

Friendly Societies Act and the National Insurance and Pensions Act, he came to the conclusion that it was desirable to have this legislation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Sampson, debate adjourned.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st December.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [10.40]: I can find nothing to object to in this small Bill. Its object is to give authority to the Main Roads Board to construct by-passes or gates in the fences that cross main or developmental roads and it will also enable the Commissioner of Main Roads to carry out the duties that have been imposed upon him by the Bill recently passed to amend the Road Districts Act. There are quite a number of by-passes already in existence, mainly in the pastoral and grazing areas, and but for the authority and the safeguards imposed by the Bill there would be a liability on the Main Roads Board or the local road board, or even a town council in the event of an accident arising from the use of the by-passes. With the passing of the Bill that liability will cease. Without the Bill the authorities concerned would have no defence whatever. Naturally the Main Roads Board, the ordinary road boards and town councils want the Bill. Those who voted for the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill will, by the same token, support this Bill. Otherwise the Road Districts Act Amendment Bill will be a dead letter.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.47]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourns till 7.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 8th December, 1938.

Question: Native affairs, correspondence, Mrs. Alice Nannup	2834
Motions: Standing Orders suspension	2835
Additional sitting day	2835
Bills: Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 3r.	2835
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 3r.	2835
Bread Act Amendment, 3r.	2835
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 3r.	2835
York Cemeteries Act Amendment, 3r., passed	2835
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 3r., passed	2835
Marketing of Onions, report, 3r.	2835
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 3), further recom.	2835
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 1), 2r., Com. report	2835
Main Roads Act Amendment, 1r., 2r.	2855
Superannuation and Family Benefits, 1r.	2855
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 1r.	2855
Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., defeated	2855
Income Tax (Rates for Deduction), 2r., defeated	2850
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2852
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2855
Marketing of Eggs, recom., Com. report	2856
Resolution: State Forests, to revoke dedication	2851

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

QUESTION—NATIVE AFFAIRS.

Correspondence, Mrs. Alice Nannup.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table all correspondence between Mrs. Alice Nannup (nee Bassett) and the Department of Native Affairs?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Yes.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

That during the month of December so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in one sitting, and all messages from the Legislative Assembly to be taken into consideration forthwith.

MOTION—ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, resolved:

That, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet for the despatch of business on Fridays, at 4.30 p.m., in addition to the ordinary sitting days.

BILLS (6)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.
- 2, Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment.
Returned to the Assembly with amendments.
- 3, Bread Act Amendment.
- 4, Supreme Court Act Amendment.
Transmitted to the Assembly.
- 5, York Cemeteries Act Amendment.
- 6, Financial Emergency Act Amendment.
Passed.

BILL—MARKETING OF ONIONS.

Report, etc.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Further Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, Bill again recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 11.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. H. Tuckey in charge of the Bill.

Clause 11—Amendment of Section 192:

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I move an amendment—

That in the proposed subsection (3c) in lieu of the words "said Commissioner" struck out by a previous Committee the word "board" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Last evening this clause was amended by inserting the following paragraph:—

(f) By inserting a new subsection after subsection (6) as follows:—(6a) For the purposes of this section the term "motor traffic pass" means a cattle-pit or other similar device or contrivance designed or intended for the purpose of allowing the passage of motor traffic and of preventing the passage of cattle and stock.

I have consulted with the Commissioner of Main Roads, who advises that the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill contains a definition of "by-pass" and he considers that a similar definition should appear in both measures. I move an amendment—

That the proposed new subsection (6a) inserted by a previous Committee be struck out and the following words inserted in lieu:—"For the purposes of this section the term 'motor traffic pass' means a contrivance constructed in a gap in a fence crossing or near a road, which is designed to permit the passage of motor vehicles but to prevent the passage of livestock over or through such a contrivance."

Hon. H. TUCKEY: It is a good idea to have the one definition in both measures and I support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that in proposed subsection (3c) the words "and shall" in line 11 are superfluous and should be struck out.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: The wiser course would be to delete the provision and re-draft it, if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well.

Bill again reported with further amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

HON. H. TUCKEY (South-West) [4.53]: This is an important Bill from the aspect of local authorities and country storekeepers.

Apparently Mr. Dimmitt and Mr. Nicholson discussed the measure from one angle only, that of the hawker. Not once did they refer to the reason for the introduction of the Bill, which reason is to protect traders in country districts from unfair competition. I do not think it is a reflection to say that those hon. members may not fully understand the problem as it affects certain out-back centres.

By the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, and also by the Road Districts Act, local authorities are limited in their activities as regards the making of by-laws to control hawking. If this Bill passes, road boards will be able, where necessary, to make by-laws to protect local storekeepers from unfair competition. Under the old condition of roads and transport, hawking did not seriously interfere with outback traders; but to-day the position is different, and the hawking business is increasing throughout the State—in many cases to the detriment of country business people. The Bill merely sets out, or confirms, what Parliament intended to do years ago under the Road Districts Act. That is similar to the corresponding provision in the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, which hawkers are now ignoring. No local authority would make by-laws to prevent hawking where the practice did not interfere with established storekeepers who had built up their premises and perhaps given considerable credit in their districts.

Undoubtedly Parliament intended road boards to have this power under the Road Districts Act when adding the words "or any other article of merchandise" to "fruit, fish, meat, poultry, game or vegetables." It has been ruled by the Supreme Court, however, that "merchandise" in this case refers to articles similar to those specifically mentioned. This interpretation limits the scope for making by-laws under the Road Districts Act. I am convinced that Parliament intended the words "other articles of merchandise" to include any other goods. This would bring the Road Districts Act into line with the Hawkers and Pedlars Act of 1892.

I am opposed to the suggestion that hawkers be licensed from Perth. This would be pure centralisation. What would a licensing authority in Perth know about the shopping requirements of, say, Wiluna or Esperance? An official in Perth could not be expected to know the local circumstances in remote centres and districts. Parliament

through the State Transport Co-ordination Act has compelled country storekeepers to use the railway system for the carriage of their goods. I know that some hawkers have an advantage in this regard by using the roads.

Mention has been made of possible loss of work to hawkers if the Bill is enacted, but shop assistants and others will be similarly affected if hawking is not checked. I was surprised to hear the statements that the Bill confers too much power on road boards. Far greater powers have already been placed in the hands of local authorities; in fact, in some cases the powers have been forced upon road boards. The Government has frequently expressed appreciation of the manner in which those powers have been exercised. The criticism and propaganda indulged in by the Rawleigh Company are an insult to the members of the 127 road boards in Western Australia. The company evidently does not know that many members of Parliament have given on some of these boards years of honorary service. Several members of this Chamber have over 20 years of such service to their credit. I know of road board members who have given even longer service than that, and one road board chairman, upon his impending retirement, will have completed 35 years of honorary service on his board. I doubt whether any member of the Rawleigh Company has served this State in a similar capacity for 35 days. The company's criticism of the members of our local governing authorities is not only unwarranted but is also greatly resented.

A few weeks ago a hawker representing a Melbourne dress establishment visited the South-West. In one small town he sold a few articles, and took orders for goods to be sent on, in respect of which he collected deposits amounting to £14. Subsequently this hawker was arrested in Perth for an offence, and I am told by some of the people who placed orders with him that they have lost their money.

The Honorary Minister: The same thing could happen if the Bill was passed.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: The passing of the Bill would enable local authorities to watch hawkers. At present they have no power whatever to do so. Now I will quote a few remarks made at a road board meeting held

in the South-West on the 14th of this month—

Recently a hawker had operated in the district selling an alleged cure for mammitis. He had charged farmers £10 10s. for the equipment and sufficient serum to treat 25 cows. He had succeeded in selling a number of the outfits, with which he gave a valueless guarantee. The guarantee stipulated that if the disease re-appeared in the cows treated within two years, further serum would be supplied free. One settler, who had checked up in Perth, had found that similar equipment and serum could be purchased for £4.

The same speaker mentioned another hawker of a similar type. After considerable discussion the meeting decided to make inquiries to ascertain what might be done in the matter. Such cases do crop up: and if local authorities are given some control enabling them to watch hawkers, that will operate as a check. This is not to say that if the Bill is passed every road board will make by-laws under it. However, some road boards feel that there is a need for this legislation. With hawkers licensed, there will be some control over them, and that will be all to the good. The Road Boards' Association recently requested the Government to amend the Act on the lines of this Bill, and other bodies have asked for some such action to be taken. There is definite need for control over hawking, and local authorities are best informed on the subject and are always on the spot to watch the interests of all concerned.

I feel it is necessary for Parliament to give road boards ample authority to cope with the trouble. I must say that members of this Chamber have no reason not to trust those authorities to do the right thing. For years past a similar law has prevailed in the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, under which, however, by-laws could not be framed. The Bill will give the boards power to issue by-laws and bring the hawking business into conformity with the Act. When the Committee stage is reached, some amendments will be moved, notably one by Mr. Drew, which will be advantageous. I regard the Bill as a good one, and I support the second reading.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [5.1]: I support the second reading, and endorse the remarks of Mr. Moore and Mr. Tuckey. The country storekeepers operate all the time and have to pay rates and taxes, whereas

hawkers come and go, and do not carry the same financial responsibilities. If hawking is to be permitted as in the past, unemployment among shop assistants will be rife. Hawkers are operating throughout the State, including the metropolitan area, and, as a resident of the city, I claim that their operations should be checked. They are absolute pests. They visit homes when women and children are alone. In one instance of which I am aware, a young girl was by herself and had one shilling for use in the gas meter. Later in the day she had to ring up her mother to say that she had been compelled to spend the shilling to get rid of a hawker.

The Honorary Minister: She should have rung up the police.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Honorary Minister may talk about ringing up the police, but some check should be imposed upon the operations of such men, many of whom have no consideration for anybody. One has to be absolutely rude to get them to leave one's premises. In the instance I particularly refer to, the girl had to spend the shilling on the purchase of a tin of floor polish before she could get rid of the hawker, who put his foot to the door so that she could not close it. I hope members will accept the Bill.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [5.3]: Not often do I find myself in opposition to Mr. Drew and Mr. Moore, but on this occasion I cannot agree with their views. Amendments to the Bill are forecast, but in its present form the Bill reads somewhat peculiarly. In view of the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act, people will find difficulty in interpreting some of the clauses of the Bill. Mr. Miles referred to hawkers operating in the metropolitan area. I admit that constant knocking at the door by these people does tend to irritate householders, but I must give credit to hawkers who, in recent years, have got together a few articles and have struck out for themselves, rather than, in consequence of their loss of regular employment, resort to Government assistance.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Why do not these people get jobs in shops?

Hon. G. FRASER: Does the hon. member know the position regarding employment in shops?

Hon. H. Tuckey: Business people pay heavy taxes to help such individuals.

Hon. G. FRASER: They do not. I know many of these hawkers who travel from door to door endeavouring to dispose of various lines of goods, and I admire them for their courage. I shall do nothing that will prevent them from carrying on their legitimate business. The average man who embarks upon hawking goes to one house two or three times only. He quickly ascertains the people that are likely to deal with him and thereafter visits only those that he regards as his customers.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Will you review the conditions in the back country?

Hon. G. FRASER: I should imagine that the conditions there are somewhat similar to those obtaining in the outer suburban areas. Many of the hawkers serve a useful purpose. A householder residing near a shop is fortunately circumstanced, but where a shopping centre is far distant, the hawkers often prove very helpful.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There is no suggestion of stopping hawking altogether.

Hon. G. FRASER: No, but if we give road boards power to charge a license fee, we must remember that there are about 120 such bodies throughout the State. Once we incorporate such a provision in the Road Districts Act, the Municipal Corporations Act will have to be amended similarly. There are 30 or more municipalities, so that we have a total of at least 150 road boards and municipal councils, each one of which could charge a license fee.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Why should the hawkers not be required to pay a license fee?

Hon. G. FRASER: If such a fee is to be charged, it might be anything up to £40.

Hon. G. B. Wood: No, more like £2.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Yes; that statement is not fair.

Hon. G. FRASER: In mentioning that amount, I am merely repeating what was suggested during the course of the debate. Even if the fee were £2, it would involve an expenditure of £300.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Nonsense! A hawker does not travel through the whole of the State.

Hon. G. FRASER: A firm may handle a number of lines and have several representatives who travel over given municipal or road board areas. In such circumstances,

the firm would be compelled to pay license fees amounting to approximately £300, if we take the license fee in each district as £2.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But do not the local storekeepers have to pay rates and taxes?

Hon. G. FRASER: I believe that hawkers should be licensed, but they should not be required to take out a license in each road district or municipality. That would be the position if the Bill were agreed to in its present form.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I understand that in York and Bunbury, for instance, the fees are £10 and £40 respectively.

Hon. G. FRASER: I know some heavy fees are charged. I admit that there are good and bad hawkers, but that applies in every trade. The decent men should be permitted to ply their calling and make a living. Should one grocer offend, members would not suggest placing a ban on every grocer. The same should apply to hawkers. The decent hawker should have the right to live, and I will not agree to anything that would militate against that right. He should not be required to pay fees that would compel him to go out of business, and force him to seek Government relief. That is what this proposal would lead to. Many hawkers have been following their pursuit for years, and have worked up good business connections, filling a real want in the community. They should receive protection and should not be required to suffer under restrictive legislation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They can go to the Trades Hall when they want a job.

