

tions do not permit of fruit being held in this way without charge. I hope the Minister will consider amending the regulation.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Roads and Bridges, public buildings, etc., £220,962:

Item, Perth Causeway reinstatement, £200:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A small amount is to be spent on the Causeway. It is necessary that the traffic congestion on the Causeway should be relieved by the construction of another bridge between the Causeway and Guildford in some convenient part of the metropolitan area. Bayswater is probably the ideal place for another bridge. Will it be possible for something to be done in this matter at an early date?

(Mr. Lutey resumed the Chair.)

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no thought of constructing any other bridge over the river this year, or of doing anything more to the Causeway this year.

Item, Public buildings (including sewerage and equipment new buildings), £97,126:

Mr. THOMSON: I would draw the attention of the Minister for Works to the accommodation provided for the officers of the Katanning branch of the Agricultural Bank. The accommodation is quite insufficient. It is suggested that the courthouse should be used for the bank, and that a new courthouse should be erected.

The Minister for Works: The matter has not yet come before me.

Mr. SLEEMAN: What is it proposed to spend on additions to the Fremantle Hospital?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A start will be made with the work this year, but I cannot say how much will be done.

Item, Loans and grants to local authorities for erection of country hospitals, £19,185:

Mr. THOMSON: This amount appears very small.

The Premier: It is more than the amount spent last year. We have been very generous in the matter of country hospitals.

Item, Urgent minor works throughout North-West, £4,568:

Mr. LAMOND: What does this item include?

Hon. S. W. MUNSIE: The items are all set out on page 29 of the Loan Estimates.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Other undertakings, £163,500; Lands Improvement Loan Fund, £31,498—agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 9th December, 1925.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	2512
Bills: Bush Fires Act Amendment, 3R., passed ...	2512
Land Drainage, Report	2512
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, Recom. ...	2513
Eight Hours, 2R.,	2513
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, 2R. (Amendment 6 months defeated), Com.	2521
British Imperial Oil Coy., Ltd. (Private), 1R., ...	2534
Main Roads, Recom.,	2535
Racing Restriction Act Amendment, 2R., Com., Report	2538

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. E. Rose, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. F. E. S. Willmott (South-West) on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—LAND DRAINAGE.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Order read for the consideration of the report of Committee.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the report of the Committee be adopted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clauses 34, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 63, and new clauses which stand as Nos. 4, 5, and 12.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I ask leave to add to the clauses enumerated by Mr. Lovekin Clauses 5, 13, 16, 22, 24, 25, 43, 45, 47, and 48 of the Bill as re-printed, and also a new clause.

Leave given, the amendment amended accordingly.

Amendment put and passed.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 10:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is impossible to follow the amendments without having clean copies of the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is difficult, as one has to work with two Bills.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I see no alternative except to move—

That progress be reported.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Will you have every member furnished with a copy of the reprint?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly.

Motion passed; progress reported.

BILL—EIGHT HOURS.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central) [3.15] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to provide for an eight hour day and a 44-hour week. As applied to our conditions the term "eight hour day" is a misnomer because, although the working day is described in that way, it is a matter

of common knowledge that men have to work more than eight hours a day. Thus, the principle of an eight hour day has not really been established in Western Australia. It is essential that a Bill, having that purpose in view, shall be placed upon the statute-book in order that we may know exactly where we stand. Throughout the world there has been an agitation for the reduction of working hours and the movement has been successful in many countries outside Australia. We in the Commonwealth are behind other countries in respect of some phases of industrial legislation, although we may be in the forefront in other directions. Certainly as regards hours of labour, we lag behind other countries. It is a long cry back to 1856 when, in New South Wales and Victoria, an agitation was commenced for the introduction of the eight hours' system. Strong, and on occasions extremely hostile, opposition was levelled against the movement but eventually, following upon a strike by the stonemasons and other industrial troubles, the principle was established. That was the dawn of the eight hour movement in Australia. The unions had to put up a very bitter and vigorous fight in those days and even to-day strenuous efforts are levelled against organisations and individuals endeavouring to establish the 44-hour week. In looking back over the time that has elapsed since those early days, one can only view with a sense of satisfaction the results that followed upon the establishment of some semblance of an eight hour day. Despite that, however, no material alteration has followed during the interim. Wherever there has been a lessening of hours in countries throughout the world records show that it has been of benefit to industry and to the individual workers alike. As with most reforms, however, this alteration can be obtained only by means of agitation and strenuous effort. It is recognised that any reform must meet with opposition. We can go back to the dark days in the Old Country when women and children had to work in the mines. There are some living amongst us to-day who had experience under those conditions, and I know that none of us would wish to return to such a state of affairs in industry. We know that mothers worked in the mines in those days with the sanction of those in authority, and those women left their em-

ployment below ground only when they were about to give birth to a new life. Then they returned to their bondage in a weakened condition. Such instances are on record and ample evidence is forthcoming to establish the accuracy of those experiences. There is ample evidence, too, of the hostile fight and opposition in those days against any person who endeavoured to liberate the working classes from their life of bondage in the Old Country. Then, as before and since, any attempt to alter existing conditions met with opposition, and only when it was fully established that the new state would prove of benefit to all concerned was any alteration effected. The Government are of opinion that it is time something definite was done regarding the establishment of an eight hour day and a 44-hour week. The Government have instituted the system throughout the public service and to-day about 10,000 men are working the 44-hour week. Although it is early to express an opinion or to furnish proof, I suggest that the results in Western Australia under the altered conditions will compare more than favourably with those achieved elsewhere. That has been clearly borne out by the railway records and those of other departments since the establishment of the 44-hour week. In Queensland, where the bulk of the industries have been working a 44-hour week for some time, it is generally recognised that the system is of mutual benefit to all concerned. The alteration there was effected not by means of a legislative enactment, but by means of agreements between the employers and the employees. However, since last July the 44-hour week has become the law of the land. In New South Wales a Bill was passed in 1921 establishing the eight-hour day. Later that Act was repealed by the Fuller Government, but it has been re-enacted by the present Labour Government. When passed originally it was only after a thorough investigation had been carried out by Mr. Justice Beeby, sitting as a Royal Commissioner. He took voluminous evidence and as the result of his report the eight hour principle was introduced into the Government service there. It has been remarked by high authorities that when Mr. Justice Beeby was framing his report he had due regard to business and commercial interests. During past years it has been recognised that the great preponderance of

the agitation for shorter hours, increased wages and better conditions has come from the ranks of the workers themselves. That, after all, is only natural. On the other hand we find that in almost every country the agitation is not confined to the workers or to the industrial unions. It has been taken up by professors, medical men, scientists and business men. They recognise that, apart altogether from the humane standpoint, the principle has a lot to recommend it in the interests of the community as a whole. Business men recognise that from an economic standpoint the best organisation is that in which the workers are satisfied with their conditions. To-day men who are really successful agree that a direct factor in the achievement of the success attending their organisations has been the bettering of the conditions and the shortening of the hours of work of their employees. Statistics prove these facts undeniably. It is not to be wondered at that the agitation is not strictly confined to those directly concerned, because it is universally recognised that it is of advantage to have a sound mind in a sound body. If we are to develop a virile and healthy nation we must observe conditions that will give the workers opportunities and encourage them to take an interest in the welfare and government of their country. That can be brought about only by making them contented with their lot and satisfied with their conditions. Probably in no country in the world, and certainly in no State of Australia, is it possible to take advantage of the movement along these lines to the same extent as is possible in Western Australia, rich as the State is in mineral and natural resources. We are hopeful that we shall be able to develop our secondary industries to such an extent that we will not only be self-supporting but be in a position to supply other parts of the world with necessary commodities. It may appear rather a strange assertion, but I believe that one of the greatest contributing factors to that end will be the Bill now before members. The object is to place the industrial affairs of the community on a slightly better footing, enabling industries depending largely upon manual labour to operate with a more contented band of employees. By these means we hope to build up our State with contented people working under conditions satisfactory to themselves and to those most vitally concerned. I have had experi-

ence in the mines at Broken Hill and in the public works and mines of this State, and I have always found that the success of any industry has been due to the fact that those engaged in it were enjoying satisfactory conditions. This question has received the consideration of eminent men. Mr. Justice Higgins, who had a long experience as President of the Federal Arbitration Court, has given expression to views having a direct bearing on industrial affairs in Australia. A most exhaustive report by that gentleman will be found in this book that I will leave on the Table for the convenience of those who care to peruse it. It contains an extract from a speech by Mr. Justice Higgins in which he conclusively proves that an 8-hour day is to the benefit of all concerned. He points out that the worker in Australia today does not enjoy an 8-hour day to the extent that he should, and that the conditions ought to be an 8-hour day with a half-holiday on Saturday. Mr. Justice Higgins says the worker has always had to pay a big price for the concession of a half-holiday on Saturday, that it has to be made up in some other direction. His Honour's recommendation is that the workers of every State in Australia should enjoy an 8-hour day with a half-holiday on Saturday. He has definitely stated that Australia is lagging behind many other countries in her industrial legislation and particularly in respect of the hours of labour. He points out that those hours are shorter in Great Britain, France, Germany and other countries.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What are the hours of labour in Germany?

The HONORARY MINISTER: They vary in various industries. Many of the workers there work fewer than eight hours per day. The same thing may be said of Canada and America. I have had interviews with a visitor from America in the course of which I was surprised to find that the conditions in his country are considerably in advance of those of our own. That gentleman intends to introduce those conditions into Western Australia if, on his return to America, his firm decide to invest in this State.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Have they an arbitration court there?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know. Nor does it matter much whether the

wages there are fixed by arbitration or by round table conference, or are arrived at by agreements between the employers and the employees. The fact remains that they are considerably in advance of those in Western Australia. I could give sheaves of information relating to the conditions operating throughout the world. Mr. Justice Higgins has made it clear that we are behind the rest of the world in our working conditions and wages. Many other countries have adopted the recommendations of the Washington and Geneva Conferences, and put them into operation. As a result of the International Treaty signed at Versailles in 1919, many countries have adopted the establishment of a minimum working day and week, regulations of labour making for the prevention of unemployment, the provision of an adequate living wage, and measures for the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury. The outstanding feature of it all was that the high contracting parties, moved by the sentiments of justice and humanity, and working for the peace of the world, agreed to a certain clause.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It sounds very nice.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It does; and, more than that, it is very gratifying. The gentlemen who represented the various countries at the conferences returned to those countries and put into operation many of the recommendations carried by the conferences. It is time some of them were put into operation in this State. I do not know that we ought to be very far behind Frenchmen or Canadians or Americans. The debates in the French Chamber of Deputies make interesting reading. The views there expressed could be highly recommended to some of our own statesmen, who seem to be utterly opposed to relieving the conditions of the working classes. Some of the leaders of the Chamber of Deputies readily admit their responsibilities in that direction.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why, they can't pay their debts!

The HONORARY MINISTER: France has been under much greater obligations than have other countries, and it could be shown that she is making her best endeavours to pay her way, and is now getting on to her feet again.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What is the value of the franc now?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not sure that that comes into the discussion. The whole trend of their argument was that

whatever the intention elsewhere, the French Government had no thought of going back on the 8-hour day. Here is the opinion of a direct representative of the employers: he said he wished to confirm, on behalf of the French employers, the remarks of previous speakers to the effect that the 1919 Act had functioned to the interest of the employers and had assisted to increase the technical value of their equipment. These opinions are from unbiassed sources. When we find employers' representatives stating these things as facts, it is only natural to believe that the 8-hour principle has something to recommend it. I have here a report from the Labour Department of the United States on the question of reduced hours and output. It shows that the firms who tried the experiment of shortening their working week did not suffer by the reduction. In certain types of industry the reduction of one or more hours per day brought no decrease in the daily production. These are excerpts from official reports, and so they command respect. The co-operative societies of England, who have given a long trial to reduced hours, are absolutely satisfied that it is in the interests, not only of the workers, but also of their societies and businesses.

