably adapted for dairying and allied industries, whilst the well watered nature of the country and the fine climate render it well suited to closer settlement. The total area of country between Manjimup and Mt. Barker outside the 12½ mile radius from existing railways, and exclusive of that to be served by the authorised Pemberton-Denmark railway, is about 1,800,000 acres, the greater portion of which is Crown land. That is perhaps the greatest stretch of Crown land within an assured rain belt that we have at present untapped by railway communication. Assuming that of the 1,800,000 acres 800,000 acres be not avail-

able for agricultural settlement, being either not suitable for that purpose or required for timber reservation, there will still remain an area of about 1,000,000 acres of land suitable for settlement consisting of first class land and second class land that can be turned into valuable pasture country and, with railway communication, profitably developed. On a basis of 400 acres per settler this should provide for 2,500 holdings, a very substantial increase in the existing number of holdings in that part of the State. The Advisory Board say that in their opinion this railway is undoubtedly warranted, but that obviously it would be impossible to serve such a large district by one railway. They have recommended the building of this line, and of a line from Manjimup out to Mt. Barker, which together with the Pemberton-Denmark line already authorised will give three railways to serve this huge territory. A glance at the map will show what an immense improvement the construction of those three lines will effect. Since the Advisory Board went over the country, Mr. Anketell, a member of the board, has made a preliminary location and found alternative routes that will give a ruling grade of one in 60. The board recommend the construction of light railways from Boyup Brook to Cranbrook, and from Manjimup to Mt. Barker, each of a length of about 107 miles. It is estimated that these lines will cost £2,300 per mile. This is only one of the three lines that will be necessary to open up the huge territory alluded to by the board. It is situated in a very favourable climate and has a good stretch of first-class country in addition to that of second class. Undoubtedly it will mean an enormous improvement, and will materially assist the dairying industry. This district is already old in point of settlement.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The third generation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have been waiting for a railway for a long, long time. This is the first of the three required to give the whole of that territory proper railway facilities. It should add enormously to the development of all that part of the State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 5:

Mr. SAMPSON: Under paragraph (e) I should like to know from the Minister whether it is proposed that the local authority shall be notified when any road is marked upon the plan of land publicly exhibited.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Many alleged roads are not roads at all, but mere tracks. Under the clause it will be necessary to have the roads marked on the plan. This will remove the doubt as to whether they are really roads within the meaning of the Act.

Mr. SAMPSON: The marking of a track on the plan might render the owner of a vehicle using that track liable to the payment of a license fee, although not using a really dedicated road at all; under the Traffic Act he would be rendered liable to the payment of a fee. Yet it is already provided that an unlicensed motor vehicle used on a farm divided by a road may pass over the road from one part of the farm to another. Would it be possible to extend that principle to allow an unlicensed vehicle to merely pass over any road at right angles without being called upon to pay a license fee?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The roads in question are all marked on the subdivision. There are other roads not only on Crown land but on private property, and difficulty arises through a desire to proclaim them as public roads.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Does it mean surveyed roads?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No other road is marked on a plan.

Mr. Sampson: Will the local authority be notified of such roads?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Very often the local authority would have to approve of such roads.

Mr. THOMSON: Some landowners have been put to great expense as a result of having to fence after land has been taken for a road.

The Minister for Lands: That is not involved in this question.

Mr. THOMSON: I should like the Minister to consider that phase.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: When the Lands Department lay out a road, I think it would automatically come under the Act. Does not this provision also apply to a private subdivision? A private subdivision might be made, and not a block of land be sold; yet the roads would be public roads. That would be unfair.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This provision deals with Crown land, and it is only in connection with Crown land that the Government publicly exhibit a plan. There is provision in the Act to cover a private subdivision. Some Crown land has tracks all over it. People even claim that because they have been able to drive across private land, such tracks are public thoroughfares. Within the last month I have had an appeal on that question. The paragraph means that a road is not a public road unless it is shown on the plan.

Mr. LINDSAY: On most Crown land there are old sandalwood tracks that have given rise to difficulty. People claim a right of way over them. Does this paragraph mean that such tracks are no longer to be roads? In my district the only road for several years passed through my property. People using it refused to shut the gates and my stock got out, or got into my crops. Some people have the impression that if a landowner gives them a track through his property, he has no right to improve his property or to prevent them from using the track after a certain time. The landowner should have some rights.

The Minister for Lands: Such tracks are not roads.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 6:

Mr. SAMPSON: A word appears to have been omitted from this clause. I move an amendment—

That after "election" in line 4 the word "shall" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think Clause 6 should be inserted after Section 29 of the Act.

The Minister for Works: This clause deals with public holidays.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, when they affect an election.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 7 and 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Repeal of Division 3 of Part III., and substitution of new division:

Mr. THOMSON: Was it at the request of the road boards that provision was made that all the councillors should retire at the end of three years? The present system is that only portion of those who make up a road board retire each year. There may be some difficulty about inducing men to stand for these positions if the clause is applied.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This provision was contained in the Bill of last session. At that time road boards disagreed with it, but the last conference of road boards, the largest gathering ever held, endorsed it. The idea is that if any matter of pronounced interest comes up for treatment the ratepayers may have an opportunity of electing an entirely new set of representatives.

Mr. LINDSAY: No doubt some of the old members of the board will be returned at each election. The present proposal would probably create more interest in these local governing bodies and result in better work being done.

Mr. DAVY: Practically every matter of important policy involves the expenditure of loan money, and the ratepayers have means of dealing with that situation through a poll. It is, therefore, unnecessary to make any drastic alteration. The fact that the conference agreed to this proposal does not make it a good one. I am opposed to the change.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think this will be in the best interests of country districts. If all the councillors went out once in three years, a new body of men might be elected, and confusion might result. The present system works well.

Mr. ANGELO: Why should the elections be delayed in that part of the State north of the 26th parallel? There is no reason for the delay on the score of mail services, because owing to the aerial mails the service in some cases is better than it is in the south.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The aerial mail does not serve all the road board districts in the North. It goes only as far as Derby, and districts back from the coast and north of Derby are not benefited to any extent. All the stationery has to be sent from Perth and as some members of road boards live hundreds of miles from their centre, it is deemed advisable to put the elec-

tions on a month. This clause is intended to meet the convenience of these particular authorities.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 33:

Mr. SAMPSON: This introduces the question of variation in voting. The parent Act provides that a person may cast a vote for more than one ward if he has property in different wards, but this clause provides only for a vote for one ward. A man may own land in more than one road board district, and in view of the provisions of Clause 11 relating to one man one vote, matters may become complicated.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The effect of the clause will be to do away with plural voting, in that if a man owns land in more than one ward he must select which ward he will vote in and exercise his one vote accordingly. At present he can exercise up to four votes. We represent the last country in the world to adhere to the policy of plural voting.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Are you sure?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. I caused a search to be made by an officer in an endeavour to find any other country where this obtains.

Mr. Latham: What about New South Wales?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There the principle is one man one vote.

