

year, he may have to bring down supplementary Estimates. I hope it will be necessary to build the line before long.

The Premier: There has been no survey yet.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 1st December, 1927.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	2287
Questions: Lands beyond Lake Mollerin	2287
State Insurance claims	2287
Bills: Bridgetown Lot 39A, Com., etc.	2287
University Endowment Act Amendment, 2R. ...	2287
State Children Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2297
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 1R. ...	2300
Constitution Act Amendment (No. 2), 2A ...	2300
Hospitals, Recom.	2307
Employment Brokers' Act Amendment, 2R. ...	2312
Leighton-Robb's Jetty Railway, 2R.	2313
Motion: Claremont Training College, Appointment of Vice-Principal	2288

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Broomehill Lot 602.
- 2, Racing Restriction.

QUESTION—LANDS BEYOND LAKE MOLLERIN.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND asked the Chief Secretary: 1, In view of the Railway Advisory Board's report, recommending extension of the Elanding Northward line beyond Lake Mollerin, what action does the Minister contemplate taking to make the farming lands there available for selection? 2, Will he bring this land under the provisions of the Agricultural Bank Act forthwith?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Surveyors are now at work subdividing all the country in the locality referred to, and the Lands Department will be in a position to throw the blocks open early next year. 2, The Trustees of the Agricultural Bank will be prepared to grant advances on the usual basis on approved blocks within 12½ miles of approved lines, and 75 per cent. value of improvements over that distance up to 20 miles.

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE CLAIMS.

Workers' Compensation.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What number of claims have been made on the State Insurance Office under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act? 2, What number have been admitted, and what is the total amount of compensation paid? 3, What number have been declined? 4, What number are still under consideration?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 36. 2, 16. £3,020 to 30/11/27. 3, 14. 4, 6.

BILL—BRIDGETOWN LOT 39A.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: In 1904 the Western Australian Government reserved 4,146 acres as a University endowment. The greater part of this, namely, 4,118 acres, consists of Perth suburban lots, and there are also 20 small country townsite blocks. The University cannot sell these lands, but can lease them for 21 years, or with the approval of the Governor-in-Council for 99 years. The University have in the past subdivided four of these areas—at Subiaco, Daglish, Claremont and Spearwood, respectively—in the hope of letting building

leases, but have succeeded in letting only six-blocks, which bring in only a few pounds per annum. The last valuation, which the University had made about 10 years ago, showed the suburban lands to be worth over £72,000. But the income derived from these lands in 1926 was only £798. If portions of the lands could be sold from time to time, as occasion offers, and the net proceeds were invested in city property, which would be easier to manage and would return a steady income, the University consider they would be better off and the State, which provides the bulk of the University's income, would be proportionately relieved. It is not proposed to include in the Bill Cockburn Sound Location 549, consisting of 2,300 acres, which is being planted with pines under an agreement with the Forests Department. Neither is it proposed to sell all the other lands, parts of which will be wanted for University purposes at some future date, but only such portions of them as have a good market value and will not be wanted for University purposes. Several of the metropolitan road boards and municipalities have been asked to have such a Bill introduced, as they consider that portions of the endowment lands are blocking development—for example, the Claremont Road Board, the Claremont Council, the Fremantle and Spearwood road boards. The following resolution was recently carried unanimously by the University Senate:—

That the Hon. the Premier be asked to introduce a short Bill into Parliament to enable the University to sell certain of its suburban endowment lands as set out below, or such portions thereof as the University Senate may from time to time determine, on the condition that the net proceeds from such sales be devoted to the purchase of lands within the City of Perth, together with any buildings erected thereon, or for the erection of buildings on land already owned by the University, provided that such lands and buildings are used for revenue-producing purposes only, as permanent endowment for the University upon the same trusts as the present endowment lands are held.

The lands are as follow:—

- Subiaco—Swan Loc. 1715, 95 acres.
- Claremont—Swan Loc. 2106, 36 acres.
- Claremont—Swan Loc. 1366, 7 acres.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2105, 172 acres.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2120, 67 acres.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2119, 44 acres 0 roods 20 perches.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 212, 10 acres 1 rood 10 perches.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2103, 608 acres.
- Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2513, 2 acres 2 roods 3 perches.

Karrakatta—Swan Loc. 2104, 64 acres.
 Cockburn Sound—Loc. 550, 580 acres.
 North Fremantle—Loc. 174, 132 acres 2 roods 6 perches.

There is no attempt to evade the provisions of the original Endowment Act, as the net proceeds of the sales are to be used for purchasing, as occasion offers, city land and property which is to be used strictly for endowment purposes. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, debate adjourned.

MOTION—CLAREMONT TRAINING COLLEGE.

Appointment of Vice-Principal.

Debate resumed from the 29th November on the following motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland: "That the method of appointment of the Vice-Principal of the Claremont Training College is opposed to the best interests of the State, in that it has caused dissatisfaction and discontent throughout the department especially and the service in general, thereby diminishing efficiency."

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [4.45]: I propose to direct my attention rather to the earlier part of the motion, namely, "That the method of appointment of the Vice-Principal of the Claremont Training College is opposed to the best interests of the State." As for the concluding part of the motion, stating that there has been dissatisfaction and discontent and diminished efficiency, it is extremely difficult to determine whether that statement is correct. I do not think Mr. Yelland established that part of the motion. One cannot expect that the House could have direct evidence of dissatisfaction. We might have hearsay and rumour, and even expressions of opinion from one or two officers, but we could not hope to get anything definite relating to dissatisfaction in the department. The Leader of the House blamed Mr. Yelland for that three months had elapsed between his asking for the papers and his bringing down of the motion. Having perused the file—and concluded there should be more papers there in respect of this appointment—and having looked into the Public Service Act, I am inclined to think that Mr. Yelland did not take quite long enough be-

fore bringing down his motion. My impression is that this Vice-Principalship of the Training College is a new position, that it did not previously exist. I find nothing on the file to warrant the establishment of a new position or to provide for the method of appointment.

The Chief Secretary: That file was prepared in the Education Department.

Hon. H. STEWART: In going through the file, one finds various points cropping up that have not yet been brought before the House. The file begins with a minute by the Minister to the Director of Education, stating that he is prepared to call for applications for a Vice-Principal of the Teachers' College. In that minute the Minister says—

In the first place we must be able to say what salary we offer, and I shall be glad to have your recommendation in this respect by the time I return from the country on Friday morning.

It will be noted that the minute says "In the first place we must be able to say what salary we offer, and I shall be glad to have your recommendation in this respect." It is not to be in respect of anything but the salary. That is the opening minute regarding this appointment. In the course of my remarks I will endeavour to deal with the principle of the appointment. I will mention no names, nor will I put up the relative claims of one officer as against those of another; but I will look at the principle of such an appointment and see whether the intentions of Parliament, as laid down in various statutes, are being carried out. Any investigation on those lines as the result of this motion should do good in the interests of those engaged in the service, and also in the interests of the people of this State. The teachers of the Education Department do not come under the Public Service Act. Section 16 of that Act reads as follows:—

No member of Parliament shall interview or communicate with the Commissioner regarding the appointment of any applicant for a position in the Public Service.

That illustrates the principle supposed to govern appointments to the Public Service; they shall be free from political influence. I propose to deal with appointments and dismissals over a period of years, the appointment of men and the retirements of men, not at the age of 65 years, but when they may be retired, such men as the late Surveyor General and that member of his staff who

did the revaluation of the North-West. Then there was the appointment of the present under Secretary of Group Settlement, the retirement of Mr. Magistrate Walter, the reduction in rank and the eventual recognition of the services—when that recognition could be no longer withheld—of Sergeant Johnson of the police. Also there was the appointment at the Muresk Agricultural College. I think we are justified in reviewing all these instances and that a good purpose will be served if the position is reviewed and, as a result of this debate, something is done to tighten up the principle in the Public Service Act prescribing that appointments to the service shall be free from political influence, and that the proper machinery shall be employed by the Public Service Commissioner. It is beyond all question that appointments, whether to the Public Service or to the teaching staff of the Education Department, should be made in the proper manner, as laid down by Parliament. I am not saying that the appointment of the Vice-Principal of the Training College should be under the Public Service Act. We are not in a position to know just what the classification of that office is. Section 37 of the Public Service Act reads—

The Governor may, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, after obtaining a report from the permanent head, create a new office in any division in any department.

If I am correct in surmising that there was no Vice-Principal of the Training College prior to this appointment, I want to know where on this file is the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner to the Governor.

The Chief Secretary: The Public Service Commissioner had nothing whatever to do with it. It comes under the Education Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: If the appointment comes under the Education Act it is rather a peculiar position when we look at the Public Service Act and see which officers of the Education Department come under that Act. There we see the inspectors, a number of whom applied for this position, the Principal of the Training College and the Director of Education, besides the clerical staff.

The Chief Secretary: The teacher of the Education Department are excluded.

Hon. H. STEWART: Therefore, it is a position that, I take it, has not been mentioned by either Mr. Yelland or the Minister for Education.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I drew attention to it.

