

mile tank at Newdegate and Lake Grace. The settlers were mild in their language compared with what one might expect to hear in the circumstances. Everything has to be carted over a wretched track with no water for 32 miles, because of the blundering of someone. Seventeen miles north of Newdegate townsite, or the 32-mile tank, there is a 2,000-yard tank which Mr. W. M. Witham, chairman of the North Newdegate Progress Association, informed me had less than five feet of water and would dry out before Christmas. There are fully 30 settlers, clearers and dam sinkers, with their horses, depending on this tank, and when it gives out all these will have to clear out or draw on the 32-mile tank, 17 miles away. Unless providential thunderstorms occur the position is serious. I did not win applause by telling the settlers that in many respects they had been given a better start than those in most wheat belt settlements, but in the matter of water supplies I consider that the Government has been guilty of very great shortsightedness. This, after so many years of experience, is not what it should be.

We don't want to see money absolutely wasted in doing work in that way. When the people took up the land they were told dams would be constructed. In consequence those people went ahead with their development as fast as they could. Now they are left without water. For the last two summers we have heard an outcry about the water in the metropolitan area. But in the metropolitan area one can, on a comparatively small expenditure, instal a series of tanks and have a supply of pure rain water sufficient for domestic purposes, leaving the bore water for use on floors and gardens. In point of water supply the people of the metropolitan area ought to be invited to contrast their lot with that of the people at Newdegate and Lake Grace, and on the wheat belt, many of whom have not a galvanised iron roof on which to catch water sufficient even for their immediate requirements. I would impress on the Minister the utter inadequacy of the £30,000 on the Estimates for the provision of water supplies in agricultural districts. In contrast with this is the sop to the metropolitan constituencies of £700,000 for water supplies that will not contribute on jot to the development of the State. In view of this it is farcical to refer to the Government as a country Government. If a proportionate amount were spent on water supplies in agricultural districts, the indirect revenue would pay for the installation of the supplies, and in addition there would be an enormous increase in the wealth produced in the State.

On motion by Hon. J. Mills, debate adjourned.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the amendment made by the Council.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 4, and 6 to 8, and had agreed to No. 5 subject to an amendment in which it desired the concurrence of the Council.

House adjourned at 11.14 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 6th December, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Police and dairyman	1894
Lake Clifton lime deposits	1895
Jandakot Commissioner	1895
Dwarda-Narrogin Railway	1895
Group settlements	1895
Njookenbooro and Gwelup	1895
Bills: Women's Legal Status, report, 3r. ...	1895
Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway, 2r., com., 3r.	1895
Redistribution of Seats, Com.	1897
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment, 2r.	1900
Yarramony-Newcarrie Railway, Com. ...	1900
Architects Act Amendment, Com., report ...	1904
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 2r., Com., 3r.	1906
W.A. Trustee, Executor, and Agency Co., Ltd. (Private), 2r., Com.	1907
Lunacy Act Amendment, Council's amendment	1908
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, Council's amendments	1908
Brookton-Dale River Railway, 2r.	1909

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

QUESTION—POLICE AND DAIRYMAN.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the following paragraph appearing in the "West Australian" of the 10th November, 1923: "A Policeman threatened"—"Provocation of circumstances" was the excuse offered by Mr. M. Cantor on behalf of Charles Chantler, a dairyman, who was charged with having used threatening language to P.C. Drysdale, at Osborne Park, on Wednesday last. It was stated that the policeman offered no provocation, but the accused was in a very excited and troubled state of mind because of certain

circumstances. He was bound over in two sureties, of £10 each, to keep the peace for six months? 2, Is it a fact that Mr. Chantler was refused bail, though bail was offered by substantial and reputable citizens? 3, Under what law or authority did the officer at the lockup submit this man to the apparent humiliation of taking his finger prints? 4, Is it his intention to deal in any way with the officer who refused bail and the officer who took his finger prints? 5, If not, does he approve of such conduct?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Bail was objected to for the time being for Mr. Chantler's own safety. 3, Gaol regulations. 4, No. The offender was convicted on the charge as laid. 5, Answered by No. 4.

QUESTION—LAKE CLIFTON, LIME DEPOSITS.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: 1, What quantity of agricultural lime has been supplied to farmers from Lake Clifton over the Waroona-Lake Clifton line? 2, What is the position of the agreement for the supply of lime from this source over this railway? 3, Is the company concerned utilising the Lake Clifton deposits (a) in the manufacture of cement, (b) for sale to farmers and others as agricultural lime? 4, Is there any law to compel the working of those deposits for the purposes stated? 5, In view of the construction of the line and provision being made to obtain lime for agricultural purposes, what are the Government's intentions with regard to (a) the enforcement of any existing agreement for its supply, (b) entering into some agreement for the utilisation of those deposits for the purposes indicated? 6, What is the loss, to date, on the Waroona-Lake Clifton railway?

The PREMIER replied: I have no information. 2, 3, 4 and 5, The W.A. Portland Cement Co. is surrendering the lease over Lake Clifton—to all intents and purposes the Crown is now in possession. 6, Railway Department's loss is £3,343 to 30th June, 1923, including interest.

QUESTION—JANDAKOT COMMISSIONER.

Mr. McCALLUM asked the Minister for Works: 1, What sum of money was granted to Mr. Sanderson, of the P.W.D., as an honorarium for acting as commissioner in administering the Jandakot Road Board district? 2, Why was not the usual practice followed of consulting the local governing bodies before any money grant was made?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Mr. Sanderson did not receive an honorarium. He received a salary at the rate of £100 per annum. 2, The procedure laid down in the Act was followed. The salary was determined by the Governor by Order-in-Council.

QUESTION—DWARDA-NARROGIN RAILWAY.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: When is it expected that the construction of the Dwarda-Narrogin railway will be commenced?

The PREMIER replied: I cannot state the date.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENTS.

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Premier: Have any group settlement accounts been finalised and the various accounts debited to the holders of the respective blocks on any group or groups?

The PREMIER replied: No.

QUESTION—NJOOKENBOOROO AND GWELUP.

Capt. CARTER asked the Minister for Works: 1, Does he intend to accede to my request to visit the districts of Njookenbooroo and Gwelup as promised several weeks ago to go into the question of unwatering certain areas which have previously been under cultivation? 2, If so, when?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, As soon as Parliament goes into recess.

BILL—WOMEN'S LEGAL STATUS.

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LAKE GRACE-NEWDEGATE RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.38]: From the debate yesterday it appears there is a marked difference of opinion as to the route the railway should follow. The advisory board have recommended a certain route, but I am not sure that the advisory board are the best judges of railway policy. Had we followed their recommendation in respect of another railway the other day, we should have had a line constructed of 25lb. rails. It is for Parliament to decide how and where a railway should be constructed. The promise given by the Premier last night should have removed most of the complaints. He said that on careful consideration the Government had decided in favour of loop lines as against spur lines, and that if instead of the line going to Newdegate from Kondinin it went from Lake Grace, it would serve a larger number of settlers. He added that another line would have to be constructed from

a point on the Kondinin railway eastward. Such a line, he said, would serve the settlers north of Lake Grace and Newdegate. Apparently it is the Premier's intention to bring down a Bill authorising that additional line next session. There is a great deal in what the Leader of the Opposition said last night about these new railways. It is impossible that we shall keep on approving of the construction of railways for years ahead. This Parliament will be leaving to succeeding Parliaments a heavy liability of authorised works, representing nearly 20 millions of money. In turn that means anything from a million to 1¼ millions in interest and sinking fund. It is advisable sometimes to call a halt. We should find out exactly how we stand. The Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, when here, said it was about time we took stock and ascertained the true financial position of the States. Railways authorised in 1915 have not yet been constructed, and one authorised two years ago has not yet been started. It is putting people into an utterly false position to authorise a railway before we have the money to go on with the construction.

The Minister for Works: To which railway are you referring?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Piawaning line. We have approved of very heavy expenditure on group settlements, and 12 months ago we authorised the construction of a railway to serve those group settlements. The cost of that line will mean close on a million of money. If we go on in this way, eventually we shall be like the man who fell from a building: he felt no effect until he reached the ground with a sudden stop. I am no pessimist, but it is necessary that this Parliament should be careful in authorising any large increase of expenditure. Of course it may be said that another £100,000 is nothing when we have already authorised the expenditure of 20 millions. Just the same, we must call a halt sooner or later, and it is likely that the State will then feel the effect pretty severely.

The Premier: It all depends upon how the money has been spent.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: However it is spent, the State is responsible for the liability. If the time comes when we cannot meet our liabilities—I hope it never will—it will be very bad indeed for the State. We are going ahead by leaps and bounds. We are told our finances are in good condition. So long as there is any amount of money being borrowed our finances are flourishing, but only on borrowed money. The State is not in the sound financial position that people are led to believe is the case.

The Premier: We have not flourished at other times when we have borrowed money.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Improvements have been effected entirely out of loan funds.

The Premier: All improvements have been made out of loan moneys.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am speaking of improvements in the financial position. Our

railways have been improved financially because of loan moneys expended by the Government in carrying out other works. This must come to an end.

The Minister for Works: They leave permanent improvements behind them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not want to go into that matter now. It is time we ascertained the exact position we are in, and if we can justly and fairly carry out the responsibilities placed upon the people of this State. Very few of us know exactly where we are.