At a meeting of the Committee on Industry and Trade recently held at the Board of Trade, with Sir Arthur Balfour in the chair, evidence was submitted by Mr. A. V. Alexander, M.P., supported by Mr. R. Stewart (Chairman Scottish Co-op. Wholesale Society), Prof. F. Hall, M.A., B. Com. (Co-operative Union), Mr. J. J. Worley (Co-operative Productive Federation), Mr. F. Cooper (Transport Department, Co-operative Wholesale Society) and Mr. A. Pickup (Director Co-op. Wholesale Society). The statement given below was part of the evidence adduced:—In regard to hours of labour, we do not need to point out that, during recent years there has been a general decrease in the number of hours constituting the standard week. The co-operative movement has always given a lead in this matter, and will go farther as fast as competing firms raise their standard and make it possible for co-operators to go farther. The following statistics are relevant to the question of hours of labour in the co-operative movement:—

Year.	Number of Societies working 63 hours or less.	Number of Societies working 48 hours
1913	223	53
1914	295	96
1917	458	134
1924	411	779*

* Including 128 societies with a 44 hour week for all employees; 368 with a 40-hour week for clerks; 169 with a 44-hour week for clerks; and 70 with a 46-hour week for clerks.

That is the experience of co-operative societies which are acting directly in the interests of the shareholders and of profit. With reduced hours of working the efficiency and output of labour have increased.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is general support given to the co-operative schemes?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes; it is recognised that co-operative societies in the Old Country are in a flourishing condition.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about co-operative societies in Australia?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am quoting evidence to prove that wherever the 44-hour week has been instituted, whether in commercial or manual occupations, it has proved successful. Many instances of a similar nature could be quoted from different parts of the world, but it is not necessary to name more than a few to show that what I claim for the Bill is amply supported by experience elsewhere.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would it not be worth while for Australia to adopt the principle of co-operation?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Of course it would. There are co-operative societies in the Eastern States that have proved a success, and the same may be said of co-operative societies in Western Australia.

Hon. J. Cornell: There are many more that have "gone broke."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have in mind one that has been a conspicuous success from the point of view of employees as well as of the society.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Did not Albany Bell try to introduce some sort of co-operative movement in his business, and was it not opposed?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have no experience of what Albany Bell did. The records prove that where a shorter working week has been instituted it has proved successful. One of the most eminent authorities in Australia is Mr. A. B. Piddington, K.C. By no stretch of imagination can he be accused of being a Labour man. Here are a few extracts from his report—

It is nearly five years since Mr. Justice Higgins conducted what was virtually a nation-wide inquiry into the feasibility of this reform. Almost at the same time Judge Beeby, in New South Wales, aided greatly by Mr. Sawkins, the Statist to the Board of Trade, examined, trade by trade, the position in New South Wales. Both judicial inquiries elicited these facts:—(1) That Australia is behind England

and far behind America in the movement to establish 44 hours as a standard working week. (2) That in the great majority of industries there is no risk to production in the proposed standard.

Hon. J. Cornell: Piddington's reasons have about as much effect to-day as would Nebuchadnezzar's.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not in accord with the hon. member in that sentiment; otherwise Mr. Piddington's opinions would not be quoted so widely as they are quoted to-day. Perhaps there may be a little political significance attached to the hon. member's interjection, because Mr. Piddington is not altogether agreeable to some members of the Federal Parliament. Anyhow, he is recognised as one of the highest authorities on matters of this kind. He continued—

From these findings there followed in Federal awards and in State awards for New South Wales a practice of fixing 44 hours as the standard week. Machinery has multiplied the output of the individual worker, but has left him just where he was in the command of his own hours for recreation or self-improvement, or for the use of his time as he likes. It is to redress the balance that Queensland has lowered the standard week by four hours. We hear much about the distribution of wealth, but what of the distribution of the most precious wealth—the living hours of the week? We hear much about diminished production, but what about the production that ought to constitute a country's staple industry—the production of a first-class population?

To have a strong, virile, prosperous population should be a vital consideration for all who have the welfare of the nation at heart. To achieve that we must create a proper atmosphere, give the workers conditions at least tolerable, and opportunities for recreation and the interchange of ideas.

Hon. J. Cornell: I would go all the way with you to abolish work if that were possible.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is a good suggestion.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are we a first-class people now?

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is room for improvement in certain directions. Mr. Piddington continues—

Every legislator and every reformer ought to act upon the fundamental maxim that the real problem of industrialism to-day is to find cures not for under-production, but for under-distribution. An exhaustive survey of the rate of production, such as that made by Mr. Justice Higgins in 1920, goes to show that it is

by no means the case that a shorter week necessarily means less production.

I admit that it is not interesting to read too many quotations, but it is essential to give the views of reliable authorities on this question. It has been argued that if a shorter working week were instituted, production would diminish. Experience does not bear out that contention. Queensland is the 44-hour State and it has the lowest cost of living index figure that it has had for a long time. At the 30th June, 1925, the cost of living index figures for the several States were:—Queensland, 1482; Western Australia, 1609; South Australia, 1679; Victoria, 1685; Tasmania, 1703; New South Wales, 1704. Thus, in Queensland, where the 44-hour week has been operating so long, the index figure for the cost of living is considerably below that of all the other States.

Hon. J. Cornell: But what is the deficit on the Queensland railways alone?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The 44-hour week is the law of the land in New South Wales. It was instituted by a previous Government, only to be repealed by a later Government, and reinstated by the present Government. In Victoria the 8-hour day operates and 44 hours a week and fewer are worked in many industries. The 44-hour week there applies to boot factory hands, boot repairers, bricklayers, builders' labourers, chaffcutters and many other workers. It might be said that if industries were established in Western Australia, they would have to compete with those of the other States. Whatever industries are likely to be started here, similar industries in the Eastern States are working fewer than 48 hours a week, in some instances 44, and in others 43 and 42.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have any reached the 30-hour week.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not know.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would it be proposed to introduce a Bill afterwards to regulate the number of hours to which we might devote pleasure?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It may be necessary in some instances to curtail the liberties of some people. The records prove that in Canada and other parts of the world many industries are working successfully under the 8-hour principle and under a week

of less than 44 hours. To show how this is viewed by many of the delegates, who were high authorities upon industrial and labour matters, I would quote from the remarks of Mr. Justin Godart the French Minister for Labour. The President in calling upon him said the new French Government, by sending to the Conference one of its members, had indicated the spirit in which it intended to collaborate in the work of the International Labor Organisation. Mr. Godart said—

The eight-hour day, established in France by the Act of 23rd April, 1919, has given valuable results. It is becoming more and more solidly based, not only on the text of an Act which served as a model in drafting the Washington Convention, but upon an evolution in social habits and upon a systematic transformation in the methods of production. The object of the eight-hour day is to secure humane conditions of labour. As regards the eight-hour day more especially, the French Government is prepared to ratify the Washington Convention.

So far the eight-hour day principle has not been established in Western Australia. Very few men are working that number of hours. When they require a half day off on Saturday they have to work overtime or make up the hours in some other way.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do they work in France eight hours a day on six days in the week?

The HONORARY MINISTER: In some cases. Not long ago the workers worked 56 hours a week. Australia ought to be ashamed of the fact that since 1856 she has done so little to alter the condition of affairs.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In some Continental countries work is done on Sundays in addition to the eight hours on the remaining days of the week.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I know that on some "black" boats men are working the clock round, because they are forced to do so. We are endeavouring to improve that position, and make things better than we found them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: We do not hold with that sort of thing.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Godart went on to say—

We shall not allow anything to be done to diminish the protection which is afforded to workers. We shall maintain the Eight-Hour Act, the elasticity of which has been proved by experience, and which has already effected such vast improvement in the material and moral conditions of the wage earners. We de-

sire the speedy ratification of the conventions adopted by the International Labour Conference at Washington and Geneva.

These opinions are worth considering. They are advanced by men of standing after mature consideration. These are men who are endeavouring to ameliorate the conditions of the workers in their own country. Another quotation I should like to make is from the remarks of Mr. Rhys Davies, the British Government delegate. He said—

He would have preferred to have kept the question of hours of work in Germany and of reparations separate and distinct, but this was apparently impossible. The eight-hour day was probably more widely observed in actual practice in Great Britain than in any other country. It was already in application in respect of several millions of work people. The British Government intended at the earliest possible moment, when the congested state of the House of Commons permitted, to proceed with a Bill which, if enacted, would make possible the ratification of the Hours Convention.

The trend in other parts of the world is in the direction of reducing the hours of labour. Mr. Justice Higgins, after a perusal of the records of the civilised world, stated that Australia lagged behind other parts of the world in regard to hours. The reason why the output is kept up to the standard to-day, despite the reduction of hours, is because of the advance of science in the creation of new machinery, to compete with the various difficulties which assail commercial men. The worker has contributed in some degree to this advance. He has contributed his labour and his brains. Owing to the long hours of labour he was not able to exercise his brains as he should be able to do under the improved conditions. Seeing that the workers have contributed to this advance they are entitled to share in the benefits. This view is held by many eminent authorities and captains of industry. I have here an extract from a speech delivered by the General Manager of a big woollen mill in Great Britain. He said—

I am very fortunate in having the results of one clothing plant which is devoted to the manufacture of trousers exclusively, and of course it is much easier for this plant to measure results. The Duchess Manufacturing Company, located at Poughkeepsie, New York, is very efficiently managed. I came in contact with that plant during the war when I was connected with the War Department. They had trouble with the union. The union demanded an eight-hour day, and the manage-

ment was opposed to it. I strongly urged them to adopt the eight-hour day, and told them I was sure it would pay, and they finally did adopt it. I have a letter here from Mr. Sweetser, the general manager of the company, which contains some very interesting figures:—Changes in working hours in a large clothing plant: In 1902, 60 hours; in 1903, 54 hours; in 1914, 50 hours; weekly units produced per individual, 22.7; 1918, 44½ hours; 1923, 44½ hours, weekly units produced per individual, 30.7. Per cent. change, 1914 to 1923, 17.6 decrease; 36.4 increase.