Hon. G. FRASER: They could not go to a better place.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We are not now discussing the Trades Hall.

Hon. G. FRASER: Decent hawkers should not be prevented from making a living. Let members consider the position of those who are operating in the metropolitan area. If each local governing body were permitted to charge a license fee, the aggregate amount to be paid by a hawker would be so great that he would not be able to continue in business. I shall not give my vote to permit of that happening. Though some of these men may make nuisances of themselves, that tendency is not confined to hawkers. I have no objection to a general license being issued at a reasonable fee; nor do I think the hawkers would oppose such a course. On the other hand, they naturally

would object to being required to pay a license fee in each local government district throughout the State. I hope the Bill will be defeated, and shall certainly oppose the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.10]: I hope members will be careful how they vote on this Bill, because it has far-reaching implications. I sympathise with the case put up by Mr. Drew and Mr. Moore. Mr. Moore explained the origin of the Bill in detail and certainly presented a good case. Unfortunately, however, the measure is wider than either Mr. Drew or Mr. Moore thinks. There is no question about that.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Not the slightest.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I say, with all sincerity, that I am sorry on this occasion to be opposed to my old leader; it is the first time for 15 years.

Member: Why do not the police enforce the existing legislation? Apparently they will have nothing to do with the matter.

The HONORARY MINISTER: To place the responsibility for action upon local authorities is not fair. We are not game to face the position ourselves. It has been left to a private member to introduce this Bill.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are not game to tackle starting-price betting.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The HONORARY MINISTER: This Bill has nothing to do with starting-price betting. We have not been brave enough to face changing conditions of business, but we shall have to do so. This innocent looking measure, apparently harmless but pregnant with possibilities, may—if passed—cause grave injustice to and seriously handicap many estimable citizens who are giving service to the community and inflicting very little hardship on tradespeople generally. Mr. Moore and other members spoke of pirate hawkers who travelled about the country selling merchandise and who, they said, should be stopped as quickly as possible. This Bill will not only prevent those men from hawking, but will throw decent citizens out of employment.

Hon. H. Tuckey: What line of business are they in?

The HONORARY MINISTER: These decent men retail local products from house to house. This Bill will affect local production.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That accounts for the many telegrams we have received from the Eastern States.

Hon. G. W. Miles: From Rawleighs!

The HONORARY MINISTER: I wish everyone would support local industries in the way that I do.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Like Rawleighs do.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They are conducting a perfectly legitimate business.

Member: They are conducting it from the Eastern States.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. Nicholson: Rawleighs do buy local products.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask members to refrain from interjecting.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Rawleighs support local products, which come back into our State in the form of manufactured articles of good quality. I agree that pirate hawkers should be stopped; but the Bill is throwing all hawkers into one class. There is a class of hawker that sells matches, boot-laces and all kind of rubbish, including razor blades that have been on the market for 20 years. Such men are looking for a piece of hose in the yard or for tools in the garage that they can steal. I resent the decent men being classed with such people. They are different men altogether; they are respectable men of irreproachable character. I ask members not to mix up these decent men with other types of hawkers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who is mixing them up?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Nearly every speaker has done so.

Members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have these hawkers a union?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The object of this Bill is to impose a prohibitive license fee upon all hawkers.

Hon. H. Tuckey: It is unfair to say that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That has been published in the Press. The Retail Grocers' Association—

Hon. G. W. Miles: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: —is behind this Bill. Country members should make sure not to prevent the decent men I have mentioned from earning a living. The

incidence of the depression put a large number of good citizens out of work. Some of them were salesmen who could not undertake hard manual labour. They were thrown out of work because of the changing conditions of business in the big shops.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You would sacrifice the people of the country.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Ten years ago the workers employed in grocers' shops were men. To-day one may go to any big grocery shop in Perth and find two men and 30 girls working there. Many youths just leaving school were, at the outbreak of the depression, unable to obtain employment.

Hon. A. Thomson: What have you done for them?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am trying to do something for them. This Bill will do great injustice to the men I have mentioned.

Hon. A. Thomson: Rot!

The HONORARY MINISTER: Many of the men specialise in selling goods manufactured in the Eastern States. The goods are of excellent quality and the price charged for them is comparatively high. They are not sold by retail grocers, and would not be stocked by them.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You just said your desire was to support local industry.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The HONORARY MINISTER: I shall deal with local industries in a moment. If everybody supported local industries as I do, twice as much work would be done at the Albany Woollen Mills.

Member: Quite right.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We have not yet solved the problem of finding work for our unemployed. Large numbers of young men who cannot obtain suitable employment do find legitimate work in hawking certain lines of goods manufactured by Eastern States firms and others. The lines are not stocked by wholesale grocers. The problem of finding work for young men, as I have said, has not yet been solved. The young men have a definite claim on society for a place in the sun. Numbers of them, of reputable character, are at present engaged in lucrative employment by the present method of house-to-house selling, and we have no right to pass legislation that will deprive them of employment. Men of 45

to 50 years of age are also engaged in this method of selling and they will be thrown out of employment if the Bill is passed. I now come to the question of local production. Had similar legislation been introduced many years ago, we should not have had a MacRobertson.

Member: He started in a backyard.

The HONORARY MINISTER: He started in a bathroom. A firm in business at Subiaco, employing about four people, can sell its locally manufactured goods only by adopting the house-to-house method of selling. Those goods cannot be sold to wholesale firms, because they will have nothing to do with them. If this Bill passes, that firm will be thrown out of business.

Members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask the Honorary Minister to address the Chair.

The HONORARY MINISTER: For small manufacturers to market local products is almost impossible, because the usual trading channels are closed to them. In other words, wholesale houses frown upon local production and offer such low prices that the local manufacturer cannot profitably produce the goods. The local manufacturer can, however, distribute his goods by a system of house-to-house selling. The Bill, if passed, will prevent him from doing so. No legislation that will tend to hinder local production, however small, should be tolerated by this Chamber.

The proposal to limit the Bill to the country and exclude the metropolitan area is not sufficient as a large number of men are engaged in this form of trading in Kalgoorlie, Collie, towns in the Great Southern and other large country towns. We would be unwise to pass legislation that would make hawking a crime in road district areas and perfectly legal in municipalities. Such a law would give rise to needless irritation and bother. There are men engaged in house-to-house selling in the metropolitan area and adjacent districts who, in the course of a week, would enter four or five different districts, and to give each of the local authorities the right to impose a license fee would make the position impossible. I impress upon members that house-to-house selling is a development of modern business methods that needs to be regulated. Our legislation dealing with hawking ought to be altered.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why have not you altered it?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am strongly in favour of comprehensive legislation covering all authorities in the State. This is a responsibility that should devolve upon the Government and should not be handed to local authorities.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government has fallen down on its job in having failed to introduce legislation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We ought to do all we can to assist men to make an honest living, but this measure will merely interfere with decent citizens. In conclusion, I resent the action of those members who would place all these house-to-house sellers in one category, who suggest that they would use a foot to block the door open and compel householders to spend their last shilling on the wares offered. A comparatively large number of these men are honest citizens working to earn a decent living. This Bill should be withdrawn so that an investigation may be made and legislation introduced. I oppose the second reading.

HON. A. THOMSON (South - East) [5.22]: I was delighted to hear a Minister of the present Government suddenly taking an interest in the youth who have been deprived of an opportunity to learn a trade. This is the first evidence we have had of such interest.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Youth employment is not the question before the Chair.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But the question is one that will affect youth employment, if the Minister's statement about young men earning a living by hawking from door to door means anything at all. He said that the passing of the Bill would cause those men to be thrown into the ranks of the unemployed.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We have been told they are married men with families.

Hon. G. Fraser: Quite a lot of them are.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I feel justified in directing attention to the fact that this is the first evidence we have had during the past six years of the Government's interest in youth employment.

Hon. G. Fraser: Nine years.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am dealing with the period during which Labour has been in office. This is the first public utterance by a responsible Minister that young men were being denied the right of earning a living. If I thought that the arguments of the

Minister would prove effective, I would certainly reconsider my attitude to the Bill.

When the Road Districts Act was passed, local authorities were empowered to regulate hawking. They were authorised to prescribe the annual fees to be paid for hawkers' licenses, and to differentiate in such fees according to the commodities hawked, the fees in country towns and prescribed areas not to exceed £10 and in the country £6. We assumed that we were giving the boards power to limit the number of licenses to be issued, and to refuse to grant any license either when such limit was reached or for any other reason. The boards according to the Act, could require a badge to be issued to persons licensed to hawk, the badge to bear a number and the year of issue. We specified that hawkers should display the prescribed badge when hawking, and we intended that the boards should have power to prohibit hawking in any prescribed road or other part of the district. When the measure was passed every member was under the impression that the local authorities had been empowered to control hawkers' licenses.

Hon. H. Tuekey: There was no doubt of that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Considerable interest has been displayed in this Bill by a certain firm, which must have spent a large sum of money on telegrams to members and on postages for letters pointing out the number of men who would be thrown out of work if the Bill were passed. Have members considered what responsibility devolves upon that firm, which is so solicitous for the welfare of its employees who sell its goods from door to door? I dare say that almost every member has been approached by one or more constituents requesting him to act as guarantor for the very company that has raised so much opposition to the Bill.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: That is the privilege of members.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Members are asked to put up a certain sum of money and to guarantee those young men as persons of good character. No men trading in Australia are working under happier conditions in disposing of their goods than are the people whom the Minister has so extolled. I have the greatest sympathy for the men engaged in the house-to-house selling of goods. If we pass this measure, we should make a further amendment. The Honorary Minis-

ter told us that the matter of hawking should be taken out of the hands of the local authorities and that there should be one issuing authority for the State, as Mr. Nicholson suggested.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I said there was one way to deal with the matter and that was to introduce an amendment to the hawkers Act.

Hon. A. THOMSON: We have the privilege of taking out motor licenses in different districts. So long as we do not engage in trading and do not travel unduly outside the district, we are free to go here, there and everywhere.

Hon. G. Fraser: You do not pay a license fee in each district.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is the difference.

Hon. A. THOMSON: But the Act permits that to be done. I am suggesting how the difficulty may be overcome.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It could not be overcome by passing an amendment of this sort.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I cannot believe that the sponsor of the Bill intended that one salesman should have to pay £10 in order to sell his wares in four or five different districts.

Hon. G. B. Wood: No road board would make such a charge.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It is a matter for those who are so greatly concerned about the welfare of the people selling the goods; it should be only a question of re-allocating the districts and keeping an individual within the confines of one road board area. I have no desire to injure those men who are making an honest endeavour to earn a living.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You will do so if you vote for the Bill.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I admit there are two sides to every question. Quite a large number of people in country towns are paying rates and taxes and employing men in their shops. I agree that they, too, must be considered. Frequently in the country districts hawkers have entered a town with a wagon load of merchandise and have immediately proceeded to lease a hall and begin selling their wares. What responsibility do such people carry? None at all. Then if all their goods are not sold the probability is that they will be auctioned. That is what might be termed unfair trading.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will the Bill stop that?

Hon. A. THOMSON: I think it will.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is not the worst feature.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The existing law certainly requires amending, and I agree with Mr. Wood that no road board would act unfairly if one of these men about whom we are worried were to say, "I am paying a certain license and I come into your area only for a short period—perhaps once or twice a month." I am certain that the average road board would treat the hawker reasonably. I disagree with Mr. Tuckey who said that the personnel of road boards consists mostly of shopkeepers or their friends.

Hon. H. Tuckey: I did not say that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The firms that are deluging us with letters, whilst very worried about the people that are selling goods in their towns, and in that way perhaps putting men out of employment, really do not care two hoots about that aspect. All that concerns them is the interference with their trade.

Hon. J. Cornell: Does that not apply to all business people?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Probably it does, but there is not much hypocrisy about it. The country storekeepers pay rent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Some city merchants are actually supporting and supplying the hawkers.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If the statement is correct that warehouses and merchants are sending men out to sell goods, then in the interests of country business people it is time we exercised control over hawking. If that system is to continue, we can say goodbye to a large number of our smaller towns. One of the planks in the platform of the several political parties is decentralisation. If we agree with that, we must give the country people every opportunity to carry on under fair and legitimate conditions.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They pay railway freights, too.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes, the country people are compelled to obtain their goods by rail, no matter whether they be only 100 or 200 miles distant from the metropolis. The transport Act obliges them to use the railways and pay freight. Compare that with the position of the man who is able to fill up his truck with goods, proceed to the country and go from door to door to effect

sales. After the impassioned speech made by the Honorary Minister I am hoping that we might get something done for those for whom I have fought here for the last seven or eight years—those young men who have not had the opportunity to learn a trade. I intend to support the second reading.