The Premier: No one knows how the world is.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so, but we ought to know how to be careful.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And when to stop. The Government should be wary of introducing Bills of this nature, and leading people to believe they will get soon what will take years to give them. The Government made an arrangement with the Commonwealth for a certain amount of money in order to settle people on the land. This money is being used for railway construction and other public works, and is not being used for the purpose for which it was obtained.

The Premier: Yes, it is.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Let the Premier look at the first statement he made on the subject. It is being used in a manner different from that originally proposed. The £6,000,000 was to be used for the settlement on the land of about 6,000 people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am showing that we have put ourselves in a false position by proposing to build further railways on borrowed money.

Mr. Teesdale: Is not that a branch of settlement?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The money represents an expenditure of approximately £1,000 on each person. Up to date we have spent only about half a million of that sum on settlement. All the other money we are getting is going in railway construction in other parts of the State, where settlement is not taking place in accordance with the agreement.

The Premier: That is not so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are putting ourselves in a false position, and ought to be careful.

The Premier: The hon. member is quite wrong; it is not so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will take the Premier's word for it, but that is how the position appears to me from the financial statements put before us. The Government ought to be careful about putting further propositions before Parliament until we have carried out our part of the agreement. I shall not vote against this Bill. The people concerned have been promised a railway, and that promise must be carried out. The promise made by the Premier must also be fulfilled. I always believe in carrying out promises made by Governments, if possible. No

matter who controls the Treasury benches after the general elections, their first duty will be to ascertain the true financial position—this will take some time—and how to meet the engagements to which we have been committed.

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.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Second schedule:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Seeing that this clause represents the whole Bill, the Committee should have some explanation from the Premier as to what has transpired as a result of what has taken place here, and what the whole position is.

The PREMIER: Since we passed the second reading of this Bill the schedules have been submitted to the Commission. After consideration the Commission did not feel disposed to recommend any alteration to the schedules.

Hon. P. Collier: Did they say they had considered it at all?

The PREMIER: They had it before them for some time, but have made no other recommendations. They felt they had done their work.

Mr. Hughes: Did they meet to discuss it?

The PREMIER: They submitted the schedules to the House, and did not feel disposed to make any alteration.

Mr. Hughes: Did they have a meeting to discuss the matter again?

The PREMIER: I do not know. The Commission was there, and the schedules were sent back to them, and this is the verbal reply I have received from the Chairman.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know whether he called the Commission together or not?

The PREMIER: No. The Commission acts independently of the Government. I have no recommendations from them to bring before members, and the proposal before the Committee is that set out in the Bill. I apologise to the Leader of the Opposition for not making the statement before he called my attention to the position. I forgot to tell the Committee that the Commission declined to make any further recommendations with regard to the schedule. It is not as easy a matter for the schedules to be altered as might be supposed. Having delegated the power to the Commission to provide this redistribution of

seats, it will be difficult for the Committee to alter the schedule. We have said it was for the Commission to suggest these boundaries, and they have done so. The Bill is, therefore, before members to be dealt with as they please. Naturally, I was anxious that the Commission should consider the discussion that has taken place here, but the only recommendation I have from them is that contained in the Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I would like to know whether at this stage it will be possible for me to move to strike out the word "Karrakatta" in the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not yet dealing with the schedule.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is rather extraordinary that some members seem to think we are discussing the schedule. Members will realise that Clause 5 absolutely fixes the boundaries of the 50 electorates. In fact, Clause 5 constitutes the Bill. If we carry Clause 5, then we endorse the whole of the new boundaries as recommended by the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: If we pass the clause it will not prevent the names in the schedule being altered.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should say that we would be able to do that. Just a few remarks generally with regard to the Bill. The fact that the Commissioners declined to have anything further to do with the whole business is a justification for the attitude adopted by the party on this side of the House, when the matter was referred back. We came in for strong criticism on that occasion and we were defeated on the motion that was submitted, but the action taken has been justified by the events that have transpired. The statement appearing in the leading article in this morning's "West Australian," alleging that the Bill was referred back to the Commissioners by Parliament is not correct. Parliament had nothing to do with that; the Bill was referred back to the Commissioners by the Government. It is well known that we strongly opposed the action of the Government in referring the Bill back to the Commissioners. But it is not worth while labouring the question. The pros and cons were thrashed out when the Bill was before the House on its second reading. All the defects as they appeared to members were analysed and, generally, with the exception of one or two members, the boundaries were considered to contain very few virtues. Certainly a number of members did not address themselves to the second reading, but with the exception of the Premier and two or three others, no member of this House expressed his approval of the boundaries as drawn up by the Commissioners. I have not altered the opinions I expressed on that occasion. I do not think the boundaries do justice to the people of the State, and notwithstanding that the rejection or defeat of this clause will mean that the general elections will be contested on the old boundaries, and notwithstanding also that the old boundaries contain very serious

inequalities that have grown up over a number of years, for my part I prefer to see the existing boundaries remain until we can obtain something more equitable than we have in the Bill. Therefore I propose to vote against the clause, and in doing so to vote against the new boundaries as drawn up by the Commissioners.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: As the Bill appears to be unsatisfactory, not only to the Opposition but also to members on the Government side of the House, and remembering that the Government were not prepared to put it through two or three months ago when it was last before us, and that the Commissioners, on having it referred back to them, declined to give it any further consideration, I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Opposition Members: Let us have a vote on the clause.

Question put and negatived.

Hon. T. WALKER: I hope every hon. member appreciates the significance of this clause. Undoubtedly, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, if we adopt this clause we shall adopt the second schedule. It fixes not only the names of the Assembly electorates but it absolutely fixes the boundaries.

The Colonial Secretary: We should alter the name "Karrakatta."

Hon. T. WALKER: You may alter a name but you cannot alter the boundaries. The clause is very definite. Therefore those who do not approve of the second schedule will be compelled to vote against the clause. The vote thus taken will be the test vote on the Bill. If we pass the clause, we pass the whole Bill. I want hon. members to understand the significance of the clause. The Bill was first of all in the hands of the House; it was discussed in Committee and was taken from Committee, and by a most irregular and unlawful method, was submitted to the Governor who was recommended to appoint a new Commission, forgetful of the fact that it was pointed out here repeatedly that the general powers of the Governor to appoint a Commission are removed in special cases when such Commissions are provided for by Acts of Parliament. The Chief Justice refused to comply with the illegal instructions, and he must have won the respect of every member of this Chamber by the strong stand he has taken. The Bill has not been reconsidered by the Commissioners, because the action of the Government was unlawful. We cannot override under Letters Patent of the Governor, an Act of Parliament specially prescribing the procedure in a case of this kind. Now, as if there had been no interruption whatever, the Bill is brought back to the Committee stage, exactly where we left it, and we have got as far as the fifth clause, which is the Bill itself. I think members have made up their minds one way or the other, as to whether this clause shall stand or whether it shall be deleted. The division on the clause will decide the fate of the Bill.

The PREMIER: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kanowna that this clause is the Bill and that the vote taken upon it will be a test vote. It will determine whether the Bill can be carried or not. We may get a majority in favour of the clause, but we must have a statutory majority at the third reading stage. The vote to be taken on the clause will indicate just how members intend to vote on the third reading. If the clause is passed and the vote indicates that we cannot get a statutory majority for the third reading, then of course the fate of the Bill will be determined. I take it that members who vote against the clause will vote against the third reading.

Hon. P. Collier: They would repeat the vote on the third reading.

The PREMIER: I hope members will understand that this is a test vote. When we were discussing the second reading of the Bill, which is a non-party measure, I explained that what we wished was a Bill that would provide fair representation for the people. It was thought by members on both sides of the House that the Royal Commission could well reconsider the boundaries of the electorates, and we recommend accordingly.

Mr. Marshall: That was not urged by members on the Opposition side of the House.

The PREMIER: It was. It was considered that it was our duty to provide a fair Bill for the proper representation of the people by the people. That was the feeling of hon. members. It is possible, of course, for members to move to amend the boundaries, but I do not see how hon. members could agree to any material alteration of the schedule. I do not see how it could be done.

Mr. PICKERING: I regret that the Commissioners appointed to report on the redistribution of seats did not see fit to function when requested to do so by Parliament. Arguments were advanced by members that were at least worthy of consideration. The arguments of members on the floor of the House were such that the Commissioners should have afforded members, or others interested, an opportunity to place their views before the Commission. I regret that the Commissioners did not exercise the ordinary functions of such a body. They did not call any evidence; they considered themselves self-contained, and considered their knowledge adequate to deal with such a measure without calling evidence. The result of their deliberations as set forth in the Bill demonstrates clearly that they did not exercise the ordinary functions of a Royal Commission. It also demonstrates that they had not at their disposal the necessary information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the hon. member to criticise the actions of the Commissioners at this stage. It is out of place.

Mr. Richardson: Is not this a second reading speech?

Mr. PICKERING: Can I not make any reference to the Bill being referred back to the Commissioners?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is criticising the personnel of the Commission, and criticising them for not calling evidence. I do not think he is entitled to do so.

Mr. PICKERING: Can I refer to the Commissioners appointed to deal with the measure?