It is conclusively proved by these authorities that in every instance where the reduction of hours has been made it has been appreciated by the employees. They have been given a better opportunity of doing good work, and have had more time for rest and recreation. They have been recognised as individuals rather than as part of the machinery. They have by this means been induced to take a greater interest in their work. Not only has this been borne out by authorities in other countries, but it is borne out by the reports of the Commissioner for Railways and the engineers of the Midland Junction workshops, and those in charge of other Government activities. They are quite satisfied that with the reduction of hours, greater interest will be taken by the workers and a healthier atmosphere will be created amongst them. There is more co-operation between all parties and it is of advantage not only individually, but to the State, to have this reduction. I trust the Bill will receive favourable consideration. The Bill is not intended to operate harshly where it can be proved that a spread over the fortnight is necessary. The Government are of opinion that the Bill will operate in the interests of economy, of the individual, and certainly in the interests of the workers who have long been agitating for this change. After close scrutiny and investigation, and gathering together the opinions of big commercial men and captains of industry, it is shown that a reduction in hours is in the interests of the commercial community as well as of the employees. It will create a happier feeling amongst all concerned, and will lead to greater co-operation between employers and employees. We must bear in mind the remarks of Mr. Piddington that this will lead to the creation of a first-class population. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.12]: I do not intend to detain members long in discussing this impossible proposition. We have had many impossible Bills brought before us, but this excels all. Not only will the country be alarmed if this House passes the Bill, but the Government would be alarmed because they know it would mean disaster to the State. The Honorary Minister urges the necessity for the Bill. Surely he does not believe that the working conditions of the whole body of employees are other than favourable. He said that in a young and undeveloped country like this we should profit by the experience of other parts of the world. Other parts of the world built up their industries, and developed their country on long hours and low pay. Does he suggest that we should profit by their experience to the extent of introducing short hours and high pay in order to supply the world's markets with goods? Could anything be more illogical and unreasonable? He went on to point out that it was an established fact that the more the hours were reduced, the greater was the production. Surely he must think we are devoid of intelligence. If by a reduction of from 48 to 44 hours we are going to get better results and greater efficiency, is it not logical to ask why we should stop at 44 and why we should, as Mr. Cornell asks, work at all? This new country which has to establish itself and compete with other nations in supplying the world's markets, this country which has clamoured for a Royal Commission to assist it in getting out of its difficulties, and which the Federal Government is generously providing, I understand, with half a million annually to carry on, this country which has claimed for years that it has started to develop at the wrong time, when everything is dear and labour not so efficient as it used to be—this new country is now asked to set an example to the world by instituting a 44-hour week and continuing to prosper. The Honorary Minister said that in France the eight-hour day had been established. By means of an interjection I extracted from him that eight hours a day does not mean 44 hours per week, but 48 hours per week. When quoting figures the Honorary Minister should realise his responsibility. It is his duty to tell the House exactly what the position is when he quotes figures, and not veil the issue, mak-

ing it appear that other countries are working 44 hours per week when they are in fact working 48.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And more.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Mr. Nicholson and I went on a deputation recently to one of the Ministers, being at a loss to understand the need for the Government of this State to impose high charges to compensate them for certain work, when the same work is being performed in the Eastern States for considerably less. The Minister's reply was that the establishments of the Eastern States had been built up with cheap money under a set of conditions altogether different from those under which this country is being built up. Yet this country is to lead the van in the reduction of working hours, while on the Minister's own showing it cannot compete with the Eastern States. We are told what is done in other parts of the world; but in those parts there is no arbitration law. In the countries referred to, the men have to work, and they do work, and are paid on results. In this country industrial arbitration is bringing all men down to the same level, and there is no inducement to work. In other countries the employer can pay one man 10s. a day, and another man £1 a day, and another man 30s. a day, according to their respective earning capacities. By that system £3 worth of labour is got for £3. But with an Arbitration Court fixing the equitable wage of a man, we get 50s. worth of work for £3, because the man who was earning 25s. a day is brought back to 15s. a day, and he says to himself, "Why should I do any more than this man who cannot earn more than 15s.? Why should I do so?" By the system of industrial arbitration all men are brought down to one level, and a less amount of work is obtained because the employer is not permitted to pay on results. The day will come when this country will have to live by putting its goods on the world's markets, and it can only do that by paying on results. If a man is worth £1 a day, let him be paid £1 a day, and if a man is worth £2 a day, let him be paid £2, and if he is only worth 10s. a day, let him take 10s. and be satisfied to get employment at all. Many other matters might be referred to on this Bill, but I wish to draw special attention to a circular I received this afternoon, a circular proving conclusively that if the 44-hour week is introduced into our mining industry, it will be the end of that industry.

The cost will be raised, I understand, by about 1s. per ton if the men now working 48 hours per week are reduced to 44 hours. It means that those men will get 14s. extra for working the additional four hours. How can we continue to load the mining industry with penalties of that description? Let me point out that at the present time Mr. Knibb and other members of this Chamber are urging the need for a gold bonus in order that the industry may survive.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And the Government have just given the industry £40,000 off the cost of water in order to allow it to continue.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The only way in which this country can prosper is to do some more work and perhaps be satisfied to take less for it. The present system is all very well under conditions of borrowing and spending. We are extracting a good many millions from the people of this State every year. I have said on the floor of the House that no other 360,000 people could pay that huge sum by way of taxation that we pay. But we have been able to do that because we have been living on borrowed money. I understand we are now going on the market for another five millions. It is all very well while it lasts, but I have tried to visualise the position for many years, and I am satisfied that the day will come when we shall have to live on what we can produce and not on what we borrow. From the Press cables a little while ago it seemed that the long-expected hour had arrived and that the Mother Country was saying "You people have gone far enough; we can not find any more money for you to squander as you have been doing; you had better get busy and earn some money." However the good old Mother responded to the cry of her children and agreed to carry us on a little bit longer; but as sure as I stand here, the day will come when we shall have to live on what we can produce. Then good-bye to the Arbitration Court, good-bye to 44 hours a week, and good-bye to the favourable conditions under which men work to-day. There is only one other matter to which I desire to refer. The Honorary Minister spoke of the improved moral condition of Queensland as the result of the 44-hour week. Does the Honorary Minister expect us to believe that since the 44-hour week was introduced into Queensland the moral standard of the community of Queensland has risen? To answer that

I wish to quote from a Queensland newspaper—I think the quotation will answer almost every point advanced by the Honorary Minister—

“Port Victor” raided. Brutal attack by desperate seamen. Serious affray at New Farm. Three assailants shot. Wireless operator arrested.

The Honorary Minister: Those were British seamen.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, British seamen defending themselves from attack by the highly moral community that has arisen in Queensland as a result of the 44-hour week. These British seamen were slumbering on the good British ship “Port Victor,” and the highly moral people of Queensland attacked them in their sleep and were giving them a pretty bad time when they got their firearms and dealt out to the highly moral Queenslanders the conditions which I think the House will deal out to the Bill. I have no desire to detain the House by discussing what I regard as an unreasonable and impossible proposition. I shall vote against the Bill.

HON. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [4.26]: I wish to congratulate the Honorary Minister on having brought down this Bill, since in doing so he is simply carrying out a pledge given to the supporters of his party during the general election. I only wish that the party in opposition to Labour would honour their pledges and bring down the Bills they have promised the people. In many instances, I regret to say, they have not done so. Therefore, I congratulate the Honorary Minister on the observance of a pledge. So far as the Bill is concerned, that is the only congratulation I can extend to him, because the Bill represents a direct attack on that fetish the Arbitration Court. I have frequently expressed my opinion of the Arbitration Court, and voiced my view that wages boards and round-table conferences would get us much further along the road to industrial peace. In conclusion let me say that the Honorary Minister cannot have it both ways. He cannot be granted a double-headed penny in this matter. He cannot have the Arbitration Court and also this Bill, so far as I am concerned. I shall vote against the second reading.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.29]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Members: No!

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not believe in imposing on the House with an unprepared speech. I think it is due to this Chamber and also to the general public that I should express my considered views on a question of this description. There is also this point: various members support the measure, and so far we have only heard the voice of the Honorary Minister in advocacy of it. If the House refuses to adjourn the debate, I shall have to give my views unprepared.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member has made a speech.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, Mr. President. I have merely explained my position in moving the adjournment.

Motion passed, the debate adjourned.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading. (Amendment Six Months—defeated).

Debate resumed from the previous day on motion by the Chief Secretary “That the Bill be now read a second time” and on amendment by Hon. H. Seddon to strike out “now” and add “this day six months.”

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan—on amendment) [4.31]: The anxiety of the thinking residents of the metropolis for the last ten years has been directed to the question of an adequate water supply for the city. I have been one of those who have strongly supported the carrying out of a scheme that would give us a supply of water by gravitation from the hills in a sufficient quantity to cope with the requirements of the metropolis. I was pleased when the Government of the day invited Mr. Ritchie to investigate the problem and as a result of his report I have supported his recommendations right through. Perhaps the select committee dealt with the matter more thoroughly than did Mr. Ritchie, because they brought to light the fact that while Mr. Ritchie thought that certain help could be secured from the supply at Mundaring, the conditions that operate this year and will

operate next year are and will be such in the metropolitan area that a cheaper supply should be obtained from Mundaring than from the undertakings the Government now have in hand. Moreover, the select committee showed that their scheme would provide results much more quickly. No doubt the objective of all the experts has been the Canning scheme, and therefore I support the works that are in progress today. I trust that the $3\frac{1}{2}$ million gallons that the Minister said would be obtained as a result of the work carried out there will be available. It may be that we can get $3\frac{1}{2}$ million gallons now, but we are not sufficiently into the summer period to know whether that supply can be maintained or whether the seepage will be more than is anticipated. We know that the Canning becomes almost dry in January and that we may be hard put to it for supplies in January, February and March. We may have to recognise that the work attempted there will not give the results that would follow had the recommendations of the select committee regarding the Mundaring supplies been adopted. I realise that while we require a permanent scheme to give us an increased and adequate supply, we must also have regard to the question of cost. I have the assurance of the Minister that while the department is asking for the right to increase the rate to 2s. in the pound, the rate to be imposed for the time being will be only 1s. $3\frac{3}{4}$ d. in the pound. I trust that it will be so and I also trust that the point raised by the select committee regarding the thousand million gallons that are lost every year will receive consideration. The Minister was silent regarding that point and did not explain how the department intended to deal with the question, converting into revenue what is now lost. I do not think that during the next two or three years at any rate we need have any fear that the 2s. rate will be imposed. I formed the opinion that there is some maladministration in connection with the water supply question, and the time is ripe for a board of experts to take charge of the water supply activities. If that were done, the position would be much improved. It is time that some attention was given to the question of taking this work out of the hands of the Government and allowing it to be dealt with by experts who would see that the people received full value for the money expended. I am loth to speak in this way,

but I am satisfied that the investigations of the select committee made it clear that we are not receiving 20s. for our pound. While we may get, in eight or nine years' time, the Upper Canning scheme completed, I am afraid it will be at such a cost that the people will regret ever having embarked upon it. I take it that when Mr. Seddon moved his amendment, his action was merely one of protest because the Government did not have any regard for the report of the select committee. Owing to the magnitude of the problem I consider Mr. Seddon was well advised in the course he adopted. I understand that the hon. member does not desire to put his amendment to the vote, but I feel also that he does not agree with the statement made by the Minister for Works that he, Mr. Seddon, wishes the ratepayers of Kalgoorlie, Geraldton and other districts to make up the loss that will accrue if we refuse leave to the Government to impose the additional tax on the people. Mr. Seddon was a member of the select committee, and is also a country member. When he takes such an action, it can be understood that he feels strongly regarding the existing conditions and desires to have some change made in the administration of the department. The select committee investigated this question thoroughly and we must give to the committee's report the consideration that it deserves. I pin my faith to the investigations by the select committee because, although we all desire an adequate water supply for the metropolitan area, it does seem that something must be done to safeguard the position; otherwise a most costly and gigantic scheme will be thrust upon the people without any adequate return. I recognise that we must support the proposal in general, but I feel there is extravagance that should be guarded against, particularly in respect of the thousand million gallons that go to waste annually and for which no revenue is received. Until attention is given to matters of that description I do not think the Government have any right to ask for an increased rate. Having heard the views of hon. members, I counsel Mr. Seddon to withdraw his amendment.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—on amendment) [4.40]: I hope Mr. Seddon will not withdraw his amendment, but in any event I will take advantage of the

Standing Orders to ensure that the amendment goes to a division. It is important that those hon. members who intend to vote for the extra taxation involved in order to meet the waste that is going on should record their votes openly in the House. Surprise has been expressed that Mr. Seddon should have moved such an amendment. I am not surprised at all, because from what I have seen of that hon. member in this House and on the select committee, I know that he has shown himself to be a student. He, as well as many others of us, knows the economic effect of waste. Some hon. members appear to think that whatever may be the waste, it is only the citizens of the metropolitan area who will have to pay. It is nothing of the sort. All waste, from whatever source it may proceed, must ultimately come from one source—from production from the soil. Members who vote for this waste—it is unwarrantable waste—must realise that it must be made up by the merchants and others in the city and through them by the agricultural and mining districts. The extra charges will be added to their costs and they will be passed on.