Hon. H. STEWART: Very well. I withdraw that remark. The Minister for Education, I do not think, explained this part of it. Here is a new office, and I should like to know how it is classified, how it is graded, and whether it was done in proper order. It is an office that, according to the file, has been created. We are told the salary is about that of the more junior inspectors, in fact £4 per year more than the lowest of those officers, which is £636 per annum. This appointment, we were told, is to carry £640 per annum. But it is only that for the present. The senior inspector receives £756 per annum. The salary of the new position, we learn on page 3 of the file, will be £640, rising by two annual increments to £700, in addition to which the Vice-Principal will have quarters, laundry, lighting and fuel. So we see that in two years this will be a very valuable appointment. To say that this position is that of a teacher in the Education Department, who does not come under the Public Service Act, is an unsatisfactory explanation of such an appointment. Accepting the Minister's suggestion that there is no necessity for a minute in regard to this appointment because the position is that of a teacher in the Education Department, I think we are justified in asking where is the minute from the Minister to the head of the department, who deals with the teachers, to the Director of Education, asking for something more than advice in regard to the salary for the position. The permanent head of the department and presumably all those officers who are in senior positions—because they are independent of the Public Service Commissioner—and are in a higher grade than that of the teachers, surely we would expect to find on the file some minute from the Minister asking for advice and guidance from the permanent head of the department, apart altogether from the question of salary, and relating directly to the duties and selection of this new officer. Although the Director of Education, as pointed out by Mr. Yelland, put up a recommendation, we are justified in concluding from the attitude of the Minister, that the advice of this permanent head and the leading officers of the department was not wanted. I noticed a correction in this morning's newspaper in which

were set out the words used by the Minister, "that if the Director had sought the advice of the board of classifiers, he would have been on safe ground." He was not to consult the leading officers, nor was he to give advice to his Minister. No. Is it not reasonable for Parliament to ask that in connection with an appointment like this if the man is to be classified as a teacher and he does not come under the Public Service Act, the senior officers of the department should be in control? Yet all we have in that respect is that the recommendations that were put up were not asked for. The Minister suggests that the Director should have sought the advice of the board of classifiers. Did he expect the Director to be a mind-reader? If he did, then that does not interpret the desire and intention of Parliament in respect of the appointment of officers. The Minister has taken up the attitude that the Vice-Principal is a teacher under the Education Department and does not come under the Public Service Act. The impression of the Director of Education is clearly that the office does come under the Public Service Act. On page 87 of the file we are told that the officer in question recommended for the position is the senior officer among the applicants, not only in length of service with the highest certificate, according to the public service definition. That clearly indicates that the Director of Education concluded that the appointment of Vice Principal was like the appointment of principal and inspector, and that the position would carry higher emoluments than those received by most of the inspectors. The Director reasonably concluded that it was going to be an appointment under the Public Service Act, and, believing that, he said it would be impossible to pass him over and to recommend anyone else. He added that there was no senior officer available as capable of satisfactorily performing the duties. That does not mean that the man, as an officer of the Education Department, can be passed over. It says that the appointment must be made in one of two ways, as a member of the public service or as a teacher of the Education Department under the Director, and the Director assumed that the appointment had to be made under the Public Service Act.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Pass who over? You have not told us.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am not mentioning any names.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Have you noticed that the salary given is higher than that of a classified teacher?

Hon. H. STEWART: That is a side-issue with which I am not concerned. I have given the House the correct impression that this is a more valuable position than we really thought it was. Looking through the qualifications of the various candidates it is extremely gratifying to see that the candidates are men of calibre and attainments, and from whom probably a number could have been chosen to fill the position with success. We are told that in the advice tendered by the Director of Education, he set out that of the 13 applicants, 11 were trained teachers, and 10 had University degrees. I am not going to say very much in regard to that except to illustrate a point. It is no indication that the man possessing a university degree has been a curled darling, that he has had advantages not enjoyed by other men. It is an indication, however, that a man with a degree has had the ability to do an amount of brain work and acquire certain knowledge in a certain amount of time, and that he has been able to attain to a certain standard in a number of single subjects spread over a period. It also shows that probably he gained his academic honours by sacrifice and pertinacity, as well as mental ability, by doing, outside his school duties, a certain amount of study which others perhaps did not bother about. There are still many men in the Education Department doing that. We can look back—over a period of 40 years—I do not know whether it was so in this State, but it was so in the Eastern States—to find that scholarships have been given by Governments and that these scholarships have assisted students to go to secondary schools and thence to the University. In this way many youths, richly endowed mentally, have been able to secure a university training. Certainly a university training and university degrees give standing to one occupying the position of vice-principal of such an institution in a modern country where culture and knowledge are requisite. Such a person is able to cover a wider field

of culture, thought and conversation, and if his training has been successful he has learned how to approach a problem in the proper manner and how to read and think. Many men who have never been to a university but who possess natural attainments have left behind men with a university degree. I would not be one to say that because a man has not a university degree he is not fit to fill an important position. Circumstances alter cases, but in this instance, from the choice available, other things being equal, it is certain that the person appointed should have been one of the ten men with the additional advantages of a university degree. Besides the question of the degrees, five of the applicants, and amongst them was not the selected candidate, had experience as inspectors of all types of schools. I do not say that the successful applicant has not had experience in small schools. I believe he has, but it has been stressed that he had been almost continuously engaged at the Fractising School at Claremont, and that therefore he has not had the advantage and opportunity of getting into touch, to the same extent as the inspectors, with the development and extensions of agricultural education. I, who represent a country province, feel, in connection with the training of teachers, that more attention ought to be paid to the outer acres. Again looking through the list of applications, I notice that three were from men whose ages were between 35 and 45, who served in the Great War between 1915 and 1918, and that all attained commissioned rank. As the ages of these gentlemen range from 35 to 45, it cannot be said that they all came within the category of "too old." Two of these three ex-A.I.F. men were placed by the Chief Inspector, who is one of the three head officials of the department, in front of the selected applicant. Two of these ex-service men are inspectors. The third ex-A.I.F. man was placed by the former principal of the college next to the man he had recommended as his first choice. In forwarding a recommendation to the Director of Education, Mr. Rooney, after setting out what he regarded as the ideals to be kept in mind when choosing the individual to occupy the position of vice-principal of the Training College, said—

Experience of a teachers' college is possessed by Messrs. Dunn, Fowler, and Lee, and to a less degree by Messrs. Milligan, Miles, Thomas, Pepper, and Wardrop. Taking the qualifications stated as ideal, it appears to me that Mr. Miles most nearly approaches them.

He absolutely stands out above the others in my opinion. One possibility would make in Mr. Fowler, who has both college and secondary experience, an absolute need almost. It may be said as axiomatic that the vice-principal's strength should fit in with that of the principal.

The name of the man Mr. Rooney mentioned, comes next to that of the man he recommended but who was not the successful applicant. Mr. Fowler, Mr. Rooney's second choice, was a man of exceedingly high attainments; he had service abroad extending over three years; he had received his captain's commission on the field; he had been educated in Western Australia; he was only 35 years of age, and he had had an exceedingly distinguished course. I am mentioning those phases from the standpoints of personality and characteristics possessed by the candidates for this position.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But did he possess as much tact as the other man? That seems to have been stressed by the Minister.

Hon. H. STEWART: There is no mention of tact in this instance, because the Minister made that an issue between the man who was recommended and the man who was appointed. I do not wish to make too many comparisons.

The Chief Secretary: Mr. Yelland made that an issue.

Hon. H. STEWART: I fail to see how Mr. Yelland made it an issue. I think the Leader of the House chose to make it that. Mr. Yelland quoted the apparently unsought, and therefore one might add, according to the Minister, impertinent recommendation of the Director of Education. Apparently the Director was not asked for an expression of opinion regarding the officer who was being appointed to the position. We have yet to learn that the occupant of that position was to be classified as a teacher in the Education Department. The minute indicates that a certain recommendation was borne out by three officers of the department, and, on the assumption that the appointment was to be that of a teacher in the Education Department, I should say that those officers, including the Director, had every right to make their recommendations. Yet the Minister saw fit to protest against it!

Hon. G. W. Miles: You see the heads of the Education Department are not members of the party, and therefore cannot carry out the policy of the party in power!

Hon. H. STEWART: I am not dealing with that phase.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is inadvisable to do so.

Hon. H. STEWART: My perusal of the file and subsequent thought on the subject indicate to me that insufficient foresight was exercised on the part of those who intended to make the appointment. They did not provide properly for the method under which it was to be made. Nothing appears on the file to show the approval for the appointment of this officer, and it is clearly to be assumed that the position should have been made on a grade comparable with that of an inspector and the appointment should have been made under the Public Service Act. In those circumstances, the appointment should have been made on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner and if that had been done, the public would have regarded it with greater confidence. As regards the slogan "Too old at 40," I have only to turn to the last report of the Public Service Commissioner in connection with the Education Department, exclusive of the teaching staff, and I find that officer No. 313 received an appointment. The slogan I have referred to was heard frequently in 1919. Slogans of that description are often quite unsound, although they may serve immediate purposes. For instance, the slogan "Keep Collier Premier" was one of them.

Hon. W. J. Maun: And that was unsound.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Was he over 40 years of age?