The CHAIRMAN: No. This is not the second reading stage.

Mr. PICKERING: The Premier gave hon. members to understand that if the second reading were agreed to, he would refer the Bill back to the Commissioners with a view to that body reconsidering the matter in the light of the evidence furnished in "Hansard." Was that not the position?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. PICKERING: Surely in face of that undertaking, I had the right to expect that the Commissioners would function and consider the evidence to be found in the pages of "Hansard." This is one of the most important measures that has come before the present Parliament. It vitally affects not only members of this Chamber, but the representation of the people of the State. In view of that fact, the wishes of Parliament should have received more consideration at the hands of the Commissioners. The Premier stated when speaking that it was possible for members to move amendments to the boundaries, but that it was hardly to be expected that members would venture on such a course, because it would be almost impossible for us, without special knowledge, to alter the boundaries and fix them on an equitable basis. The boundaries of my electorate as fixed by the Commissioners originally, were unsuitable. It was in view of that fact that I offered strenuous opposition to the Bill at the second reading stage. In consequence of the Commissioners refusing to reconsider the matter at the behest of the Government, I feel much perturbed. I would be lacking in my duty if I did not offer an emphatic protest against that action by the Commissioners. The appointment of a Royal Commission is not to be lightly dealt with in ordinary circumstances, but when we take into consideration the importance of the question before the Commission in this instance, I consider greater attention should have been given to the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The actions of the Royal Commission are not before us at the present time and I cannot allow a discussion along those lines. If the hon. member considers I am wrong in my decision, he can enter an objection. In the meantime he must address himself to the clause before the Committee.

Mr. PICKERING: The Premier pointed out that the Bill is really contained in the clause under consideration which fixes the boundaries. Those fixed by the Commissioners are not equitable and had I been given an opportunity I could have suggested to the Commissioners a readjustment which would have been more desirable.

The Premier: If 50 members all wanted alterations to the boundaries, I do not know what would happen.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know whether the Premier or any other hon. member, had an opportunity to place his views before the Commissioners.

The Premier: You have no right to say that. I had no more opportunity than you had.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow a discussion regarding the Commissioners at all.

Mr. PICKERING: Had I been given the opportunity I would have suggested an amendment to the boundary to the Sussex electorate by starting at Balbarrup and going due south to Black Point.

Mr. Latham: You are anticipating—

Mr. PICKERING: Is the member for York (Mr. Latham) chairman of the Commission?

Mr. Latham: No, but you are wasting the time of the Committee.

Mr. PICKERING: The Commissioners did not consider the community of interests concerned.

Mr. Corboy: Would that alteration of yours have cut out the timber mills?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, and it would have left them in the electorate to which they rightly belong.

Mr. Clydesdale: And very bandy too.

Mr. PICKERING: With the alteration I would have proposed it would have made the Sussex electorate an agricultural district.

Mr. Clydesdale: We can all suggest satisfactory amendments of our own electoral boundaries.

Mr. PICKERING: All the group settlements in the district would have been included in the Sussex electorate and it would then have been a purely agricultural seat. When the matter was under discussion it was shown that an adjustment could have been made between the Collie and Forrest seats and balanced up the quotas.

Mr. Richardson: And make nice easy seats too.

Mr. PICKERING: It would have made the seats suitable for the proper representatives of those electorates.

The Minister for Works: How would that amendment have affected the other seats?

The Colonial Secretary: It does not matter. Sussex must be fixed up first!

Mr. PICKERING: I am concerned with Sussex, because I represent that electorate. I do not think hon. members will consider that I am entirely selfish. I pointed out when speaking on the second reading that a readjustment of boundaries could have been made that would have given an extra seat to the South-West, instead of providing the extra seat at Plantagenet. My views are fixed regarding the Bill, and I shall vote against the clause. At the time I referred to the Murchison and metropolitan seats, and stressed the injustice in connection with them. In view of that, I do not think I was parochial in my arguments. The Commissioners

did not take into consideration the instructions issued to them and certainly they had no regard for community of interests.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	23

Majority against 1

Ayes.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. H. K. Maley
Mr. Broun	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Carter	Mr. Money
Mrs. Cowan	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Sampson
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Harrison	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Latham	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mann
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Denton	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gibson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Heron
Mr. C. C. Maley	

(Teller.)

Clause thus negatived.

Progress reported.

BILL—STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.36] in moving the second reading said: When the Labour Administration came into power in 1911, they had a so-called mandate from the people to establish State trading concerns. During the last six years, it has been part and parcel of the Government's policy to oppose State trading concerns. I do not intend to discuss the merits of State trading concerns. The Bill is a simple measure suggesting the deletion of the proviso to Section 25 of the Act. That section reads—

Subject as hereinafter provided, the Minister may sell or lease any State trading concern for such amount and upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Governor in Council.

Had the Act stopped there, it would have been all right, but the section contains the following proviso—

Provided that possession shall not be given to an intended purchaser or lessee

under a contract of sale or agreement for lease until the approval of Parliament has been obtained.

The hands of the Government should not have been tied in that way. If the Government believe that trading concerns are not in the interests of the State and can get a satisfactory price for them, they should have the right to dispose of them. The Government have the right to dispose of a large number of things, including, I believe, obsolete railway stock, without first securing the consent of Parliament. It is impossible to find a purchaser for a trading concern so long as the proviso is retained, because no one is prepared to deal with the Government on the basis of placing all his cards upon the table. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment) put and a division called for.

Mr. A. Thomson: I ask permission to withdraw my call for a division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the division is off and the "Ayes" have it.

Debate thus adjourned.

BILL—YARRAMONY-NEWCARNIE RAILWAY.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 29th November; Mr. Angelo in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Authority to construct (partly considered):

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister promised to give some information in connection with this clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member said he felt confident that the alteration here involved would not have been made by the Engineer-in-Chief unless that officer had been instructed to make it. The hon. member also drew attention to the absence from the file of a certain letter. A copy of that letter has now been obtained. The letter is from the Engineer for Existing Lines, Mr. Darker, and points out that, in view of the decision that the junction should be at Newearnie, he requires information whether the Working Railways desire that the line should come in at the north or at the south of that town. The Engineer-in-Chief has spontaneously written the following letter, dated the 4th inst.:—

The Acting Under Secretary for Public Works. In regard to the discussion that has lately taken place concerning the terminus of the Yarramony-North Baandee railway, and the relative merits of Merredin and Newearnie for the junctioning point to existing railway, it should be remembered that the Advisory Board's

report dealt with no further length than from Yarramony to North Baandee, a distance of some 78 miles, which would constitute a dead-end. This was pointed out by me in discussions with the Hon. Minister as objectionable from a railway working point of view, and, on instructions from the Hon. Minister, draft Bill was prepared for junction with Merredin. I then pointed out that to junction with Merredin would involve an additional length of line construction (about four miles) over and above what would be required if the line were run out easterly to junction with the Dowerin loop, and moreover such a junction (Merredin) would locate the last few miles of the line in such a position as to additionally serve country that was already well served with railway. It is doubtful, too, from investigations, whether one in 80 grade could have been obtained into Merredin without heavy work and expenditure. Having made these representations, instructions were issued to trial-survey in order to junction with the Dowerin loop, and Newcarnie was ultimately selected as the junction, as serving the best country. A collateral reason for the selection of Newcarnie was the ultimate possibility of extending the Mt. Marshall extension southwards, and in order to eliminate the present dead-end—dead-ends are always undesirable from a railway working point of view—curve it round to junction with the Dowerin loop. Newcarnie offered advantages of location in this regard. Just as the junctioning at Merredin of Yarramony-North Baandee extension would over-serve, from a railway point of view, the country passed through by the line immediately surrounding Merredin, so would the extension of the Mt. Marshall line to junction at Merredin impose the same undesirable conditions. (Signed) Jas. Thompson, Engineer-in-Chief.

Mr. Piesse: The reason is excellent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not consider it an excellent reason.

Hon. P. Collier: There is nothing at all in it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is the view of the Engineer-in-Chief, who is the expert on the matter, and who is responsible. He is the highest authority in the land on railway construction.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment—

That "Newcarnie" be struck out with a view to inserting "Merredin" in lieu.

I do not consider that the statement of the Engineer-in-Chief contains anything whatever of importance. The Engineer-in-Chief is the highest authority in the land as to where a line should junction, not as to the most economical working of a line after it has been built—more particularly when it matters not to the serving of a district where the line should junction. Whether the line junctions

at Newcarnie or Merredin does not make the slightest difference to one farmer or one settler, because all the farmers and settlers would be equally well served by a junction at either place. Why cannot the Minister hang the map of the proposed line on the wall, where hon. members might see it? One cannot discuss the route in the light of a map rolled up on the Table. It has always been the practice to hang maps of railway routes on the wall of the Chamber. Unless every member examines the plans for himself, it is impossible to follow the argument. When the line comes to the point where it turns at a sharp angle in order to junction with Newcarnie, the question arises whether it should turn up to join at Newcarnie or should continue on to Merredin. All the settlers at that point or elbow are already served by existing lines. If it could be shown that by junctioning at a certain point the line would serve a considerably greater number of settlers than by junctioning at another point, a good case would be made out for the former route. But, that being out of the question here, the only factor to be taken into consideration is the point of view of the Working Railways, which would be the more economical point from which to operate the line for all time after it has been built? To my mind there is no shadow of doubt that it would be infinitely more economical for the Working Railways to operate the line if it came into Merredin, where there are already the necessary staff and equipment, with loco. sheds and so forth. Merredin is the biggest junction on the eastern line. Undoubtedly the Working Railways could operate the proposed line better from that centre than by setting up another junction some 10 or 16 miles away, where they would again have to go to considerable expense in providing the facilities required.