Hon. A. Burvill: Then we will have to pay 3d. for our newspapers.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: You may have to pay 6d. I wish briefly to refer to what has been said against the amendment. First Mr. Dodd said that he was not convinced by the arguments I had advanced against the Bill. But curiously enough he went on to support the very arguments I had used. He said that 90 per cent. of the people believed that enough water could be secured from Mundaring and that it seemed inconceivable that the immense body of water running to waste there every year could not be impounded. That, also, is the conclusion that the select committee, after investigating the question, came to. Surely the opinion of 90 per cent. of the people must have some influence. An ex-Minister called it the opinion of "impudent amateurs." It is almost inconceivable that 90 per cent. of the people are fools and impudent amateurs and the remaining 10 per cent. experts. I should certainly class most of the 10 per cent. as incompetent experts, content to sit still as they have been doing for 20 years past and see an average of 27,000,000 gallons of water overflowing the weir and take no steps to make use of

it. That overflow occurs on the average 133 days in every year, and during that time bore water is being pumped in the metropolitan area. Yet this so-called expert opinion which has guided the Government allows that to take place. The same expert opinion allows 1¼ million gallons of water to remain in Mundaring every day in the year to evaporate, because the engineer in charge will not permit a pipe to be put in to convey the water to Perth. When the select committee suggest that, in face of these facts, this money should not be spent on Churchman's Brook, they are on good ground. Mr. Dodd said—"I am faced with the fact that not one expert who has reported on the water supply question has been in favour of drawing from Mundaring for the metropolitan area." That is not the case. The engineer himself admits that we have been drawing 841,000 gallons from Mundaring for some years and that we are drawing it to-day. He says he can spare another 1,200,000 gallons, because at present the goldfields are not using it and the agricultural areas do not require it, "but," he adds, "I shall not allow you to put a pipe in to take that extra quantity and the overflow because you might turn the water on when there was no overflow." That is the expert advice on which the Government are acting. Instead of getting that water, which would tide Perth over, the Government are spending this huge sum in schemes in the hills which, with every pound they spend, increases the deficit. We have it in the evidence that the deficit of the department last year was £17,500. The Government propose to spend £4,000,000 more between this and 1936, and the deficit then is to be £247,000. Are members going to support that? Those are the facts on the department's own showing. The returns supplied by the department will be found in the appendix to the report. Mr. Dodd said, "It would be a very bold Government who would go against the advice of their experts." I should say it would be a very incompetent Government if, in the face of those facts, they took no steps—and they are taking no steps at present. On that argument Mr. Dodd suggests that the Government are justified in asking for an increase in the rates and price of water. He says the Government have to pay interest and sinking fund, and that is the reason why they are justified in asking for

the increase. If members turn to the report, they will see the cost of these several works set out, and in each case the interest is added to the capital cost and is not chargeable to revenue until the water is supplied. Therefore, there is no need to talk about interest and sinking fund. It is already provided for by additions to the capital. The Chief Secretary expressed surprise that Mr. Seddon should have moved this motion, and said it was an unfathomable mystery to him. I commend the hon. member. This is a non-party House. The hon. member knows as well as I do that it is a most disastrous waste that is now about to be perpetrated, and he has tried to stop it. That is one of his duties. The Minister says, "No metropolitan member would have the hardihood to move such a motion." I would be prepared to move it, and I do not think I would be doing my duty if I refrained from supporting it. He says, "The amendment is an effort to tie the hands of the Government and hinder them from making the scheme self-supporting." The scheme self-supporting! With a £17,000 deficit, to spend four millions more and have a deficit of £247,000! Does he ever hope to make the scheme self-supporting on those figures? It is a snowball that is gradually accumulating in size and, as happens when huge masses get out of control, it will overwhelm the people. What business could stand it? None at all. If a private business could not stand it, certainly the Government cannot. The Minister said that for nearly 30 years the rate had been 1s. If he turns to "Hansard"—part of which Mr. Nicholson read, though he did not go far enough—he will see that when Mr. Frank Wilson put up this scheme, he said the more water consumed and the more people in the metropolitan area, the lower would be the rate. He went on to outline this very Canning scheme, and said at the time that the rate would be not 1s., but would be down to 7½d. The Canning scheme is in the clouds still, but we have no rate of 7½d. and no rate of 1s.; that rate is now to be double or treble that because the assessments have been increased. The Minister said the capital expenditure had been increased since 1919 by £710,000, exclusive of the bills scheme. If members turn to the report of the department they will see that one half of that amount—£490,000—has been spent on works that will not yield any additional revenue,

and that more than the £710,000 has been frittered away here and there without any corresponding increase in revenue. Where is the management in a department that carries on in that way? In previous years there was an incidental vote for the department of £5,000, which was spent in books and magazines and sundries. This year the amount is £6,000. Why it should be increased I do not know. Perhaps it is to cover some of the expenses of the outing on Monday last. The Minister said that the deficit was growing like a snowball as the years went by. It is growing like a snowball and where we shall end, I do not know. It seems to me the only way to do any good is to put the peg in now and say to the Government, "Stop this waste; put this scheme into proper order before we give you any more money." What is the excuse given by the Government for not having done anything regarding the report of the select committee?

Hon. G. W. Miles: What would happen if we carried the amendment? The Government could not carry on at all.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, they could.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The report of the department, page 18, shows that the interest is being added to the capital during the constructional period. The select committee suggested that the Government should obtain payment for £50,000 worth of water that is now lost, and also money from other sources of income to which I shall refer presently. I shall show members what waste is going on and I ask them to consider whether, by their action to-day, they are going to endorse its continuance.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Meanwhile you are saddling the country with the water supply for Perth.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: How can that be when the interest is being added to capital cost?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Who pays last year's loss of £17,000?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is a debit balance.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Which the country will have to take a share in paying. The country water supplies have to pay for themselves.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Is that the principle the hon. member suggests should be adopted? Half the people of the State are in the metropolitan area, and if they

adopted a similar policy, there would be very little work done in the country. There would be no nationalisation of country drains; members would tell the country to go on its own. Members should not suggest that because there is a deficit of £17,000 in the working of the department, this one scheme should immediately make it good, notwithstanding the enormous waste. Yet some members appear to be adopting the attitude of "Pay up," rather than that of "Stop this waste."

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I say we should give the Government power to rate the people who use the water.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The hon. member will have an opportunity to record his vote on those lines. The Minister, as an excuse why the waste was not checked, said that there was the report of the select committee, but how could any Government consider it until it was before them officially? The report was before this House and had not been adopted. Surely any Government, seeing such a report, whether it was adopted or not should step in and check the waste. Surely that is the duty of the Government. One of the recommendations of the select committee was that the Government should get an engineer to consider the whole question. The Government managed to take notice of that. I am glad that they have obtained an engineer.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Did not they have an engineer before the report came out?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know, but at any rate they have seen fit to do what they did not do before—to finalise something. The curious part of it is that the engineer, soon after getting here—judging by the speech of the Minister at the opening function on Monday last, endorsed the action of the select committee and endorsed to some extent what I said, that if it were my business I would stop it now. He says in effect, "I will stop the work now. You have the pipe in and I will consider the dam." We know that the first proposal for the Churchman's Brook dam was a concrete core. That was before the department knew where they were going to put it. Then they did so much work and found they could not use a concrete core, and a clay core was proposed. We knew they could not get clay at the spot suitable for the job. The new engineer came along and said, "Although you have promised that this scheme would be in operation two years ago, you will have to

wait another two years because I wish to see whether the clay core will be safe." Surely the Government, seeing this waste, have no right to wait for the House to adopt the report of the select committee. There should be no chance of the House turning down a report which seeks to stop waste. The Minister said that I declared I would have stopped the work if it had been in my power to do so. I certainly would have done that, because the first loss is the cheapest loss. The interim report presented by the select committee said, "Stop the work." The later report said that it was too late to stop the work. Why? Because in the first place the pipes were not in and afterwards it was found that the pipes had been hurried into the ground. The Government got hold of motor lorries and hurried the pipes along as quickly as possible and put them into the ground. It was too late then to stop that part of the work and the select committee had to make a recommendation to that effect. If this were my own business, I should stop it even now, and my view is borne out by the present Engineer-in-Chief in holding up the work for 12 months.

Hon. J. Ewing: But we must have the water.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I could show the hon. member that there is as much water running out from under the mount where the pipes are being put in, as there is running into Churchman's Brook, and it is running all the summer, and will continue to run all the summer, whereas Churchman's Brook will run only part of the time. The Minister said that the wastage we complained of as being 1,000,000,000 gallons every year, and worth £50,000 was a matter that had to be faced. We want to get more meters, he said. There are some 22,000 meters in and the year before last there were 17,000 unmetered services. We know that it is impracticable to put in meters with the water in the condition in which we find it. The meters were costing the department £3 10s., whilst the cost of manufacture at the State Implement Works was £1 17s. 6d. That is not good economy; it is utter waste. We were told by the officers of the department that to meter small consumers cost £1 per year in maintenance and interest, and from that expenditure a revenue of 10s. was obtained. To obviate that the committee suggested that the Sydney scheme of garden areas should be adopted, and in that way waste could be prevented. The Minister told

us that the department had considered the question of area charges and came to the conclusion that the system was unsuitable owing to the sandy soil and the probability of water being used excessively where there were no meters. But we find that the water is being used on the sandy soil to-day, and that it is bringing in nothing. If it was used on a rate charge, the department would be better off, because a person cannot use too much on a garden area, for the reason that there is a condition attached that on each 200 sq. ft. the water shall be used with a half-inch hose, and that the hose must be held in the hand. If we put that into force we would get some revenue, and even if we got only half of the £50,000, there would be no deficit.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The people would allow the water to run to waste more than ever.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That would not be possible. The regulations in Sydney set out that the hose must be held in the hand, and the object of that is to prevent waste. The Minister said that Mundaring could not be tapped any further. Mr. O'Brien said that it could be tapped to the extent of 1,200,000 gallons more. Mr. O'Brien admitted that the consumption on the goldfields was rapidly falling, and he added that he was in hopes that the drop would be picked up in the agricultural areas. That is the position with regard to Mundaring which has cost the State such a lot of money. The agricultural areas on the rate charged have no hope of taking a much bigger supply of water. The pipe line runs through the wheat belt, but irrigation cannot take place. All that could be done would be, in the event of a drought, to supply water for stock, and that would not warrant putting in pipes. Therefore, as time goes on, there will be more water available from Mundaring. Let me remind the House, too, that some steps should be taken to utilise that water from the viewpoint of the goldfields scheme itself, because, although it has been said that the scheme has paid for itself, we must not forget that sinking fund and working costs have been provided out of revenue, and last year, when it was calculated that if the aggregate loss on that scheme were compounded at 5s. per cent. per annum, it would be found that the taxpayer had paid £3,700,000 towards the redemption of the two million odd pounds worth of bonds. Some hon. members say, "Make the goldfields pay; they have the

water; why should Perth pay?" But we take a different view.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: On what authority does the hon. member make that statement?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have worked out the figures from the report.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The calculation must be incorrect.