Mr. Latham: Is that so under the Pastures Protection Board Act?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not going so far as the adult franchise, but merely ask members to agree to take a step forward.

Mr. Sampson: There has been no request for a change.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is astonishing to find that there are still some people who adhere to the conservative hoary-headed idea that because a man owns many broad acres, he has more knowledge and more intelligence than a man who does not own so much.

Mr. George: But the big landowner has more responsibility.

Mr. Thomson: The principle of one man one vote is first raised in this clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. It is the function of Parliament not of local governing authorities, to decide the basis upon which men shall be elected to carry out the work of the people in country areas.

Mr. Latham: This is a question of policy.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, this is the policy of the Government. We stand for the principle of one man, one vote. We do not represent the troglodytes of old who still live in the dead past and advocate the possession of five or ten times the voting strength of their fellow human beings. No country apart from Australia will permit plural voting in connection with local government matters. It is a reflection upon the intelligence of the people.

Mr. Latham: It is not a question of intelligence at all; it is a question of the man who pays the most in rates calling the biggest tune!

Mr. Thomson: That is the point.

Mr. Latham: I believe the Minister has four votes now.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am surprised to think that even some members of Parliament still hold the view that plural voting is right. Australia represents the last of the Mohicans in this respect.

Mr. Latham: You know that the road board conference turned down the principle by a big majority.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know that. It is not a function for the road board conference to carry out at all. It is the function of Parliament to determine the basis upon which road board members shall be elected. If we were to hand over our privilege to those people, we would lose control. Plural voting is an old, worn-out, exploded principle that everyone possessing an ounce of progressive ideas discarded generations ago.

Mr. Sampson: You did not convince the road board conference regarding the principle.

Mr. Thomson: No, they turned down the principle.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I told the road board conference that it was not a matter for them to determine. We concede the right of one man, one vote in the election of our national Parliament, but when it comes to a matter of a small local governing body dealing with roads and footpaths, we are not prepared to follow that principle. Yet some men calling themselves democrats wish to adhere to the old conservative principle of plural voting!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Your proposal takes away the freedom of the individual.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The fundamental basis of democracy is involved

in the principle of one man one vote, and anyone who votes against the application of that principle cannot call himself a democrat.

Mr. Sampson: Conference voted against the principle.

The Minister for Lands: What has the road board conference to do with this?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member keeps barking like a small puppy about the conference.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: On a point of order. Is the Minister right in referring to an hon. member having barked like a puppy? We should have some order displayed in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I did not take the Minister's interjection in that sense.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I meant no offence whatever. I said I had not discussed the principle with the road board conference, as it was not the function of conference but of Parliament. When the member for Swan repeats over and over again references to the conference, it is enough to try one's nerves.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You told the conference that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and I have repeated it to-day. I do not intend to restrict my feelings further: I may say something worse.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members must keep order.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Australian Constitution is most democratic, but in this particular respect regarding plural voting. Australia has been left standing by other countries. I regard the principle contained in Clause 11, which is touched upon by Clause 10, as vital to the Bill. I would not grant extended powers to the local governing authorities unless the basis upon which road board members are to be elected, were broadened. I would not be prepared to grant the local authorities the extended powers if those to be elected were not the chosen of the bulk of the people, but of a selected few.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister has told us clearly and effectively that the clause is vital to the Bill. I understood we were amending the Act to make it more workable for the local governing authorities. The Minister said a great deal about democracy, but I am afraid that the so-called democrats are not so democratic as they pose: they are more inclined to be autocrats. This

matter was discussed at the road board conference and it was turned down by an overwhelming majority. The Government are quite prepared to introduce a number of matters that were passed at the conference by way of resolution. I was opposed to the retirement of all the members of boards at the one time, but the conference decided against me, and naturally I had to waive my objection. What is the position so far as democracy is concerned in respect of the expenditure of public money? This afternoon the member for Fremantle asked certain questions as to why the Labour Bureau had not been used in connection with the employment of men for Government works.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not introduce foreign matter into the discussion on this clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with a question that was referred to by the Minister, when he spoke about democracy—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not intend to allow the hon. member to introduce anything that is foreign to the clause under discussion.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with Clause 10. Provision is made for one vote as against four under the existing Act, and I contend that on this clause I am entitled to discuss the question of democracy which was introduced by the Minister himself.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not deal with anything not affected by the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I thank you for drawing my attention to the matter; I was referring to the Labour Bureau by way of illustration.

The Minister for Mines: What has that to do with the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see how such an illustration can apply. There is no connection between what the hon. member proposes to do and the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister dealt with the question of democracy as it affects the clause.

Hon. G. Taylor: On a point of order, the Minister dealt with the constitution of the Commonwealth Parliament on democratic lines, and also the Parliaments of other countries and he also referred to other road boards elsewhere. The hon. member, therefore, is entitled to reply to those arguments.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister dealt with the question of democracy so far as it affected the principle of one vote. The member for Katanning is trying to intro-

duce a question asked by the member for Fremantle this afternoon. He must not argue that point at this stage, and I ask him not to continue on those lines.

Mr. THOMSON: We are discussing a vital question; the Minister told us that this was a vital part of the Bill. He pointed out also that the Commonwealth was established on democratic lines and my desire is to give an illustration of democracy as it is being carried out by the present Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Only as it affects the question before the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON: As it affects the Bill and the arguments advanced by the Minister. He is in charge of the Bill and I consider I am entitled to reply to the statements he made. What is the position so far as democracy is concerned? As it is administered by the present Government no man can get a job unless he has a union ticket.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Minister for Mines: On a point of order, the hon. member is defying the Chair. His remarks are not relevant to the question. May I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to compel him to observe your ruling on this matter. As it is he is just setting your orders at defiance.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not intend to allow the hon. member to continue on those lines. I have called him to order several times for introducing matter that is foreign to the Bill. I ask him once again not to digress.

Mr. THOMSON: I am dealing with the clause under discussion, which provides for one vote. Under the parent Act if a man has property in four wards he is entitled to a vote in each ward. If the clause is carried it will mean that he will have only one vote. The Minister dealt with the position from the point of view of democracy.

The Minister for Lands: As it applied to voting.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister said we were lagging behind the other States and that we were the most backward country in the world.

The Minister for Lands: And that is quite true.

Mr. THOMSON: That is a matter of opinion.

The Minister for Works: You do not know the difference between facts and figures.

Mr. THOMSON: I know that at the conference this very question was discussed and

by an overwhelming majority the Minister's proposal was rejected. As a matter of fact it has been turned down by every conference I have attended, and I have attended quite a number. The property owner is the man that has to be considered, not the individual who reaches the age of 21 years and has no property. The existing system has worked satisfactorily and there is no demand for a change. The Government are not democratic when they try to impose such a restriction upon the people, especially when they say that a man who has not a ticket—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the hon. member one more chance; if he disobeys the Chair again, I shall order him to leave the Chamber.