The Minister for Works: It would not be a serious matter.

Mr. Latham: An officer would have to be kept there all the time.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Although I endeavoured to follow closely the letter from the Engineer-in-Chief which the Minister read, I did not understand that the Engineer-in-Chief had consulted any of the higher officers of the Railway Department and that they had concurred in the junction at Newcarnie.

The Minister for Works: They are always in touch with one another.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does not the Minister know that it is a most extraordinary thing for the Engineer-in-Chief to decide the terminus or the junction of a line without consulting the Working Railways as to how they will be affected? I have never known such a thing to be done.

The Minister for Works: If the Working Railways were not satisfied, they would put in a very urgent protest.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is not the way to do business between departments. The previous history of this matter shows that the

question of junction was one of doubt, or at all events that Merredin should be considered. How comes it that the Minister and the Engineer-in-Chief, the latter being the highest authority in the land, and everybody else concerned, so far as we know from the file, should last year have decided that the line must junction at Merredin? A Bill accordingly was printed for presentation to Parliament.

The Minister for Works: I gave the reason in the memorandum I read.

Hon. P. COLLIER: How can one assimilate the contents of a couple of sheets of type-written matter read in an undertone by the Minister? The Minister, after moving the second reading, unfolds a map, lays it on the Table, and then asks us to proceed with the debate.

The Minister for Works: You have had plenty of time to look at the plan.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so; but if the map were hung on the wall, members would be able to follow the argument. It is not my business to hang the map on the wall. The fact that last year's Bill was not presented to Parliament had nothing whatever to do with the route, but arose from other circumstances. It was only in April or May of this year that the question of junctioning at Newcarrie or at a point other than Merredin arose. How is it Newcarrie did not appeal last year to "the highest authority in the land?" For my part I have not much faith in the qualifications of the highest authorities in the land when those authorities are prepared, apparently, to recommend a certain junctioning point to-day, whereas if circumstances had been favourable for the presentation of the Bill to Parliament last year, and if the measure had gone through, the junctioning would have been effected at another point for all time. Then, apparently without any justification, this "highest authority in the land" changes his mind and thinks the line ought to junction somewhere else. What is the reason for it? I know the Minister says, "Don't you criticise my officers"; but, unless the Minister is prepared to take the responsibility, I am going to criticise his officers. The Minister is not taking the responsibility, for he says it is the Engineer-in-Chief who is responsible.

The Minister for Works: I did not put it that way. You always take the same carping attitude.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If I did always take a carping attitude I should dress you down on many occasions.

The Minister for Works: Well, do it now.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I would not waste time on you. You and other Ministers have got into the habit, so easy is your passage made for you, of resenting anything said by the Opposition. In your view, the Opposition dare not offer an opinion contrary to the ideas of Ministers. Everything that Ministers do is perfection. Apparently that is the attitude of Ministers. The Minister for

Works ought to talk about carping criticism! No other Government of Western Australia have ever been freer from carping criticism than have the present Government, and no member of this House has indulged in less carping criticism than have I. The Minister helps to decide that a railway shall junction at one place one day and at another place the next day; and because a member merely points that out, he is accused of indulging in carping criticism.

The Minister for Works: Well, now let us get on with the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is only when we get close to recess that the Minister indulges in such comments. Early in the session he would not dare to accuse me or any member of the Opposition of carping criticism. At this late hour he feels he can afford to be as offensive as he pleases and talk about carping criticism. The Minister knows nothing whatever about the Bill, no more about it than does his office boy. He is in charge of a Bill involving the country in an expenditure of over £400,000, yet he knows nothing at all about it.

The Minister for Works: I know all about it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Anywhere the Engineer-in-Chief might suggest as a junction, is the right place, even though it be one place to-day and another place next day. Neither on the file nor in the statement read by the Minister is there any indication that the responsible departmental officers were consulted about the junction. I am loth to believe that the Engineer-in-Chief is such an indiarubber man as the Minister's statements would lead us to understand.

The Minister for Works: He is not an indiarubber man, he is a man of great ability.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Nevertheless, the Minister should take the responsibility.

The Minister for Works: I am not shirking it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: You are. You read something from the Engineer-in-Chief which explains nothing, does not touch the point. The proposal was raised by the Premier as to whether this line might not be made portion of the trans-Australian line with a 4ft. 8½in. gauge.

The Premier: No. This was to be a light line with a broad gauge through to Northam.

Hon. P. COLLIER: However, it was only a suggestion. It went to the Engineer-in-Chief, and on the 2nd May he wrote a minute regarding it. In the course of that minute the Engineer-in-Chief wrote, "Let them make a trial line into Merredin." That was in May of this year. He instructs that a survey be made to Merredin. I always understood that surveys were made before the route was decided. Here, it seems, it was decided that the line should be built to junction at Merredin, although no survey had been made. How is it possible to give an estimate of the cost of

the line without a survey? Moreover, the Working Railways, the Chief Traffic Manager and the Commissioner for Railways, have not been consulted. That is the vital point in respect of this line. If it were a question of giving railway facilities to settlers, it would not be for the Working Railways to determine; the Government would decide. But when the only point at issue, as in this case, is the economic working of the line after construction, the people to be consulted are the responsible officers of the Working Railways. Having regard to that point, one must say that the only place where the line ought to junction is at Merredin, where there exist the necessary accommodation and equipment. I would not attempt to divert the line if it would serve more settlers by going to Newcarrie. But as to serving settlers, it matters not whether it goes to Newcarrie or to Merredin, for whichever be the terminus, there will not be at that end of the line a settler more than five or six miles from one or another railway. Moreover, it does not matter what may be the quality of the land close into Merredin, because all the good land will be well served, will be not more than five or six miles from one or another railway. Moreover, if the line does not junction at Merredin there will be 16 or 17 miles of dead running from Newcarrie round to Merredin.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the amendment submitted by the member for Boulder. There is a rule that prevents any member, with the exception of a Minister of the Crown, from introducing measures involving an expenditure of money, or amendments to Bills proposing to increase the expenditure. The Minister for Works has indicated that an extension to Merredin instead of Newcarrie would involve four more miles of railway, and this would mean additional expense. I cannot, therefore, accept the amendment.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is no proof that my amendment would have this effect. We have only the statement of the Minister that this would mean more expense. If your ruling is correct it would be an extraordinary thing for members to have any say in determining the route of any railway, and the matter might well be handed over entirely to the Government. The junction at Merredin might mean an additional four miles of railway, but that is not to say the cost would be greater. It might even be less than the cost of the junction at Newcarrie.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like the Leader of the Opposition to appeal against my ruling. The Minister for Works also said he considered the earthworks would be more expensive if the line went to Merredin. I cannot but see that the amendment means additional expenditure.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If I said the cost would be less my word would be just as good as the unsupported word of the Minister for Works. I do say it would cost less, and I

should not be prevented from moving this amendment. If you adhere to your ruling I shall have to disagree with it.

The PREMIER: No one wishes to deprive any member of the right to express his opinion, but I am afraid in this case each additional mile of railway will mean further expenditure.

Hon. P. Collier: One cutting or bridge would cost more than ten miles of railway. Everything depends on the contour of the country.

The PREMIER: Yes. Discussion should not be limited merely because the money involved will be a sum slightly in excess of that mentioned by the Minister.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I submit, Mr. Chairman, you cannot rule my amendment out of order because it is merely to strike out the word "Newcarrie." It will be for you afterwards to say whether the words I propose to substitute are in order or not. First of all, however, I wish merely to strike out "Newcarrie."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will realise that I allowed him to speak at length before the point of order was raised. I think he is in order in moving to strike out a word, but when he proposes to substitute "Merredin" for "Newcarrie" it becomes another matter, because the information given by the Minister indicates that additional expenditure will be involved by that change.

Hon. P. Collier: But you cannot rule me out of order because I wish to strike out "Newcarrie."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has indicated what he intends to do afterwards. At any rate I will accept the amendment to strike out "Newcarrie."

The PREMIER: I think I am responsible for "Newcarrie" being inserted in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It will cost more money.

The PREMIER: No fear.

Hon. P. Collier: The estimate on the file is £40,000 more to Newcarrie than to Merredin.

The PREMIER: I am afraid the hon. member has possession of an old file.

Hon. P. Collier: No; this is dated 18th January, 1923.

The Minister for Works: We shall be using 60lb. rails, you know.

The PREMIER: It must cost less to go to Newcarrie than to Merredin. Eventually the line will have to run to Merredin because Merredin will be the terminus for almost every train run over this line.

Hon. P. Collier: If that be so it will mean an additional 12 or 16 miles running via Newcarrie into Merredin.