Hon. H. STEWART: At any rate, it achieved its purpose at the time. Although the slogan was heard so much in 1919, I find that officer No. 313 was appointed as an inspector on the 1st December, 1923, at which time he was 50 years of age. I fail to see how the Minister can claim any advantage from that point, when he said, had the gentleman recommended by the Director been appointed to the position of vice-principal, that gentleman would have been 55 years of age. After looking through the recommendations and considering the attainments and experience of the various applicants mentioned in the file, I am forced to the conclusion that there was no necessity for any great restriction as regards any one of the candidates. There was ample choice between them to fill the position with a man of high attainments. I draw attention to the papers of one of the applicants, for I think the quotation I will give will cause

a great deal of sympathy amongst members of this Chamber. The applicant I refer to is a university graduate and a fully qualified teacher. He rose from the ranks to a commission as a captain in the A.I.F. He is one of the five experienced inspectors and included in his application is the following:—

As the result of an illness—a duodenal ulcer—contracted upon war service in Gallipoli, a position which does not involve travelling about is absolutely essential if I am to retain good health. I have suffered severely during the past seven years, and at times last year was seriously ill, on one occasion in hospital while travelling on duty . . . Dr. —, of Perth, who treated me in December-January, 1925, and again in August, 1926, and Dr. —, or Kalgoorlie, from whom I received medical attention during several months last year, both emphasised that the irregular meals, quality of the food incidental to the travelling necessitated by my work, were wholly responsible for the periodical outbreaks of this ulcer. Dr. —'s last words to me were, "Organically as sound as a bell, but you must get a settled job."

To my mind, other things being equal, that furnishes a very strong appeal on behalf of this applicant for appointment in preference to the gentleman who was subsequently chosen for the position. The man who did receive the appointment must have a strong personality.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But these other applicants were not considered at all. The Government had made up their minds about the appointment.

Hon. H. STEWART: That is evident to me. I know little about any of the candidates, although I have met some of them casually. I have not met the vice-principal but anything I have heard from primary scholars about him has been to his credit. Quite apart from experience, university degree, A.I.F. service, or experience as an inspector, the vice-principal is one of the 11 trained teachers who have been referred to. In the Education Department of this State we have an exceedingly fine system of primary education and a fine system of secondary education, too. For the Modern School and the various district High Schools we must have teachers of high attainments and sound knowledge of languages and the sciences. Nearly all the teachers in the Government secondary schools are university graduates and, I take it, all have been trained in the Training College at some stage of their service. It would not be fair to appoint a man who had not had experience in the Training College and in the secondary

schools as well. I doubt if the successful applicant has had experience in connection with secondary schools, and that is an outstanding weakness. I understood the Minister to say that Mr. Milligan had been offered the position of principal of Muresk College. Is that correct?

The Chief Secretary: Yes.

Hon. H. STEWART: I wonder if Mr. Milligan was offered the position with the approval of the Public Service Commissioner! The Public Service Commissioner was the man who was consulted about the appointment, which I believe comes under the Department of Agriculture. It is to me astounding that though the Public Service Act provides for such appointments to be made in a certain way, that post should have been offered to Mr. Milligan not through the Public Service Commissioner.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government take no notice of that. They take the bit in their teeth and simply do these things.

Hon. H. STEWART: We have an instance of an illegal act on the part of the Government in regard to State insurance. Anyway, it shows the good sense of the gentleman who was offered the position at Muresk College that he did not accept it, because, if it was illegally done, he would have stood a good chance of losing it subsequently. It is a mark in his favour that he did refuse it. A couple of years ago a select committee, of which I was chairman, inquired into the Main Roads Bill then before the House and I now think a grave mistake was made by giving the Governor-in-Council power to appoint two engineers and an administrative officer to constitute the Main Roads Board. In future we would be wise to ensure that appointments to the Government service, whether under the Public Service Commissioner or the Education Department, are made directly by Parliament on the recommendation of the Government, or on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner, or the head of the department in consultation with a board of classifiers. The appointment by Parliament of the Commissioner of Railways on the recommendation of the Government is a case in point. Such appointments should not be left to any Government.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Especially a Labour Government.

Hon. H. STEWART: I do not agree with that. The hon. member should not attempt

to twist my words in that way. I have spoken on non-party lines—

Hon. J. Cornell: You have got pretty close to the line at times.

Hon. H. STEWART: Nothing will procure efficiency so much as giving every individual in the service a feeling that he will have a clear and straight run for any appointment or promotion that is offering. I was speaking to some officers of the Education Department, none of whom had the requisite qualifications for the vice-principalship—the conversation took place more than six months ago—and without my opening up the subject, they forecast what would happen regarding the Muresk and Training College appointments. Mr. Yelland has not proved his case with regard to the latter part of the motion; he has not been able to produce the necessary evidence to this House. Nobody could do that, but we can surmise a good deal. Our object should be to ensure that the Government adhere to the principle laid down by Parliament and that appointments should not be made by the Government independently of expert advice, no matter what party they may represent, as the members of the Government are nothing more or less than laymen in such matters.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [5.37]: I wish to refer to a few points that have been stressed during the discussion, firstly that the successful applicant is actively associated with Labour in politics; secondly, that he has been active in trade union circles; thirdly that he was not possessed of a university degree. I have not heard any severe criticism of Mr. Milligan's capacity to fill the position, but it has been stated that there were other applicants holding higher qualifications. Dealing with the point that Mr. Milligan has actively associated himself with Labour in politics, may I repeat what the Chief Secretary said, that Mr. Milligan had been invited by the Labour movement to give his views on education and that he had addressed not only the movement as a whole, but various sections of it. Is there anything wrong in that? Does it not show that the Labour movement stands for all that is best when it is prepared to secure experts like Mr. Milligan to give addresses on subjects of which they have expert knowledge? Is it a crime that a man should be prepared to give of his knowledge to the Labour movement?

Hon. H. Stewart: No.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Is it wrong that a man should be active in his own trade union?

Hon. G. W. Miles: I myself have been down there and addressed the movement.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Yes, and so have other members of this House. What is wrong in that? Mr. Yelland, when moving the motion, said—

Preference to unionists is practised by the Government in respect to the appointments on the teaching staff. That has the effect of conscripting the teachers into party politics. Whenever any Government official is conscripted to follow a particular party, it is demoralising to the department.

Hon. H. Seddon: Is not that statement right?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: How can it be right? How can any individual be conscripted? I say it is impossible. If it were possible the individual that could be conscripted into party politics should not hold any responsible position. A man that is not prepared to stand up to his convictions, whether in politics or in anything else, is not worth his salt.

Hon. A. Burvill: If he does it too often, he is liable to get the sack.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The hon. member is speaking from experience.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Very poor experience. Suppose a man was actively engaged in an organisation covering his occupation, but not associated with the Trades Hall, would any exception be taken to it? Have not there been scores of appointments to highly responsible positions of men that have been active in their own associations? I refer to members of the legal profession, medical profession, and engineering profession. Is any exception taken to the appointment of such men because they were active in their organisations? It speaks well for Mr. Milligan that he has been prepared to give of his time and energy in the interests of his fellow workers. The Teachers' Union is regarded as a professional body and I should place it in the same category as the legal, medical and other organisations I have mentioned.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Surely you would put them ahead of the devil's brigade!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I would. Let me repeat that there is nothing demoralising in the system of preference to unionists. Mr. Yelland takes exception to the fact that the Government have put into operation that part of their policy as applied to teachers.

I thought Mr. Yelland was aware that preference to unionists has been in existence for many years in the Commonwealth service, but there it is carried a little further, for unless a man is a member of the Commonwealth Service Association, he does not receive a salary equal to that paid to a member of the association. That has not been forced on the Government by the members of the association; it is the result of their efforts through arbitration. It is recognised in the Commonwealth service, and in the State service the Government have put that plank of their platform into operation. Mr. Yelland laid stress on these particular points. He repeated the statement that preference to unionists in the civil service is demoralising. He went on to say that in his opinion, and in the opinion of those who were dissatisfied with this appointment, the position should have been given to someone who possessed a university degree. He declared emphatically that no man could fill the position adequately unless he possessed a degree.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is a lot of rot.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Of course it is. Is that not just another brand of preference to unionists. Is not the hon. member putting forward the view that all these positions should be given to men with degrees to the exclusion of men who has no degrees?

Hon. H. Stewart: No other modern country except an Australian State would make such an appointment.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not think the hon. member is correct.

Hon. H. Stewart: I am sure of it.

Member: Have not degrees some value?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No doubt a degree is a valuable asset, but it would be easy to mention many individuals who are estimable people, and are possessed of degrees, but have not the necessary qualifications to fill many positions such as that which we are now discussing.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I agree as to that.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is not necessary for an individual to be possessed of a degree to be able to occupy a position to the satisfaction of all concerned. It cannot be seriously contended that Mr. Milligan is not able to fill this position with success. So far as I have been able to learn, there is not very much dissatisfaction over the matter except in the minds of two or three individuals, who may think they had a better claim for the position than Mr. Milligan.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is the method by which the appointment was made that the House objected to.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I will deal with that later. It should not be a disability upon a man that he is active in his own association or in trade union circles, or holds certain political beliefs. It is not fair to the successful applicant that he should be charged, as has been done in this case, with having obtained the position as the result of being a convert of a certain line of political thought. That is what the motion means. I believe Mr. Milligan is quite capable of filling the position. I was pleased to learn that his own union recognised that a wise choice had been made by the Government in this matter. I know of no appointment in recent years which has met with such a magnificent reception, and practically the unanimous endorsement of those engaged in the profession. It is a fact that the Teachers' Union have recognised Mr. Milligan in no uncertain way. They have recognised his services to the organisation and to the people of the State, both publicly and privately. Immediately the appointment was made known, Mr. Milligan was deluged with congratulations from all parts of the State, particularly from those who have been under his charge at one time or another. I have here a few of the congratulatory messages he has received.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Were they sent to you? Will they be laid on the Table of the House?