Mr. THOMSON: I should like to know to what you are taking exception, and in what way I am disobeying your orders. I am not breaking the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. member a number of times not to depart from the clause we are discussing. In referring to democracy the Minister dealt with it as applied to other countries. The member for Katanning is attempting to introduce matter that has nothing whatever to do with the clause and I ask him once again not to disobey the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON: It is a most remarkable thing that I am not allowed to discuss matters of local Government.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may do so, provided he does not bring in any matter foreign to the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I claim that I am entitled to advance my views, and so long as I do that in accordance with the Standing Orders, I am not out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is now defying the Chair. I ask him to direct his remarks to the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: It is a remarkable position when a member is not permitted to put his views before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. member to put his views on the clause before the Committee.

Mr. THOMSON: If the Chairman of Committees will permit me, I will do so.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Committee quite understand that the hon. member has the opportunity.

Mr. THOMSON: On this phase some of us hold our views just as strongly as the Minister holds his. He has not produced

one tittle of evidence that the Government have been requested to alter the provision referred to. The proposed alteration is purely a matter of policy with the Government. I regret we are not permitted to discuss the question as we would like. It is rather hard lines for us if we are to be restricted.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not restricted in discussing the clause, and he must not continue to make that inference.

Mr. THOMSON: I strongly object to the proposed deletion.

Mr. LATHAM: I am surprised at the Minister's endeavour to draw an analogy between the functions of this Chamber and those of a road board. The latter are practically restricted to the collection and spending of rates. To-day the man who pays £150 in rates has a bigger say than the man who pays half-a-crown. The latter ought not to have equal voting strength with the former.

The Minister for Railways: It is a question of principle.

Mr. LATHAM: No question of principle is involved. If all ratepayers paid the same amount, then certainly they should all have the same voting power. Where does the request for the proposed alteration come from? I get about among country ratepayers, but I have never heard the request from them. On the other hand, I have heard this proposal turned down at annual conferences of ratepayers; and so has the Minister. I defy the Minister to name one district that has asked for the alteration.

The Minister for Railways: It has been asked for by the people generally.

Mr. LATHAM: Possibly it has been asked for at conferences held at the Trades Hall.

Mr. Wilson: The matter was brought up at the last conference of road boards.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, and it was rejected by a large majority, although the Minister for Works with his persuasive manner tried to argue—

The Minister for Works: I was not present when the matter was discussed, and I did not argue the question.

Mr. LATHAM: I refer to the speech delivered by the Minister at the conference.

The Minister for Works: I never attempted to do anything of the kind suggested.

Mr. LATHAM: In a speech delivered at the conference the Minister said that whether his listeners agreed with it or not, he was going to put this provision into the Bill.

The Minister for Works: I never attempted to persuade the conference or to argue the question.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister did make a speech.

The Minister for Lands: When a man tells you the truth, why are you not satisfied?

The Minister for Works: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is not speaking the truth. I have denied his statement repeatedly, and he still persists in making it. I ask that his statement be withdrawn. I never argued the matter with the conference: all I did was to inform the conference that I was going on with the proposal. I ask for a withdrawal of the statement that I attempted to persuade the conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has denied that he attempted to persuade the conference, and the hon. member should accept his assurance.

Mr. LATHAM: I accept the Minister's assurance. I referred to the persuasive manner in which the Minister argued—

The Minister for Works: Have sense and be a man for once.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not wish to offend the Minister. The hon. gentleman made a speech at the conference, and in that speech he told members of the conference certain things, among them that whether they agreed to this proposal or not, he would put it into the Bill.

The Minister for Works: Try to be a man.

Mr. LATHAM: I try to be as good a man as anyone else in this Chamber. I was present at the conference when this matter was discussed. I see no great objection to the principle of one ratepayer one vote, but the people concerned have not asked for its application to them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If we adhere strictly to the clause, the discussion of one ratepayer one vote is entirely out of order. This clause deals merely with the question whether a man shall have the right to vote in more than one ward.

Mr. Sampson: By implication the clause establishes the principle.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: By the hon. member's implication. The clause does

not contain one word relating to one rate-payer one vote.

Mr. Thomson: But under the clause a man can have only one vote, and not four.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under the clause the man must choose the ward for which he is to have a vote. Under the law as it stands, a man with a large amount of property in one ward can have four votes. If a district were divided into four wards, that man could have 16 votes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. He has the right to vote in each ward.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Some members opposite affect to disbelieve that one person can have 16 votes. I am surprised at their innocence. At a certain referendum poll the owners of one building claimed 40 votes. Their solicitor advised that they were entitled to be enrolled for that number. Members must know how these things are worked.

Mr. Latham: It must have been for a whole block of buildings.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was not.

Mr. Davy: That was on a referendum poll, an entirely different thing.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Votes can easily be scattered amongst the members of a family in order that the full number may be exercised. The member for Katanning said the same system had applied right through. Had it applied right through, many of us would not have votes for this House. However, our predecessors saw that it was unfair, and so the franchise was amended. There has been growing up in this Chamber the practice of ignoring a member's denial. Such a denial should be accepted, and the statement denied should not be repeated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot pursue that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: However, ill feeling must be engendered when no notice is taken of a denial. It is about time Western Australia fell into line with the rest of the world in respect of plural voting in local government. In 1904 an enthusiast, well known to all here, inquired into the practice obtaining in various parts of the world. He found that plural voting existed only in Australia. South Australia

did not have it, nor did New Zealand. Only in Victoria, New South Wales, and Western Australia did it obtain. Since then New South Wales has amended her law, but Western Australia remains in the same old groove. This proposed amendment will result in a greater interest being taken in local government. In many parts of the State difficulty is experienced in getting men to stand for road boards. This reluctance has to do with plural voting, desirable candidates realising that, probably, the system would defeat them. Many property holders do not pay any rates at all; they pass on the rates to their customers, just as they pass on the income tax. So they exercise a number of votes without paying any rates.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: That might obtain in the metropolitan area, but not in country towns.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, in country towns as well. Frequently I meet electors who want roads opened, but the local road board opposes the proposition. Why? Because it would interfere with the property of some large ratepayer.

Mr. Lindsay: I have never known of such a case.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Is there not such a case in the hon. member's electorate, a case in which certain soldier settlers are interested?

Mr. Lindsay: Oh, yes, that is right.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The proposed amendment will be an improvement in every way, and will bring Western Australia into line with the rest of the world.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Minister for Lands spoke of the number of votes allowed. Section 34 of the amended Road Districts Act limits the votes to be exercised by any voter in any road district to four.

The Minister for Lands: Suppose I had land in two wards, and put my son on to one block as an occupier.

Mr. LINDSAY: Before he could get on the voter's list he would have to pay his rates.

The Minister for Works: I have my name on a voters' list, although I have never paid rates.

Hon. G. Taylor: How do you manage it?

Mr. LINDSAY: The Act prescribes that on a capital value exceeding £600 the maximum number of votes is four. It means that if a man holds 400 acres the unimproved value of which is £600, he has four votes. If he is working on the annual value it must exceed £50 before he has four votes.

In other words a man with a shop or a house in a country town is sure to have the maximum number of votes. Examination of any ratepayers' roll would show that the average ratepayer has three votes. The whole argument seems to hinge upon the democratic slogan "one vote, one value."