The PREMIER: It will mean eight miles. Newcarrie is 90 miles from Yarramony and 14 miles from Merredin; that makes 104 miles, and the distance from Yarramony to Merredin by the most direct way is 96 miles.

Hon. P. Collier: What is the distance to Merredin via Newcarrie?

The PREMIER: That would be 104 miles. There will not be room for all the lines to run into Merredin, there are so many of them. Merredin must of course be the terminus, whether the line junctions with Newcarrie or not.

Mr. Willecock: There will be additional running all the time to get to Merredin.

The PREMIER: I do not think the proposal will make the slightest difference to the railway working.

Mr. Willecock: It will.

The PREMIER: We are not wedded to any particular point; we want it where it will serve the best interests.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill drafted last year provided for the railway from Yaramony to Merredin, a total length of about 98 miles. The file was placed at our disposal only on the afternoon of the day when the Bill was submitted and we had not an opportunity to look through it properly. Having been through it again, we find from the minute already quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, that it will be better to use the proposed line in connection with the 3ft. 6in. system and if it goes into Merredin it will also suit the Naremburn line. If hon. members look at the line from Wyalcatchem which goes on to Bencubbin, they will see that, in all probability, in view of the fact that the land in the district between Bencubbin and Bullfinch is recognised now as good agricultural land, the line will ultimately go on to connect up with the Bullfinch line. The route from Newcarrie to Bencubbin is practically a straight line and will not serve so many people. The Premier's suggestion is a good one. The Bill says that the line will extend for 96½ miles, whereas the schedule to last year's Bill gave the distance as 98 miles.

Progress reported.

BILL—ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from 31st October. Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; Mr. Latham in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2, to which the member for North-East Fremantle moved an amendment to add at the end of the clause the following words: "But before such registration the applicant shall be approved as competent to practise as an architect by the Government Chief Architect."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Since moving the amendment I have come to the conclusion that it would not be fair to place the sole responsibility upon the Chief Architect and I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. PICKERING: I have already drawn attention to the fallacy of asking an architect to certify as to the competency of his own student. It is like asking a contractor

to pass his own work. We do not trust a contractor to carry out his contract without supervision. The desire on the part of most of those who wish to become qualified as architects is that they shall pass a qualifying examination. Of those who will be brought within the scope of the clause, nine of the twelve prefer to submit themselves to examination. If an architect has a pupil, it would not be reasonable to expect him to certify, after some years of tuition, that his tuition has been unsatisfactory and the money spent on the pupil's articles has been wasted. The effect of the clause will be that those who come within its scope will, ipso facto, become qualified as architects. As buildings increase in size, the problems of architecture become so much greater and thus is emphasised the necessity for the examination of those who are to practise as architects. Human lives as well as competency are involved in the question. I have an intimate acquaintance with most of the architects in Western Australia. Recently I was speaking to Mr. G. T. Poole, one time Chief Architect of the State, and he told me that even to-day, after all his years of experience, he was not satisfied he could design a small house giving the maximum of conveniences and accommodation.

The Colonial Secretary: A true artist is never satisfied.

Mr. Mann: But is he not an extremist?

The Premier: He is a very clever man.

Mr. PICKERING: He is a man of sufficient standing in his profession to be selected to represent the State officially at exhibitions. With the raising of the standard of buildings, it is necessary to assure the competency of architects.

Mr. Mann: Will the clause make the position worse?

Mr. PICKERING: The clause is against the spirit of the Act. It cannot prevent an individual from drawing plans, but it sets out that an individual cannot call himself an architect unless he has passed a qualifying examination and become registered.

The Premier: But an injustice has been done.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not think there has been any injustice.

The Premier: Well, I think so.

Mr. PICKERING: Architects know that an injustice has been done and agree with the remainder of the Bill, which will overcome that injustice, but as to the clause under discussion they claim that no injustice has been done.

Mr. LATHAM: The member for Sussex realises that the Bill is a temporary measure only, and that it merely seeks to permit the people affected to carry out a contract entered into prior to the commencement of the Act. In other circumstances these men would have been recognised as architects and been registered. We go further and say that these men shall receive a certificate to show that they are qualified. Although an outsider, I have sufficient faith in the profession to know that

no architect would belittle his profession by giving an unworthy man a certificate of competency as suggested by the member for Sussex. That hon. member said that nine out of twelve desire to submit themselves to an examination. The Act sets out that in addition to the examination in architecture, the candidate must produce a certificate showing that he has passed the junior examination at the University of Western Australia. That is the examination these men do not desire to pass. The hon. member knows that. The Premier: They may have been articulated for years.

Mr. LATHAM: Some articles may have expired two months after the Act came into existence. We should remedy an injustice done unconsciously by the passing of the Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Do I understand the member for York to say this clause provides for the registration of a man only after he has completed his articles?

Mr. Latham: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Does the clause say so?

Mr. Latham: Yes, read in conjunction with the principal Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is nothing in the clause to show that he must have completed his articles. The Act merely lays down the conditions to apply at the passing of the Act. The amendment does not provide that he shall have completed his articles.

Mr. Latham: It says "for not less than three years."

Hon. P. COLLIER: As I read it, an architect may give a certificate to a man that has not completed his articles.

Mr. Latham: The Crown Law authorities are satisfied with it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have great respect for the Crown Law authorities but, after considerable experience of them, and without reflecting on them, they are not always infallible. I am agreeable to any person articulated at the commencement of the Act being registered on the completion of his articles even without passing an examination. It may not be a high qualification, but it is equal at least to the qualifications possessed by nine-twelfths of the practising architects. The Committee may be surprised to learn that not one member of the present board of examiners has qualified by examination. Surely we shall not be doing any harm if we allow those that were articulated at the passing of the Act and have since completed their articles to come in as were those practising at the passing of the Act.

The Premier: It would be only justice.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. Those articulated after the passing of the Act knew what was before them. I know of one instance where a considerable sum of money was paid for a man to be articulated. He was not in the State when the Act was passed. He is getting up in years and it is not fair to ask him to pass an examination. There would be no risk in allowing such a man to be registered after completing his articles.

Mr. Latham: Two King's Counsel have advised me that a man must have completed his articles?

Mr. MONEY: I read the clause to mean that a man must have been articulated at the commencement of the Act, and must have completed his articles. Then, instead of sitting for an examination, he could apply for a certificate of competence from his employer.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

That after "or" in line 4 the words "having completed his articles or indentures" be inserted.

Mr. MONEY: The amendment is merely repetition. The Act provides that prior to its commencement he must have been articulated or indentured for not less than three years and must have completed his articles. Then he could either pass the examination, or, if he held one of the qualifications mentioned, he could get a certificate, but that would only apply to articles in existence and where they had been completed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I may be at fault, but the matter is not plain to me. The amendment represents an alternative. Section 14 of the Act sets out the many methods by which a person may become registered. Towards the end it says, "and has completed such articles and indentures." Those words have no bearing at all upon the persons who will be affected by this amendment. One method by which a person may be registered is "and has passed the examination set by the board." Now I come to this clause, which says—

or holds a certificate in writing by the practising architect to whom the applicant was articulated or indentured to the effect that the applicant has such knowledge and experience as to justify his registration. That stands alone.

Mr. Mann: Do you mean, apart from being articulated?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Irrespective of having completed his articles. If the worst came to the worst, the words would be merely redundant, and in that case would do no harm. I would register a man without his having a certificate from a practising architect.

Mr. MONEY: Paragraph (d) has no application whatever to any articles which were not in existence before the commencement of the operation of this measure.

Hon. P. Collier: I admit that.

Mr. MONEY: That is a full answer to the query which has been raised. This clause, when inserted in the Act, becomes part of paragraph (d). Paragraph (d) goes on to show what state the articles shall be in when the paragraph operates. It says, "and has completed such articles." Further, the articles must be completed before the subsequent portion of paragraph (d) can operate. A man's interest in original articles is not at all affected by the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Committee are fairly unanimous as to what they desire. We are

trying to patch up paragraph (d), but apparently in a manner which will complicate matters. There is certainly a duplication of words.

Hon. P. Collier: It will do no harm.

Mr. LAMBERT: Would I be in order in moving that all the words after "indentured" be struck out?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will be in order in moving that after the present amendment has been disposed of.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LAMBERT: I move an amendment—

That the words "to the effect that the applicant has such knowledge and experience as to justify his registration" be struck out.

The Premier: Someone has to certify.

Mr. LAMBERT: All that need be certified is that the applicant has served his indentures, not that he has such knowledge and experience as to justify his registration. I think the words which I propose to strike out are distinctly undesirable.

Mr. CORBOY: The wishes of the member for Coolgardie would be met better if the words "such knowledge and experience as to justify his registration" were struck out, and "completed his indentures" were inserted in lieu.

Hon. P. Collier: That has already been done.

Mr. CORBOY: If the amendment is carried, what will the certificate state? The clause does not say.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I see no necessity for retaining the words which the member for Coolgardie desires to have struck out. If an articulated person has completed his indentures, all he needs is a certificate to show that he has done so.

The Colonial Secretary: He might not be competent.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is an architect likely to give a certificate saying that a person whom he has instructed is incompetent?

The Colonial Secretary: It is possible.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think so at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: A person indentured to an architect might have a row with that architect, and then the architect might say, "You are in my hands, and I will not give you a certificate."