The PRESIDENT: Have the hon. member's remarks any reference to the Bill being read this day six months?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: My object is to show that we should get water from Mundaring instead of from Churchman's Brook, and that if we do that there will be no need to impose the 2s. rate. Mr. Kirwan will find in the report the figures I have quoted.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It does not necessarily follow that those figures are correct.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: I think they are a little bit short.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The figures stand there for what they are worth.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: They are not worth much.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I thank the hon. member. We are drawing a million gallons from Mundaring for which £2,500, or a trifling sum like that, is being paid.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: A totally inadequate charge.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It might be shown that in sending that water to Kalgoorlie, and sending it to Perth, that Perth pays a much bigger ratio than does Kalgoorlie. I have no desire to be parochial. I am aware that the goldfields were helpful to the metropolis, and that the scheme had to be a national one. All the same, if the principles enunciated by some hon. members were given effect to, and everyone had to pay for his own supply, some of us would be in queer street. Mr. Ewing told us that the reason why he intends to vote against the amendment is that a deficit has been created and that the Minister desires to wipe it out. According to the view of Mr. Ewing, there is only one way of wiping out deficits, and that is by taxing the people. I say there is another way, and it is by exercising a little economy and carrying out sane work. Unfortunately, the hon. member made the statement in such a form that shows he could not possibly have read the report. If he had read it, he would have seen that the deficit had not been created in any way by the increased expenditure

on these works. The select committee arrived at the conclusion that there was waste, and the hon. member said that was not sufficient reason for stopping the work. If it is not, I do not know what is. Then he asks, how can the waste be stopped? I have suggested one way, namely by those controlling the scheme realising where the leakages are and stopping them. The hon. member said he would not wait until the Engineer-in-Chief reported, because he did not believe in delay. Don't wait, get on. That is exactly what the Mitchell Government did. They had no plans, no specifications. It was to cost three or four millions, but the cry was "Don't wait, get on."

Hon. J. Ewing: They have the plans now.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, they have not. The Engineer-in-Chief told them the other day that they are to wait a year before they can conserve water. There were no plans, no estimates at the time the Mitchell Government authorised this scheme. They went to work to put up a dam where there was no bottom. The hurry was in order to get rid of the unemployed at the time.

Hon. J. Ewing: Is it not exactly the same scheme as the Mitchell Government put up?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, not at all. The Mitchell Government had a proposal to construct a concrete core dam at Churchman's Brook. It was found to be impossible to erect such a dam, because there was no bottom to carry it. Then they changed the plans and said, "We will put down a clay or pug dam." Now it is discovered that that is not a settled quantity. We have a pipe line to catch the water in the creek, and that is all we are to have for the next two years. The Minister told the people the other day, "We shall pull through this summer, but I do not know how we are to get on next year." In face of that, hon. members would give him more money to perpetuate this state of things! Mr. Ewing said he would not wait until the new Engineer-in-Chief submitted a report.

Hon. J. Ewing: Would you stop the work?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The hon. member said he would not wait. I want him to think it over again before he votes to give more money for the perpetuation of this waste. This is the time to step in and stop it. If we once pass the Bill giving

authority to extract a 2s. rate, we are gone. The departmental return shows that it is only the beginning, that the rate will go up to 2s. 11.17d., and that without taking into account a number of facts, namely, that Churchman's Brook will cost a lot more money than was originally estimated, and that the 44-hour week will make a lot of difference to the cost of the work, as will also the increased wages to the unemployed, who formed a union after they got the job.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The Honorary Minister this afternoon said that a 44-hour week resulted in lesser cost.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We have it in evidence from the engineer of the scheme that the 44-hour week ordered by the Government meant an increase of over nine per cent. on the price of the job. For himself, he said it would mean 12 per cent.; but when Mr. McCallum challenged him about it and it was worked out to a decimal point, it came to over nine per cent. So by 1936 this rate of 2s. 11.17d. will be more than 3s. And the basis of the rate is on an estimated increase of assessments of three per cent. per annum. So in 10 years we shall have a 30 per cent. increase on the assessments, and a 3s. 6d. rate on top of that, which will make it an impossible proposition for the people. Now is the time to stop it. It was said the other day, "Two years ago preliminary approval was given to a scheme the first stage of which was opened yesterday." That is true. The first stage—only the pipes put in at the head of the stream. Not a yard of dam. Nothing to impound any water. "The first stage was opened yesterday. In two years' time we will tell you whether or not we can put up the dam." That is the real position. All the interest is being added to the capital cost. The Minister tells the people that these works could not be constructed without a considerable capital expenditure, and that to meet the interest and sinking fund obligations higher charges must be levied. But with everyone of these works is specifically set out the interest to be added to the capital. He said that if the Bill were lost the whole of the charges would come upon the whole community. But the charges are added to the works specifically set out. It has been said that the select committee held that Mundaring should be tapped, but that the overwhelming weight of opinion by engineers was against it. Nobody questioned it. But

what we have set up is this: Until the time we get the Canning dam constructed—which will give 16,000,000 gallons per day, and which will be of some use to Perth—we can tide over 133 days in the year by taking 27,000,000 gallons per day from the overflow from Mundaring. And if we get 5,000,000 gallons per day during 40 of the hottest days, we shall only be taking the equivalent of 200,000,000 gallons for the whole year; whereas Mr. O'Brien, the engineer, says we could have an extra 365,000,000 gallons per annum. The Minister says the question of meters will have to be faced. Why has it not been faced already? It is half a year since the necessity was pointed out, yet nothing has been done. Then Mr. McCallum makes this statement:—

From the present indications, according to the advice of Mr. Stileman it would be risky to try to impound next year's water in Churchman's Brook, and it would be advisable to wait until the banks are in a thorough state. What does that mean?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Ordinary precautions.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It means that he does not want to take the stupid risks his predecessors have taken, running the risk of a happening at Churchman's such as occurred in Wales a little time ago. He went on to say he was confident that we would get over this summer with the increased supply from Churchman's Brook and Canning River, but that a worse period would be next summer, when there would be little if any additional emergency supply, and when they would still be unable to impound water at Churchman's Brook. Then, of course, the Minister went on to denounce the Legislative Council for, as he said, attacking everything progressive and holding fast to everything retrogressive. He said the Council's action meant that Kalgoorlie would be paying for Perth water, and that Perth would be getting it cheaper than would the goldfields. That, of course, is pap for those entirely lacking in vision.

Hon. H. Seddon: Political propaganda.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, food for those who have no knowledge of even elementary economies. It should be clear that if we are going to load up the people of the metropolitan area with double rates for water, it will mean money wasted, for it will be earning nothing, producing nothing, and so the disadvantage will fall back upon the country.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That does not disprove what the Minister said.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you suggest that it proves it?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I cannot quite follow the hon. member. It is just the reverse of what the Minister says. He said the Council's action would mean that Kalgoorlie would be paying for Perth water. Actually, it will mean Kalgoorlie and the country districts paying if this waste goes on, paying not only the charge itself, but a profit on it also. For if because of this increased charge the city merchant has to increase the prices of his goods, he will increase them plus a profit, and the charge will go back on the country districts. It is of no use thinking that because the rate is directly levied in one place it will not travel along to other places. This scheme is quite the converse of that which the late Mr. Frank Wilson set out in 1905. He proposed that when in 1921 this Canning scheme should be completed, the rate would then be 7½d. The hills water board reported on it, and set out the rate at 9d. Sir James Mitchell put up the Churchman's Brook scheme, which we are now told involves a rate of 2s. Let me say in respect of Churchman's Brook that the ex-Engineer-in-Chief was so staggered at the cost that he said, "We cannot charge all this to Churchman's Brook. What we must do is to charge only 2/26ths of it to Churchman's Brook, because Churchman's Brook will provide 2/26th of the water, and we must charge the rest of the money to Canning and Wongong. The result is that Churchman's Brook is not now being charged what it is costing. The rest of the cost is being debited to the Canning and Wongong schemes, and those schemes will be started with a huge debit balance without anything to show for it." Hon members require to see what they are doing when assisting the Government to get rid of the temporary inconvenience of a small deficit by raising the rate to 2s. I am opposing this Bill solely on the ground of the waste that is going on. It has nothing to do with the capital cost, because the interest during the construction period is added to the capital in each of the schemes. Let hon. members look at the waste that is going on. The scheme was entered into without any plans or specifications, or any inquiry as to the suitability of the site, or the exactitude of the cost.

It has been carried out so far by day labour. It has been a dumping ground for the unemployed ever since it was started. The 44-hour principle has been put into operation since the last Government came into office, by administrative act, and the engineers say that this has put 9 per cent. on to the cost. The unemployed have formed a union, asked for increases, and the Government consented to arbitration by Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh gave a quick and rapid award, and the wages of the unemployed have been increased by 1s. and 6d. and so on a day. The new engineer-in-chief has practically stopped the construction. If we go to Mount's Bay road we see immense pipes that have been put down there for five years. There is no water in them. The engineers did not order enough pipes to finish the job, whatever that was, and these pipes are eating their heads off, and the interest is going into the deficit. The ex-engineer-in-chief, seeing the staggering cost to the community, told the committee he would not put the pipes at Canning and Wongong at present, because they would be eating their heads off and that he would wait until Churchman's Brook was a going concern. This Government put the pipes into Wongong and Canning, and they will remain there at enormous cost only to bring down the water that flows in the creeks during the summer, a negligible quantity. In the winter very little water is required. There again waste is going on. At Mundaring 27,000,000 gallons a day are flowing away over 133 days of the year. We are paying Mundaring £2,500 a year for 841,000,000 gallons. Why cannot we get the other million gallons Mr. O'Brien told us we could have without risk to the scheme, and pay the Goldfields Water Scheme another £2,500 or more if required? Whatever it is, it will be helpful to Mundaring, because at present a large quantity of water is evaporating every summer. Whatever the charge is, it would be cheaper than the perpetuation of waste at Churchman's. At Mundaring there is a weir already constructed, and there is none at Churchman's. We could get 438,000,000 gallons a year from Mundaring without loss. We only want 5,000,000 gallons a day during the 40 odd hot days in the summer. I suggest that the water at Mundaring would be better drained off, to the advantage of some of the people of the State, rather than that it should be allowed to evaporate. In the

early days we borrowed money on debentures at 4 per cent., and sinking fund had to be provided. The sinking fund has been paid out of revenue, which forms part of the deficit, and 1 per cent. bonds are paid off and redeemed with the sinking fund money, and 6¾ per cent. is paid for the money that redeems them. That class of finance must involve waste and loss. It was admitted during the inquiry that pipes had been in store since 1914 on which the Treasury had charged £7,700 interest, and the pipes had not been used. That is waste.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Does a merchant charge interest on his stock and add it to capital?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The engineer told us that some spasmodic work was done on the Subiaco sewerage—see Question 630. This involved a rate of 6s. 10d., and the work was put in hand for the benefit of the unemployed. To collect the rates which must be paid it is costing £3,300 a year, and the money could be collected by the Perth Municipality at one-tenth of the cost.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why cannot the two be combined?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is what the committee want to know. This is one direction in which a saving could be effected, and the deficit reduced. Apparently the only way the Government can reduce deficits is by taxation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And they have the benefit of the assessment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. The engineer said that £42,930 had been added to the cost of works at Churchman's because of the 44-hour week. Mr. Thompson said that £50,000 had been added as the result of the investigations into the foundations, which were originally faulty. This made a total cost, without the increased cost of wages, under the Walsh award, of 7s. 10d. for every thousand gallons from Churchman's.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you say that part of the increased cost is due to the reduction of hours?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Honorary Minister said that better results were achieved by the 44-hours.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The engineer gave data showing how he arrived at this figure of £42,930. I would refer members to pages