Hon. H. Stewart: They look like a few, considering the number of teachers in the service.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Many of these messages are from those who have had an opportunity of judging the value of the position Mr. Milligan holds to-day.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Is that all you have got?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Is it not sufficient.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I hardly think so.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is the quality that counts and not the quantity.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Quite right. An inspection of these letters will show in what high esteem Mr. Milligan is held in the teaching profession of the State.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Will you lay them on the Table of the House?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Any member is welcome to peruse them. Any man, upon

his appointment to such a position, who is congratulated to the extent that Mr. Milligan has been congratulated by members of the profession, must be qualified to fill the post. Some remark was made with regard to the method by which the appointment was made. We have been informed by the Chief Secretary that this was a new appointment, created in accordance with the policy of the Government. That policy has been enunciated from time to time. About two years ago the question of the appointment of a Vice-Principal was mentioned as being part of the educational policy of the Government. Having decided to make a new appointment, the Government took the stand that they were not going to be dictated to by any permanent head of the department, or by anyone else, as to the method they should adopt in filling the position.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: And they have gone outside the Act and the regulations.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They have gone outside no Act. The Minister has fully explained the position.

Hon. H. Stewart: He has not explained how the position was created.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I can say with certainty that the Government have done nothing they were not entitled to do in the method followed concerning this appointment. I do not know Mr. Milligan well. Since Mr. Yelland moved this motion I have, however, made a few personal inquiries. I find that the general opinion amongst those who should know is that the dissatisfaction which exists in the service is limited to two or three people, who are perhaps disappointed that they have not had an opportunity of getting their nominee in or that they themselves were not successful.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is not a question of nominees by any party, is it?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Mr. Stewart gave me the impression that he considered a position of this kind should not be open to any member of the teaching staff.

Hon. H. Stewart: I did not mean to convey that. All of these people are not on the teaching staff. I wanted to know how the position was created.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I accept the hon. member's statement.

Hon. H. Stewart: You thought I meant an inspector should be appointed.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Not necessarily. Mr. Yelland laid stress on the

points I have mentioned. He said that Mr. Miles had not associated himself with the Trades Hall and that Mr. Milligan had done so, and that this, together with the other circumstances he related, was responsible for the appointment being made. I do not believe that Mr. Milligan's association with Trades Hall, or the fact that he held the position of president of the Teachers' Union, had anything to do with the matter. I have more faith in the honour and integrity of the Chief Secretary than to think he would be influenced by such facts, if he were satisfied that there was someone else more capable of filling the position than that particular applicant. He made this statement very clearly.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Did the Chief Secretary recommend him to Cabinet?

Hon. H. Stewart: Yes, that is on the file.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Chief Secretary made it clear, and Mr. Yelland also made a point of it, that if there were two applicants for the position, he would give preference to the one who was a member of the union. Because of that statement Mr. Yelland said it was another factor that proved this was purely a political appointment. I have more faith in the Chief Secretary than to think he would be a party to the appointment of an individual to a position of this kind on political grounds.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Do you not think that that chain of evidence points in this direction?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No, I do not.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: I do.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am trying to point out that scores of appointments have been made by this and other Governments of men who have been actively associated with various political parties and their own professional organisation.

Hon. H. Stewart: Could you not give us ten out of these scores?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There have been scores of cases. We have never taken any exception to that, and I do not take exception to it now.

Hon. H. Stewart: There have not been scores of appointments.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: A man's political opinions should not count, but unfortunately on the statements of some members they count only too often.

Hon. J. Cornell: A man who has no political opinion in these days ought to be put into a museum.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: He is not fit to hold a responsible position. I take strong exception to the hon. member's remark that Mr. Milligan's appointment was a political one. Because he was prepared to give up his own time and energy to his union, that should be no disability against his securing the position. I do not know that any other applicant had superior qualifications for the position. I sincerely hope the discussion on this motion will not affect the position Mr. Milligan now holds. I can understand a member bringing forward a motion like this with a view to clearing up something that may savour of irregularity, but I do not think it is fair to bring forward a motion and use it for the purpose, as appeared in this case, of showing that the successful applicant secured the position partly because of his political views. If the only complaint against him is that he has been actively associated with his union, that he has been an active unionist, and that he does not happen to possess a University degree, I do not think the motion is worthy of much consideration at the hands of members.

On motion by Hon. H. J. Yelland, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

A message having been received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to three amendments made by the Council in the Bill, had disagreed to one amendment, and had agreed to three amendments subject to further amendments in which the Council's concurrence was desired, the message was now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1.—Clause 6: Delete.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment is as follows:—

Substitute the word "amend" for the word "delete," and add the words "by inserting

the words 'with the approval of the Minister,' after the word 'department,' in line 4."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be agreed to.

The Assembly's amendment is in accordance with a wish expressed in Committee here.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will not oppose the Minister on this, but I wish to point out how little the department evidently know about the State Children Act. We struck out the clause because it did not contain the words "with the approval of the Minister"; but Section 10 of the principal Act contains the words that no recommendation or decision of the court shall be interfered with without the approval of the Minister. This clause amounts to double-banking. It shows how little the department know about their own business.

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

No. 4.—Insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 8, as follows:—"Section 70 of the principal Act is amended by omitting in paragraph (b) the words 'twelve shillings and sixpence,' and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one pound.'"

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment is—

Insert the words "and in the fifth line of Subsection (2)," after the words "paragraph (b)," in line 2 of the proposed new clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is merely consequential.

Question put and passed: the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 6.—Insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 14, as follows:—"There is hereby inserted in the principal Act, after Section 147, a new section as follows:—147a. Whenever any person is liable to arrest under Part IX. of this Act, and such person is arrested at a distance exceeding twenty miles from the court which has

caused the warrant to issue, the person arrested may be brought before the Children's Court nearest to the place of arrest, and the case shall forthwith be adjudicated upon by such court. For the purpose of the hearing at such court, a certified copy of the proceedings of the court which caused the warrant to issue, together with a certified account of the arrears of maintenance and costs, shall be accepted as prima facie evidence of the proceedings therein set forth and of the amounts which are owing and payable. Such certified copy shall be under the hand of and signed by the Clerk of the Court which caused the warrant to issue. The court which adjudicates upon the matter so transferred to it may make such order as it may determine, and thereupon such order shall be deemed to have been made by the court which caused the warrant of arrest to issue."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment reads—

Insert the words "with the consent of the complainant" after "may," in the fifth line of the proposed new section.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not think the Assembly's amendment on our new clause is in the interests of the department, because the consent of the complainant is the last thing that should be introduced here. The very object of the clause is to prevent the complainant having any say in the matter. The clause was suggested by the clerk of the Perth Children's Court. It has been found that men go away leaving their families unprovided for. An order is made against them to contribute so much per week, and they do not make the contribution. Such a man is found in, say, Albany or Geraldton, or other remote place, possibly in work; and an attempt is at once made to obtain payment from him. At present the procedure is to bring the man from Albany or Geraldton to Perth at the expense of the State. When he gets to Perth he has nothing and is allowed to go, and the State loses the money incurred by bringing him here, and the man has probably lost his job. The object of the new clause is to prevent these things. A complainant will frequently ask that her husband be brought to Perth at the expense of the State because here

she can dun him better. The clerk of the Children's Court says immense expense is incurred in this way. Under the new clause, if the defaulting husband is at Albany in work, he can be brought before the Albany Children's Court. It has been said that the Albany court may reduce the order made. However, they cannot do that. The rehearing must be by the court which made the first order. I would suggest an amendment on the Honorary Minister's motion, as follows—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be disagreed to, and that an alternative amendment be forwarded to the Assembly, as follows—"Add at the end of the Council's amendment 'Provided that no such order shall be altered or varied.'"

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The intention of the new clause is to save the expense of bringing the person charged to Perth from some distant place, and the Assembly desires that effect should be given to the new clause only by desire of the complainant. That is reasonable.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It defeats the whole clause.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I would like Mr. Lovekin to explain how that effect comes about.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: What happens is this. A woman wants to get her husband back from, say, Albany, and she has an order against him for so much per week, which order he has failed to meet. She goes to the clerk of the Perth Children's Court and has a warrant issued for the husband's arrest. Under the new clause, if the matter is left with the Perth Children's Court, that court will have the husband brought before the Albany court and will have steps taken there to enforce payment of the order so as to provide the woman with the money to which she is entitled. It is no advantage to her to have the man brought to Perth; what she wants is the money. But another woman wanting to get her husband back from a distant part at the expense of the State, and having an order against him, gets a warrant issued. Then the husband is arrested in, say, Albany, and in the ordinary course is brought back to Perth. If the clerk of the Perth Children's Court is given a discretion in the matter, he will say in such circumstances, "Do not bring him to Perth, but take him before the Albany children's court to get the order enforced." Under the Assembly's amendment on our new

clause, the woman may say, "No; I want him brought before the Perth court." Then the man is brought here and loses his job.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And the warrant may be withdrawn.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The woman gets her husband back at heavy cost to the State. Our new clause is intended to prevent that. Once the complainant is given a say in the matter, the whole object of the clause is defeated.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: During the tea adjournment I discussed this matter elsewhere, and I understand that if we disagree with the Assembly's amendment and send it back there will be a conference, at which the words that have been suggested can be considered. Under our Standing Orders I am debarred from moving my amendment, and so we have to follow that course.