The Colonial Secretary: An architect is too conscientious to do that.

Mr. LAMBERT: Do not let us have such piffle and nonsense talked.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LAMBERT: The objectionable principle should be eliminated from the clause, even if the clause has to be redrawn.

Mr. Latham: The object of the words is to avoid the necessity for passing the examination set by the board.

Mr. LAMBERT: A man will be automatically registered on the completion of three years' articles. Why make a dangerous departure of this description?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Especially dangerous if the applicant intends to set up in opposition to the architect to whom he has been articulated.

Mr. LAMBERT: The danger of the words is indicated by the resentment occasioned

certain quarters by the proposal to admit to the profession those who have been articulated for three years.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The clause is now in complete.

Mr. MONEY: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause — "proving the completion of such articles or indentures."

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

Clause 3—Extension of qualification under Section 13 (2) (b).

Mr. LATHAM: This merely allows of the registration of any applicant who may have been absent from the State.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 and the succeeding lines the following be struck out, "at any time within three months after the commencement of this Act (notwithstanding that he may have applied for registration to the provisional board, and his application may have been refused)".

If the amendment be carried, the registration will be left to the discretion of the board.

Hon. F. T. Broun: You are defeating your own object. If they do not apply within three months they cannot apply at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so, they will be in exactly the same position as they are today. But under the amendment it will be left to the discretion of the board. However, I am prepared to accept a compromise. First I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 "three" be struck out, and "six" inserted in lieu.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 7th November.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; Captain Carter in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 6 of No. 14 of 1920.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This opens up an entirely new question. Its purpose is to compel the Government to carry out their duty by recognising the awards of the Arbitration Court. I thought the Premier would have looked into this question and told us something about it. This applies to relatively few persons who get an award from the Arbitration Court. Only the other day applications were made, some by fairly high officials, to the appeal board for increases in salary. Every application was granted except that of a cleaner, to whom the board said, "We have no jurisdiction in your case, for you are under an award." There would be no necessity to appeal to the board if the Government obeyed the awards of the Arbitration Court.

The Premier: The Government do so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This Bill gives the right of a second appeal to the board. It should not be necessary to bring it down.

Capt. Carter: I quite agree.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are setting up two tribunals to try one case. If the Government will not abide by the decision of the Arbitration Court, their servants will have the right to appeal to the appeal board. Of all persons the Government should obey arbitration awards.

The PREMIER: We have set up an appeal board to which officers may go. The clause under discussion makes it possible for applicants before the board to ask which portion of an award shall apply to them. In that respect it will make the Act more simple than at present for the board. If a highly placed official has the right to appeal to the board, surely the same right should be extended to the cleaner of an office.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Government should obey the awards of the court.

The PREMIER: The Arbitration Court ought to be sufficient. There ought not to be two strings to a man's bow. It is not a question of whether the Government will pay or not. We have a Public Service Commissioner who interprets awards of the court and findings of the board, and applies them to the people employed in the Government service. The cleaner referred to by the hon. member has been well treated. He wants to be regarded as a caretaker, but he is only a cleaner. I am surprised that the hon. member should oppose this clause.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am not doing so, but regret the necessity for it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: This Bill will permit of an officer appealing to the Public Service Appeal Board for an interpretation of an award of the Arbitration Court.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is giving him a dual right to a hearing. If the Arbitration Court delivers an award that body should interpret its own decisions.

The Premier: He can go to the board for a decision as to which award he comes under.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The award would say to whom it applied.

Capt. Carter: The Court is still open to the individual to approach.

The Premier: He is trying to fire both barrels at once.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Then why should he go to the appeal board? The Bill arises, I understand, because of one case.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not good to legislate for one individual.

The Premier: It is bad.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It may apply to a principle which will clear up other matters in doubt, but if it does not do so I do not see that we are justified in passing it.

Capt. CARTER: The object of the Bill is not so much to cover one case, but to deal with a number of cases. The individual referred to is in the temporary service and comes under the category of cleaner, caretaker and lift attendant, and under the award covering such employees. The schedule attached to that award makes several distinctions in regard to the work done. This particular man is a caretaker at night, and does odd jobs by day. The appeal board dismissed his case on the ground that it had no jurisdiction to decide whether or not he came under this award, or what award he did come under. This state of affairs alone warrants the introduction of the Bill. The appeal board was set up to decide questions amongst civil servants for services and other things. This man is on wages, and there are many others similarly situated.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—THE WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND AGENCY COMPANY, LIMITED, ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 4th December.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [9-3]: The member for Perth in submitting the Bill said that it was introduced for the purpose of giving the company powers similar to those accorded to a rival company last session. The Bill, however, exceeds those powers and I do not think we should give one company privileges over and above those enjoyed by the other company.

Mr. Mann: I propose to withdraw clauses 15 and 16.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have no objection to putting this company on an equal footing with the other but beyond that we should not go. I have looked through the select committee's report and I find that the powers were extended, but as there were one or two objectors in another place, those additional powers were removed.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; Mr. Mann in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 12:

Mr. LAMBERT: I understand from the member for Perth that there are only two clauses in the Bill that vary from what is contained in the Bill that was before us last session applying to the other company.

Mr. Mann: Yes. I will ask the Committee to vote against those clauses.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Company may sell or transfer mortgage or other securities to itself as trustee:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Will the member for Perth tell us what this clause means?

Mr. Mann: It speaks for itself.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: The hon. member has offered no explanation. We are entitled to know what it means.

Mrs. COWAN: This clause will establish a dangerous precedent. We had a similar Bill before us last year. It was carefully considered and was up to date in its powers. A clause like the one we are now considering, however, was not included. The more we think about it the more we realise how dangerous it might prove. We want to be careful to see that the position is safeguarded, that nothing can be done without the approval of the Supreme Court. That has been done. In these circumstances of course it is quite possible to trust any company, and therefore I feel it makes it possible to support the Bill as it now is.

Mr. Lambert: A nice sort of back-handed compliment.

Mr. Mann: I will not press the clause.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 16—negatived.

Clause 17—Orders of court subject to appeal:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We must retain this clause; every person should have the right of appeal.

Mr. Cunningham: What is the intention of the member in charge of the Bill?

Mr. MANN: A similar clause was included in the Bill dealing with the other company last year. The clause should be permitted to stand.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.*Council's Amendment.*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; Mr. McCallum in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Add a proviso as follows—
"Provided that this Section shall not apply where a person is detained during His Majesty's pleasure under Section 653 of the Criminal Code."

Mr. McCALLUM: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

If we agree to the amendment, it will nullify the Bill. The amendment should not have been accepted by the Chairman of Committees in another place because it is a direct negative. There is no patient in the Hospital for the Insane that would benefit by the passing of the Bill if the proviso were agreed to. It would make the Bill ridiculous. I do not know what the law courts would have to say if we agreed to it.

Hon. P. Collier: The Bill says we may do something, and the amendment provides that it shall not be done!

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the position. It means that no one who is committed for an indictable offence can be brought within the scope of the Bill. Only non-indictable offences are dealt with in the Police Court. If a man is charged with being of unsound mind he is remanded to the observation ward of the Perth Hospital, and from there is sent to the Claremont Asylum under a certificate furnished by two doctors. Consequently they do not come under the heading of indictable offences. The Legislative Council's amendment simply means that the Bill shall not apply to any individual whatever. It is silly wasting time considering it.

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

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Reason for disagreeing with the Council's amendment drawn up by a committee; the reason adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.*Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of eight amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; Mr. McCallum in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2.—Strike out Subsection (1) in the new section to be inserted in the principal Act.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The effect of the amendment is to strike out the clause in the Bill which provides that certain things shall be done by regulation. Instead of that, it is proposed that the provision shall become part of the Act. That is an improvement from my point of view.

I do not believe in Government by regulation except where necessary.

The Colonial Secretary: This prescribes the standard of efficient ventilation.

Mr. McCALLUM: The parent Act gives the necessary power to deal with that.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2. In Subsection (2) of proposed new section to be inserted in principal Act, strike out all the words after "where," and insert "white lead, red lead, litharge, or other compounds of lead, mercurial, or arsenical preparations are manufactured or produced."

No. 3. In paragraph (c) of the same subsection, strike out the word "reduction," in line one, and insert the words "manufacture, production."

No. 4. In Subsection (3) of proposed new section, after the word "whenever," in line 3, insert "it comes to his knowledge that."

On motion by Mr. McCallum, the foregoing amendments were agreed to—

No. 5. In Subsection (4) of the proposed new section, strike out all the words after "prescribed by" to end of paragraph (a), and insert "the Superintendent of Public Health or some duly qualified medical practitioner appointed by him, who shall have power to order suspension from such employment; provided that such examination shall be without charge to the occupier or employee."

Mr. McCALLUM: The Bill was copied from the regulations under the British law. The practice there is for the Health Department to do the examination without charge to the employer or worker. Medical men connected with the department carry out the examination and keep the statistics for the information of the State, and have laws framed according to the report given by the Medical Department. The amendment merely sets out that practice in detail. I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out "superintendent" and inserting "Commissioner" in lieu.