Mr. DAVY: One vote, one value?

Mr. LINDSAY: Well, of course, not even in this House do we get votes all of one value. This House deals with legislation that affects the lives of the people, and breaches of the law are punishable by imprisonment. Practically the only duty of a road board is to collect rates and expend them on roads.

Mr. PANTON: Have not they to look after the health of the people?

Mr. LINDSAY: What does the ordinary road board do in that direction? If I pay four times as much rates as does my neighbour, I should at least have a little more to say. Is there any disadvantage to the small man in my having a greater say? Quite a lot has been said about social reform and democracy. I have been a member of the road board executive for a long time. In 1912 the then Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) brought this matter before a road board conference, and met with a very bad reception. The present Minister, when he addressed the conference, only just touched on the question. Members have argued that we should give expression to the will of the people. The people who do the work of road boards are the people who attend the road board conferences, and if they cannot express the will of the boards and of their ratepayers, who can? I am not prepared to say that the Minister for Works can. I have yet to learn that the present system has inflicted any injustice upon the small man. As a member of a road board for 15 years, I have never known it happen that the man who paid a large amount of rates could influence a board to put a road through in other than the right place. Road boards make mistakes, but the guiding principle when putting roads through is the amount of money available. The Minister deserves commendation for having introduced the Bill, but his action in objecting if he does not get what he wants impresses me as being not quite honest. The question of road board voting is not a vital issue. It will not make any difference to the work of the local authorities. It will not improve the administration, and I fail to see why the Minister should make it an issue of this

Bill. At the road board conference I stated that possibly the reason why the Bill did not pass last session rested with the Minister himself. If this Bill does not find a place on the statute-book it will be because the Minister insists upon this clause being treated as vital.

Mr. SAMPSON: I claim to represent a majority of the people on this question, which has been opposed by conference after conference of road boards. I could not follow the Minister's statement that a ratepayer could exercise 16 votes. That is not so. Four votes is the limit that any ratepayer may cast. I hope that this question will not be made vital to the passage of the Bill. I fail to see how anyone can logically support this proposal and yet permit a ratepayer to have a vote in more than one road district. The Minister objects that a ratepayer casting more than one vote would unduly affect the result of a road board election. A ratepayer may exercise a vote in more than one road district, and it might as reasonably be claimed that he would be exercising greater influence than should be exercised by any one ratepayer.

The Minister for Works: You are now complaining that I am too moderate.

Mr. SAMPSON: To be logical, the Minister should insist upon a ratepayer voting for one district only. It would be manifestly unfair to deprive any ratepayer of the right to vote in any district where he is called upon to pay rates.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I voice my opposition to this proposal. I have had 21 years' experience of road board work, and to my knowledge there has been no demand for this reform, as the Minister terms it. If a vote were taken on the question throughout the country districts there would be an overwhelming majority against it.

Mr. Wilson: Nonsense!

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I am certain of it.

Mr. Richardson: And the same would apply to the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: A vote of whom?

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: Of the ratepayers, even on the basis of one ratepayer one vote. I admit there are family votes that total 14, but they are not cast in respect of one block of land. Four votes is the maximum, and the ratepayer has to declare in which ward he desires to vote. The Minister said that men with big votes were blocking the declaration of roads. Gener-

ally speaking, that is not correct, and the Minister is not treating road board members fairly when he makes that assertion. Road board members are honourable men, and if they acted as the Minister suggests, they would not long remain in office.

The Minister for Works: I have had members of this House come to me with complaints of that description.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: I am sure that in most instances they could not prove their case. Formerly road boards were often thwarted in their desires by the tactics of the department, but I am glad to say there is no complaint on that score to-day. This is said to be a democratic principle, but it does not come from those who are vitally interested. It may have come from the Trades Hall.

The Minister for Works: Does that make it any worse?

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: It comes from a large body of people who have no vote at all, and who in many cases are too indolent to get one. I hope the Minister will realise that this clause is not desired by the people concerned. In attempting to force it through he will be weakening his chance of having the Bill passed.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: If the Minister would modify the clause I might vote in favour of it. The ratepayers are satisfied with the present system of voting, which allows a maximum number of four votes to any one person. The Minister might perhaps reduce that number to three. His enthusiasm has outrun his better judgment when he says that if the clause is not carried the Bill will be wrecked.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The only case made out against the clause is that the chief function of road boards is to collect rates, and spend the money on roads and footpaths.

Mr. Davy: A case ought to be put up for the clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member would have heard the case put up if he had not been too busy outside the Chamber to pay attention to the business within.

Mr. Davy: I heard all that last year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Perhaps the hon. member did not pay more attention to his work last year than he has done to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause is the subject under discussion.

Mr. Davy: It is up to you to prove your own case.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must not interject.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If insults come from members opposite they will get them back.

Mr. Davy: I did not insult you. You are getting very touchy.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We must apologise for speaking at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! These interjections must cease.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Members ignore the fact that this Bill increases the functions of local authorities which will enter more into the lives of the people than they do now. Those who disagree with this proposal are men who were elected on the present restricted franchise. We have heard the cheap sneers of the member for York as to my persuasive powers at the conference. All I did was to explain that there were many matters of interest to me on the agenda paper, that I proposed to bring down an amending Bill this session, and would be pleased to have the decision of the conference upon the various points, and to discuss them with the delegates. I also said that the franchise was a question of policy, and that this rested with the Government, and subsequently with Parliament. The conference was not asked to discuss the franchise. The member for Beverley also cast cheap sneers at the Trades Hall. He said that the only people who asked for this reform might be those associated with Trades Hall.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: Was I not right?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I could refer to many reforms now on the statute-book, which are regarded as essential to democracy, but which were opposed vigorously by members opposite, although they have now adopted them.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What are they? Name a couple.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Chairman would not permit me to do so. Every adult in the district pays the rates, not merely the man who hands in the cheque. The rate is passed on by every man who employs another. Every time a union approaches an employer for increased wages the employer trots out as his excuse for not increasing the pay the fact that he has all these rates and taxes to meet.

Mr. Latham: That does not affect the farmer.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course the farmer would not be guilty of doing that. Why does he not pay more wages to the men he employs?

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: What has that to do with the rateable value?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: All the rates and taxes are passed on, and are finally paid by the wages man, he who produces the wealth.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are on dangerous ground now and had better not pursue that line of argument.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: All these charges are passed on. One would think we lived a century ago when members insist on continuing this system of plural voting. Some members have talked about their experiences on different road boards, and the attitude of conferences on this question. I can scent in their references evidence of jealousy concerning the relations between the road boards and the present Government compared with the relations that existed between the boards and the previous Government. That feeling was demonstrated at each conference and road board gathering I attended.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You flatter yourself!

Mr. George: My word, he does.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The feeling was overwhelmingly in favour of the present Government.