HON. W. J. MANN (South - West) [5.36]: I recognise there are two sides to the hawking question. I know personally several men who by reason of adverse circumstances have been forced into this business and who are of the type that the Honorary Minister defended so ably a little while ago. At the same time I am convinced that the damage done to traders throughout the State is greater than any good that might have accrued to the individuals to whom I have just referred. May I tell the House something of what I have seen on occasions? In the group settlement areas the 10th of the month is known as cream cheque day. That day is looked upon as an occasion for fraternising in the town and doing business. In quite a number of instances I have seen as many as a dozen hawkers in the town button-holding settlers and offering them all sorts of goods, making all kinds of promises and representations, and in that manner succeeding in getting away with quite a large amount of trade. Yet country storekeepers give the settlers credit for 12 months and frequently have to carry them from month to month. How galling is it for those storekeepers to have to stand by and see the trade that legitimately belongs to them drifting away to hawkers! I do not think any of us can defend that. There will be no chance of our building up rural areas so long as we permit people to take away trade from local residents in that way.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That has happened in the mining areas and the timber districts.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Possibly it has. I am referring to what happens in the country on one particular day of the month. These hawkers do not bother about the city on the 9th of the month, but one can see them travelling out of town in their cars on their way to country areas to secure the patronage of country people.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The same thing happens on the goldfields on pay-day.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have no doubt that is so. I intend to support the Bill. I have

one regret—that we are unable to deal with those persons who buy up a lot of rubbish and then go into country areas and rent a shop—

Member: Or a hall.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Most of the country towns are becoming more loyal to their local storekeepers, and permission to use the halls is refused. Some newspapers, also, have declined to accept advertisements from these hawkers, not once but on many occasions. These people are a menace, but we do not seem to be able to deal with them. They take car loads of rubbish to the country towns, and both men and women interview householders, inviting them to a display of frocks and other merchandise. Once the ladies are induced to enter the business premises, away goes their cash. The Bill does not provide means of dealing with this problem, and I cannot see any way out of the difficulty. Nevertheless, those people are as great a menace as the hawkers referred to in the Bill.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.43]: I approach this matter with a recollection of my experience 40 odd years ago.

Member: As a hawker?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, as a hawker; and I still have a kindly feeling for the men who go out hawking.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is not an easy job.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No. Forty-three years ago, I was up against it. I was told that one predominant evil that the population in the metropolitan area had to face was the presence of fleas. At the time I did not know where my next meal was coming from, so I accepted a position as a hawker of flea powder in Subiaco.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Was there a good sale?

Hon. A. Thomson: Did you give demonstrations?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No. The inhabitants had become inured to the fleas, and I occupied the position for only four days. The work I did in those four days was the hardest I have ever done. Anyone who thinks hawking is an easy job ought to try it.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Did you get paid by results?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes; and I got nothing. I have no objection to hawkers. The remedy is in the hands of the people them-

selves. If they do not want to buy from hawkers, they need not do so.

Hon. G. B. Wood: They have to do so in order to get rid of the hawkers.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member would not have to buy anything from them in order to get rid of them.

Hon. G. B. Wood: My wife might; I am talking about the womenfolk.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The womenfolk can deal with hawkers. Women are not so foolish as to give away money in order to get rid of somebody. Most hawkers know how to conduct themselves, and are decent fellows.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Some do not.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Some members of Parliament do not, either!

Hon. G. W. Miles: At times!

Hon. J. CORNELL: I know, and you, Sir, know some of these men. I know half a dozen in the metropolitan area who were constituents of ours for many years, and who spent eight, nine or ten years endeavouring to win a livelihood from the soil—some of them being married men. Rather than accept the dole, they have since tried to make a living as hawkers.

Hon. A. Thomson: This measure will not prevent them from doing so.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It will, most definitely.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Men such as they are seeking to make a living by selling products that Western Australian manufacturers do not produce; or, if they do produce them, the purchasers run a risk in buying them, because as soon as they open the containers, the contents are likely to blow off their heads, like a Mills bomb. Rayner's tomato sauce was like that a few years ago. One ran a risk in opening the bottle. These hawkers know how to conduct themselves, and they are making a living. If people do not want to buy from them, there is no necessity for them to do so. Even if there is a desire to tighten up the position, the Road Districts Act is not the legislation by which to do it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The proposal is to give local authorities extended powers. There is no reason why a hawker who is licensed in the Bassendean road district should not go into the Midland Junction or the Guildford municipality. If a man pays for a motor license, he is free to travel throughout the State.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is a different matter.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The principle is exactly the same. If a man who is obtaining his livelihood by hawking has a license to operate in the Bassendean, Mosman Park or some other road board area, he is not to be allowed to go into the Cottesloe or some other municipality unless he pays another fee, but a man with a motor car who obtains a license, say, in the Yilgarn district, is able to go into the district of any local authority in the State, including the metropolitan area, with that license. I do not share the opinion of some members as to the manner in which local authorities will administer this provision. There is an old adage that charity begins at home, and I think we shall find that local authorities will use the provision in their own interests. If hawkers could go from the district of one local authority to that of another, it would not be so bad.

A new definition of "hawker" being proposed by Mr. Drew will be a direct contradiction of the definition in the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, which applies throughout the State. He is sufficiently experienced to know that hawkers will probably test the legality of this legislation. If he succeeds in getting his interpretation accepted, it will undoubtedly necessitate an amendment to the hawkers Act. There is no reason why this question should not be tackled from the State point of view, just as traffic is dealt with. If hawkers were allowed to ply their calling throughout the State, some justification could be found for the proposal. We are now asked to permit all local authorities to license hawkers. One might as well suggest they should be allowed to license hotels. I hope the Bill will not be passed, but that a comprehensive measure will be brought down to deal with hawkers from a State-wide aspect. This measure will not have that effect. This Bill originated from a few local authorities on the Murchison, and perhaps they had some justification for the attitude they adopted. Many members seem to think that all local authorities have both hands out to grab license fees of this nature.

Hon. H. Tuckey: You are mistaken.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Mr. Moore told us where the Bill originated. Members now want it to apply to their own districts. The Yilgarn Road Board officials admitted that until they read about it in the newspaper, they did not know of this proposal to amend the Act.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Most road boards thought they had the necessary power under the Road Districts Act.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: So they have.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The hon. member wants to give them suppressive powers. Would he favour an amendment to the Traffic Act so that the same principle might apply under that legislation?

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is a different matter. Do you want a license to carry Collie coal to Newcastle?

Hon. J. CORNELL: As I sell nothing, I am not interested in this question.

Hon. H. Tuckey: And I am not a store-keeper.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The unfair competition will affect the people of your province.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is a strange interjection to come from Mr. Miles. In the South Province there are nine local authorities and two municipalities. Three weeks after the Bill was introduced a member of the Yilgarn Road Board noticed in the Press a reference to it, and wrote to Mr. Moore. I was in Boulder City last Saturday, and I say that no storekeeper or business constituent in my province has made any mention of the subject to me.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They know they have live members to look after their interests.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Life is only a question of degree. Some men are dead but will not lie down. I oppose the second reading.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [5.55]: It is extraordinary what a serious view has been taken of this Bill, and to what extremes members have gone and what superlatives they have used in expressing their opposition. Even the Honorary Minister, mild as he is at most times, let himself go and advanced extraordinary and extreme views in expressing the opposition of the Government.

The Honorary Minister: Not of the Government.

Hon. L. CRAIG: His own personal views, then. The Bill simply asks that the local people who make the roads—the ratepayers—shall say who may hawk goods amongst them. They want permission to control the activities of hawkers.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They have that power now.

Hon. L. CRAIG: By means of the licenses they can say whether a person shall hawk in

the district. Some members hold up their hands in horror at the idea of a local authority having such extraordinary power. When it comes to a question of closing the shops in a country town the decision is left to the local people who may hold a referendum every three years. If they decide to close the shops on Saturday their wish is carried into effect. When the question is one of hawkers operating on Saturday afternoon, the local people are to be given no say, though they are most concerned.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There would be no hawkers if a referendum was taken.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I understand this Bill will mainly affect six districts in the State. The request came originally from the Murchison area. I should be surprised if any action is taken for some time by any other district. In my province the people are not concerned, nor will they be interfered with. I regret that a certain firm put itself to the trouble of issuing so many letters and sending so many telegrams on the subject. Had I favoured that firm before, I would not be inclined to do so to the same extent after it had issued so much propaganda on the subject.

Hon. G. Fraser: The firm was badly advised.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Honorary Minister suggested that starving men and widows have been forced to become hawkers so that they may earn a living. Hawking is a highly profitable as well as a legitimate trade.

Hon. J. Cornell: It used not to be.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is profitable to-day. Hawkers sometimes vend so-called expensive carpets. In my absence they have landed at my place, though I have explained to my people what to do when they call. My wife acquired a carpet in this way and subsequently found it was dear at the price. She was so angry about it that she set out to ascertain where the hawker belonged. To her disgust and my amusement she found he was living in great style at the Adelphi Hotel. In other instances small and inexpensive goods are hawked in country districts by means of a motor car. Inevitably unduly high gross profits are made on these goods so that the business may remain profitable to the man after he has allowed for his own wages and car running expenses. Inevitably, costs must be somewhat excessive. That is why goods that as a rule are not saleable in ordinary country shops are

hawked. The goods usually sold in local stores are not hawked as a rule, because they cannot compete. I do not see that anybody will be affected by the passing of the Bill, except in odd places where hawking is indulged in to more than a reasonable extent. I have discussed this matter with members of my road board—I am on a road board—and they are not even interested, let alone concerned. They do not know anything about the subject, and do not want to know anything about it.

The Honorary Minister: That is an argument against the Bill.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No. If the business of hawking grows as it may grow with bitumen roads all over the country, local authorities need the power for use, if necessary, to curb, control or eliminate the hawking of goods. The power will not be used unless necessary. However, people do not want hawkers blowing in at any time, especially on a farm, where the menfolk are often absent. Unknown people strolling about may be a menace. That is one reason for passing the Bill. Another reason is that in ordinary circumstances local stores should be supported. I fail to see why the Bill cannot become law without doing harm to anybody. Therefore I shall support it.

HON. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [6.3]: I am still in a quandary as to voting on the Bill. I am not so much concerned about the hawker who takes around matches and similar articles, as I am about the traveller who goes out with legitimate goods.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: That is provided for.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I want to be quite sure of that. The machinery merchant's traveller and the motor car traveller have been mentioned. Generally speaking, the hawker is my pet aversion; in fact, I will not allow him on my farm. If a hawker comes on to my place in the country, he is told quick and lively that we do not deal with hawkers. I would restrict them, if possible. However, I was under the impression that road boards already had sufficient power. I am merely wondering whether in tinkering with this measure we may not be doing injustice to other types of hawkers, the types I have mentioned. Like other members, I know personally many travellers, not only Rawleigh's but also travellers of other firms, firms having business premises in this State and in many cases selling goods

not procurable through any other source. I consider such travellers are entitled to be protected.

Member: They will still be able to get licenses.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I agree with the Honorary Minister that there are many different types of hawkers, and that it is not right to put them all in the same basket. Undoubtedly, some should be protected.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The local authorities would see to that.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes; but I feel diffident about giving local authorities too much power. However, the Bill has been introduced by Mr. Drew, and introduced, I should say, in the interests of his constituents, of whom I am one. I am still sitting on the rail, and will wait until I have heard the hon. gentleman's reply before I decide whether to cast my vote in favour of the Bill or against it.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [6.6]: The debate has been highly interesting, and most of the ground has been covered; but in my opinion one or two aspects of the case show that unquestionably an evil arises from so many of these men travelling around hawking goods. On the other hand, there is not the slightest doubt, and I believe every member of the Chamber knows, that many hawkers are decent fellows who, finding themselves up against things, have taken on the business of hawking and are making an honest and reasonable living at it. They are the class of men who, I fear, may be hurt by the passing of the Bill. I knew of a case in Kalgoorlie many years ago, in which a store was robbed, and a large quantity of goods removed. Eventually it was discovered that the thieves had got away with those goods into the country and were selling them off around the farms. In another case a traveller came around selling autographed photographic enlargements. His method of dealing was to get hold of the wife and flatter her about the kiddies or something else, and then induce her to sign a document which, he pretended, was only just a kind of recognition involving no bother, but which she afterwards found was an undertaking to purchase an expensive photograph.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is a reason why hawkers should be licensed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am not happy about the Bill, for I do not think it deals with the problem in the right way. Unquestionably the Honorary Minister made out an excellent case. I wish to inform members about two men in my electorate. One of them is the father of a big family, and resides in a town. He took over an agency for a firm and to-day is making quite a reasonable living. Another young fellow, who lives not far from my home, lost his hand as a result of an accident.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Bill will not prevent them from continuing.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I think it will.

Members: No.

Hon. H. SEDDON: This young man procured a bicycle and attached a box to the back of the machine. He goes around selling cigarettes and other articles.

Hon. T. Moore: He would deal with only one local authority.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No; he travels through the districts of three local governing authorities. I claim such men should not be interfered with.