The CHAIRMAN: If that course is to be followed, it will be necessary to negative the motion moved by the Honorary Minister.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have strong objection to Mr. Lovekin's proposed amendment. When a defaulter is brought up at a court in some remote district, he may touch the sympathy of that court and induce it to reduce the original order. That sort of thing can happen, and there is no chance of the complainant reaching that remote court except at considerable cost.

Hon. A. Lovekin: She couldn't give evidence even if she went there, for the original case has already been tried and heard.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Of course the amendment outlined by Mr. Lovekin might overcome some of the difficulty. I hope the amendment made by the Assembly will be agreed to.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wish the Minister, when he comes here to help us, would previously look into matters so that he might give us something consistent with the facts of the case. It would be of no use whatever the complainant going to the place where the defaulter was arrested. If the man were arrested at Albany, the Albany court would have no jurisdiction to vary the original order. All that it could do would be to enforce the order. If the complainant's case is bona fide, if it is not simply that she wishes to have the man brought back to Perth, she is quite prepared to have him tried at Albany.

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

No. 2.—Insert a new clause, to stand as Clause 5, as follows: "Section 7 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following proviso to Subsection (1): Provided that at least two of such inspectors or officers (one being a male person and the other a female person) shall be charged with the supervision and control of children released on probation under Part IV. of this Act."

The CHAIRMAN: This amendment, made by the Council, has been disagreed to by the Assembly for the stated reason that the power to appoint the officers mentioned in the amendment is already vested in the Minister controlling the Act, and interference with his discretion by Act of Parliament is undesirable.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to this is the very reason for the clause. However, I do not intend to press this any further, for I think we have gone far enough in telling the Government what is necessary. Some time ago we succeeded in having a probationary officer appointed to look after the boys and, in consequence, three industrial schools have been closed, thus saving thousands of pounds to the State, to say nothing of the improvement among the delinquent boys. There are more delinquent girls than delinquent boys, and if we had a probation officer for girls, such as we have for boys, the State could close up several of the institutions for girls. In order to show our bona fides, those who wish to see this officer appointed have offered to pay the salary of £300 per annum for two years. If at the end of that time it was found that the scheme was not a success, it could be dropped. I cannot understand a department that sets its face against a proposition such as that.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Honorary Minister, Hon. A. Lovekin and Hon. J. Nicholson drew up the reason for insisting on the Council's amendment No. 6.

Reason adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.55]: I feel sure that the Chief Secretary will have been duly impressed with the feeling of this House after having heard the speeches delivered by various members on the Bill. The convincing character of those speeches cannot have escaped his notice, and whilst one might offer congratulations to the Chief Secretary on having presented the Bill in the manner in which he did, there is a certain amount of feeling that the amendments would not be desirable. There is one argument that might be advanced in addition to the many already brought forward, and convincing arguments too, and it is that just a little time back, less than two years ago, there was an election for members of this House, and one of the prominent features of that election was the question of the abolition or retention of the Legislative Council. I ask those hon. members who faced the electors on that occasion how the electors viewed that proposition when it was put to them. I can speak for myself in the Metropolitan Province. I touched on that point at every meeting, and I received undoubted support in favour of the retention of this House and its existing constitution. I dealt somewhat fully on the constitution and made the position very clear to the electors. The result of my election was such as to convince me that I certainly could not support amendments of so radical a character as those now before us. Other hon. members presented views of a similar character to their electors, and from what I read in the newspaper it was a frequent topic of discussion at the meetings of practically all the candidates. They, too, are now in a position to declare that the opinion of the electors was in favour of the retention of the constitution as it now stands. Surely,

it is too much to ask those of us who were returned less than two years ago to change front. When introducing the Bill, the Chief Secretary referred to an incident in the early constitutional history of the State, and while he admitted that the Labour Party had a plank in their platform and a prominent plank too, for the abolition of the Legislative Council, he incidentally mentioned that the Labour Party had not been the first to advocate a single Chamber. He alluded to a motion that had been moved by Mr.—afterwards Justice—Hensman, now deceased, which made provision that the Parliament of the State should consist of only one Chamber. I have looked up that motion and found that it was to this effect: "That Parliament should consist of a single Chamber of 30 members to be called the Legislative Assembly." But there was a very carefully worded provision in the motion embodying a reservation that when two-thirds of the members were in favour of it, the Legislative Assembly could create a second Chamber.

The Chief Secretary: I quoted that.

HON. J. NICHOLSON: I thought that portion was omitted.

The Chief Secretary: No, I gave that as well.

HON. J. NICHOLSON: We know that motion was not agreed to. The subsequent history of the colony showed that the members of the then Legislative Council, as it then existed, were distinctly in favour of the bi-cameral system of Parliament. In reading through the early debates, one cannot but be impressed by the strong opinions voiced by members of that early Legislative Council. I hardly think that that particular motion would be sufficient to justify the Minister in quoting it to indicate that it represented the wishes of more than one member of the Legislative Council at that time, but rather that it was introduced to test the feelings of the Council. I think that motion was dealt with in 1883 or thereabouts. In considering the Bill it may not be out of place to refresh the memories of hon. members by references to some of the proceedings in the earlier years of the colony. As we all know the real government of the colony began shortly after its foundation with the formation of a Legislative Council consisting of the first Governor and certain officials who were appointed by virtue of an Order-in-Council under an Imperial Act that had been passed.

Five persons, with the Governor, at first constituted the Council, but as the years advanced various additions were made to that number. In 1850 a further Imperial Act was passed designed to give facilities for a certain form of representative government. That first Legislative Council was wholly nominated by the Governor. In 1850 the Act passed to enable a form of representative government to be established, provided for a Legislative Council consisting of such number of members as might be locally determined, but that two-thirds were to be elected and one-third nominated by the Crown. Provision was made for the qualifications of electors and members, to which I shall refer later. Before that Act could be availed of, it was necessary for a petition to be presented by at least one-third of the householders of the colony, and it was necessary that the settlers or colonists should be prepared to undertake to defray their own expenses of government out of revenue. That condition was a severe stumbling block to Western Australia, because the revenue in those days was very small, and the people had to depend upon financial help from the Mother Country. It was not until 1870 that the colonists found themselves in a position to avail themselves of the Act referred to. In that year the first Legislative Council was constituted. It consisted of 18 members, six being nominated and 12 elected. In later years other additions were made, but the proportion was always borne in mind, two-thirds of the members being elected and one-third nominated. That was the dawn of representative government in this colony. I refer to this because it is interesting to note the qualifications required for electors as well as for members. Every adult man 21 years of age was entitled to a vote if he owned property worth £100 or was a leaseholder paying a certain annual rental, or held a depasturing license for which he had to pay a certain amount. The qualification for members was that they had to possess property of a capital value of £2,000 or of an annual value of at least £100.

The Chief Secretary: What year was that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That was in 1870. That form of government continued until 1890 when, after many keen fights, responsible government, as we now know it, was secured. A delegation had actually to visit England to secure that privilege and it consisted of the then Governor, Sir Frederick

Broome, and, I think, Sir Thomas Cockburn-Campbell and Mr. S. H., later Sir Henry, Parker. They visited England and owing to the excellent service rendered by the delegation, mainly due to the capable leading of Mr. Parker, and after a considerable amount of opposition on the part of a certain number of members of the Home Parliament, they achieved success and secured the privileges we enjoy to-day. Most of us are familiar with the position of Parliament since the establishment in 1890 of responsible government. The form of government granted to us was that recognised as the bi-cameral system. In the debates that took place prior to the achievement of responsible government, members of the former Legislative Council undoubtedly showed their desire to retain that system. They displayed a great amount of wisdom indeed, as well as tact, in securing for us the Constitution which is so effectively safeguarded by the bi-cameral system. We should, therefore, hesitate to do anything that would undo the good work they achieved for us. The first Legislative Council was nominated and consisted of 15 members, while the Legislative Assembly comprised 30 members. When the population reached 60,000, as it did about 1893, the Legislative Council became an elective body. The qualifications for the electors was the ownership of freehold property of a capital value of £200, or an annual value of £30. This was reduced later to a capital value of £100 and an annual value of £25. By later amendments to the Act as it exists to-day, the qualification for electors was materially reduced, namely, to a capital value of £50 or an annual value of £17. That, I think, displayed a very liberal spirit and an effort on the part of Parliament to mete out what they regarded as a fair measure of justice to every elector. When presenting his views on this question to the House, Mr. Burvill mentioned what was a very important point indeed. He demonstrated why there should be no alteration in the direction of a reduction in the qualifications that now exist, having regard to the purchasing value of a sovereign to-day and the increased rentals for premises. Those conditions did not obtain in the earlier period when a reduction in the annual value was made to £17. It follows as a logical sequence that in place of reducing the qualifications we should increase the amount of £17, in preference to the proposals in the Bill. But I am not asking for that. It must be admitted, I think, that a

most liberal spirit was displayed in the amendments that have been made to the Act. Anyone who is aware of the value of the very humblest abode knows full well that anyone may be an elector duly qualified to vote for members of this Council if he desires, especially in view of the small qualification provided under the Act. We might even go further and compare the position that obtains in the Eastern States. I have endeavoured to find out the position there by referring to Year Books and other publications, as to the law governing these matters in each of the States where Legislative Councils exist. Unfortunately I have been unable to get information later than 1919. There may have been some alterations since that year. If there have been, the Chief Secretary may be able to tell us of them. The Year Book shows the Parliaments and elections summary, March, 1919. As members are aware there is no Legislative Council in Queensland and the Legislative Council in New South Wales is a nominee Chamber. In Victoria the qualification set out is as follows:—

Adult British subjects of either sex if either (a) the owner of a freehold of the annual value of £10 or of a leasehold of property rated at £15; or (b) a graduate of a British University, matriculated student, etc.