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

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are endeavouring to provide a measure of reform regarding the scope of local governing bodies. I have not provided all the power that I would like the boards to possess. I merely ask hon. members to agree to move one step forward. During the discussion there has not been one answer to the argument I advanced that whereas we were willing to grant equal voting strength to individuals when electing the National Parliament, we refused to grant similar powers in the election of road board members. It is not always the wealthy man who employs people in the country.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, apparently he is the scoundrel.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: He generally gets out of it, and leases his property to someone else who does the employing. References have been made to the lack of interest in connection with road board mat-

ters, but that lack of interest is easily explained. It is because so few people are enfranchised. If the basis upon which road board members were elected were widened, greater interest would be taken in local government matters. The same experience has been gained in connection with other institutions. I ask hon. members to compare the interest taken in connection with Legislative Council elections and with Legislative Assembly elections. I trust members will agree to the small step forward proposed in the clause.

Mr. DAVY: I am not concerned about the origin of the clause, but desire to take it as it appears in the Bill. An amendment should not be agreed to until the necessity for it has been demonstrated by the member proposing it. Until it is demonstrated that that which exists is wrong, the existing conditions should not be changed. The Minister for Works apparently takes the view that anything that exists at present must, *prima facie*, be wrong. To such an extent is he convinced on that point that if hon. members sitting on the Opposition side of the House suggest any thing to the contrary, the Minister promptly accuses us of being negligent regarding our duties, and casts insults at us. There may be something to be said for the proposal if it can be demonstrated that the road districts should have the greater powers that the Bill proposes. If it were proposed that the local authorities should have power to pass the laws affecting intimate details regarding citizens' lives, every citizen should have the right to a vote. But that is not the position. Apart from the power to establish a cinematograph show, the Bill merely seeks to extend the powers of the road boards to construct roads and footpaths. The Minister desires boards to have power to establish cinematograph shows with the money of the property owners of the districts concerned. It might be argued that the existing law should remain, so that the ratepayer contributing the largest amount towards the establishment of the cinematograph show would have a larger say in the question of the establishment of it, compared with that exercised by a person paying much less. Would anyone be prepared to take up shares in a company in which the holder of one share would have an equal voice with the holder of 99,000 shares? That is really what the Minister proposes. When Parliament decides that road boards shall have the same powers as

the Legislature, then will be time enough for the Minister's desires to be met.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I would not have spoken on the clause but for the lecture delivered by the Minister for Works and the accusations he has made against Opposition members. What the Minister seeks to do is not to extend the authority of the road boards; he seeks to cast upon them additional financial obligations that the Government have already collected money to discharge. The Minister desires the Government to retain that money and yet to compel the road boards to do work for which the Government have already collected the money. The main function of road boards is to attend to roads and footpaths. I object to the way the Minister has treated members regarding this matter.

Mr. Withers: You have more objection to the Minister than to the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, in many ways I have no objection to the Minister at all. On the other hand, I think it very dangerous for a barn-door fowl to think he can soar like an eagle. I certainly object to the way the Minister has treated members of the Opposition. Neither the Minister for Works nor any other Minister has ground for complaint regarding the treatment we have meted out to him. The Minister compared the election of road board members with the election of members to this House. The positions are entirely different. Every detail of the lives of the people is dealt with by Parliament. If the Minister had really been serious he would have proposed a property qualification for road board electors. I am not very much concerned about passing any of the clauses in the Bill; I do not think the position will be improved one bit. The Bill gives authority to spend money on picture shows and hospitals and if the boards care to do so, to establish libraries, to carry on agricultural shows and build halls. The last named might be all right and if they could have a really good library in every centre it would be a wonderful boon to the people. Unfortunately, the revenue prevents them from getting many of the things they wish for. The Bill imposes further obligations on boards that are already impoverished by reason of their having to keep roads in order. They have quite enough to do with their revenue and I hope the Committee will not pass the clause.

[Mr. Pantou took the Chair.]

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister's cheap sneer brought me to my feet. I merely repeated what a certain gentleman said at the conference. I wish the Minister to know that while I am here I will say what I think is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon member must speak to the clause or resume his seat.

Mr. LATHAM: Very well; I hope the Committee will not agree to the alteration of the franchise. It has been generally demonstrated that there is no need for it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have listened to the whole of the debate on this question with a good deal of interest and I have heard nothing from the Minister to convince me that the suggested alterations should take place. I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition who said that the Bill was not an improvement. I contend that it proposes to grant many of those things that road conferences have asked for from time to time.

Mr. LINDSAY: One of the difficulties in the past has been the attendances at road board meetings, and in many instances members of boards have had to travel as much as 40 or 50 miles. The trouble has always been to get men with sufficient public spirit to devote time to this work. For several years I travelled 25 miles in a sulky to attend meetings and I know of an instance where it used to take a member between two and three days to get to the meeting place and back again to his property. The Minister took us to task for not being democratic. Who is going to advise us? There are 123 road boards and they administer the Act. They do the work and therefore should be able to say whether this provision is wanted or not. Every year it has been turned down. When it comes to a question of democracy the voice of the people must be acted upon. The Minister talks about going back 100 years and about being democratic. The Minister has shown to-night that he is not democratic, but autocratic, and he should have lived in feudal times.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	19
				—
Majority for	4
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corbooy
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Heron
Miss Holman
Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lambert

Mr. Lamond
Mr. Lutey
Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Withers
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. George
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Mann
Sir James Mitchell

Mr. North
Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Thomson
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Richardson

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Munie
Mr. Hughes

NOES.

Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Maley

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11—Each elector to have one vote:

Mr. SAMPSON: As there is no mandate from the people to limit voting in the way suggested by the clause, I hope the Committee will turn it down.

Mr. THOMSON: The clause proposes to abolish a privilege which the people who pay the rates have enjoyed for years, and which they are entitled to retain. One man one vote, apparently, is democratic, but there is no democracy when it comes to equality of payment. Under this clause an absentee holding land for what the Minister for Works would call the unearned increment is to have the same voting power as the man who has shown his confidence in a town or district by residing there and putting up buildings or making a farm. Assume that the road board have power to enter into the picture show business: they might propose to erect a picture palace at considerable cost, with consequent loading of the rates. In regard to such a proposal the absentee would, under this clause, have as much say as the resident owner. According to the Minister, it is nonsense to maintain that rates are not passed on. I should like to know how I can pass on the rates which I now have to pay to the town of Katanning. There has been no demand for the proposed alteration. As stated by the

member for Toodyay, the conference of road boards to which the Minister submitted the alteration turned it down by a large majority. It is also true that the Minister definitely told the conference this was a matter of policy on which he would not be guided by any resolution which might be carried.

The Minister for Works: Who usually decides what shall be the contents of a Bill?

Mr. THOMSON: While the will of the people is supposed to govern us, we are in fact frequently governed by the will or whim of a single Minister. If this matter could be decided on non-party lines, the clause would be rejected.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister does not propose that all residents of a district should have a vote irrespective of whether they pay any rates or not, but he does propose that the man who pays a rate of half-a-crown shall have the same voting power as the man who pays hundreds of pounds in rates. In my opinion, the Minister is wrong. Hon. members should note that the next half-dozen clauses are consequential on this one.