Hon. A. Thomson: No one wishes to interfere with them.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Some of the most prominent men in Australia to-day commenced their careers in this particular line of business. When they got a few pounds together, they were able to launch out in other directions. Then, again, I am concerned about the position of local traders. When they find people visiting their towns with motor cars loaded up with goods, engaging a shop and holding auction sales, with the result that local business operations are knocked to smithereens, the traders of the township naturally resent such happenings. Members will see there is an evil associated with the hawking business. I do not think the Bill sets out on the right track. The trouble should be dealt with under two headings. Firstly, we should deal with those people that travel round the country districts and interfere with legitimate trade, and, secondly, we should provide for men who are battling to make an honest but modest living. We should protect the latter, but I am afraid they will be adversely affected by the Bill. I do not want that to happen.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Let us give the legislation a trial.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The whole matter should be reviewed. The Hawkers and Ped-

lars Act should be amended, and the better class of hawker should be protected.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central—in reply) [6.10]: Mr. Dimmitt told the House that the Bill was a wolf in sheep's clothing, but his remarks, after due consideration, incline me to the belief that a much more ferocious measure than this too considerate Bill is required to cope with the actual situation. What grounds did the hon. member give for making his statement? He said that to his knowledge 200 men would be thrown out of employment and the majority of them had motor cars with which they were hawking goods. Mr. Dimmitt did not question my facts nor did he attack the arguments I used when I moved the second reading of the Bill. On the contrary, he did something far more helpful to me; he confirmed my statement that many men with motor cars loaded up their vehicles with goods and hawked them through the country districts. Mr. Dimmitt mentioned the Rawleigh Products Co., the Watkins Products Co. and the British Products Co. He said that the salesmen associated with those firms numbered a little over 200, each of whom was earning a livelihood by selling, or, if hon. members prefer the term, hawking goods manufactured by their principals. He informed the House that the representatives of a carrying company had told him that the business of these people represented a big item in their income for the hauling of their goods. Where are those goods being hauled? Through uninhabited parts of the State?

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: No, from the ship to the warehouse. The firm I referred to is James Kiernan and Co., shipping agents.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Mere haulage from the ship to the warehouse in Perth would not provide an enormous revenue.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: It is quite a big business.

Hon. J. M. DREW: My reference was to the Murchison, and the information furnished to me by the State Transport Board shows that only one out of 22 persons granted licenses for commercial goods vehicles operates in that part of the State. From what seven local governing authorities in the Murchison district have told me, large numbers of men are clearly violating not only the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, but also the State Transport Co-ordination Act.

That matter is due for very early investigation.

Evidence has been supplied to me by a member of this House to show that he was asked to back a man to the extent of a fairly large amount to enable him to obtain goods, and to-day that man is trading in the outer areas in an old motor car while the country storekeepers are forced to use the railway. The hon. member I refer to is not present now, but I state the fact that he did assist the man with a considerable sum of money. As I said when moving the second reading, my action followed upon a conference of seven local governing authorities in the Murchison district. Those who attended the conference were all honourable men, many of them pastoralists, and none with an axe to grind. Such gentlemen must have had grave reasons indeed for the conference deciding unanimously to approach the representatives of the Central Province in this Chamber and the member for the district in the Legislative Assembly with a view to legislation being introduced to deal with an alarming situation.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Before tea, I was referring to what Mr. Dimmitt had said. He mentioned that if the Bill passed 200 salesmen would be thrown out of work; that is, 200 salesmen known to Mr. Dimmitt, and probably a far greater number unknown to him. Here we have clear evidence from one member that he knows of about 200 salesmen travelling about the country hawking. That ought to be sufficient to enable members to come to the conclusion that the time has arrived to take steps to control hawking. Mr. Dimmitt mentioned Collie and two adjacent districts where, his words indicated, the law was being evaded, but there are scores of other places—as I have learned since I took charge of the Bill—where similar evasion has taken place. We have been told, on the authority of my old friend and helper, Mr. Gray—and he was supported by other members—that salesmen would be thrown out of work, but I would not trust Mr. Gray five yards when sentimentality steps in. He is the worst gentleman one could possibly find to adduce arguments in support of a measure of this kind. I admire him for it; it is due to his kindness of heart. It is kindness of heart, however,

that severely affects his sound common sense.

Member: How will he be influenced when dealing with the municipalities Bill?

Hon. J. M. DREW: The hon. member seems to have but one idea. He has great compassion for people thrown out of work and desires that they should make money, and make it easily; but he has no compassion at all for the unfortunate country storekeeper. He does not take into consideration, as I stated when introducing the Bill, the expenses that must be incurred by the storekeeper for rent, taxes, employment of labour, and contributions to local movements of every kind. In addition, there is the risk of making bad debts. Will the men to whom the Honorary Minister referred incur any such expenses at all?

Railway freights are a heavy burden on residents of the Murchison district. By far the greater quantity of goods used on the goldfields is despatched from Perth. The freight from Perth to Wiluna for second-class goods is £12 10s. per ton, and for first-class goods £9 10s. a ton. These itinerant hawkers contribute nothing to the revenue of the railways. They use a motor car when travelling through the country, and do not pay license fees to the road boards, but they injure the business of country storekeepers.

Member: But they pay a high fee to the Transport Board.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Mr. Dimmitt is clearly against granting to road boards any powers whatever to control hawkers. He said that one member of a road board might be able to influence all the other members to withhold a license. I have had a great deal of experience of road boards, particularly country road boards. I have attended various road board gatherings where I have come into contact with road board members, and I have had considerable correspondence with them. My experience leads me to the conclusion that Mr. Dimmitt has no justification whatever for his statement.

Member: It is an insult.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Upon further consideration, no doubt the hon. member will come to the conclusion that he was not justified in making such a statement. I am certain that road board members, collectively and individually, will dispense justice if the Bill is passed. They are not seeking to prohibit hawking, as I have already informed members. Boards may desire to exercise only a fraction of the powers available to

them. Large numbers of people outside the towns on the Murchison welcome the arrival of a hawker. The road board would clearly recognise that position. The State Transport Board must also be taken into consideration; there should be the closest co-operation between that board and the local authorities. Mr. Nicholson takes the stand that road boards should not have power to control hawking. Mr. Cornell adopts a similar attitude. These two gentlemen are of the opinion that hawking should be controlled by one authority. My experience over a long course of years has been that if members have not a solid argument to advance against the amending of an Act, they fall back on the suggestion that the particular Act sought to be amended should not be amended, but amendment should be made to some other measure not relevant to the matter at issue. I do not desire the amendment of any Act other than the Act that this Bill seeks to amend.

Hon. J. Cornell: We are aware of that.

Hon. J. M. DREW: It is rather late in the day for Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Cornell to put forward that proposal. Road boards were given power to deal with hawking as far back as 1919. The Bill for the purpose was introduced, if not initiated, in this Chamber by Mr. Colebatch, now Sir Hal Colebatch. That measure gave the road boards very great powers, which it was intended they should exercise. The Bill passed through the House without amendment to the provisions relating to hawking. Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Cornell now suggest that we should amend not the Act of 1919, but an Act passed 47 years ago, the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, which is out of date.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is youthful.

Hon. J. M. DREW: It is useless and ridiculous. I ask again, for what reason was this power given to local authorities? Because it was deemed necessary to relieve the police of some responsibility. There had been an enormous increase of population since 1892, when the Hawkers and Pedlars Act was passed, and to administer that Act properly and efficiently, many additional constables would have been required. Up to that time the Act had been vigorously administered by the police. The Government of the day—no doubt for reasons of economy—decided to throw the responsibility upon the local governing authorities, who cheerfully accepted it. They

endeavoured to administer the law, but found it was defective. If this Bill passes, the Act, in my opinion, will be watertight. It will correctly define what a hawker is. Last year a similar provision was included in the municipalities Act. That Bill was introduced by the Government. It is a retrograde step for Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Cornell now to suggest that some other Act should be amended.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Hawkers and Pedlars Act could be amended to enable the police efficiently to administer it.

Hon. J. M. DREW: As I say, my experience has been that when a Bill is objected to by members and they can adduce no sound argument in support of their objections, they suggest that some other Act be amended.

Hon. J. Nicholson: If our suggestion were adopted, there would be one licensing authority.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Yes. Mr. Nicholson suggests that power should be taken away from the road boards and given to one authority in the metropolitan area. Whether that authority is to be the Perth City Council or the Government I cannot say.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I said the Government.

Hon. J. M. DREW: That would not be acceptable to country people.

Hon. H. Tuckey: We would not agree to that.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The police would not take it over. The force is not large enough to undertake the work. The hon. member suggests one authority, and that authority might be the City Council. What are we coming to?

Hon. J. Nicholson: There would be such a complexity of by-laws that the hawker would not know where he stood.

Hon. A. Thomson: The road boards would not know where they stood.

Hon. J. M. DREW: At all events, country residents would strongly object to administration of the Act by the City of Perth. One reason why road boards were first vested with authority, in 1919, to administer this legislation—so I am given to understand—was to enable them to frame by-laws to suit local conditions. I have already said that the boards may not desire to exercise all the powers that may be given to them under the Bill now before the House. They could choose which of the

powers they would use. Therefore, it would be more satisfactory for road boards to administer this law, rather than have some central authority, as Mr. Nicholson suggested.

Objection was raised by Mr. Nicholson to the definition of hawkers. Before I took charge of the Bill, I approached the Parliamentary Draftsman, who informed me that the definition had been drawn originally for the Government. I therefore considered it would be suitable, as it had been carefully considered by him and so was likely to be without much fault. To make the definition of "hawker" clear I have had it redrafted, and in Committee I shall move an amendment to that definition and also propose a definition of "shop."

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think your amendment is quite clear?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I think it is very clear.

Hon. J. Cornell: A fish hawker will still be a hawker under the Hawkers and Pedlars Act.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am prepared to accept suggestions to make the definitions still clearer. Mr. Nicholson contended that commercial travellers and other persons seeking orders for goods would be debarred, as well as the sellers of newspapers.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is a fact.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If a commercial traveller is a servant of a person who keeps a shop, he will not be interfered with. Similarly, with a newspaper man; if he is an agent of a newspaper proprietor, he will not be touched.

In the Sparks-Nooney case referred to by Mr. Parker, the court held that the servant or agent of a manufacturing firm who carried samples around and solicited orders was not a hawker or pedlar if the shopkeeper had an established place of business. This was held by the court, despite the fact that the servant or agent is not mentioned in the Hawkers and Pedlars Act. Therefore Mr. Nicholson's sympathy with commercial travellers, newspaper men, butchers and bakers is very much misdirected.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Commercial travellers are especially exempted under the Hawkers and Pedlars Act.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I am aware of that. If the Bill is passed, the bona fide commercial traveller will be protected; newspaper proprietors will jog along as merrily as he-

fore, and no matter how rigorously the law may be administered in road districts, the people will still be able to enjoy their morning chop and the baker and butcher will still be constant visitants. Mr. Nicholson said that if he manufactured goods, he would not be able to sell them. There is no justification whatever for that statement. Under the Bill, if he had a shop qualification, he could sell them. Even if he manufactured the goods in the open air, he could sell them, but he could not hawk them without a license. The hon. member also stated that the shop must be in the road district. The Bill does not say so, and in the absence of such a reference, it applies to Western Australia.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would not you suggest it could refer only to the particular district that makes the by-law?

Hon. J. M. DREW: There is no need for me to make any reference to it because the term "shop" will be clearly defined.

Hon. J. Nicholson: A road board has no jurisdiction outside its own district.

The PRESIDENT: I remind the hon. member that he has already spoken to the Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I am sorry, but my desire was to clarify the point.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The Bill does not say that the shop shall be in the road district. Some members think it should be in the road district. One member proposes to move an amendment to the effect that the shop shall be in the State. I intend to accept the amendment.

Then we were told about the farmer's wife who goes about selling eggs. The poor unfortunate farmer's wife! A farm is a permanent place of business.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: On seven days in the week.

Hon. T. Moore: Not in the marginal areas.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The farm produces goods for consumption and for sale, and if the industrious wife of a farmer has eggs for sale, she cannot be molested by any road board, refractory or otherwise. Power is already given in the Act to make by-laws in respect to fish, meat, fruit, poultry, game or vegetables. The Bill proposes to delete that specific provision; it will be re-inserted in another form.

According to a statement by Mr. Parker, if a person has no place of business, he can sell as much as he likes. The hon. member

did not tell us how the Bill would enable him to do so, and I could not follow his argument on that point. The hon. member called to his aid the definition of "shop" in the Factories and Shops Act. That Act has nothing to do with this Bill, which stands on its own legs. I shall be giving a definition of "shop" when the Bill is in Committee. Mr. Parker's criticism was not at all helpful—

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It was not intended to be.

Hon. J. M. DREW:—except indirectly, for apart from his objection to the phrase, "some other person," he did not point out specifically what he considered was wrong with the Bill. The Supreme Court's reference to the words "some other person" was not a perpetual ban; according to my reading, it did not outlaw the words. It barred their use in the particular connection in which they were employed, and the soundness of the judgment will be recognised by any person after studying the Hawkers and Pedlars Act. Obviously, the judge's mind was influenced by common sense apart altogether from law. Mr. Macfarlane told us that the measure would be restricted if he had his way. His leaning is to confine the operation of the measure to places outside the metropolitan area. There may be instances of a road district within 25 miles of the G.P.O. being partly outside the 25-mile radius, and then the whole of that road district would come under the measure. His suggestion to exclude the metropolitan area will not be opposed by me. My proposed amendment means that anyone who travels and trades from house to house with goods that he asks people who are not traders to buy definitely becomes a hawker under the amendment and must take out a license.

Several articles, mostly foodstuffs, are conditionally exempted under the amendment. The exemption applies when the person selling has a shop as defined in the amendment. A servant also will be covered if the employer has a shop. Thus, such people will not be hawkers under the measure. Even a person who has not a shop for selling foodstuffs may hawk them if he has a license. That will be his qualification. Under the amendment a farm becomes a shop if the goods sold are primary products. That seems reasonable.

Hon. G. Fraser: Are you going to compel a man who sells a penny bun to take out a license?