In South Australia the qualification is set out thus—

Adult British subjects of either sex who are either (a) owners of a freehold of the clear value of £50, (b) owners of a leasehold of the clear annual value of £20 with at least three years to run, or containing a right of purchase, (c) inhabitant occupiers of a dwelling-house, (d) registered proprietors of a Crown lease on which there are improvements to the value of at least £50. Claimants must have resided in the State for six months prior to application for enrolment.

The qualification for Tasmania is thus given—

Adult British subjects of either sex who have resided in the State for 12 months, if either (a) possessing freehold to the annual value of £10 or leasehold of the value of £30, or (b) graduates of a University, qualified legal or medical practitioners, etc.

Our qualifications for electors compare more than favourably with those of the other States. We have made provision of more than a liberal character for anyone who has any intention of settling in the State and becoming qualified as an elector. It may be asked, "Why were such qualifications attached to electors for the Legislative Coun-

cil?" My answer is that the electors should be persons who have shown some evidence of possessing property, of taking up a permanent residence and acquiring some permanent stake in the country. That evidence, requirement, or qualification, call it what we will, has been reduced almost to vanishing point when we require electors merely to have a property qualification of the small value of £50 freehold or to be the householder of premises of a clear annual value of £17.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But it shuts out thousands of desirable people.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In what way?

Hon. E. H. Gray: The working class people chiefly.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: We all belong to that class. We are all workers.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Precisely. Wives may be shut out, but there are many wives so thrifty that they show their desire to become good citizens of a fine State.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The possession of money does not make them good citizens.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Thrift makes them better citizens.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There was a strong reason why evidence of having some permanent stake in the country was required as the qualification attached to electors for this House.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That was to prevent this House from becoming a rubber stamp.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. As this House in the past has concurred in making the qualification one simple of attainment, I do not see how anyone can possibly object to it. The Bill proposes to omit paragraph 2 of Section 15 of the Act, which contains the householder's qualification, and substitute something that would practically abolish the qualification entirely. The proposal is to substitute "an inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling house." There is no suggestion of what a dwelling house is to be except what was dilated on by Mr. Harris last night. I shall not occupy time by discussing the definition. I ask members to examine the clause closely and weigh the position. If they do so, they must realise that to pass the Bill would mean to put electors for this House in practically the same position as electors for another place.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: How can you justify that statement?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: By directing attention to the amendment contained in Clause 2 of the Bill—"An inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling house."

Hon. E. H. Gray: There may be five people in the house who would have votes for another place but only one would have a vote for the Council.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: That would not give the wife of the occupier or the adult members of the family a vote.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I know many wives who interest themselves in land speculation and have wisely put their savings into land.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Some have done it unwisely, too.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I should not like to say that, having regard to the position of the State. I prefer to believe they have invested their money in a very good way.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Perhaps they have been very fortunate.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the wives to whom Mr. Gray has referred have purchased property of the value of £50, they are entitled to the vote. If the wife was the registered owner of the dwelling, she would be entitled to the vote.

Hon. A. Burvill: Then she would have to pay the taxes on it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is one of the burdens attached to the holding of land. When we obtained responsible Government it became necessary to undertake the liabilities it involved, and in order that those liabilities may be discharged, rates and taxes have to be paid. So there is a good and valid reason why a property qualification should be required for the electors of this House. It is a sound and valid reason, because it shows some indication of permanence on the part of the individual concerned. In the circumstances, and having regard to the fact that I made it part of my platform during the last election to adhere to the existing Constitution, I cannot possibly support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.27]: I do not intend to say very much because during the first session I had the honour to occupy a seat in this House I debated the question at considerable length. There is no doubt about the attitude of the Government,

especially after the forcible explanation given by the Chief Secretary in presenting the Bill to the House. He told us that a plank of the Labour platform was the abolition of the Legislative Council. I stand here as one of the most recently elected members for the largest province in Western Australia. I had the honour of polling the greatest number of votes and being elected by the largest majority ever gained by a candidate in Western Australia. A great deal has been said about the mandate of the Government. I, too, have a mandate from the people who sent me here, and it is couched in no uncertain terms. During my election campaign I addressed meetings in every part of my large constituency, and I took the precaution to post a copy of a manifesto to every one of the 21,000 electors in my province. At every meeting I addressed I made my attitude clear, so there can be no question that the electors were well acquainted with the views I hold. I have always held extremely strong views on the retention of the Legislative Council on its present basis. The following are the words in my manifesto:—

The Council is the people's bulwark against hasty legislation. It is a House of review, and its rights must be zealously guarded, and any attempt to abolish the Council or even to reduce its power must be strongly fought in order to avoid the deplorable calamity which has been brought about by the Governments of Queensland and New South Wales.

The Chief Secretary made it clear that that was the direct intention of the Labour Party. Further than that, the various planks in the platform of the Labour Party also contain the statement that they are desirous of abolishing this Chamber. We have heard it so many times that there is no use beating about the bush, and talking about what the franchise will be or ought to be. The fact remains they do not care what the franchise is; they desire the abolition of this House. We have been asked by interjection why we do not agree to a franchise on the same basis as the Senate. Some members who asked this question are the very ones who desire the abolition of the Senate. It is also a plank in their platform. They desire also the abolition of State Governors, and many other things which, so long as I have breath in my body, they will never get. I listened to the courteous way in which the Chief Secre-

tary alluded to present members of the House. Whilst he spoke strongly on the question of abolishing the Legislative Council, he paid a great tribute to present members. I am sure we all appreciate his courtesy. Whilst we may differ politically from him, we have the greatest regard for the Chief Secretary, and I am sure that he has a kindly spot in his heart for his fellow members. During a recent trip we had through the Midlands, the Chief Secretary made a speech at one of the many functions and this was what he said about the Legislative Council, which the Labour Party are so desirous of abolishing—

In the past the Hon. Mr. Collier had given the Leaders, Sir James Mitchell and Mr. Thomson, a fair deal, and to-day they were both reciprocating. He did not of course always agree with the Council, especially when they amended Bills which he put before them. But they had always given both himself and Mr. Hickey a fair deal, and always treated them with courtesy and respect due. We have three other direct supporters in the Chamber, but we managed to place on the statute-book no fewer than 55 out of 60 measures.

Here we have it that with five stalwarts of the Labour Party in a House of 30 we were able to place 55 out of 60 Bills on the statute-book. I never heard or read of a greater testimonial to the impartiality and fair-mindedness of the other 25 members of this Chamber than fell from the lips of the Chief Secretary. We realise that the directors of the policy of the Labour Party are very insistent in their desires. If they cannot gain them in one way they will try to do so in another, and keep on trying. While I have anything to do with it this structure will stand as it is with every brick intact. I will not give away one brick, because I know that as soon as one brick is taken away from the structure the Labour Party will not be satisfied until the demolition of the whole Chamber occurs. The last people who should desire the abolition of the Council are the members of the present Government, for it is through the action of this Chamber that they are still in power.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is not the Collier Government but their supporters.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I know they have a difficult task in front of them, and so have we if we wish to retain our rights. One would imagine that great hardships were inflicted upon many people.

If we take the Metropolitan and Metropolitan-Suburban rolls we find that the total enrolment is 27,824.