Mr. BROWN: This is the vital clause of the Bill. From inquiries made in my electorate I find that all the road boards there are opposed to the clause and regard it as unfair. The question here is one entirely of local collection and local expenditure, and the people who pay the piper should call the tune. Undoubtedly the man who pays hundreds of pounds in rates should have more say than the man paying only a few shillings.

Mr. Marshall: Then the Government should have a representative on every road board in the State, seeing that they subsidise every road board.

Mr. Thomson: Very little.

Mr. Marshall: Very much.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BROWN: Road boards now have to strike rates high enough to meet all their requirements. Members of road boards, who are elected by the ratepayers, should decide how the ratepayers' money shall be spent. Some ratepayers have no material stake in the country. It is unfair that they should have the same say in the expenditure of public money as has the man who pays hundreds of pounds in rates. The landlord's tenants have each a vote, notwithstanding that it is the landlord who pays

the rates. Moreover, those tenants would vote for candidates who would try to reduce rents. So the landlord is hit both ways.

The Premier: That is not right. We must stop that.

Mr. BROWN: To-day, although a man pays hundreds of pounds in rates he has but four votes. All the road boards in my electorate are satisfied with the present system of voting. The Minister said he would insist upon this clause because it represents the policy of the Government. Of course the Government, having a majority here, will carry the clause. If we had not another check I do not know how we should get on.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you think that check, as you call it, represents the people?

Mr. BROWN: Certainly. I do not know what would happen if we had not that other House. Under this clause a man with no land is to have the same privileges as a man of property.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	19
				—
Majority for	4
				—

AYES.

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

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Munle	Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Maley

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 12 to 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Repeal of Section 62 and substitution of new section.

Mr. SAMPSON: There must be a little error here, for Subclause 2 provides for the filling of a vacancy within four months. In Clause 9 provision is made for the filling of a vacancy within five months. It would be better if the two periods were made uniform. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 2 “four” be struck out and “five” inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Five months is a rather long period during which to leave a district without representation. I think four months is sufficient for all purposes.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Repeal of Sections 123, 124, 125, 126 and 127 and substitution of new sections:

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That after “conclusion” in Subsection 2 of the proposed new Subsection 125 the words “or adjournment” be inserted.

Without those words a meeting that was merely adjourned would require the acting chairman to continue as chairman, notwithstanding that at the adjourned meeting the regular chairman was available.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 26—Amendment of Section 128:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I congratulate the Minister on having introduced this clause, which is the best in the Bill. It provides that boards may join in the appointment of an engineer. It is impossible for each board to employ a competent engineer to look after the roads, but if two or three boards can join, they will have a better chance to get a competent man who will obtain 20s. worth of work for every pound expended. Wherever one goes one can see the difference in work resulting from different supervision, some of the roads being good and others entirely bad.

Mr. DAVY: Anyone who has been in the House this session must have realised that the Minister is one of the most pertinacious and persistent persons. He has strenuously endeavoured throughout the session to obtain control of the insurance companies of this State.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. DAVY: I hope to satisfy you without a shadow of a doubt that I am distinctly in order. Portion of Clause 26 deals with the excision from Subsection 2 of Section 128 of the words "or a bond with sureties." The section reads—

No secretary or other officer entrusted with moneys shall be appointed until he shall have given security to the satisfaction of the Minister for the faithful discharge of his duties by the guarantee of an insurance company or a bond with sureties approved by the Minister, nor shall any officer be continued in his office unless such security is from time to time renewed.

The Minister has told us on numerous occasions that wherever an insurance company have to be approved by him, he automatically gains the right to fix their premiums. Here again we find the Minister popping in an amendment that looks perfectly innocent, so innocent that it has probably escaped the notice of most members. We are asked to appoint him a premium-fixing commissioner without control by anybody. The Government in their State Insurance Bill agreed that the Minister should not have the power to fix premiums and a proviso was added that approval should not be refused if a company had complied with the Insurance Companies Act. If there is any reason for confining the kind of security to be given for the faithful discharge of office to a guarantee with an insurance company and cutting out the right to give a bond as surety, I suggest that a proviso be inserted requiring the Minister to give his approval of a company who comply with the Insurance Companies Act. I do not know why we should be asked to strike out the words "or a bond with sureties." If a man can produce a bond duly executed by himself and two reputable citizens of substance to be approved by the Minister, why should he have to go to an insurance company? Why thrust every bit of business into an insurance company?

The Premier: They are the proper ones to do it. We want to drive business into them.

Mr. DAVY: I do not wish to see that.

The Premier: We cannot please you seemingly. We thought this would just suit you.

Mr. DAVY: I am not pleased with this. There is no reason why Section 128 should not be allowed to stand. If we agree to this cunning little amendment, which will allow the words "approved by the Minister"

to qualify the words "an insurance company," we shall be walking into a trap.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for West Perth has paid me the compliment of saying I am a pertinacious, determined individual. I suggest that he is a bit of a paranoic and that he sees insurance companies in everything. Apparently they are haunting him; he must dream of them at night.

Mr. Davy: No, you are the dreamer.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Act provides that the Minister must approve, and the Bill suggests no alteration in that respect.

Mr. Davy: It does.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It does not.

Mr. Davy: The words "approved by the Minister" qualify "a bond with sureties."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They qualify both. The hon. member suggests that this is a deep-dyed scheme or some underground move on my part. If I have one fault it is that of being frank, not of trying to sneak things through without members knowing.

Mr. Davy: You are quite frank when the time comes.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment was suggested by the department; I had nothing to do with it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are responsible for it when you bring it here.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, and I accept the responsibility. I have no feeling whatever regarding the proposal. The department said the provision for a bond with sureties was unnecessary because an officer of good standing could get a guarantee from any insurance company.

Mr. Davy: He would have to pay for a fidelity policy but would not have to pay for a surety.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When I say I have no feeling in the matter, I hope the hon. member will be satisfied. It is not a little scheme of mine to get something through without members being apprised of its purport.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do not accuse yourself.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am answering the argument advanced by the member for West Perth.

Mr. Davy: You have answered it completely by indicating your agreement to an amendment that I shall presently propose.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I hope that in future the hon. member will not have his sleep disturbed by dreams of insurance companies or by seeing pictures of funny men about him.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Better that than seeing funny women.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The words complained of are in the 1919 Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are not stonewalling, are you?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not like accusations of the kind made by the member for West Perth.

Mr. Teesdale: I got into trouble the other night for making a similar remark.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have put up with a good deal from members opposite.

Mr. Teesdale: And we over here have put up with a good deal from your side.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not care a dump about that.

Mr. Teesdale: And you do not care a dump about the Chairman of Committees, either.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for West Perth imported into the amendment an idea that did not occur to the framers of the amendment, and did not enter my mind. The usual thing is for the policy to come from the company. I cannot see that the words will do any harm. At any rate I am not guilty of the offence alleged against me by the member for West Perth.

Mr. SAMPSON: A board with which I am associated finds it difficult to get enough money with which to carry on.

The Premier: That is not the cause and effect of your being associated with it, I hope.