Hon. J. M. DREW: Mr. Fraser told us that a hawker would require a license in every district, and he foresaw hawkers travelling throughout the State from Esperance to Wyndham. Such a hawker, he told us, would require a license from every road district in the State in order to be able to exercise his vocation. The license fee, however, is very moderate indeed. Mr. Thomson has already mentioned it—not exceeding £10 a year in towns and £6 a year in the country. If I can rely upon the literature I have seen since I undertook to sponsor this Bill, £2,000 a year would be quite an easy payment for some of the gentlemen who have said how much they would lose if the Bill be passed. Therefore I think Mr. Fraser need have no sleepless nights regarding the burden to be placed on the shoulders of the hawkers if the Bill becomes law.

Another statement by Mr. Fraser was that the Bill would throw the responsibility upon the local authorities. As I have pointed out, that responsibility has been thrown upon them for 19 years and they have endeavoured to discharge it, but owing to the defective nature of the Hawkers and Pedlars Act, they have not been able to exercise the powers with effect. The Honorary Minister also had the idea that there should be a license for the whole of the State. I omitted to mention him when referring to Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Cornell. Now I include him. The Honorary Minister also said that the object of the Bill was to prohibit hawkers from making a living. There is not a tittle of justification for that statement, and only the Minister's sentimental qualities could have led him to make it.

I am surprised at the hostility shown to this measure. When the administration of any law is suspended for a time through one cause or another, there is sure to arise a wail of protest from those who have battered on its suspension. Many cases can be quoted in support of that remark, and sometimes the plea of vested interests is raised in extenuation and as an argument why existing legislation should be allowed to continue. The bona fide trader has nothing at all to fear from the Bill or any amendments I intend to move, and those amendments are already on the notice paper. The object is to place a check upon the itinerant crook who is out to take people down. He will have to be licensed, and before he is licensed, his character will be closely exam-

ined by those who know him. Members will appreciate that I am placing before the House all the facts within my knowledge.

If the road boards do their duty, which I regard as a foregone conclusion, they will clean up the undoubted evil that exists, at any rate in the Murchison district. I cannot speak of the position in other parts of the State. Helpful criticism characterised the speeches of opponents and also of supporters of the Bill, and I thank them, particularly the latter, for the help they have accorded me. Mr. Moore confirmed my statement as to the origin of the measure, which arose from the unscrupulous actions of people to the detriment of the storekeepers, in the advantage they took of the looseness of the parent Act. In the dark days of the goldmining industry there were no hawkers or pedlars in the Murchison area, but with the return of prosperity, they quickly appeared upon the scene. Their numbers are increasing from day to day. Their presence means extremely unfair competition for the storekeepers who helped to keep the mining industry alive for years when it was on the border of collapse.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: And that applies to the farming community, too.

Hon. J. M. DREW: In those distressful times there were no hawkers, but with the return of prosperity they are assembling like crows in a newly-sown cornfield. To-day they are operating in greater numbers than ever; hence the necessity for legislation to require men, who are acting in conflict with the purposes of the original legislation, to take out licenses. If their reputations are at fault and unclean, I daresay the local authorities will refuse to grant them licenses. No one can raise any objection to that. In the agricultural districts hawkers and pedlars are never seen in a bad season; they are not in the country areas to-day. When crops are good throughout the countryside, back the hawkers come.

Hon. W. J. Mann: And the emus.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: And the kangaroos.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The hawkers return to induce the country people to buy goods that they do not want and at prices that sometimes will not bear examination. In the days of depression the storekeepers financed the farmers. The hawkers at such times were not to be seen there. They returned with the good seasons. That position will recur from time to time. When

the seasons are bad, the storekeepers have to meet the situation, finance the farmers and incur bad debts. At the same time they have to pay their rentals and meet all other expenses, as well as assist local movements.

The Geraldton traders are also suffering from the competition of hawkers. I discovered that fact lately. According to a recent issue of the "Geraldton Guardian and Express," in contesting an application by the local branch of the Shop Assistants' Industrial Union of Workers for increased pay and reduced hours, the employers pleaded, among other things, that they had been subjected to unfair competition as the result of the activities of canvassers who were selling goods, with or without licenses throughout the district. Members will agree, therefore, that the Geraldton traders must be suffering severely from the invasion of hawkers in their district. In the issue of the "Geraldton Guardian and Express" of the 15th October last, there appeared the following advertisement:—

Situation Vacant: There is available a most desirable connection for a salesman who is of the big type, who can intelligently present a unique service of extraordinary merit; the opportunity is with a highly successful organisation in their field with a high reputation of quality products, and a capable and extensive staff. Previous experience not necessary, but ability above the average is decidedly important; the type we seek may be employed at present and may feel sceptical about answering a blind advertisement, but you will find it worth while to satisfy us that you are big enough. The position requires travelling in an assigned territory. Apply in writing to —.

The advertisement concludes with some initials and a postal box address, but I shall not mention them. When I read the advertisement, I came to the conclusion, in my innocence, that the advertiser was a confidence trickster. During the last two or three weeks I have formed an entirely different opinion. I am satisfied that the advertiser is one of the promoters of the hawking menace at present infesting Western Australia. I do not think it necessary to say more. I submit the Bill for the consideration and deliberate thought of this Chamber. I trust that members will not only pass the second reading of the Bill, but will agree to it in Committee, together with my amendments, strengthened as may be deemed necessary in order to secure the efficient administration of the Act.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	8

Majority for	10
--------------------	----

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. L. Craig
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. W. H. Kitson

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. T. Moore
Hon. H. V. Piessie
Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. G. D. Wood
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. J. Holmes

Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt
(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Drew in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 204 (41):

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

I made a promise last year to be of service to people who submitted a good case for consideration. Since then the movement has spread to the metropolitan area. I have every sympathy with the men who will be thrown out of work as a result of this legislation, and the amendment will provide that men will not lose their jobs. If the paragraph is deleted, I shall move to substitute another.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted in lieu of the paragraph struck out:—

(a) by striking out all words in subparagraph (i) after the word "merchandise" in line three of the subparagraph and substituting the following:—"and where the board's district is wholly situate outside a radius of twenty-five miles from the General Post Office at Perth, for regulating the hawking of any goods, wares or merchandise whatsoever and (whether the board's district is wholly situate outside such radius or not), for requiring licenses to be obtained by hawkers whose hawk-

ing the board may regulate under this paragraph, and enforcing the obligation of hawkers and traders to carry scales."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Will the hon. member explain what he means by the concluding words "and enforcing the obligation of hawkers and traders to carry scales"?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The Parliamentary Draftsman told me that this provision was in the parent Act and that as hawkers in the back country are dealing largely in dairy products and foodstuffs that are made up from bulk, it was necessary for hawkers to have scales so that they could be inspected as well as the goods.

Hon. J. M. DREW: A similar provision exists in the parent Act, and is inserted in a different form in this amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (b) all the words after "words" in line 1 be struck out.

These words define "hawker." I propose to submit another definition.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted in lieu of the words struck out:—

Subject as hereinafter provided, for the purposes of this paragraph the term "hawker" means any person who travels and trades and goes from place to place or to other men's houses or places of business, soliciting orders from or carrying to sell or exposing for sale any goods, wares or merchandise to any person who does not in the ordinary course of business buy and sell the same. Provided that if the goods, wares or merchandise consist only of one or more of the following, namely, fruit, fish, meat, poultry, game, vegetables, butter, eggs, milk or any victuals or books or newspapers, the term means any person who (or if he is a servant, whose employer) does not carry on the business of selling or producing the same in a shop or permanent place of business, and who travels and trades and goes from place to place or to other men's houses there soliciting orders for or carrying to sell or exposing for sale any such merchandise or articles.

In the foregoing definition of the word "hawker" the term "shop or permanent place of business" means an established or permanent place of business of substantial construction wherein goods, wares or merchandise of the kind being hawked are made, produced or sold, and when the article hawked is a primary product includes the farm or place where the same was produced.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "construction" the words "within the State of Western Australia and."

As the amendment stands the permanent place of business may be considered to be in a specified road board district. I fail to see why a large firm, paying huge rates and taxes in Perth, Fremantle or Northam, should not be allowed to hawk under license in any other district.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have difficulty in grasping the meaning of the proviso to the amendment, and should like Mr. Drew to explain it.

Hon. J. M. DREW: The term "hawker" is defined as being a person who travels from place to place soliciting orders for or carrying to sell or exposing for sale any of the goods enumerated in the amendment. If a man sells or produces those commodities in a shop, he does not have to obtain a license because he is not a hawker. A man with a shop—say a butcher—could hawk his commodity, but he would not be regarded as a hawker and would be exempt from the provisions of the Act.

Hon. G. Fraser: He could go from door to door, the same as a hawker, but would not come under the Act?

Hon. J. M. DREW: That is so.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: So a man could set up a shop in Perth and then travel throughout the State selling goods without a license?

Hon. J. M. DREW: If a man sells to a trader, that is all right, but if he sells to someone other than a trader, he becomes a hawker and must have a license.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That is not so if the goods are victuals.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If they are victuals, and the man has a shop, he is not regarded as a hawker.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am concerned about the interpretation that magistrates in the backblocks may place upon this definition. I am afraid Mr. Drew will have a busy time going around the country explaining to justices just what it does mean. Frankly, I cannot understand it.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I should like to ask Mr. Drew whether "victuals" would include patent medicines. Foodstuffs are undoubtedly victuals. As I read the defini-

tion, all that the persons who have been pestering us will need to do is to have an agent who has a residence here which he calls a permanent place of business. That man can then hawk victuals to his heart's content. Will the provision not prevent the legitimate commercial traveller for the big firms from travelling around the country to the stations? A station-owner does not buy and sell windmills. Would not the amendment prevent commercial travellers from doing legitimate business on behalf of their firms? Very often they take samples far inland, and dispose of them at the end of their journey. The amendment might prohibit them from doing that.

Hon. T. Moore: Would a road board want to interfere with them?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Any individual might wish to do so.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This amendment is impossible of interpretation. If Mr. Drew persists in it, he will find that something will be inflicted upon the community he will very much regret. Progress should be reported so that members may consider the matter more deeply. I defy anyone to put a proper interpretation upon the amendment.

Hon. A. Thomson: In what way is it wrong?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is impossible to say what is meant by the proviso. The desire is to exempt from the earlier part of the amendment the vendor of fruit, fish, meat, poultry, etc.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The authorities will never be able to obtain a conviction under this proposal.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is my duty to point out the position. I suggest that Mr. Drew strike out all the words of the proviso after "that" down to "newspapers."

Hon. J. M. DREW: The proviso is perfectly clear to me. It defines the ordinary hawker, who must have a license. If he becomes a trader, he no longer remains a hawker.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have here the opinion of counsel of some standing. He says that the servant of a master baker who solicits orders when delivering bread would not be a hawker either under the Bill or the proposed amendment, but that if a master baker personally solicited orders under the conditions set out in the amendment, he could be classified as a hawker.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: If this amendment has been drafted by the Parliamentary Draftsman, we should either accept it or have progress reported.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the Committee has agreed to the amendment right down to Mr. Wood's proposal. Any amendment may now be moved only in the last four lines. I suggest the new definition be accepted, and the Bill be recommitted.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The man who sells machinery would not come within the classification of the man who sells fruit, fish, etc.

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

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [8.45] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this Bill is to grant authority to the Commissioner of Main Roads and local authorities to construct motor traffic passes on main and developmental roads respectively.

This authority is absent from existing legislation. The position is that if the Commissioner or the local bodies did take action to instal by-passes, he or they would be liable in the event of livestock being killed or injured, or any person sustaining damage as a result of such installation.

Members will recognise that it is essential for the authorities concerned to be released from such liability. Nowadays, as a result of the development of fast motor traffic, by-passes are becoming increasingly necessary, particularly where roads run through rabbit-proof fences or traverse pastoral areas. The Bill therefore provides that by-passes may be lawfully constructed by the Commissioner or the local authorities on roads passing through land enclosed with a fence. In the event of accident, neither authority will be responsible for

any damage or loss, unless it was caused through negligence in the construction or maintenance of the by-pass.

Construction of by-passes both on main and developmental roads will be the responsibility of the Commissioner. The local authorities will simply bear the onus of maintaining by-passes on developmental roads. The Bill stipulates that gates must be provided close to all by-passes, in order to permit of the passage of horse-drawn vehicles and livestock. Under this measure we are preserving the right vested in the owners of resumed land under Section 149 of the Road Districts Act. That section provides that where a board has taken any enclosed land for a road, the owner or occupier may require fencing to be erected. The owner of such land will have the right to say whether the resumed road shall be fenced in, or whether a motor pass shall be erected in the fence. I need not detain the House as the measure is self-explanatory. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—STATE FORESTS.

To Revoke Dedication.

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 14, 15, 22, 24, 29, 30, 37, 38, 39, 49 and 54, laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly by command of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on 7th December, 1938, be carried out.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Superannuation and Family Benefits.
- 2, State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [8.52]: I was pleased to hear from so many members who

have spoken on the second reading that they are quite in accord with the principle contained in the Bill, though rather surprised that so many members should show by their remarks that they were under a misapprehension. Before dealing with that point, may I refer to the statements made in the attempt to ascribe reasons for the Government's having brought down the Bill this session. The suggestion was made that the Government had been quite a long time awaking to the fact that an amalgamation of the income tax and the financial emergency tax was necessary. Then we were told that the measure had been brought down because the general election was due next year. This subject has been under discussion for quite a long time, and only the difficulties in the way have prevented the earlier introduction of the measure.