Hon. E. H. Gray: How many absentee landowners are there in that?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Perhaps the hon. member is one of them. The ratepayers in the municipality and road board districts comprised in that area number 55,624, which leaves an excess of ratepayers over enrolments of no less than 27,800. All these people ought to be eligible for enrolment and a large proportion of them would be eligible. It is safe to say that 90 per cent. of them are eligible, and if they do not enrol it is their own fault. They had the opportunity, and the vast majority of them had the necessary qualification. Certain people, for political purposes, do not desire to be enrolled for the Legislative Council, although they may be qualified several times over. It provides a good red herring to draw across the trail for them to show what a formidable place this is. And yet in this House with only five stalwarts assisting the Government we passed 55 out of 60 measures. No greater testimonial to the impartiality of this House has ever been given.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: The Chief Secretary did not mention the Bills that this House did not pass.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The only conclusion I can come to is that the majority of the people are so well satisfied with the Legislative Council that they desire to leave it as it is. They do not want a change. Members of the Labour Party want everything to go through their channels. Those who seek the support of the Labour Party vote according to the ticket and according to the instructions given to them. With regard to the Legislative Assembly, I say emphatically that they follow that principle very closely. When it comes to the preservation of their property rights and the infliction of extra taxation, and the guarding of those rights, which every Britisher holds so dear, the great majority of members of the Labour Party are prepared to trust themselves to members of this august body, the Legislative Council, where the Government are assisted only by five of their own stalwarts, notwithstanding which we passed 55 out of 60 Bills. Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Burvill referred to the £17 qualification. When that qualification went

through the value was different from what it is to-day.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It was then about a third.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I should say that the £17 value would now be somewhere about £10. Very few people desire to see Western Australia brought to the same position that Queensland and New South Wales have been brought to. In my speech last year I gave the history of the New South Wales House. It only shows that, with our coming into being as it were, as a self-governing colony, in years much later than those of the other States, we were privileged to follow all that was considered soundest and best. We have the freest, broadest and most satisfactory legislation, based on the most perfect principles and ideals, that is to be found in any part of Australia. Queensland is without a Legislative Council and its finances are in a deplorable condition. We know the position to which the Government of the State has been brought. We also know the deplorable position of a rich State like New South Wales owing to the application of the nominee principle to the Legislative Council. Thus we may realise what may be the position of Western Australia if the Labour Party have their way. I shall vote against the Bill, and do everything I can to maintain the present franchise upon its extremely broad and liberal basis. I shall also do all I can to uphold the principles which have so often been enunciated in this Chamber.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [8.40]: Bills of this nature have been before the Chamber on many occasions. I do not think any member opposing this one has brought forward any new argument, with the possible exception of Mr. Burvill, who claimed that owing to the depreciation of the sovereign, in effect the franchise to-day is broader than it was a few years ago. The purport of the Bill is to introduce the household franchise, which is a perfectly fair one for a second Chamber. Certain things are being read into the Bill which are not there. Upon that reading members have based most of their arguments. Mr. Harris last night when speaking of the definition of dwelling house, said that this would mean that quite a large number of people would be entitled to vote who to-day had no vote, people such as shearers who

may be occupying premises which are provided for them while they are at work.

Hon. E. H. Harris: In serviceable employment.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Bill is clear on that point. It would provide for only one individual having a vote for any dwelling house. His argument must fall to the ground.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I did not say it was more than one. When I used the term plural shearers I meant one shearer for every hut.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member made it clear that when he mentioned shearers and domestics he was reading into the Bill that any person who lived in a dwelling house, as defined by the Bill, would be entitled to a vote.

Hon. E. H. Harris: A person who lived in any dwelling house.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If the hon. member did not mean what he said that puts a different complexion upon his statement.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I said a person living in any dwelling house.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member referred to persons, and qualified the remarks by mentioning shearers and domestics. I will, however, accept his explanation. Other members have said the Bill is a stepping stone towards the abolition of the Council. They may honestly believe that. Do they believe that the passing of this Bill will mean the abolition of the Council?

Hon. A. Burvill: It will lead up to it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Their argument points to their being afraid to trust the people who should vote upon the subject.

Hon. E. H. Harris: To abolish it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: If they are not afraid to trust the people with a vote on this subject, why do they so strenuously object on that ground? Mr. Nicholson had something to say in regard to only those with a stake in the country being given a vote for this Chamber. He implied that those who have a stake in the country are the people who own property.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is to give evidence of permanent citizenship.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member did not take into consideration any people except property owners. I would suggest to him that any married man having a family born or reared in this State has a very big stake in the country; and there are thousands of such men who have no qualifi-

eration under the existing law for a vote for this Chamber.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Such a man would have a £17 house rented.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member knows quite well that in districts known particularly well to him there are hundreds of such men not qualified to vote for this Chamber.

Hon. A. Burvill: I know hundreds who have the qualification and do not get on the roll.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That may be so, but it does not affect the point. In the timber districts, of which Mr. Nicholson has a good knowledge, the greater proportion of the men engaged in the timber industry have not the qualification for a vote for this House. The member for Forrest (Miss Holman) quoted, in another place, certain figures which to me are very illuminating; and I propose to repeat them to this House. The member for Forrest said that at Dwellingup there were 83 dwellings, and 152 names on the Assembly roll and only 27 on the Council roll.

Hon. A. Burvill: How many were qualified to be on the Council roll, but not on it?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Miss Holman made it particularly clear that they had not the qualification for this House. I take it the timber worker is just as good a citizen as any other worker, and just as much entitled to a vote for the Council as any married man in the metropolitan area. This measure will rectify that position. The men in question cannot help themselves. It is said that as the result of an Arbitration Court award the men have been placed in that position. At Hoffman and Hoffman Landing there are 74 dwellings, and 148 names on the Assembly roll with only four on the Council roll. At Holyoake and Holyoake Landing there are 161 dwellings, and 412 names on the Assembly roll and 19 on the Council roll. At Jarrahdale there are 154 dwellings, and 390 names on the Assembly roll and 27 on the Council roll. At Marrinup there are 46 dwellings, and 124 names on the Assembly roll and only 7 on the Council roll. At Mornington Mill and Landing there are 175 dwellings, and 377 names on the Assembly roll and 11 on the Council roll. At Nanga Brook Mill and Landing there are 100 dwellings, and 228 names on the Assembly roll and only 2 on the Council roll. At Pindalup there are 34 dwellings, and 8 names on the Assembly roll

and 1 on the Council roll. At Wellington there are 143 dwellings, and 80 names on the Assembly roll and 6 on the Council roll. At Whittaker's Mill and Landing there are 86 dwellings, and 153 names on the Assembly roll and not one on the Council roll. At Wuraming Mill and Landing there are 73 dwellings, and 138 names on the Assembly roll and none whatever on the Council roll. Those figures have been quoted by the member for Forrest. I take it that the figures are correct; I am sure that they are correct; and they show that a very large proportion indeed of men who are just as good citizens as can be found anywhere in the State, have but a small percentage of votes for the Legislative Council as compared with votes for the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You should say, "Who are enrolled," not "Who have a vote."

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am quoting those who have a vote for the Council as against those with a vote for the Assembly, and the proportion of the former is very small indeed.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In order to ascertain the exact position, you need to examine the claims.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: One cannot get away from those figures. They are most illuminating, and any franchise which places such a large number of citizens in that position is unfair.

Hon. J. Cornell: But the hon. member knows that hundreds of occupants of £17 houses in the metropolitan area are not on the roll.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is so. I quote these figures because I believe that under our present franchise the men referred to are not entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why do you believe that?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Because upon inquiry I have been assured that the figures are correct.

Hon. J. Ewing: The men in question do not pay the necessary amount of rent.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is so; the rent they pay does not give them the necessary qualification.

Hon. J. Ewing: They cannot have it both ways.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: As a matter of fact, their wages to-day are less than they

should be, on account of the fact that they get their houses at a cheap rate.

Hon. J. Ewing: That means a big advantage to them, surely.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: There may be an advantage in it, but at the same time there is a big disadvantage to them in not being entitled to a vote for this House. A remark was made by Sir William Lathlain, and also I think by Mr. Nicholson, that if these people would only exercise a little more thrift they could easily become entitled to a vote for this Chamber. That is indeed a poor argument.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I did not use that argument, but I said that any number of thrifty people could get qualified if they desired.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Taking the working classes by and large, my experience is that although they are as thrifty as it is possible for anyone to be, it is impracticable for them to own land apart, possibly, from the homes in which they reside. In that case, moreover, there is only one voter; as a rule, the husband. Very few workers indeed are in a position to own another piece of land while paying, or endeavouring to pay, for homes for themselves. We cannot get away from the fact that at present approximately only 33 per cent. of the electors on the Assembly roll have the Council franchise. That state of affairs should not exist, and this Bill would to a certain extent prevent it. The passing of the measure would make a difference which is long overdue, and would give to large numbers of men and some women the right to a vote for this Council. We regard ourselves as a democratic community, but I doubt whether in any country outside Australia such a franchise as ours obtains for the Upper House or a second Chamber. I do not know of one. As a matter of fact, the most recent Constitution in the British Empire provides for adult suffrage for both Houses. Take the examples quoted by Sir William Lathlain—Queensland and New South Wales. It is well known that in Queensland the Legislative Council has been abolished for some years. Notwithstanding Sir William Lathlain's remarks as to Queensland's position, we cannot get away from the fact that ever since the Queensland Legislative Council has been abolished, a Labour Government has been returned. There has been no change since that time. If the people of Queensland were so enamoured of a second Chamber, it seems

strange that they should have consistently returned a Government responsible for the abolition of that Chamber.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: By controlling the elections.

Hon. J. Nicholson: A redistribution of seats Bill is needed in Queensland.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The next point I want to deal with is plural voting. I am astonished to find that there should be even one member in this House prepared to attempt to justify plural voting. I thought the time had long passed when anybody would attempt, in any shape or form, to justify that. Mr. Harris quoted the number of votes that could be termed plural votes on the roll at present.

Hon. E. H. Harris: In 1915. The roll has not been compiled since then.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is not a large number, but it is a fair percentage of those enrolled for the Council. In no circumstances whatever can anyone logically justify the retention of that form of voting.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is convenient sometimes, though.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It may be. Personally I do not agree with it, and I do not think this Chamber agrees with it. There is sufficient democratic thought in this Chamber, particularly with regard to the franchise, to prevent members from attempting to retain a provision of that kind. At this date it requires no argument from me or anybody else why plural voting should be abolished. Every member here, I believe, realises that the time is more than ripe for its total abolition. Beyond that, I do not know that the Bill contains anything of great importance. That question of dwelling house, if it is not clearly enough defined, can be more clearly defined in Committee. I hope the House will agree to the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—HOSPITALS.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering Clause 27:

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

Clause 27—Power of local authorities to expend revenues on public hospitals:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the clause be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

Several members, dissatisfied with the clause in the Bill, suggested to me that they should have a conference with the Crown Solicitor. I arranged for that, and the result is the amendment that members have before them.