13 and 14 of the report, where they will find some illuminating facts which have not been challenged by the department. Here are some instances of waste and the piling up of interest. Although £3,000,000 odd was spent on the work, there are only £2,000,000 worth of assets. See page 18 of the report. The report shows lost capital amounting to £43,550 and unprofitable expenditure £439,325. See page 19 of the report. These are all departmental facts. With regard to meters, 22,114 were supplied, and 17,272 houses were not metered. This largely accounts for the £50,000 worth of water going astray. A sum of £3 10s. was paid for meters which cost the State Implement Works £4 17s. 6d. to make, so that the loss was £1 apiece. The meters are installed at a cost of £1 and 10s. is the revenue.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Does the State lose £1 on each meter?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Has not the engineer the right to refuse to supply at that price?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know. This is hasty legislation and is perpetuating waste. It is adding to the taxes. The last thing we should do is to add to the burden of taxation. We are already heavily handicapped by the high rate of taxation as against the Eastern States. Some figures have been supplied to me showing that during the last 12 months no less than £1,765,000, owned by five persons, has been sent out of the State for investment owing to the high rate of tax here. I have worked out the amount of tax that would be paid on that sum. The interest receivable at 5 per cent. would amount to £88,250. The State would get £16,456 in tax and the Federal people £28,813, a total of £45,269. No one who is not an idiot would keep his capital in this country on such conditions, and so it is sent away for investment. It must be sent away because the tax represents half the interest, calculated at 5 per cent., and the owners receive only 2½ per cent. This is driving money out of the country when we badly need it. The Government are paying outsiders somewhere about 6 per cent. for money, but if they get it from local people, the equivalent to half the interest is taken in tax. We are going to do the same thing in this case if we add this rate to the water scheme. Instead of people

investing their money in houses they will say they cannot stand the rates and taxes. The city will receive a setback for no other reason than that we shall be perpetuating waste and shall be making no effort to retrieve the position. I support the amendment, and will divide the House upon it if necessary.

Hon. H. SEDDON: As the moving of the amendment has attained the object I have in view, I ask leave to withdraw it.

Leave refused.

The amendment was put, and the House divided.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We cannot have a division with one member on the one side; but Mr. Seddon is voting against his own amendment, and he cannot do that.

The PRESIDENT: As there is only one Aye, we cannot have a division.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Mr. Seddon cannot vote against his own amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should support his own amendment.

Hon. H. Seddon: I asked leave to withdraw it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That does not matter. You cannot vote against your own amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member was not permitted to withdraw the amendment.

Hon. H. Seddon: Am I in order in going over now to vote Aye?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, you are in order. You are supposed to go over.

Hon. H. Seddon: As I have to support my own amendment, I will pass to the right.

The PRESIDENT: Mr. Duffell must vote, as he is inside the Bar.

Hon. J. Duffell: I am here, Sir. What is the matter?

The PRESIDENT: It is not usual to sit at a table there while a division is in progress.

Hon. J. Duffell: I was engaged in doing something else, Sir. I do not even know what the division is about.

The PRESIDENT: Then the hon. member should not be in the Chamber. Mr. Duffell must be included in the Noes.

Result of division—

Ayes	4
Noes	23
					—
Majority against	..				19
					—

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. G. W. Miles

Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Lovekin
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. W. T. Glasheen
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. W. Kirwan

Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the
Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Repeal of Section 94 and substitution of a new section:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the words "two shillings," in line seven, be struck out with a view to the insertion of other words.

The words I wish to insert are "one shilling and sixpence."

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

Ayes	6
Noes	19

Majority against .. 13

AYES.

Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane

Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. Duffell
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. W. Miles

Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. T. Glasheen
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will not take up any further time in debating this question, but hon. members, before agreeing to the clause, should study the effect of it. I have said all that I think I should say, and in view of the attitude of hon. members, I will not press it further.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have been defeated on my amendment to limit the maximum rate to 1s. 6d. in the pound, but I would remind hon. members that it is proposed to increase the maximum rating power by 100 per cent.

Hon. A. Lovekin: To 4s. 1d. in the pound.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That does not make it as much as some of the country people have to pay.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is a monstrous increase and is not justified by circumstances. This question affects the whole of the people of the State because the burden will be passed on.

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is always done.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The rate provided in the second paragraph is also increased by 100 per cent.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If the 2s. rate stands, the 4d. rate must stand.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I propose to bring the matter before the Committee by moving an amendment to reduce the 4d. rate. It is a vital matter in the interests of the people. We have had the cost of this work placed before us and it is suggested that there is waste and extravagance. It is our duty to place some check upon such waste and extravagance, and the only way we can exercise wholesome control over the business of the country is by way of limiting the amount of taxation. It has been overlooked by hon. members that within the last year or two the assessments have been increased enormously. Under the existing Act the rate is 1s. on the property values, but owing to the increased assessment, the 1s. rate has been practically equal to a rate of 2s. in the pound, and that has had to be borne by the owners of property throughout the metropolitan and suburban areas. If we agree, as we have done, to increase the rate to 2s., the effect of it will be to practically quadruple the rate imposed under the Act, and that is a serious matter. Had the Committee agreed to my proposal and fixed the rate at 1s. 6d. in the pound, we would have exercised some re-

straint upon the expenditure, and next year if the Government required a further increase in the rate we would have had an opportunity to go further into the matter.

Hon. J. Ewing: You have that opportunity now.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: We have not. I am afraid that before very long the rate will be increased to the maximum of 2s. in the pound. With a view to further testing the feeling of the Committee I move an amendment—

That in line one of paragraph (2) of proposed Subsection (1), the word "fourpence" be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I offer a suggestion to the Committee. The departmental report shows that a rate of 1s. 3½d. is required this year. I suggest that we fix the rate at 1s. 4d. for this year because if we give the Government power to fix the rate at 2s. by way of regulation they will gazette that regulation while Parliament is not in session, and it will not be possible to disallow that regulation. If we fix the rate in the Bill, the House will always have control over the position, but if we allow the rate to be fixed by way of regulation, we shall lose that control. As the Government will not stop the waste that is going on, we can take cognisance of the fact that they want a rate of 1s. 4d. this year and if it is found that an extra 2d. is required next year, the Government can ask for that additional rate.

Hon. J. EWING: Is the amendment in order? I do not consider that it is, because it is an alternative rate. The Committee decided that we would not reduce the rate of 2s., and now the amendment is to reduce the rate fixed in the Bill of 4d. in the pound. In both instances the principle is the same, for it doubles the tax.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But they refer to two different rates.

Hon. J. EWING: I do not think so, if the increase is in the same proportion in both instances.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment is in the interests of owners of unoccupied blocks. Mr. Nicholson proposes to relieve them of taxation. I do not think anyone would agree to that. Here the Government contemplate spending millions of pounds in order to provide the metropolitan area with an adequate water supply. Are the Government to proceed with such schemes

if Parliament is to restrict them to a rate of 1s. 4d. in the pound.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is all you want this year. You must come again next year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have already passed the rate fixed in the Bill but it may interest hon. members to know that in Bridgetown the people pay a rate of 3s. in the pound, and in Brookton the rate is 3s., whereas the Perth residents have been paying only 1s. in the pound for many years past. At Collie the rate is 2s. 6d. in the pound, at Geraldton 3s. in the pound, at Leonora, 2s. in the pound, at Wagin 3s. in the pound, at Pingelly 3s. in the pound, at Roebourne 3s. in the pound, and so it goes on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I would point out to the Chief Secretary that an assessment at Bridgetown and an assessment at Perth represent two different things.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Yes, it is twice as high as Bridgetown.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I know of a small house in Perth containing five rooms and on the present assessment the owner has to pay £18 a year on account of his water rates. Can any hon. member tell me of a five-roomed house in Bridgetown in respect of which £18 is paid for water? Under the proposal in the Bill £36 will have to be paid in respect of that five-roomed house in Perth. Then again, the Government desire an increase of 3 per cent. in the assessment per year, and that means that in 10 years' time the assessment will be increased by 30 per cent.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I submit that the Leader of the House is correct respecting the point raised by Mr. Ewing. One deals with the annual values and the other with the capital unimproved values.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the amendment is in order.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Minister quoted rates paid by certain country towns as an argument why the higher rate should be conceded here. There can be no comparison between the capital city and country towns. If we combined the whole of the assessments of country towns, they would represent a very small proportion of the rateable value of the metropolitan area. Members who support the rate of 4d. overlook the fact that an increased supply will bring in-

creased revenue. Business houses in Perth will have to pay double the present rates.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Not next year.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It will not be long before the maximum is reached. We should exercise a wholesome control over these rates. Even if the Committee had agreed to my proposal of 1s. 6d. on the annual value, it would have been double the amount estimated as necessary by the board of engineers. To grant that would have been to treat the Government more than liberally. Then if the Government later on required a still higher rate, they could approach Parliament and submit reasons for the increase. That is the only way in which control can be maintained by this House. If the proposed increase be granted, business firms will pass on the increase, and so people throughout the State will be affected. Having regard to the assessments, the metropolitan area is paying a considerably higher rate than are the country towns.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I appeal to members to consider the amendment in view of its importance. I have two assessment notices for a five-roomed house not far from this building, a house of the size suggested as necessary for a worker under the basic wage. The annual value last year was £70, and water, sewerage and stormwater rates amounted to £8 15s.. This year the annual value is £78 and the amount payable is £9 15s. The rent of the house is 32s. a week. Even if the assessment does not move at all next year, the doubling of the rate will mean that the total rates payable on the property will be £19 10s. If the Bill be passed in its present form, it will be possible for the Government to impose the rate upon one area. Section 93 of the Act reads—

Separate rates shall be made for each district and for the following purposes:—(a) To provide funds to defray the expenses of the general administration of this Act apportioned to the district. (b) To provide funds to defray the expenses incidental to each district, incurred in the maintenance and management of the water works, sewerage works, and stormwater drainage works in the district. (c) To provide funds for paying the prescribed interest and sinking fund on the capital cost of such works allocated to each district. (d) To provide funds for the construction, extension and improvement of such works in the district as may be constructed, extended or improved out of revenue.

In another place the Hon. W. D. Johnson asked why the district between Midland Junction and Perth should pay anything.

He said that district had the water from Mundaring and required no further expenditure, and therefore was not involving any increase; it must all go on to Perth. Mr. Johnson would have sufficient influence to bring that district within the exemption, and then the 2s. for water, 1s. 6d. for sewerage and 5d. for stormwater would all fall upon the one area. It would be fair to attach a proviso as follows:—"Provided that the combined water, sewerage, and stormwater rates shall not exceed 3s. in the pound on the annual values or a parity rate on unimproved land."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Let me give instances of what is paid in Geraldton. That town has a population of 5,000. The water scheme there cost £90,000, and the rate is 3s. The scheme for Perth will run into many millions, and the people of the metropolitan area must find the interest. The time will come when it will be necessary to impose the 2s. rate and the 4d. rate. The Committee must remember that the rates fixed in the Bill are the maximum rates, and that the Government will not be in a position to exceed those figures. The rate that will be struck will be only sufficiently high to cover cost.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I oppose the amendment. As has been pointed out by the Minister, there are towns that are paying as much as 3s., but those towns are better off in that their water schemes are controlled by a board.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They have not such high values.