Something like 12 months ago the Commissioner of Taxation made numerous inquiries in the Eastern States on behalf of the Government about certain aspects of this legislation. Though some members complained that the measure had been brought down rather late in the session, I assure them that the Bill could not possibly be completed to the satisfaction of the Government until the time it was introduced in another place. My statement that some period must necessarily elapse before arrangements could be completed, assuming that the Bill be agreed to, was also the subject of discussion. This, too, is perfectly correct. Quite a number of very important arrangements will have to be made, and if the Bill is not approved on this occasion, there will be no chance of amalgamating the two taxation measures before the 1st July, 1940. Quite a lot of matters have to be considered, and in view of the fact that the Commonwealth makes all the necessary arrangements, we have to notify our intentions as early as possible. Additional premises must be obtained where more accommodation will be available; extra staff must be engaged and time will be required to train the extra staff. I am assured by the Commissioner of Taxation that from his knowledge and experience, and from the information he gleaned in the States where these taxes have been amalgamated, no difficulty need be anticipated in this State. Those are the points raised in opposition to the Bill, and I have considered it only right to make the position clear.

One or two members, in opposing the Bill, uttered statements that are not borne out by facts, showing that they misunderstood some of the provisions of the Bill. While I do not wish to delay the House, appreciating as I do how many members have already committed themselves to vote against the second reading, I wish to make clear, particularly to the members who have made the statements indicated, that the Bill does not contain the provision to which they object. I freely admit that the policy of the Government is to amalgamate the income tax and the financial emergency tax. At the same time that amalgamation will not be effected by this Bill. The purpose of this measure is simply to establish machinery for the collection of income tax at the source, and we propose to do that by inserting a new division in the principal Act. Some members have an entirely different idea.

The Bill will not commit members in advance to any particular rates of income tax or to the maintenance of existing statutory exemptions and concessional deductions laid down in the Act. The rate of tax will be a matter for Parliament to determine next year when the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill is presented for consideration. The Government will also have to decide next year whether any change in exemptions and deductions will be necessary. Those, of course, are matters to be dealt with next session. Meantime we are merely asking Parliament for endorsement of the principle of collection at the source. Mr. Seddon, speaking last night, stated definitely that this Bill would alter the exemptions, that it would reduce the £100 exemption to £96—I think that was the figure the hon. member mentioned—and that in the case of the financial emergency tax the exemption would be increased from £78 to £96. Nothing of the kind. The Bill simply gives authority for the collection of income tax in advance. It has nothing whatever to do with the actual liability of the taxpayer. For example, under the Bill a taxpayer would be called upon to pay instalments at, we will say, 6d. in the pound. Then, if as the result of Parliament's decision next session he is found not to be liable to pay any tax, he will obtain a refund of all the money that would have been paid to the State in the form of stamps deducted week by week from salary or wages paid.

Hon. L. Craig: That is the danger. He might not be liable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Parliament is to decide that. The Bill has nothing to do with it.

Hon. L. Craig: Let Parliament decide both together.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then the system cannot come into operation until July, 1940. In my opinion there is a great advantage in the amalgamation of the taxes. Certainly it will be of great advantage to many people to be able to make contributions towards their tax liability week by week. In view of the fact that the system is operating very satisfactorily in other States of the Commonwealth, I see no reason why Parliament should not give the Government authority to arrange for these taxes to be amalgamated, and for the new system to be brought into operation from the 1st July, certainly not before the 1st July, of next year.

Hon. L. Craig: Does not this Bill exempt certain people from taxation of which the new Parliament may disapprove?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. The Bill simply provides machinery whereby the two taxes can be amalgamated. It has no decisive effect with regard to those taxes. Parliament will determine that matter next year.

Hon. L. Craig: Does not the Bill cause certain people to pay a tax as from the 1st July?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig: Before Parliament meets?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is right.

Hon. L. Craig: Under the Bill certain people are exempt. This will impose on the new Parliament the task of taxing such people back three or four months.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill does not exempt anybody. All that the measure does is to fix a figure at which the taxpayer will be called upon to pay his weekly contribution by deduction from salary or wages. The exemptions and deductions, however, will be determined by Parliament when these matters are under consideration next session.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But we will not have an opportunity to decide with regard to the exemptions. Say you exempt up to £300; this House will not be able to alter that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This House will never have a chance to do that. Whatever is decided by the Legislative Assembly shall be next year's income tax will be the basis upon which taxation will be payable. But the Bill merely provides for collection at the source. I want to make that position perfectly clear, for I see there is a misunderstanding. This Bill commits members neither to a rate of tax nor to statutory exemptions, concessions, or deductions laid down in the principal Act. The new Parliament will decide those matters—not this Bill. This Bill authorises the payment of taxes by instalments before taxes are levied.

Hon. L. Craig: But will not people be paying taxation before the new Parliament meets?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig: But under this Bill certain people will not pay any tax at all, people who the new Parliament might say should be paying taxation. Is not that so?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think it is so.

Hon. L. Craig: The point is very important.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill does not exempt anybody.

Hon. L. Craig: But you are not collecting from certain people, as to whom the new Parliament may disagree with you. Then in the following September Parliament may have to re-assess such people.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Re-assess them?

Hon. L. Craig: If they have not been paying since the 1st July, those people will have to be taxed retrospectively. That is the only point that is worrying me.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member need have no worry on that score, because another Bill lays down that people receiving salary or wages under £8 per week shall pay 6d. in the pound, and that people receiving over £8 per week shall pay 9d. in the pound.

Hon. L. Craig: Everybody?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, from salary or wages. That provision applies only to salaries and wages. Consequently, if such people have paid more than their tax liability after it has been fixed by the next Parliament, they will be entitled to refunds. On the other hand, if they have not paid enough, they will have to make up the balance. In addition, if at any time during

the year the taxpayer is of opinion that he has already paid sufficient to cover his taxation liability, he applies to the Commissioner of Taxation for a certificate of exemption. If his contention is correct, he receives his certificate of exemption, presents it to his employer, and no further deductions are made during the balance of the year.

Hon. L. Craig: I understand that. You tell me that everybody receiving over £96 per annum and up to £8 per week will on the 1st July commence paying tax at the rate of 6d. in the pound. If that is so, there is nothing wrong with the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is so. If the taxpayer is of opinion that he is not entitled to pay any tax, he can make application to the Commissioner of Taxation, who will determine on the facts as he thinks right. We are not getting away in any circumstances from the necessity for rendering a return. A return has to be rendered each year under the Act. If a taxpayer makes representations to the effect that he is not taxable, then if that is so the Commissioner will give him a certificate of exemption. The taxpayer presents that certificate of exemption to his employer, who then refrains from making any further deductions. But in the absence of that certificate of exemption it is compulsory for the employer to make deductions.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is only a minor issue in the large scheme.

Hon. L. Craig: On what basis will the Commissioner of Taxation give exemption? On the present exemption rate? He has to be able to give an exemption on some basis.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would be immaterial on what basis exemption was arrived at, because whatever Parliament eventually decided, would be the basis on which the taxpayer would have to pay. That would be the final determination.

Hon. H. Seddon: On the present assessment a man with two children would be exempt up to £300.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is a little bit ahead of himself. He is not perfectly correct. What happens is this, that the deduction for a family comes first, and then of course there are other deductions. As a matter of fact, the married man without children on £300 a year is not entitled to any exemption at all.

Hon. H. Seddon: A married man with two children is exempt up to £6 a week.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. However, we will not argue the point to a pound or two. The hon. member is not strictly correct. Similarly, a comparison made last night by Mr. Cornell between the man on the goldfields with two children and the man in the metropolitan area with no children, both being on the same income, was not strictly correct. However, that is beside the question. The Bill has nothing whatever to do with either the rate of tax, or with exemptions or deductions. I want members to accept that assurance from me.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would become part of the assessment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will become part of the assessment Act if we agree to this Bill. This is a separate division of the assessment Act, and has nothing whatever to do with either the rate of tax, or with deductions or exemptions. Some members, I think, made the mistake of assuming that the deductions referred to in this Bill have some bearing as regards fixing the rate of tax and the exemption. The figures inserted in the Bill were put there as figures upon which the Commissioner of Taxation could work, and the employer also, in making those deductions of 6d. or 9d. per week, as the case might be, from the salaries or wages of taxpayers. They have no significance whatever as to any statutory exemption or deduction. I do not know why hon. members cannot get their minds off the existing Income Tax Assessment Act. Naturally, if we are going to make deductions from salaries or wages regularly week by week, then there must be some point applying to everybody. If the taxpayer has not purchased stamps to the value of the tax for which he is liable, then he must pay the difference. On the other hand, if the taxpayer has purchased stamps of a value greater than the amount of the tax for which he is liable then he will receive a refund of the difference.

Hon. H. Seddon: Will the exemption fixed by the Financial Emergency Tax Act cease?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The exemption is the basic wage.

Hon. H. Seddon: Will the exemption of 30s. a week for a single man be wiped out?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. H. Seddon: Under the Bill the maximum is 37s. a week.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That has nothing whatever to do with the matter.

Hon. H. Seddon: It has. The exemption will be wiped out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot understand why the hon. member cannot see the point.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Will the Chief Secretary explain exactly what the proposed new section 193 means?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It means what I have been trying to explain to the House.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: It means that every worker from the 1st July next will start to pay the tax if he is receiving a wage of 37s. a week.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so. He pays the tax by instalments of 6d. in the pound on the amount of his wages per week.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The amount fixed by the Financial Emergency Tax Act is 30s.; this Bill fixes the amount at 37s.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This Bill has nothing whatever to do with statutory exemptions or deductions. Parliament will deal with that matter later. The present exemption under the Financial Emergency Tax Act for single men is 30s. a week.

Hon. L. Craig: The 37s. a week is only a starting point?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, to make it uniform.

Hon. L. Craig: Why not start at 30s. a week?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Because the Income Tax Assessment Act provides for an exemption of £100 and 37s. a week is as near to that as we can get. It ensures the uniformity about which I have been speaking, and has nothing whatever to do with the fixation of the rate or the deduction for exemptions. Those are matters for the succeeding Parliament to decide.

Hon. H. Seddon: The financial emergency tax will be wiped out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, when this proposed legislation is proclaimed.

Hon. H. Seddon: Will it wipe out all the exemptions under the Act?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is the point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know that it is.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I think it is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This Bill is purely a machinery measure and has nothing

whatever to do with the fixation of rates or with statutory deductions. That, as I have said, is a matter for the next Parliament to determine. This measure simply provides machinery to enable the tax to be collected at the source.

Hon. J. Cornell: Assuming the Bill is passed, there would be no necessity for the incoming Government to bring down an amendment of the assessment Act as it stands to-day.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I suppose it could do so.

Hon. J. Cornell: An amendment of the assessment Act?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. J. Cornell: No.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not when making an alteration like this. That is too ridiculous for words.

Hon. J. Cornell: The exemption now, as Mr. Seddon has said, is 30s. for a single man. If this Bill passes, the exemption will be 37s. In order to get back to the exemption of 30s., an amendment of the assessment Act would be required.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The rates and the exemption will not be determined until Parliament meets. Parliament fixes the rates and exemption.

Hon. J. Cornell: The starting point is the exemption.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As I say, that will be determined by the next Parliament.

Hon. J. Cornell: Not necessarily.

Hon. H. Seddon: The assessment Act remains on the statute-book until it is amended.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member can have his way. I do not desire to repeat myself. I am surprised at some of the statements that have been made by Mr. Seddon, because I understand he has given the Bill much thought and made inquiries into the matter. I have given the House the particulars supplied to me by the Commissioner of Taxation. I can but repeat that this is merely a machinery measure, and that the rates and exemption will be determined by the next Parliament. If the Bill is agreed to, the new system will come into operation as from the 1st July, 1939. If it is not agreed to, the system cannot possibly come into operation until the 1st July, 1940.

Hon. J. Cornell: The Minister will agree that the statutory exemption provided by the income tax Act has not been altered for 10 years.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At present the Government is seeking to amalgamate the two taxes. I am afraid the hon. member is too suspicious of me to-night. As I say, I do not wish to keep repeating what I have said. I have explained the Bill in the clearest possible manner and can do no more. The Government believes in the principle of amalgamating the two taxes and I sincerely hope this House will support the principle. We are anxious that the Bill, when passed, should be put into operation as early as possible. I am assured by the Commissioner of Taxation that any alteration in the legislation must take effect as from the beginning of a financial year. I am also assured that the other aspects of the proposal are quite satisfactory. The difficulties to be overcome are not great, because we have the advantage of experience gained elsewhere, and so are in a position to make adequate arrangements to meet the convenience of the taxpaying public.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: On a point of order, if the House passes the second reading of the Bill, can an alteration be made in Committee to the proposed new section 193, reducing the amount therein mentioned from 37s. to 30s.?

The President: The Committee cannot make that alteration.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Thank you.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	20
					—
Majority against	14
					—

AYES.	
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. G. Fraser
(Teller.)	