Amendment passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

No. 6. In paragraph (c) of same subsection, strike out all the words after "require," and insert "every employee to forthwith notify the occupier as to any symptoms which lead such employee to believe that he has contracted poisoning of any kind, and require the occupier to record such notification in a health register to be kept at the factory for that purpose."

Mr. McCALLUM: This amendment merely amplifies what would have happened under the Bill as printed.

Mr. Teesdale: A ridiculous amendment.

Mr. McCALLUM: We can accept it. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 7. In paragraph (h), insert after the word "damped" two new paragraphs, as follows:—(i) require that no occupier shall permit an employee to partake of a meal in and upon the factory; (j) require the occupier to provide for the employee such suitable drink as may be prescribed as an antidote to poisons inhaled or ingested.

Mr. TEESDALE: This is an absurd amendment and will merely have the effect of harassing employers. There is no necessity for it. Plenty of men wish to take their meals on the footpath. The men are able to look after themselves.

Mr. McCALLUM: I think the hon. member has misread the amendment. The Bill applies only to works where poisonous trades are carried on. The atmosphere in those works is laden with poison, and medical men agree that food and drinks should not be consumed in that atmosphere. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 8. Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—Amendment of Section 119. 3. Section one hundred and nineteen of the principal Act is hereby amended by the excision of the word "and," in the sixth line of the section, and the substitution of the word "until."

Mr. McCALLUM: This amendment is necessary to rectify an error in the printing of the Act. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—HROOKTON-DALE RIVER RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams - Narrogin) [9.58]: I support the Bill. This line was recommended by the Railway Advisory Board in the same report in which they recommended the Narrogin-Dwarda line. It was a comprehensive report issued some years ago. We know the trouble the people between Narrogin and Dwarda have had regarding that line, and that it was intensified by the action of a member of the Upper House, who was opposed to the line and repeatedly tried to convince the people of Dale River and Brookton that the Dwarda line should go there, al-

though a glance at the map would show that it had nothing to do with the case. Repeatedly the whole of the communities I represent at Narrogin assured the people of Brookton and Dale River that we were in complete sympathy with them in their desire to get this line. I remind the Government that the line is a section of the Brookton-Armadale project. It must eventually be extended from the Dale River to at least the 42-mile post on the Albany-road.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not accepted as part of this line.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I should say it is. A fairly direct line from Brookton to Armadale, serving the Dale River, was recommended by the advisory board, who also recommended a line from Dwarda to Armadale and that this line should be extended to junction with the Dwarda-Armadale line at the 42-mile post on the Albany-road. In that way direct communication would be given between Brookton and Armadale and between Narrogin, Dwarda and Armadale. In the present financial position of the State we cannot expect this comprehensive policy, connecting both Narrogin and Brookton with Armadale, to be carried out at once.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That has nothing to do with Narrogin.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It has a great deal to do with Narrogin. The advisory board in a comprehensive report recommended this line, and also the line from Dwarda to Narrogin and from Armadale to Dwarda and Narrogin.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the question of the Brookton-Dale River railway. Narrogin does not appear.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I shall keep that carefully in mind. The Minister said this was a section of the line that must ultimately be extended from the Dale River to Armadale.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the railway mentioned in this Bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I wish to urge—

Mr. SPEAKER: You can urge that at some other stage. This is not the time.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I wish to urge that the line from Brookton to Dale River should be made as direct as possible, because the whole of the wheat traffic from the districts east of Brookton will ultimately pass over this line on its way to the port of Fremantle. This will save 40 miles of freight between Narrogin and Fremantle, via Brookton. On reference to the map it will be seen that the line is not as direct as it might be, nor, I think, as direct as recommended by the Railway Advisory Board. The Government would do well to obtain the more direct survey made in this locality in connection with the Transcontinental Railway. I do not wish to labour the point. I am very pleased to have the opportunity of supporting the Bill. In my opinion, the Minister should take the fullest advantage of the power of deviation given under the measure in order to straighten the line as much as possible, having in view its

ultimate extension to Armadale. This railway has been desired by the settlers concerned for many years.

Hon. F. T. BROWN (Beverley) [10.3]: I also have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, because for a number of years I have advocated giving the settlers in the Dale River area a line which would bring them much nearer to the railway system than they are at present. The settlers have been agitating for a railway during the last 20 years. Representatives of nearly every Government in power during that period have visited the locality, and all of them arrived at the conclusion that the district is most fertile and undoubtedly deserving of railway communication. On each occasion the representative of the Government promised that serious consideration would be given to introducing a Bill during the current session, or else during the next session, and that in the near future the Dale River district would be blessed with a railway. That has gone on until the present time. Although a Bill has been introduced this session, I fear some time must elapse before the line is built. However, it will be some satisfaction to the Dale River settlers to know that at last there is a hope of a railway being built to their district to enable them to produce at a considerably greater profit than to-day. It speaks volumes for the country to be served by the proposed line that nearly all the pioneers there—some of them have been succeeded by their sons—have done very well, so well, I believe, that not one of them has applied to the Agricultural Bank for assistance. Neither have they ever worried the Government for help. These things, in view of the remoteness of the district, are eloquent as regards the quality of the soil. The settlers are now carting up to 30 miles, and some of them more than 30 miles. The various Ministers who have visited the district include the Hon. Frank Wilson, the Hon. J. Scaddan, Premiers, and the Hon. W. D. Johnson, formerly Minister for Works.

Hon. P. Collier: Did I visit the district?

Hon. F. T. BROWN: I do not recollect the member for Boulder coming there.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He was there. I was there with him.

Hon. P. Collier: But I did not commit myself.

Hon. F. T. BROWN: Mr. W. D. Johnson, when Minister for Works, was entertained in the Dale River hall, where he said—

The time had come to take that proposition (the railway) seriously into consideration. The Government had a very big railway construction policy ahead of them, including a number of railways which had been authorised by Parliament previous to the Scaddan Government coming into power. The Wilson Government passed through Parliament the Bills authorising the construction of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway, which was 180 miles in extent, the Merredin-Wickepin line of 108 miles, the Brookton-Kunjin line of 48 to 50 miles, the Quairading-Nunagin line of 40 miles,

and the extension of the Hotham-Crossman line for 20 miles. When the Scaddan Government took control, there were 50 miles under construction and 400 miles waiting to be started. This was a formidable task, and one which had to be tackled in a serious manner. . . . The railway they were interested in was within the scope of practical politics, but he did not want them to think that it was possible to start it within the next year or so. It was the Government's duty to see that the line was to be surveyed, so that they might know where it was going. They need not make long speeches convincing him of the necessity of linking up their part of the State with Armadale by railway. Both political parties recognised that the line had to be commenced, but it was a matter for experts to decide which was the best route to take. They recognised the necessity for the line, and purposed to have it surveyed at the earliest possible moment, and later on to intimate definitely to the settlers when the construction of the line would be started and when it would be completed.

Later on Mr. W. D. Johnson said—

Had the Government pushed out a railway into the Dale River district, assured success would have made it a paying proposition. They would overcome the difficulty in due course, but in the meantime they had to carry an unnecessary burden. He promised to convey their wishes to Cabinet and report to his colleagues what he had seen for himself, with a recommendation that particular attention should be paid to the merits of the line they suggested to serve their interests.

I regretted to hear the member for Pingelly (Mr. Hickmott) say that he intended to move an amendment in the route. I know the area very well indeed, and I view this Bill, not from a parochial standpoint but from the standpoint of the State. I wish the line to be built so as to serve the people and the State for all time at the lowest cost. That is my idea in asking for a deviation of five miles at the north end of the present route. I have before me a plan of an old survey made for the purposes of the Transcontinental Railway, which was surveyed from Brookton to Armadale. The route was as direct as possible, with a grade of one in eighty. On the route here proposed a grade of one in sixty is believed to be possible. Eventually the proposed line will be a through line, carrying a considerable amount of wheat produced in the districts eastward and also of wheat produced towards Narrogin and Merredin.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In that case the Government seem to be starting the line at the wrong end.

Hon. F. T. BROWN: No, because there is no one to serve if they start from Armadale. The settlers in that district have a railway already. A report was made in 1911 on the line now under consideration. The Railway Advisory Board then consisted of Mr. H. F. Johnston, acting chairman, Mr. John Muir, Mr. Despeissis, and Mr. Hume.

Hon. P. Collier: Is there nothing later than that?

Hon. F. T. BROWN: No. It is not necessary.

Hon. P. Collier: Conditions have altered since then.

Mr. Hickmott: There is a very much later report.

Hon. F. T. BROWN: This is the only report I know of. In asking that the engineers should have an opportunity of bringing the railway down five miles, my object is not to draw the line away from its present position to serve fewer settlers, not to cut out settlers at the south end who now anticipate being served by the line. The deviation I propose would leave the two sidings marked on the plan as they are at present, practically. Looking at the proposed route, hon. members will see that at the farthest south-west corner it takes a deliberate turn, and comes back to the old surveyed route. Mr. Oliver says that owing to the hilly nature of the country there can be no siding at that point. Unfortunately, most of the country is hilly, and involves difficulties as to grades. I am sure that a good grade can be procured if the line is taken out to the Warrinine Brook, between 15 and 16 miles as marked on the proposed line from Brookton. A siding put there would serve all the settlers on the southern end. Then the line goes out five miles due west, where the country is very poor and where there is very little settlement. After that the line bears back in a north-westerly direction to the 25-mile peg on the old surveyed road. I am certain that if the line bore slightly east from the Warrinine Brook after going over the range of hills, a good grade could easily be obtained; and then the line would strike the old surveyed road at about the 24-mile peg. Thus the length of the line would be reduced from 26½ miles to 25. The siding at the west end would then be in almost the same position as now proposed.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If the other line had been put into Mt. Kokeby, it would be considerably shorter.