Mr. SAMPSON: I felt some anxiety touching this. A written request was sent to the Public Works Department to ascertain if it would be possible to put up a guarantee for the secretary, and avoid the payment of fees to an insurance office. The reply was unfavourable, and the policy was taken out with a company. That money could have been better spent on the roads. I hope "a bond approved of by the Minister" will be availed of.

Mr. DAVY: I move an amendment—

That all the words from "by" in line 2 down to "and" in line 3 be struck out.

I am glad the Minister has not the Machiavellian designs I attributed to him. It did seem, however, from past experience that

my suspicions might be justified. I must say too he is not justified in saying that I am suffering from paranoia to-night. This evening when I suggested that the onus was on him to support with argument any amendment he might move, he accused me of insulting him. Paranoia means a persistent delusion of persecution. I ask members, who has shown most symptoms of that to-night?

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

Clause 27—Amendment of Section 129:

Mr. SAMPSON: I am pleased that other employees are to have the advantage of receiving a gratuity, but I regret this amount cannot be greater than that which is equal to one year's salary. This was approved by the 1926 conference.

Mr. THOMSON: Why has this alteration been made?

The Minister for Works: It was done at the request of the conference.

Mr. THOMSON: There is some doubt as to the wisdom of including this clause in the Bill, and people consider that it may lead to a lot of ill feeling, such as was occasioned at Fremantle.

Mr. Sampson: In the opinion of the conference this clause goes far enough.

Clause put and passed.

[Mr. Angelo took the Chair.]

Clause 28—Amendment of Section 136:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This clause comprehends some of the additional powers to be given to road boards. They will be able to control mechanics' institutes, cemeteries, recreation grounds, hospitals, agricultural halls, libraries, reading rooms or any other institution or utility vested in them or under their control. Road boards are already overloaded. Can they manage to finance all these other things? They might be given power to make a public hall into an agricultural hall. In some districts a library would be most useful, but it is all a question of what they can afford to do.

Mr. Teesdale: Is it compulsory?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, it could not be; but is this not overloading the local authorities? If we agree to the clause, no doubt the responsibility of erecting and running hospitals will be cast upon local authorities. Already the Government collect taxation for that purpose, and we

should not collect such taxation and yet evade our responsibilities. What will happen will be that in one centre the people will be enthusiastic and support a movement for the establishment of a local hospital; the Government will provide a subsidy; the building will be erected, and then the local people will be compelled to carry it on. Subsequently the Government would be in a position to say to other people that the residents of such and such a centre had provided their own hospital and therefore the other people would have to accept a similar responsibility. That would not be right. I hope the Minister will not press for the inclusion of the reference to hospitals. The Premier will remember the reception accorded in this House to the Bill, based on the report of a select committee, dealing with hospitals. While the Bill passed in this Chamber, the Premier was successful in carrying his opposition to the Upper House, where the Bill was defeated.

The Premier: Those were the days when our voices were not listened to in this Chamber.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Too often your voices were listened to on important occasions, and to the hurt of the country.

The Minister for Lands: Did we not keep you in office at the time?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No.

The Premier: It was the determined stand we took beside you that made the opposition keep back.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is impossible to ask road boards to accept the financial responsibility of running hospitals. Unless the Minister can advance very good reasons for retaining the reference to hospitals, I shall move an amendment to delete it.

Mr. LINDSAY: I do not altogether agree with the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition, because my experience goes to show that the local authorities should have power to appoint committees to deal with such matters. To a certain extent I agree with the hon. member in his references to hospitals. At the same time, in my district we found it necessary to bring the road board into the matter, particularly when it came to a question of providing funds. In the course of two years we collected £2,000 and provided a hospital. It was then found that the use to which the institution was put necessitated the spending of another £2,000 upon

it, and in view of the drain upon the resources of the people who had contributed to the fund, we had to secure the assistance of the road board in conjunction with the Public Works Department. Despite that, the hospital is managed by a committee, not by the road board. I do not think there is any likelihood of a road board seeking to take the management of a hospital out of the hands of a committee that has successfully carried on the undertaking.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am surprised at the opposition to the clause.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: My opposition was raised to the reference to hospitals.

Mr. LAMBERT: Most of the powers of the Committee are almost synonymous with the functions of the members of road boards, and I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition should take exception to authority being given to a road board to delegate certain powers to a hospital committee or in fact to any other committee in the district. In my district where a road board is operating there is a medical fund at present, and there is a conflict of opinion. Members of the road board feel that the support they should receive from members of the medical fund is not forthcoming.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: My idea was to shorten the discussion on the Bill. The clause provides for the management of all these things and as we came to it I thought it would help the Minister and the Committee to raise the discussion on it instead of having it later. I have no objection to the clause going through.

Mr. THOMSON: This is a request that has been made in respect of hospitals. We in Katanning are up against the proposal that we had a hospital which had been condemned, and the local authorities were desirous of building an up to date institution. The Government signified their willingness to grant a pound for pound subsidy provided the district accepted the responsibility. The people said that they were desirous of procuring power to levy a rate upon the whole district in order to thus subsidise the hospitals. But when they came to put the proposal into effect they found it was impossible to do so, and all they were able to do was to extend the provisions of the Health Act to cover the whole of the road board district. The Leader of the Opposition is somewhat scared and perhaps rightly so, that road boards may rush in and build hospitals from their own funds and then

levy rates upon the people. That position, however, can be safeguarded. Personally, I can see no objection to the clause, because it is what the people have been asking for.

Mr. CHESSEBROUGH: In my district the road boards are trustees for the recreation grounds and also for the mechanics' institute. There are many instances where secretaries of road boards are also secretaries of other local bodies, all of whom contribute towards the salary of the officers. The clause will give the local bodies an opportunity to appoint a committee to assist, or even to take over, with the consent of the people, other institutions.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The function of a road board is to collect rates with which to make and maintain roads, not to look after hospitals. This will inflict extra rates upon the local people for the erection of hospitals that it is the duty of the Government to provide. I hope the Minister does not think this will relieve the Treasury of any expenditure under this head.

The Minister for Works: The clause does not give councils the power to erect hospitals.

Mr. TEESDALE: If a council chooses to appoint a committee to go into these matters, it is their affair. I hope this will not apply to hospitals already in existence. Local authorities should not be allowed to interfere with them. Two or three women on a hospital committee can play the very devil. Surely the Minister would have to give his consent before a committee was allowed to interfere in a matter of this kind.

The Minister for Works: A hospital can be taken over only with the consent of the Government.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—"or the establishment of which is under the consideration of the council."

I wish to ensure that the district council shall have the assistance of citizens other than those who happen to be members of that council to advise them in the preliminary work of establishing such institutions as are mentioned in the clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment is quite out of place here, as the clause deals with a committee to advise the council regarding management or control of any institution. There cannot be management or control of something which is non est.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The word "establishment" might be inserted before "management or control."