NOES.	
Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. E. H. Hall	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Thomson
(Teller.)	

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

BILL—INCOME TAX (RATES FOR DEDUCTION).

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [9.31]: This Bill is, of course, complementary to the one we have just rejected, and I take it the House cannot now pass this measure. Still, it contains one very important feature to which I should like to draw attention. The object of introducing it was to provide the requisite machinery, but if the measure were placed on the statute-book, it could be retained practically for all time. One of the greatest crises in Britain arose from the fact that the King had power to impose taxation without being called to account, but after the revolution it became a fundamental principle of parliamentary government that no tax could be levied on the people without first having been submitted to and approved by Parliament. If members read this Bill, they will find that once enacted it would stand for all time, or at any rate until the Government thought fit to amend or repeal it. If the Government did not take action of that kind, Parliament could not do so. The power to levy taxation is certainly one of the most important. I do not think that the Government had any intention of infringing this principle of parliamentary government—

Hon. J. Cornell: Ministers might lose their heads over that.

Hon. H. SEDDON: But the fact remains that this has been done in putting the Bill forward. The measure has been framed with the object of enabling deductions to be made all through the year, but I thought it only right that this feature should be pointed out to the House.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West—in reply) [9.34]: In the circumstances there is no alternative to rejecting the Bill. Replying to Mr. Seddon's comments, may I point out that we are not alone in endeavouring to adopt this method. Though the previous measure provided certain machinery for the deduction of amounts specified in the Bill, I reiterate that this has nothing to do with the tax liability of the individual. I do not think I can possibly make the point any clearer. These are purely machinery provisions whereby people may be permitted to pay their tax by instalments,

whatever Parliament may declare to be the rate and, therefore, the amount for which they are liable.

Question put and negatived.

Bill defeated.

RESOLUTION—STATE FORESTS.

To Revoke Dedication.

Message from the Assembly requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 14, 15, 22, 24, 29, 30, 37, 38, 39, 49 and 54, laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly by command of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on 7th December, 1938, be carried out.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [9.36]: I move—

That the resolution be agreed to.

This is the usual resolution introduced annually dealing with portions of forest areas that we desire, for various purposes, should be revoked. For the information of members I present particulars of each area, as follows:—

Area No. 1.—Half a mile north of Dwellingup. About $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres of ironstone and gravel country carrying practically no jarrah. Required by the adjoining settler for a house site and small winter paddock.

Area No. 2.—One and a half miles north of Holyoake. About 6 acres of sandy loam carrying very little jarrah. Applied for as an extension to an existing holding.

Area No. 3.—Two miles north of Allanson. About 33 acres of cut-over country carrying a permanent water supply. Applied for by the adjoining landholder.

Area No. 4.—Four and a half miles north-east of Mundijong. About 19 acres of swamp country required for market gardening.

Area No. 5.—Four miles east of Mundijong. About 38 acres of swamp and semi-swamp country applied for for market garden purposes.

Area No. 6.—Three miles south-east of Jarrahdale. About 70 acres of semi-swamp country carrying no marketable timber. Applied for by the adjoining settler, who desires additional grazing country.

Area No. 7.—Three miles south-east of Jarrahdale. About 45 acres of good swamp land applied for as a market garden proposition. Carries no marketable timber.

Area No. 8.—Three and a half miles south-east of Muja. A surveyed location of 267 acres of poor forest country. Applied for by the adjoining settler.

Area No. 9.—Three miles north-west of Bowelling. About 200 acres of poor forest country carrying only stunted jarrah. Applied for by a local settler.

Area No. 10.—One and a half miles north-west of Wilga. About 72 acres of cut-over country carrying very little timber. Applied for by the adjoining landholder.

Area No. 11.—Two and a half miles north-east of Balingup. About 24 acres of good agricultural land applied for by the adjoining settler.

Area No. 12.—Seven miles north-east of Hester. About 545 acres of poor quality jarrah forest which has been cut out by sawmill and hewers and is not required for forestry purposes. Applied for by a local resident.

Area No. 13.—Six miles north-east of Hester. About 38 acres of poor quality forest that has already been cut over. Applied for as an extension by the adjoining landholder.

Area No. 14.—Four miles south-east of Wilga. About 128 acres of poor forest country applied for by the adjoining landholder. Carries very little timber.

Area No. 15.—Four and a half miles north-west of Bridgetown. About $5\frac{1}{2}$ acres of gully land carrying practically no marketable timber. Required by adjoining landholder to enable him avoid washaways in his present fence line.

Area No. 16.—Two miles south-east of Yornup. About 196 acres of poor forest country carrying only a little timber of poor quality. Applied for by a local resident.

Area No. 17.—Fifteen miles east of Manjimup. Approximately 1 acre of well-drained land required by the adjoining landholder as a building site for his dairy and milking shed.

Area No. 18.—Ten miles east of Manjimup. About 30 acres required by the adjoining settler who desires to improve the water supply on his block. Carrying very little timber.

Area No. 19.—Seven miles south-west of Pemberton. About 1,200 acres of broken country along the Warren River of considerable scenic value for inclusion in National Park Reserve A.7691 in exchange for an area of forest more accessible for sawmilling to be excised from the reserve and cut over by Pemberton Mill.

Area No. 20.—One mile south-east of Pemberton. About $7\frac{1}{4}$ acres to be exchanged by arrangement with a local settler for an equivalent area giving access to an important fire tower site.

Area No. 21.—Two and a half miles north-east of Kirup. Approximately 50 acres not required for forestry purposes. Applied for by the adjoining landholder.

Area No. 22.—Two and a half miles south-west of Mundaring Weir. About 20 acres of good agricultural land to be made available by way of exchange for an area of good jarrah country.

In every instance there is a satisfactory reason for the revocation, and I hope members will concur in the resolution.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [9.41]: I support the motion. I have examined the list laid on the Table, and in only one instance had I any doubt. That related to an area of 1,200 acres, which seemed rather a large area for revocation, but the Chief Secretary has explained the reason, and it is quite satisfactory. The action of the Conservator of Forests in making these small areas available for selection by settlers, particularly areas adjacent to established farms, is much appreciated, and is in conformity with the policy that members have advocated for many years, namely that where good agricultural land is not carrying jarrah, it should be made available for selection.

Question put and passed.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1 and 8 made by the Council, had disagreed to amendments Nos. 2 to 4, 6, 7 and 9 to 12, and had agreed to amendment No. 5 subject to an amendment now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

No. 2. Clause 2: Delete this clause.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The Assembly's reasons for disagreeing are—

The amendments proposed by the Legislative Council, if accepted, would deny reasonable protection and compensation to injured workers and their dependants.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 3. Clause 3: Delete this clause.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 4. Clause 4: Delete this clause.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 6. Clause 6: Delete this clause.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Committee deleted the clause but also amended Section 10 of the principal Act to provide that all insurance companies could undertake workers' compensation business if they so desired. As the Act stands, such companies have to secure the approval of the Minister, and we deleted the reference to ministerial approval. That left it open to all registered insurance companies to accept workers' compensation business.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Can the Honorary Minister give the Committee the Assembly's objection to the amendment? Surely the Government knows that the fate of the State Government Insurance Office Bill depends on what happens to this amendment. If we have the reasons that actuated the Assembly in rejecting our amendment, we may find some other means of overcoming the difficulty without departing from the desires of the Council.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: During my second reading speech I stressed the importance of this clause, but the Committee struck it out.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And inserted a new clause.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: The Council should give way to some degree.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: But this is the one clause we want.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: The Committee should meet the wishes of the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You know we do not agree with what the Government desires.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I desire to get the Bill through. I have heard that the fear was expressed in the Assembly that if the amendment were agreed to, a crop of small companies without strong financial backing, would be formed to carry on workers' compensation business. Every such company has to put up a substantial deposit, and I do not think the objection that has been raised is valid.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I fail to understand why the Committee should object to the clause, which sets out that the term "incorporated insurance office" shall include any duly incorporated company carrying on insurance business in Western Australia under the provisions of the Commonwealth In-

insurance Act, which was devised for the purpose of protecting the public. Surely members should not object if the Government provides in a State measure that any company that is eligible under the Federal Act shall also be an incorporated company for the purposes of this legislation. That is all that is desired.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Does not the question of ministerial approval enter into it?

The Chief Secretary: How could it?

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind members that the new clause moved by Mr. Seddon took the place of Clause 6, and the Assembly agreed to the new clause with an amendment.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I moved an amendment to Section 10 of the principal Act, as a result of which the words "from an incorporated insurance office approved by the Minister" were struck out, so that the position was left open to any insurance company to engage in workers' compensation business. According to what the Chief Secretary has said, the Government desires exactly what the amendment effected except that now the Minister has not the right to approve or disapprove. Every authorised insurance company can embark upon the business. The original proposal that came from the Assembly provided for exactly the same result in other words but included the provision for ministerial approval. The companies do not carry on "under" the Commonwealth Insurance Act but are "subject" to it, which is rather different, and that Act merely requires that the companies shall pay certain moneys to the Commonwealth Government. The Assembly desires to retain the provision making necessary the approval of the Minister. We want it omitted.

The Honorary Minister: Then every insurance company will be able to carry on the business.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: A company would have to comply with the Commonwealth laws, and they are strict. I do not think anyone can say that any insurance company in Australia is not financially sound. The only insurer that need not be financially sound under the law in Western Australia is the State Insurance Office. All other companies have to be financially sound by virtue of the Commonwealth Act.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Do they not have to provide a deposit?

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Yes. No person is likely to insure in a company that is not financially sound.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 7. Clause 7—Delete this clause:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

These men should be protected, and I ask the House to reconsider its decision.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 9. Clause 10, paragraph (c)—Insert the words "by his employer" after the word "required" in line 16.

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill originally provided that a subparagraph should be added to the proviso to Clause 1 of the Schedule, as follows:—

Where a worker is not or is no longer required to remain in hospital or other place for treatment but is required to travel from the place where he resides to a hospital or place for treatment or medical examination, then in addition to the compensation payable to a worker under this section the employer should pay all reasonable fares and expenses. . . .

and so on. The Committee inserted the words "by his employer" after the word "required."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Suppose a doctor ordered a worker away for treatment, the employer might know nothing about it. Surely the man should not have to wait for the employer to tell him to go.

Hon. G. FRASER: Suppose a worker is injured in Kalgoorlie, and his own doctor who is attending him considers he should go to the Perth Hospital for treatment that cannot be obtained at Kalgoorlie. If the amendment is included in the subparagraph, the man will have no claim for expenses unless his employer has required him to travel. The Committee should reconsider its decision.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The amendment is essential. If a man had to travel some distance for treatment, an employer would willingly send him. He would be only too anxious to get him well as quickly as possible, because he would thereby save money. I can see grave dangers arising if it is left for the man's own doctor to decide the matter. He will perhaps say to

the man, "You will be well-advised to go to the coast for a time," I am considering the case of a man in Kalgoorlie. The man might say, "I cannot afford it," to which the doctor could reply, "We will fix that up. I will get you to see Dr. Jones in Perth." A certain amount of fraud is possible.

The Chief Secretary: The medical profession will be pleased to hear that.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The medical profession has heard worse than that.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: My word it has!

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Fraud is possible on the part of some medical men. If a man required attention by a specialist in Perth, I think the insurance company or the employer would advise the trip.

Hon. G. FRASER: Doubt still exists. Action is to be taken, and after it is taken a decision will have to be made as to who shall pay. The inclusion of these words leaves room for doubt.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We have debated all this before. Let us get on with the business.

Hon. G. FRASER: The subject is worthy of further debate. Mr. Parker raised the point of a doctor in Kalgoorlie sending a man to a doctor in Perth. The Kalgoorlie doctor would reap no personal advantage from getting rid of a patient. It would be to his advantage to retain the patient in Kalgoorlie.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 10. Clause 11—Delete paragraph (f) on page 7.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—That the amendment be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 11. Clause 12—Delete this clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—That the amendment be not insisted on.

I hope the Committee will alter its ideas about the amendment.

Hon. A. Thomson: I hope it will not.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 12. New clause—Insert a new clause after Clause 1. to stand as Clause 2 as follows:—

2. Section four of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting after the word "family" in line 2 of the interpretation of the

word "dependants" the words "domiciled and resident in the Commonwealth of Australia at the time of the accident";

(b) by adding the following proviso to such interpretation.—

Provided that where the Governor is satisfied that by the laws of any other country within the Dominions of the Crown compensation for accidents is payable to the dependants of a deceased worker although they are domiciled and resident in the Commonwealth of Australia he may by Order in Council declare that dependants domiciled and resident in that country shall have the same rights and remedies under this Act as if domiciled and resident in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The object of this amendment was to bring our legislation into line with that of New Zealand.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is a pity you did not seek to embody other portions of the New Zealand Act in this Bill.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 5. Clause 5—Delete the words "by adding thereto a subsection as follows" in the first and second lines of the clause and substitute the following:—

(a) by striking out the words "from an incorporated insurance office approved by the Minister" in lines 2 and 3 of subsection (1);

(b) by inserting the words "or group of employers" after the word "employer" wherever appearing in the proviso to subsection (1); and

(c) by adding to the section a subsection as follows:—

The CHAIRMAN: To the amendment made by the Council the Assembly has agreed, subject to a further amendment as follows:—

Delete paragraph (a) from the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment, as amended, be agreed to.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Hon. J. Nicholson, Hon. H. S. W. Parker and the Honorary Minister drew up reasons for not

agreeing to the Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment No. 5.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had disagreed to the amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

Delete the words "the Governor" in line 36, and substitute the word "Parliament."