Hon. F. T. BROWN: We cannot get out of Mt. Kokeby. I do not want members to think I am attempting to pull this railway north to serve a few of my friends. I have no interest in the line, political or other. I shall be leaving Parliament shortly and I have no investments in the district. I am asking for this to be done in order that in time to come there will be a possibility of having a siding put in to serve all the people at the north end. Let me read a portion of this report—

This proposed line would make the approximate distance from Brookton to Fremantle via Armadale 89 miles as against 130 miles via Spencer's Brook, or a saving of 41 miles. The area served and lying within 12½ miles from the suggested route, exclusive of land served by existing railways within the same distance, would be about 561,000 acres. From this, however, must be deducted 161,000 acres lying within the proposed Canning reservoir watershed and the goldfields water supply area, both of which are reserved, and so not open to settlement.

That land will not be locked up for all time as a watershed area, because not much water drains down through the area, and the land will become too valuable to be allowed to remain idle. At that time the board recommended the construc-

tion of a spur line from Brookton about 25 miles to serve the Dale country. It was intended ultimately to carry that on to Armadale. I want to make it clear to the Minister that when I suggested that he leave a 5-mile deviation it was with the idea that the line should go to the Warranine Brook and then, if possible, be brought on to the old survey. This would leave the two sidings in the same position, and the line would serve all purposes. The railway will soon become payable, for the men there have made great progress even without a railway, and carting for long distances. With the assistance of the railway the development of the district will be very rapid. It is an exceedingly well watered area and the land is mostly of high quality. I will support the second reading.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [10-21]: I should like to express appreciation of the hon. member's informative speech. I do not question his sincerity when he tells us the line will traverse some very fertile country. At the same time one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that even the most virtuous amongst us are likely to be somewhat biased, though unconsciously, when recommending a railway for the district they represent. It is no reflection on the hon. member when I say he may perhaps have indulged in what is known as painting the lily when describing the fertile areas of the Dale River. If I could accept that country as being as the hon. member has described it, I might be persuaded to vote for the line; but, as I say, the hon. member and others representing that part of the State must, by their association with and knowledge of it, speak favourably of its prospects. If we could have similar testimony from an impartial source, it would be much more satisfactory. The impartial source in this case would be the Minister in charge of the Bill; because, after all, the Minister for Works, sworn as he is to do equal justice by all men, has no likes or dislikes, prejudices or antipathies, and so we might expect him to give a clear and unbiased statement of the merits of the proposed line. But we had this Bill presented to us in a three minutes' speech by the Minister for Works.

The Premier: No, that was the other one.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, on the other one he spent five minutes. As the Minister for Works kept bringing down the Bills he became more emboldened, until in the end he thought the House would accept anything. He dwelt for three minutes on the merits of this line. The member for Beverley (Hon. F. T. Broun) has spoken for half an hour, giving us a budget of information, and I venture to say has not nearly exhausted the subject. Does the Minister expect us to agree to a Bill for the construction of a railway costing £100,000 on information that is conveyed in a period of three minutes? The House ought to have been given some particulars. We ought to know the number of settlers in the district, whether they are large or small holders, the development that has taken place during the long years the district has been settled, and the possibilities of future development. All that the Minister told us was that some of the farmers there, he understood, had

to cart their produce long distances. He was not even sure of it. He said the railway had been promised years ago. That has been confirmed by the member for Beverley, who said it had been promised for 20 years. I notice from the statement read by the hon. member that the then Minister for Works hoped the line would be constructed in a year or two, and promised that the survey would be made almost immediately. Something has lagged since then, because the present Minister for Works says the permanent survey is only now being made. See the casual way in which the Minister handles projects of this kind! It is to cost only £100,000, which, of course, to the Minister is but a small sum. How they arrive at that estimate, not having yet made a permanent survey, I am unable to understand. I had some little knowledge of railway construction in my youth, and from experience I know that before a reliable estimate of the cost can be made, it is necessary that a permanent survey should be completed. The Minister tells us they are now making a permanent survey of the line, after its having been on the board for 20 years!

The Minister for Works: This new line has not been on the board for 20 months.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What surprises me in regard to these railways is how long it takes the officers of the department to determine the correct route. Various routes are suggested and adopted, and Bills are prepared for the construction of the lines on those routes. Then, somehow, at the last moment something turns up as a result of which the officers change their minds and adopt a new route. Am I to understand that when surveyors go out to survey a line they do not examine the whole of the country to be served, do not take into consideration every possible route? Is it only when suggestions are made by members representing the district that the surveyors discover there is, perhaps, another route more suitable?

The Premier: The member for North-East Fremantle had this survey made.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister says it is not made yet.

The Premier: The one that is made, he made.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Apart from telling us how much this would cost, this was the only other information the Minister gave us. It is a very casual way of preparing a railway Bill. I cannot understand how the Minister can expect the House to pass it when he does not volunteer the slightest information regarding it. Are we to understand that the member for Beverley and others will supply the information? The House is entitled to know what justification there is for it, and, whatever information there is available, supplied by the Minister. We should not be asked to accept as final and authentic a statement made by members who, after all, are somewhat interested in that they represent this portion of the State. The people of the district have been able to get along without this railway for, we are told, some 20 years. Whether we pass the Bill now or next year, the line cannot be constructed for several years. The settlers have

already waited all this time for the fulfilment of a promise, and no harm would be done if the period of this waiting were extended for another year. The Minister cannot do more than complete the permanent survey during the next two years. There are about 350 miles of railway to construct, and this short line of 26 miles could not be commenced for a long time. Why not, therefore, wait until the permanent survey is completed? The Minister will have an opportunity during the recess of collecting information upon the subject, and of giving us something that may enable us to come to a right conclusion. The matter is not so urgent that we should be asked to accept this Bill on the information supplied to us in the course of a three-minute speech. For that reason, it should be allowed to stand over. I have lost count of the millions of pounds of expenditure to which we are committed for the next few years, but this expenditure of £100,000 could well be held over. If the Minister should persevere with the Bill, when in Committee we shall want to know why he has taken the right to deviate to the extent of five miles. That is not the usual distance allowed for this purpose, the limit generally being three miles. This larger deviation would seem to indicate that the matter has not received thorough consideration. If the whole of the country were properly examined, and the departmental officers were confident in themselves, there would be no need to ask for this deviation. It is for Parliament to decide where a line should go, subject to proper discretion being given to the Government to go two or three miles on either side. If we give power to deviate five miles, we shall not know where the line will finish.

The Minister for Works: It is broken and undulating country, and the deviation is intended to improve the line as we go on with the permanent survey.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The power is sought because the permanent survey has not yet been completed?

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If it had been completed, there would have been no need to ask for this deviation. As the survey proceeds, it may be found advisable to depart from the route to this extent.

The Minister for Works: If it is possible to find a grade of 1 in 80, surely a deviation should be allowed to take that in.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but that supports my argument that we should not proceed with the Bill until the permanent survey is completed. The Minister would then know where the line should go. It is only a business proposition to suggest that the matter should wait until this work has been finished.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.37 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 11th December, 1923.

	PAGE
Question: Auditor General's report, as to papers	1918
Motions: Peel and Bateman Estates, to inquire by select committee	1913
Sandalwood, amended regulations, to disallow	1916
Bills: Factories and Shops Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1914
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Assembly's Amendments	1914
Stamp Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1929
Land Tax and Income Tax, Com.	1930
Appropriation, 2n.	1936
Machinery Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1941
Loam, 2n.	1941
Architects Act Amendment, 1B.	1941
Road Closure (No. 2), 1B.	1941
Brookton-Dale River Railway, 1A.	1941
W.A. Trustee, Executor and Agency Co., Ltd., Act Amendment (Private), returned	1941
Postponement of Orders	1936

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

QUESTION—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT, AS TO PAPERS.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Minister for Education: Will he, before the debate on the Appropriation Bill is finalised, lay on the Table of the House all papers on which the following statements in the Auditor General's report, 1923, were based:—1, In several instances the stock sheets submitted were unreliable. Fictitious entries were made in the head office accounts, etc. 2, It was reported last year that the Government Stores' account was, with the sanction of the Treasury, used for manufacturing, and that there was no proper authority for the procedure. The practice still continues.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: The papers are being tabled to-day.

MOTION—PEEL AND BATEMAN ESTATES.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.34]: I move—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the operations of the Government in connection with the purchase and development of the Peel and Bateman Estates, and to report thereon.

When speaking on the Appropriation Bill last week I went fully into this matter, and indicated that I would move for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the operations of these two estates. I realise that, at this late stage in the session, a select committee will be faced with some difficulty, and that unless Parliament remains in session it cannot continue its inquiry. I understand, however, the Government offer no objection or opposition to the motion, and it is, therefore, in their hands to suggest a way out of the difficulty.