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In that case there would be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: I discussed the amendment with someone who has advised me on the subject, and he suggested this as the best means of dealing with the matter. If there is anything wrong, the clause can be recommitted. I should like to get the amendment in somewhere. There should be consideration of the usefulness of an institution prior to its establishment. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. SAMPSON: I now move an amendment—

That "establishment" be inserted between "the" and "management" in line 5 of the proposed subsection.

Mr. LAMBERT: Would that amendment meet the case? Should not the words to be inserted be "proposed establishment"?

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

Clause 29—Amendment of Section 130:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is a clerical error in this clause. "Subsection 2" should read "Subsection 3." I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the figure "2" be struck out and "3" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 30, 31—agreed to.

Clause 32—Amendment of Section 147: power of Governor to open or divert road:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move an amendment—

That in proposed Section 147a, after "district," line 2, there be inserted "or of a ward of the district in which the road is situated."

There is considerable difficulty as regards the opening of roads in some of our new settlements. Occasionally, when it is necessary to declare a road to get into a siding land owners object strongly, and use their influence on the road board to prevent the road from being declared. The Government at present have no power to open a new road unless the road board consent. In the case of a sol

dier settlement it has been necessary to make a considerable detour in order to get to the siding, whereas a much shorter road could have been obtained direct. The position in that instance is that the people have been asking the Government to declare the road during the last 12 months or more, but the Government cannot do so. The position has had to remain as it is. The desire is that if a majority of the ratepayers in the district concerned require a road, they shall be able to appeal to the Government to declare that road irrespective of the desires of the road board. After due inquiry, if the Governor-in-Council is of the opinion that the road should be declared, it will be declared as if the road board had suggested that course being followed. It is essential that the people affected in the district shall have a say.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think we declared roads.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No. I have the assurance of the Under Secretary that the power was not provided for that course being followed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, we have done it, and you have done it too.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Some provision such as I have indicated should be included in the Act so as to provide the opportunity outlined for the people concerned. In this particular instance, I tried to make arrangements with the railways so that the road could go inside the fence. It was found that it would be necessary to go through a gate, but as objections were raised to that, the necessary provision could not be made.

Mr. LINDSAY: It is news to me that the Minister cannot override a road board, because nearly every section of the Act provides that the Minister may do this or that. I took a deputation to the Minister concerning the road he referred to and I believe that if the Minister had given a decision to the members of the road board, their opposition would have ceased and they would have done as he suggested.

The Minister for Lands: The board was written to repeatedly.

Mr. LINDSAY: I believe that if the Minister had given a decision, the board would have carried it out.

The Minister for Lands: I could not give a decision because I had not the power.

Mr. LINDSAY: The board put their case before the Minister, knowing that the other side had also made representations to him.

I believe the Minister should have decided the question and whatever his decision might have been, effect would have been given to it. We have been discussing the granting of additional powers to road boards, but the proposition now under discussion represents a simple way of taking power away from the local authority. The Act provides that the chairman shall convene a meeting if a requisition signed by 20 ratepayers is presented to him, and a majority of the ratepayers present at a meeting so convened shall decide the issue. It is easy for a disgruntled ratepayer to secure 20 signatures and the decision of a meeting held in accordance with the petition will decide the issue. There is nothing in the Act, however, to say how many ratepayers must be in attendance at the meeting, and it is quite possible for a small number of ratepayers to determine the question. I am doubtful whether the power should be taken away from a road board. A good deal of ill feeling has been engendered in my district regarding the road question, and possibly if the road in question had been asked for at the outset, the trouble might have been settled straight away.

Mr. DAVY: Apart altogether from the general principles governing the proposal, there seems to be an aspect that may have been missed. Section 143 of the Act deals with the calling of annual or special meetings in the manner set forth. Either of those meetings, whether the general or the special meeting, would be a meeting convened in the prescribed manner. So it would appear that at a general meeting of ratepayers if the majority present carried a resolution in favour of opening a new road, it could be done by the Governor-in-Council over the heads of the road board, although no notice of intention to bring up such an important matter had been given to the ratepayers. It is only when a special meeting is held that any notice stating the business to be presented at such meeting has to be given. Although it might well be a proper thing for the Government to have some supervision over road boards in respect of feeder roads, yet where a new road is merely for the convenience of one or two settlers, surely it is not a matter for Government interference.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope some power will be given to the Minister to override boards that are stubborn in their opposition to the opening of new roads, particularly feeder roads. The amendment does not state whether the meeting is to be a general meet-

ing of ratepayers of the whole of the district, or whether it is to be confined to ratepayers of one ward.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This provision is required by the department to get over existing difficulties. Only in isolated cases will the power be exercised. Some boards are unreasonable, generally because the proposed new road runs through the land held by some member of the board.

[Mr. Lutey resumed the Chair.]

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should not say that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But it is a fact. During the last 12 months I have been beseiged by returned soldier settlers asking for this road.

Mr. Mann: Have you not the power already?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, we have not. Only under the clauses here can we deal with roads through private lands. If it is only for the one case under review, this provision is needed. This one case has been going on for the past 12 or 18 months.

Mr. Davy: Should not every ratepayer know what the business of the meeting is to be?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think that altogether necessary. Even if the meeting be packed, it will be packed by those who want the road.

Mr. Davy: What about those who would suffer from the road?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would be only one man at most.

Mr. Lindsay: Would not the rest of the ratepayers suffer if they had to pay out £200 or £300 for the fencing of the road?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have nothing to do with that. The road was there long before I took office. The owner of the land is on the road board, and so the board will not agree to declaring a public road through his land to the siding. This is right alongside the railway fences. There have been various instances of people having a keel for roads and of road boards having refused to approve of them. The Government should have power to declare a public road in case of necessity. It is impossible for the provision to do any harm because the greatest care would be exercised if the road board were opposed to the proposal.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government ought to have power to provide roads to railway sidings, but the points

raised by the member for Toodyay should also be considered. The roads should be provided when the railways are being built, and the work of constructing and fencing the roads should be part of the railway cost.

The Minister for Lands: I was referring to a railway that you constructed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is hardly a railway in the State in which I have not had a hand. If the Minister knows that a road is necessary to enable people to market their produce he should have the power to construct it. I suggest that the Minister take the necessary power and not bother about a meeting of ratepayers. I fancy that the Minister already has the power.

Mr. LINDSAY: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that where a road is necessary it should not be a tax on the other ratepayers of the district. I warn the Minister that presently I shall be approaching him for a subsidy.

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

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 13th October, 1926.

		Page
Question: Unemployment, Prothero miners' relief scheme	...	1360
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment, 2r., Com. Report	...	1361
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2r.	...	1361
Traffic Act Amendment, 2r.	...	1362
Supply (No. 3) £1,363,500, 1r.	...	1364
Inspection of Scaffolding, Com.	...	1364
Justices Act Amendment, Com.	...	1366
Weights and Measures Act Amendment, 2r.	...	1366
Reserves, 2r.	...	1369
Adjournment	...	1369

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

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT, PRO- THERO MINERS' RELIEF SCHEME.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON asked the Chief Secretary: 1. Is it a fact that when the Prothero miners, under the relief scheme,