Hon. A. BURVILL: We waste a great deal of time over matters of this description, and it could all be obviated if a board were in control. I am convinced that if we pass the amendment we shall cripple an undertaking that is now badly needed, and the position will be reduced to a standstill by reason of there not being sufficient funds with which to carry on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is true that there is greater expenditure involved here than is the case with country supplies. Still, the revenue derived from the metropolitan area, as compared with a centre such as Geraldton, presents such a disparity as to render the comparison unfair. If one were to examine the figures, it would be realised that the course suggested would exercise wholesome control. Mention has been made of the payment by country centres of 3s.

Under the Bill the combined rates will amount to practically 4s. in the pound when the maximum is attained. We have rates of 2s., 1s. 6d., and 5d. The difference in the assessment values is so marked that the comparison that has been made is out of the question. No one is seeking to prevent the Government carrying out the work, but if they do require to impose a further rate, they should obtain the sanction of Parliament first. In fixing 1s. 6d., as I suggest, we shall provide an ample reserve.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It must be remembered that for nearly 30 years there has not been an increase in the water rates in the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There should be a decrease, because there are more people and there is a greater consumption.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I propose to quote some figures which will show what has taken place in the last ten years in respect of property and rates imposed. Take Bassendean first. In 1914 the unimproved value of property there was £96,236, and there was a general rate of 3d. In 1924 the rate was increased to 6d., and in addition there was a loan rate of 1½d. At Bayswater in 1914 the total unimproved value was £108,486, and the rate was 3d. Ten years later the rate was 6d., and in addition there was a loan rate of 4¼d. At Belmont in 1914 the total unimproved value was £141,726, and the general rate was 3d. Ten years later the general rate was 4d., and the loan rate 1d. In the Perth Road Board area the total unimproved value in 1914 was £481,768, and the general rate was 2¼d. In 1924 the unimproved value was £693,109, and the rate was increased to 5d., and in addition there was a loan rate of 6½d.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Give us the figures for the Perth Municipality.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perth Municipality: on the 31st October, 1914, the total annual value was £640,184, the general rate 1s. 5¾d., the loan rate 9¾d., or a total of 2s. 3d. On the 31st October, 1924, the total annual value was £1,012,544, the general rate 2s. 1½d., the loan rate 7½d., or a total of 2s. 9d. Midland Junction: during the 10 years, the general rate increased from 2s. 5d. to 3s., and in Subiaco for the same period the increase was from 2s. 3½d. to 3s. 2d. So it will be seen there have been

substantial increases all round during the 10 years.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—“Provided that the combined water, sewerage, and storm water rates shall not exceed 3s. 3d. in the pound on the annual value and a parity rate on unimproved land.”

I move the amendment for this reason: the department announces that it wants 3½d. to square its account. Under the amendment I propose to give the department 9d., after which they will have to come to the House again. In the meantime they may see the advisableness of appointing a board or economising in some other way.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	20
					—
Majority against					14
					—

AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. C. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—BRITISH IMPERIAL OIL COY., LTD. (Private).

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by Hon. W. H. Kitson, read a first time.

BILL—MAIN ROADS.*Recommendation.*

On motion by Chief Secretary Bill re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clauses 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, 21, 28, 29 and 30 and proposed new clauses.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title—Commencement and extent of operation:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That after “shall,” in line one of Sub-clause (2), the words “except as provided by Section 30” be inserted.

Hon. H. STEWART: Clause 30 deals with licenses to sell petrol, and has been struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At any rate, it is my intention to move for the insertion of a new clause to stand as Clause 30.

Hon. H. STEWART: The proposed new clause would have no application in this case. It deals with contributions by local authorities, and is foreign to Clause 1.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think the clause had better be postponed.

Clause postponed.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in the interpretation of “main road” there be inserted after the words “main road” and before “includes” the following:—“means a road declared by proclamation under this Act to be a main road and.”

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move a further amendment—

That the definition of “petrol” be struck out.

Hon. H. STEWART: The definition will have to be either altered or deleted. The select committee took out any reference to petrol and substituted motor spirit, and it may be necessary for the Government to bring forward a definition of motor spirit.

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

Clause 5—Term of office:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (1) the following be added:—“For misbehaviour or incompetence, or if he become incapable of performing his duties, or absents himself from three consecutive meetings of the board except on leave granted by the Minister.”

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

Clause 10—Payment of engineers and inspectors:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line three all the words after “Governor” be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—“as an officer of the Public Service shall in respect of his service on or under the board be deemed to have served in an established capacity in the permanent service of the Government.”

Hon. H. STEWART: I have not had time to consider this amendment and would like the Chief Secretary to postpone the clause.

Clause postponed.

Clause 12—Main roads may be proclaimed:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move the following amendments—

That in Subclause (2), paragraph (b) the word “trunk” be struck out, and that paragraphs (c) and (d) be amended consequentially.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move a further amendment—

That paragraph (e) be struck out.

Hon. H. STEWART: In the opinion of the select committee this paragraph should be retained. It was inserted by the Government as one of the factors leading the Government, on the recommendation of the board, to come to a decision as to what should be a main road.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The departmental view is that the paragraph should come out because if it remained, the board would be up against the fact that roads such as that from Perth to Bunbury, Geraldton and Albany run through areas served by railway, while they are the very roads required to be brought under the provisions of the Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: This was fully considered by the department in the first case. The paragraph is not laid down in the Bill

as a hard and fast rule, but as a factor for consideration, and as such it should remain.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I support the Chief Secretary. The roads which have been mentioned traverse districts which are served by railways and the board may consider that such parts of the country are sufficiently served. Nothing is to be gained by retaining the paragraph.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	12

Majority for	..	2
--------------	----	---

AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)
Hon. H. Seddon	

Amendment thus passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (3) the words "Section 49 of," lines one and two, be struck out.

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

Clause 15—Powers of board:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (3), after "Chief Engineer," in lines six and seven, there be inserted "and except insofar as the expense is incurred by a local authority under the authority of paragraph (b) of Section 30 hereof."

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

Clause 16—Chief Engineer to conduct experiments:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That after "shall," in line 1, there be inserted "conduct or cause to be conducted experiments with different materials to test their relative durability and suitability for the construction and maintenance of roads."

The words in question were struck out by the select committee, and the Government wish them restored. The departmental view is that this provision appears in the legislation of the Eastern States, and that the University of Western Australia have consented to conduct all tests free of cost provided the Government furnish the equipment.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment does not appear to read with the clause.

Hon. H. STEWART: The select committee's recommendation and their amendment in the Bill already fully provide what the amendment seeks to provide. The departmental officers are apparently endeavouring to repeat what is already done, and to do it in a way not as good as that adopted in the Queensland and Victorian Acts. I believe that when I have explained the matter the Minister will withdraw the amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am at a great disadvantage, having had the amendment handed to me only this afternoon and not having had an opportunity to study it.

Hon. H. STEWART: I would like to direct the attention of members to that portion of the report which deals with the evidence of Mr. W. H. Shields, the representative of the Institute of Engineers of Australia, which was to the effect that the country roads in the drier agricultural areas when suitably formed, and with due regard to the proper combination of local materials such as sand, clay, gravel, etc., if regularly maintained, should last 30 years. He furnished an extract from a report of Mr. Calder, who was for 12 years the chairman of the Country Roads Board, and who spent nine months in travelling around the world making inquiries into road matters. That report refers to the methods adopted in North Carolina, and the extract in question is set out in the report. Generally speaking the select committee were fully seized of the necessity for full investigation. They examined the legislation in operation in the Eastern States. The Queensland and Victorian Acts have been in force sufficiently long to prove their worth. The Queensland Act of 1920 follows in many respects the Victorian Act word for word. The amendments suggested by the committee in their report cover the whole ground, and the amendment suggested by the Minister will merely double-bank the provision.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is a provision for making an investigation re-

garding the resources of the State with reference to materials for road-making, but there is no provision for making tests. The University authorities have agreed to conduct those tests free of charge, and we should avail ourselves of that offer.

Hon. H. STEWART: The word "investigate" fully covers the position. If the Minister desires his amendment to be included it should take the form of a separate paragraph. No further authority for such work is contained in any of the Acts in the Eastern States, and their Acts have been found sufficient to cover tests and so on.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister's proposal will not improve the position, because as the clause stands there is a general instruction to do the whole job. Surely common sense will suggest to the board what action should be taken in accordance with the general instruction.

Hon. N. NICHOLSON: No harm will be done by including the Minister's amendment. No reference is made so far to the board causing experiments to be conducted.

Hon. H. Stewart: What are "investigations"?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am quite aware of what Mr. Stewart has in mind, but if we provide that the board shall carry out investigations, the board will not be entitled to delegate their authority to someone else unless proper authority is set out in the Bill. I agree with Mr. Stewart that the Chief Secretary's proposal would be better placed as a separate paragraph.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It is desirable to insert the amendment moved by the Chief Secretary. The clause without the amendment would direct the board to make investigations of only material obtained within the State. From what I have seen of road-making in St. George's-terrace I should imagine that material not obtained in the State is used in road construction, and without the amendment there would be no power for the board to make tests of imported material.

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

Clause 21—Developmental roads may be proclaimed or provided:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in line three "proclaim" be struck out, and "declared" inserted in lieu, and that in lines eight and ten, the word "declar-

ation" be consequentially substituted for "proclamation."

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

Clause 28—Main roads trust account:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the words "All revenue obtained from motor spirit used in road transport" be struck out, with a view to inserting the following:—"All net revenue received by the Commissioner of Taxation under any Act imposing a tax on the income of vendors of motor spirit in addition to any other income tax payable by such vendors if and so far as such tax is paid into a fund for the purposes of main roads."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have already pointed out the difficulty in connection with the imposition of a tax on petrol. It was made clear that it was only the consumer of petrol, he who purchased his petrol within the State, that would pay the tax. The company, or a combination of people, that purchased petrol elsewhere and brought it to the State would escape payment of the tax. The Bill provides only for the taxing of the people who sell petrol within the State. I cannot see that the amendment suggested by the Minister will get us any further because we do not catch the man who is bringing the spirit to the State in small quantities. We go back to the vendor, the man that sells in the State. It is the big consumers of petrol, people like the charabanc owners, that are importing the petrol themselves. It is for their own use and they will be exempt.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is a Bill at the present time before another place dealing with the taxation of those who sell motor spirit, and the amendment I have moved will dovetail with the provision in the other Bill for the taxing of the spirit. No harm can be done by passing the amendment I have suggested.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: What is the meaning of "all revenue obtained from motor spirit used in road transport"? The more one looks at it the more difficult it seems to be. The words proposed by the Chief Secretary are intended to get over the difficulty, but I doubt whether they will do so. Then, again, what is the meaning of "all net revenue received by the Commissioner of Taxation"?

The Chief Secretary: I presume the net revenue is the revenue after the cost of collection.

Hon. H. STEWART: While I do not oppose the amendment of the Chief Secretary,

tary, the amendment suggested by the select committee was comprehensive enough, and might have been allowed to stand.