Consequently the word "Parliament" was substituted for the words "the Governor" in line 14 of page 3.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reasons for disagreeing are—

1. Under the amendment the approval of Parliament could only be obtained by an Act of Parliament to be passed whenever it was desired that the board should borrow money. Such a measure could be submitted to Parliament without the present Bill.

2. Money which would be available to the board early in any year would be lost, because of the necessity of waiting several months for the board to secure approval to borrow it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The reasons submitted by the Assembly are sound. I feel we should approve of the Bill as introduced into this Chamber.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I agree that the board should be given power to borrow money. This is a matter in which we must trust the Government. We should not make it necessary for the Government to introduce legislation each time the board requires money.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I also am of the opinion that we should agree to the Assembly's request. The board is not likely to borrow more money than it requires, and we have the protection of the Minister. I shall vote with the Minister on this occasion.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I was responsible for the amendment. Apparently members have now turned round. I point out, however, that a precedent is being created. If Parliament gives the board power to raise money then other boards will desire that

power to be conferred upon them, and their request could not be refused.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I hope the Committee will not insist upon the amendment. The board possesses ample security which it can give for any moneys that it may borrow. I also shall vote with the Minister.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I suggest, as an alternative, that the borrowing powers of the board should be limited to, say, £20,000 in any one year. A proviso might be added to the following effect:—"Provided that no loan shall exceed £20,000 in any one year without the approval of Parliament."

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: That would be sufficient to build only 40 houses? Why not make the amount £100,000?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not wedded to the amount of £20,000. The Committee should agree upon an amount up to which the board may borrow without Parliament's consent.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I intend to reverse my vote. Shortly after I had supported the amendment a week ago I realised that I had made a mistake.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: If we give the board this power we might be creating a market for materials supplied by State trading concerns. We have heard houses referred to as gilt-edged securities. Start a policy of this kind and wages will increase, and when difficult times overtake us, many of the houses will not be worth 50 per cent. of the cost. I still consider that we should insist upon parliamentary approval.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope the amendment will not be insisted on. The proposal is an excellent one and the board can be trusted for a year or 18 months. If anything were done of which we disapproved, Parliament could take action. The board will be able to borrow without its loan forming part of the State borrowing for which Loan Council approval is necessary.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: Mr. Cornell's suggestion would be a reasonable compromise, but probably £100,000 would be a more suitable amount. I prefer to err on the side of liberality rather than to hamper the operations of the board.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope members will not discuss the amount that the board should be able to borrow without obtaining parliamentary approval. The board has a good reputation and can be trusted to do the right thing. Much would depend

upon the amount of money available to the board and to the demand for homes. Realising that there would be a limitation on the board through the assets controlled by the board and that the money would be used for the creation of new assets, we should not place obstacles in the way.

Hon. J. Cornell: The board is more likely to under-borrow than over-borrow.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so. The board should not be restricted in its operations.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The board should not enter into consideration. The whole question involved is the policy of State borrowing, and if we allow the board to borrow subject only to the approval of the Minister, Parliament will lose control. Everyone admits that we have an excellent board, but the point to be considered is the policy.

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

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

BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. G. B. Wood in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Constitution and personnel of board:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That subclause 1 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

(1) (a) The Governor may whenever requested so to do by a petition signed by not less than fifty producers carrying on the business of production issue a proclamation fixing the day for the taking of a poll of the producers so carrying on business in Western Australia, on the question whether a board shall be constituted. The issue of such proclamation shall be conclusive evidence of the validity and regularity of the petition.

(b) If on the taking of such poll more than three-fifths of the votes polled are in favour of the constitution of a board, the Governor may by a subsequent proclamation declare that a board to be known as the Western Australian egg marketing board shall be constituted and may thereby appoint a day for the election by producers of the elective members who shall sit on the board.

Provision for the expenses of any poll under section three and for the first election of the elective members of the board shall be made by the signatories of the petition pursuant to which the poll was ordered; but the board shall be on receipt of a notice in writing signed by the Minister specifying such expenses reimburse such signatories out of the proceeds of sales of eggs to be made by the board as hereafter in this Act provided.

The amendment will give the growers an opportunity to decide for themselves whether they want a board. Similar provision is made in the Marketing of Onions Bill and is to be found in Eastern States legislation.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I oppose the amendment, which will involve unnecessary expense. Organised and unorganised producers, at a mass meeting at the Town Hall, voted against a poll. Already three Acts are on the statute-book dealing with various commodities, and they do not contain any provision for a poll, or for the producers terminating the legislation. On the other hand, the Bill sets out that the producers can end control if a majority vote accordingly at the end of two years. The Dairy Products Marketing Act, the Dried Fruits Act, and the Metropolitan Milk Act contain no such provision. Parliament will decide whether the legislation shall continue or be repealed. Mr. Macfarlane referred to the position under a general marketing Act, but the Bill deals with a specific commodity, which is a totally different proposition.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The meeting at the Town Hall was not representative of the industry generally. There are thousands of egg-producers who were not represented. I am informed by the Westralian Farmers Ltd. that it sends out 750 notices when matters affecting egg-producers are concerned; I send out from 250 to 300 notices, and other people interested send out from 300 to 400 notices each. Members will readily appreciate that the 160 people who attended the Town Hall meeting could not be regarded as representing the majority of the poultry-farmers. I would not submit the amendment if I regarded the meeting as fully representative.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Those who attended the Town Hall meeting were delegates representing branches, and acted on behalf of 800 or more producers. The thousands of people that Mr. Macfarlane referred to are those of whom we are afraid. In prosecuting the interests of the merchants as against those

of the producers, the party spending the most money will secure the majority at the poll.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the clause is passed in its present form, the board will be constituted without any poll being taken of the people affected. Mr. Wood referred to three Acts that contain no provision for a poll. The time has arrived when Parliament should require polls to be taken under such circumstances.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That could not be done with regard to the three Acts already on the statute-book.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I admit that; but if a general marketing Bill were introduced, a petition from a majority of those interested in the production of a specific article would be required before the board would agree to the industry being covered by the legislation. Why should we not introduce the system now? Provision for a poll was made in the Marketing of Onions Bill. There are many people who have no opportunity to read the newspapers and who would not know that legislation of this type had been passed until they found they were bound by its provisions.

Hon. G. B. Wood: They would get information through propaganda long before that stage was reached.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The fairer way would be to accept the amendment, and provide for a poll.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: No demand for a poll was made when the three Acts mentioned were discussed in Parliament. There is no comparison between the onion business and the production of eggs, the latter of which is vastly more extensive.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: As I explained during my second reading speech, the Dairy Products Board would have been dissolved had it not been that the butter manufacturers met Dr. Sutton in conference and carried a motion, as the result of which it has since operated as a voluntary board. Thus it has not taken advantage of its statutory position. When the board contemplated taking action against a firm that refused to pay its levy, legal advice was tendered that, on constitutional grounds, no action should be taken. At a general meeting of manufacturers, the decision was arrived at to support the board on a voluntary basis, and that disposes of Mr. Wood's contention.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We are dealing with a poll of producers, and not considering the position of the board.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Surely we should consider what the majority of the egg producers desire. Why is Mr. Wood afraid of the amendment? He suggested that the merchants might influence the decision if a poll were taken.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That is what they did before. Look at the position in the wool industry.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Parliament should legislate in the interests of the majority. How shall we find out what the majority wish unless we get a vote? I support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division called for.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the tellers are appointed, I give my vote with the Ayes.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	9
Noes	10
Majority against	1

AYES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. A. Macfarlane	Hon. E. H. Angelo
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. M. Draw
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Elections, conditions and regulations relating thereto:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in subclause (2) the words "one hundred and" be struck out.

The effect of the amendment is that anyone with 50 head of poultry will be entitled to vote.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I definitely object to the amendment. Under it wheat farmers, dairy farmers and others with 50 head of poultry would control the poultry industry. The amendment is iniquitous.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: This is Mr. Wood's own Bill, and by Clause 2 he agreed to bring in men with 50 head of poultry. Yet he would refuse those men a vote.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am not wedded to the figure 150; I would not object to 250. However, the figure 50 would mean that 5,000 producers with 50 head of poultry could take control of the entire situation.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I oppose the amendment, and favour 150 head. I overlooked that Clause 2 provides for 50 head, and therefore shall ask for a recommittal of the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Payment of members:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—Provided that the remuneration to be paid to the members shall not exceed, in the case of the chairman, two guineas for each meeting of the board attended by him and in the case of a member the sum of one guinea for each meeting attended by him together with, in either case, any travelling or hotel expenses properly incurred for the purpose of attending a meeting of the board or while wholly engaged on the business of the board.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I oppose the amendment. I do not consider it the prerogative of Parliament to fix the remuneration of members of the board. That matter could be left to the discretion of the Minister.

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

Clauses 11, 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Dissolution of board:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause (3) the words "three-fourths" be struck out and the words "three-fifths" inserted in lieu.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I agree to the amendment.

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

Clause 14—All eggs to be delivered to board:

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—
(5) Eggs bona fide produced and retained by the producer for use by him for hatching purposes only or for sale by him as settings or parcels of eggs for hatching and for no other purpose shall be exempt from the operation of this section.

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

Clauses 15 to 19—agreed to.

Clause 20—Accounts of board:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That the words "the Auditor General or" be struck out.

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

Clauses 21 to 23, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. L. B. Bolton, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 2 and 3.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. G. B. Wood in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of the definition of "producer" the word "fifty" be struck out and the word "seventy-five" inserted in lieu.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have no objection to the amendment. Some people want the figure to be 25, some 50 and some 75. I am not wedded to any particular number.

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

Clause 3—Constitution and personnel of board:

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) the words "three members, all" be struck out, and the words "two members, both" inserted in lieu.

By an oversight, I omitted to move the amendment previously. I think the board is not properly balanced. I am particularly desirous of having one member with mercantile and commercial experience.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I object to the amendment. The board is very well balanced. I think there should be three elective members on the board who are producers; one member representing the consumers, and one elected by the Government.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The most important part of the Bill is that relating to the marketing of eggs, but there is no pro-

vision that any of the five members suggested should have experience of export business. One member should have experience of such business.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have no objection to Mr. Baxter's suggestion. The provision for one of the two members that are to be appointed by the Governor to be a chartered accountant could be omitted, and there could be a stipulation that one of the members should have export experience.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Why not accept my amendment? I wasted a lot of time last night explaining the difficulties. We are proposing to place the whole of the control of the egg business in the hands of the producers, but a man of business experience is needed.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Mr. Macfarlane misses the point that the board aims to assist producers and not the agents. The manager of the board will no doubt be an expert in regard to a lot of the matters Mr. Macfarlane has in mind. I have no objection to Mr. Baxter's suggestion, and I wish he would move an amendment along those lines.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I suggest that progress be reported.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I object to any postponement. It is only a matter of altering the words "chartered accountant" to others that will meet Mr. Baxter's wishes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: As paragraph (b) is worded the Government will be able to appoint to the board a representative of the export interests.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That should be laid down in hard and fast terms.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I want upon the board a man with commercial and mercantile experience.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am not prepared to accept any amendment from Mr. Macfarlane on those lines. We can surely trust the Government to do the right thing and appoint an expert in the export trade if necessary.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported with a further amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 8th December, 1938.

	PAGE
Motion: Great Southern Water Supplies, as to urgency motion, Deputy Speaker's ruling	2869
Questions: State Shipping Service, purchase price M.V. "Kangaroo"	2872
Lotteries Commission, receipts, distribution, Heathcote Mental Home, reception villa, etc., architecture	2872
Unemployment, relief workers and Christmas holidays	2873
Water Supply, Great Southern, shortage at Narrogin	2873
Motion: State Forests, to revoke dedication	2873
Bills: Reserves 1R.	2873
Midland Junction Land (Rights Termination), 1R. Superannuation and Family Benefits, 3R.	2874
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, 3R.	2874
Wagin Water Board (Reserve), 2R.	2874
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 1R.	2875
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, Council's amendments	2875
Bread Act Amendment, 1R., 2R.	2875
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 1R.	2876
York Cemeteries Act Amendment, returned	2876
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, returned	2876
Marketing of Onions, Council's amendments	2876
Proteffing Prevention, 2R., Conn. report	2877
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Council's Message	2894
Resolution: State Forests, Council's Message	2894

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

GREAT SOUTHERN WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Urgency Motion—Deputy Speaker's Ruling.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER [7.33]: I have received a letter from the member for Williams-Narrogin asking leave to move a motion for the adjournment of the House to discuss the question of the water supply of Narrogin and district. The hon. member had an opportunity on the discussion of the Loan Estimates on the 29th November to discuss this question, and he availed himself of it. He had also an opportunity on the Loan Bill and has had opportunities to question the Minister both by way of a written question and a question without notice on this subject. The Speaker, although he has surrendered certain powers as to urgency to seven members arising in their places, has still the right to determine whether a motion for the adjournment of the House is a definite matter of public importance—I stress the words "definite" and "public"—and has still the power to determine whether a motion is obviously not urgent. On the latter ground