Amendment put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—RACING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West—in reply) [9.30]: With all due respect to those members who have spoken against the measure, I submit that no reasonable argument has been put forward why Fremantle should not be granted the privilege of conducting trotting meetings. Perhaps I should be correct in saying that one hon. member in opposing the measure uttered what can only be described as the most damning indictment of racing in general ever uttered in this or any other legislative Chamber. It seems strange that a member, prominent in racing in this State, should make the sweeping statements he did and still retain his connection with the game. If I were in racing and believed all that the hon. member said, I should think it time that I got out of it. But, apparently, he was prepared only to use the arguments he did use in order to prevent the inauguration of trotting in Fremantle. I do not desire to descend to personalities, but I must refer to one or two of the statements he made. He said that over 80 per cent. of the owners and trainers and others connected with racing were not solvent at the present time. He added, "I say that without fear of contradiction, because I know it to be true." What a sweeping statement to make! There are in this State large numbers of business men connected with trotting, men of standing in the community, men whose reputation is equal to that of the hon. member who made the statement. I admit that in the racing game probably there are one or two not solvent; but I submit that no matter what section of the community we examined we should find the same state of things, namely that there are a few not solvent. To say that 80 per cent. of a fairly large section of the community is not solvent, is to invite deep resentment. I know from several business men that they do resent the statement. Notwithstanding the hon. member's declaration that he did

not fear contradiction of the statement, I give it a flat denial. Then the hon. member said that if Mr. Kitson, Mr. Gray, or Mr. Brown would attend a trotting meeting and go behind the bar between 9 o'clock and 10 o'clock they would there see more drunken women than were to be seen at all the other sports meetings put together. He added that he defied anyone to contradict that statement. What a studied insult, what a vile slander of the women of Perth who attend trotting meetings! I have never heard such a strong statement made on such a flimsy foundation. On the second reading I referred to the conduct of trotting in Perth. The statements I made on that occasion would be endorsed by any reasonable individual who has attended trotting meetings and seen just how things there are conducted. While the Trotting Association have been prominent in this effort to secure additional dates for Fremantle, it is only natural that the president of that association should do what he could to see that the Bill became law. Unfortunately when the hon. member made his statement charging the president of the Trotting Association with having attempted to intimidate him, the president of the Trotting Association was not in the State. Immediately the hon. member's remarks were brought to his notice the president of the Trotting Association took the earliest possible steps to show just what he thought of them. He went to the trouble of sending a lengthy wire to most of the members of this Chamber. That wire shows how far the president of the Trotting Association is prepared to go to disprove the statements made by Mr. Stephenson.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: How far would you be prepared to go?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Just as far as the president of the Trotting Association. That gentleman's wire reads as follows:—

Re Racing Bill. As this measure may come before you before I return to-morrow, I desire to give the Hon. Mr. Stephenson's derogatory statements an emphatic denial. Am prepared personally donate one hundred pounds to the hospital if the hon. member will prove his statements before a tribunal consisting of the Mayor and two other respected and honoured citizens. The Hon. Mr. Stephenson's statements were so serious regarding racing and trotting, consider full investigation should be made. Will personally throw open all avenues of information including our race-course detective and staff, C.I.D. men and police on course, also ground staff and officials. Regarding my endeavouring to intimidate the

hon. member, such a statement is untrue, and I am prepared to apologise if found guilty of the charge. I trust the untrue and unsportsmanlike statements of the member will not prejudice your vote. Fremantle is the only city of its size in the British Empire where racing is unpermitted. The argument may be used that trotting is not entitled to more dates. May I ask what judgment or decision of the public decided that only thirty-five dates be granted trotting as against sixty to eighty for galloping, the most of which are for proprietary gain? As president of the Trotting Association controlling trotting in almost every important centre of our State representing a membership of many thousands, I ask your vote be in accordance with the public wish and your usual fair judgment. It may be the opinion of some members that we have too much racing. May I suggest then the passing of a Bill for the abolition of proprietary racing such as New Zealand, South Australia, and Tasmania. Certain members may also contend that when the Racing Restriction Bill was passed that the thirty-five dates granted trotting embraced the whole metropolitan area. As I was a personal friend, and much in the confidence and company of the then Premier, the Hon. Frank Wilson, I give that an emphatic denial, and the vote in the Assembly recently (27 to 8) surely proves this view.

While I cannot claim to have been a regular follower of trotting in this State, I have attended quite a number of meetings recently. As a result of what I have seen I can say I know of no other sport in the Commonwealth that is conducted on more exemplary lines than these trotting meetings in Perth. In addition to attacking the president of the Trotting Association, Mr. Stephenson challenged my own sincerity in respect of this measure. He said—

I have always had a high regard for Mr. Kitson's sincerity, but owing to the way he has handled this Bill my faith has been somewhat shaken. In future I intend to keep my weather eye lifting where he is concerned.

I should like to explain the reason for those remarks. They were made because I replied to an interjection as to whether a referendum had been taken in Fremantle. I said a referendum had been taken some time ago. When somebody asked what was the result I said it was in favour of trotting in Fremantle. Because I did not go into the whole of the details, did not state that the referendum had been taken on the Mayoral roll, and give all other details, the hon. member considered I was not sincere. I might as well use the same reasoning and say that because the hon. member gave us a dissertation on the evils of racing he should

have gone further into detail and given us to understand all those little things that led up to the state of affairs he described, and which I can only assume he has at some time or other been connected with. The logic is the same. I will do my best to make a success of any measure I may take in hand, but I will not stoop to any underhand methods to secure my ends. Although I am not actively engaged in the racing game and have no knowledge of the seamy side of it, I have just as much commonsense as the next individual. I have been long enough on the earth to take notice of things, whether on a racecourse or in this House. I have no fault to find with the conduct of trotting in Perth. Some members oppose the measure on the question of principle. I have no fault to find with that. I honour the man who is prepared to stand up for a principle in which he believes. I have nothing but respect for such a man, but one cannot have too much respect for one who is prepared to do what the hon. member did—run down a sport to the lowest, a sport with which he has been so intimately connected on his own showing, for something like 35 years. It is true that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, neither should they pose as moralists unless they are free from taint. I have no desire to descend to personalities, but I cannot allow the statements of the hon. member to pass without some comment. Reference has been made to the way in which racing was conducted at Bieton. I remember that racecourse many years ago. Although it may have had a bad reputation, the conduct of Bieton during its later days was equally as good as the conduct of most other courses in the State. It was an unregistered course. The hon. member at that time was a patron of unregistered courses. I believe he was connected with horses that used to race on that course. He can, therefore, claim some knowledge of the way in which the sport was conducted there.

Hon. J. Cornell: He should know a bit about ringtails.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not know that that gives him the right to attack one of the officials of that club, who is at present a prime mover in the effort to establish trotting at Fremantle. Mr. Stephenson is not content with attacking all and sundry who attend trotting meetings, or with attacking the president of the Trotting Association as well as myself, but he goes on

of his way to attack a gentleman who at that time was handicapper and secretary of the Bicton Race Club.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Who is that?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I refer to Mr. Farrell. As one of the leading officials of the Fremantle Trotting Club that gentleman has every right to take whatever steps he may think fit to bring about that which is desired. He is held in the highest esteem in Fremantle. It is an abuse of the privileges of the House for Mr. Stephenson to make the statements he did with regard to that gentleman, when he knew it would be impossible for him effectively to reply. It has been suggested that opposition to the Bill came originally from followers of galloping races. I know of many estimable gentlemen who are supporters of both classes of racing. I know some who prefer the gallops and do not attend the trots, and others who prefer the trots and do not attend the gallops.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There are some who do not go to either.

Hon. J. Cornell: I keep away from both.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Whilst some of the adherents of galloping may be opposed to the Bill, I doubt if one of those would subscribe to the sweeping statements, charges and innuendoes that have fallen from the lips of Mr. Stephenson. Comparisons were made between the number of racing dates on the trotting grounds in Perth and those of other racecourses in the metropolitan area. Those comparisons were hardly fair. The only ground in Perth that is suitable for trotting is that on which the Trotting Association hold their meetings. When the Racing Restriction Act was introduced it was claimed that other clubs had the right to a certain number of dates. Their representations were respected, but many of those clubs were proprietary clubs, the profits from which go out of the State. While I have not been an active supporter of either type of racing, I would prefer to see a curtailment of those racing dates that are allotted to proprietary clubs and an addition made to the dates of the Trotting Association, which is a non-proprietary body and has been responsible for so many good works since it has been in operation. One member said he could see no reason why a certain number of dates should not be taken from the Trotting Association and allotted to Fremantle. There are two reasons against that course. The Fremantle club is

not prepared to accept dates at the expense of the Trotting Association.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Are they not one and the same?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No. The Trotting Association has proved to be one of the most successful bodies of its kind in the Commonwealth. It has endeavoured to lift the sport to as high a plane as possible. In its efforts in this direction it has entered into certain financial obligations in the way of equipping a new ground of its own. This will entail an ultimate expenditure of £100,000. Its liabilities in this direction are already nearly £40,000. If any of the Association's dates are taken away, it will be almost impossible for it to meet its obligations, and carry on as it has done in the past in the way of assisting charities, agricultural societies and subsidising other clubs and associations in the State. Another member asked whether the ground it was proposed to use for trotting in Fremantle was suitable. I am informed that this ground is capable of being made the best in the Commonwealth. I live fairly close to it and have therefore some knowledge of it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What is the size of it?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It would make probably the largest trotting ground in the Commonwealth. It is adjacent to other grounds that are used for cricket, football, tennis, bowling, croquet, etc.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And private residences.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There are very few private residences within close proximity to the ground.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They are on three sides of it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There is a desire on the part of responsible people in Fremantle to have an opportunity of conducting trotting races there. Another progressive body, the Melville Road Board, made an offer some 12 months ago to secure the right to conduct trotting meetings on ground held by them for recreation purposes. The road board offered to the Fremantle Trotting Club an area of 19 acres, close to the board offices, for 50 years, rent free, for the purpose of conducting trotting meetings. The Fremantle "Advertiser" in commenting upon this says:—

Even though nothing may come of it, we are pleased to give the matter publicity, if only for the purpose of commending the Mel-

ville Road Board on being such a live, progressive body, whose desire to forward the interests of their district may well be copied by other bodies in and around Fremantle. It is not difficult to visualise the revenue that would come to the Melville Road Board per medium of the trams, were a trotting track and general sports ground opened in their midst, and also the added value of property in the vicinity, and failing the introduction of trotting in East Fremantle we wish the road board success in their efforts, which are so different to the attitude of a big band of killjoys in this corner of the State.

There is a large section of people in favour of the project. The Bill has been before Parliament for some time, but I have not had one letter of protest from any individual or organisation during that period.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Take two or three from me.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If there had been any strong feeling in this matter I should have received some intimation from those who are strongly opposed to it. In almost any country centre in the State trotting and racing may be conducted. A race meeting is being conducted to-day in Bunbury, while Fremantle, one of the foremost ports in the Commonwealth, is denied a similar right. As a result of the Racing Restriction Act, Fremantle is the only section of the metropolitan area denied the right—which it previously had—of conducting race meetings. Strangely enough, no matter what kind of sport the residents of Fremantle desire to patronise, they have to leave their own town in order to witness it; at all events if it is an important phase of sport. Fremantle residents have to go to Perth to see a decent football or cricket match.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you want to see a good dog fight, go to the Fremantle wharf.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: We can hold our own there. This measure has the support of every member of both Chambers who represent Fremantle, and that fact alone should induce this House not to stand in the way of the Bill. I leave the matter there, commending the measure to the tender mercies of hon. members and trusting that they will give Fremantle an opportunity which it should never have been denied, to hold ten trotting meetings per annum, with an additional two meetings, at the discretion of the Treasurer, for charity purposes.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	13
Majority for				1

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. E. Ross
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. J. R. Brown
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

PART.

AYES	NO
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. E. Dodd

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

House adjourned at 10.8 p.m.