Hon. H. STEWART: This puts a different interpretation on Clause 27. In the proviso to Subclause 1 the amount is limited to £500, which in some instances may not be sufficient. Under this, local authorities can make payments for a period covering five years to the extent of 10 per cent. of their general rate. In addition, if they want to go in for capital expenditure, they can raise a loan and strike a rate to pay interest and sinking fund on that loan. Consequently the amendment gives wide power to local authorities, whereas I think the feeling of the Committee was that their powers in this respect should not be increased. However, I will not oppose the amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is a very important amendment. There is a desire to facilitate the giving of assistance to hospitals by local authorities. There are country districts that find considerable difficulty in establishing and equipping hospitals. So the desire has been to see what could be done to meet them. It was realised that unless some limitation such as is in the amendment were imposed, a district with a large revenue might be induced to divert its funds from more legitimate purposes and apply them all to a hospital, which should be a subsidiary consideration.

Hon. H. STEWART: We have in this amendment something that is entirely new. Why should every road board have to go to the Minister? In the Bill it is provided that it shall be lawful for any local authority to apply any portion of its annual general rates towards all or any of the objects that are set out. There is nothing about going to the Minister there. It is quite unnecessary to have to go to the Minister.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is a copy of what was in the Bill at first.

Hon. H. STEWART: What the Committee struck out. Now it is suggested that it should be put back.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It would be wise to report progress at this stage so that we might look carefully into the matter before we undo all the good work we have already done. The amendment was carefully drafted to meet the wishes of a majority of the Committee.

Hon. H. STEWART: The proposed amendment is long and involved and although we have had it before us since 3 o'clock, it is not possible to grasp its full significance at once. It needs very careful perusal.

The CHAIRMAN: The discussion might be confined to the words it is proposed to strike out and not to what it is proposed to insert. After we have struck out the clause as it now appears members can debate the new clause it is proposed to insert.

Hon. H. STEWART: Am I in order in pointing out why I think the words that are at present in the Bill should be permitted to remain?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will be in order if he speaks in favour of the retention of the clause as it appears now.

Hon. H. STEWART: The former provision set out that the Minister could only be called upon to contribute to the fund when the expenditure was practically all capital expenditure—in the direction of maintenance, nursing and medical expenditure. Under the new proposal the Minister does not enter into the agreement and the hospitals will have an additional burden to bear. I would like to give the matter further thought and I agree with Mr. Holmes that progress should be reported.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is an obvious difference between the clause in the Bill and the proposed amendment. The clause limited expenditure on the actual cost of construction, enlargement and equipment of hospitals, but no money could be applied out of general rates towards meeting any additional expenditure without raising a loan. It was suggested that the Crown Law Department should adapt the original clause with a proviso limiting the powers of the local authorities to a certain amount. That has been provided for in the

proposed amendment with a limitation up to £500.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Will the Honorary Minister tell us what is the amount of the average general rates collected by road board districts.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We were told that it ranges from £1,000 to £3,000.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: A road board having rates totalling £1,000 would, on a 10 per cent. basis, contribute £100, and that would be useless for the purposes indicated. On the other hand, if the board had a revenue of £25,000, they would be limited by the £500.

Hon. H. Stewart: But they could raise the money by way of a special loan.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then they could raise the special loan, and use the 10 per cent. of the general rates to meet the interest and sinking fund. We should be careful that we do not provide the local authorities with greater power than we intend.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am sorry Mr. Stewart was not at the conference this morning.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: (conference!)

Hon. H. Stewart: I do not believe in these private conferences.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There was a suggestion that the Bill should be referred to a select committee and I think it was on the suggestion of the President that we held a conference this morning to have an informal chat about the position. We had present Dr. Stow, Mr. Huelin, and Mr. Nicholson.

Hon. H. Stewart: I told you last night that I did not believe in these conferences.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: When I arrived at the House this morning I could not see any daylight because of the limitation of 10 per cent. It seemed to us that it would mean that the local authorities would have to raise their ordinary rates very considerably. If their general rates were 1s. 8d. in the pound for ordinary purposes and they desired to make a contribution that would be covered by 2d. in the pound, they would have to levy a rate of 1s. 10d. in the pound, so as to be able to secure the desired amount on the basis of 10 per cent. After a discussion we solved that problem.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You think so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We decided that the 10 per cent. should be fixed on the basis of the average general rates of the preceding two years, which will not mean the levying of any extra rates, with a

proviso making the maximum amount payable £500. The first two portions of the new clause are quite different. The first portion is intended to apply in cases where the local authority wishes to provide a subsidy for a doctor or to support a small nursing home or hospital. That can be done out of general rates so long as the contribution does not exceed 10 per cent. on the basis of the previous two years. Under the next portion, if a local authority desires to provide a hospital of its own, then it can float a loan, but cannot raise more than seven times the annual rate and must provide interest and sinking fund. More than that, they will not be able to raise the loan until they have an undertaking from the Government that they will contribute on a fifty-fifty basis.

Hon. H. STEWART: I understand that Mr. Lovekin was largely responsible for drafting these several amendments.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You are utterly in error; I did not draft them.

Hon. H. STEWART: I would like to know from the Honorary Minister whether the Government are bound to contribute on the fifty-fifty basis under the conditions mentioned by Mr. Lovekin.

[The Hon. J. W. Kirwan took the Chair.]

The Honorary Minister: The policy is to contribute on a fifty-fifty basis.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The contribution of one half by the Government would be in respect of construction only and not in respect of maintenance.

Hon. H. Stewart: I realise that. It is an importation by this Chamber not proposed by the Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That has nothing to do with the question. The proviso to the proposed new Subclause 1 begins, "Provided that no such undertaking as aforesaid shall be valid," etc. "Undertaking" refers to the binding undertaking at the beginning of Subclause 1 and to the power to spend and apply. The proviso should be widened to cover the expenditure and application.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In considering the striking out of the words, may we refer to what it is proposed to insert in lieu?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, incidentally.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Members representing the West Province told us the other evening that the Fremantle people were desirous of availing themselves of this measure.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: I said nothing of the sort; I said they had no objection to it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They would be unable to avail themselves of it if the proposed alteration is included because of the £500 limitation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is it necessary in matters of this kind to try to draw a red herring between town and country?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That is exactly what the conference has done. Under the amendment the metropolitan area will be protected.

Hon. H. Stewart: It seems to be left-handed protection for the metropolitan area as regards loan raising.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The conference has protected the metropolitan area, and members of West Province are silent because neither their district nor the metropolitan area will come within the scope of the measure. The country districts, however, will be caught.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I understand a conference was held to draw up the proposed new clause.

Hon. A. Lovekin: To try to draft a clause.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Was the Minister for Health present at the conference?

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, but the Hon. Mr. Hickey was present.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I take it the Minister for Health knows nothing about it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He ought to know about it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I should like the Honorary Minister to report progress so that we may ascertain the views of the Minister for Health. I understood the object of the measure was to give to municipalities similar power to that within reach of the road boards. The amendment will defeat the object of the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Hon. Mr. Hickey, Mr. Huelin, head of the department and Dr. Stow, the Parliamentary Draftsman, were present. It was an informal gathering because we realised the difficulty. I believe the amendment will be satisfactory. We had no regard for town or country. We tried to put up something that would be in the best interests of the State, having regard to the people in the back blocks.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Then you made a bad job of it.

Amendment (to strike out Clause 27) put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

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

27. (1.) A local authority shall have power to expend and apply or, with the approval of the Minister, to give a binding undertaking to expend and apply for any number of years any portion of its annual revenue in subsidising any hospital scheme, and in or towards the construction or acquisition, establishment, and maintenance of any public hospital, and in subsidising any district nursing scheme, and in contributing towards a subsidy or providing a subsidy to secure the services of a medical practitioner, and the powers of its local government Act shall be deemed to be extended accordingly:

Provided that no such undertaking as aforesaid shall be valid in so far as it purports to bind the local authority to expend or apply in any year a sum exceeding ten per centum of the average annual amount received by it from general rates during the last two financial years preceding the year in which the undertaking was given so that no such sum shall exceed in any year the sum of £500:

Provided also, that no such agreement shall have effect for more than five years, but any such agreement may be renewed during the last year thereof (with or without modification) from time to time for any period not exceeding five years.

(2.) It shall be lawful for any local authority to borrow money for all or any of the following objects, that is to say—the construction, enlargement, improvement, and equipment of any hospital within the area of such local authority, and such objects shall be deemed to be works and undertakings within the meaning of Part XXIV. of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, and Part VII. of the Road Districts Act, 1919, as though the same had been included therein respectively, and the powers and provisions contained in the said respective Acts relating to the borrowing of money shall apply to the objects above-mentioned.

(3.) It shall not be lawful for any local authority to make any contribution under this section, whether out of revenue or loan moneys towards the capital cost of the construction, enlargement, improvement or equipment of a hospital unless the Minister shall have previously given a valid undertaking to provide at least one-half of such capital cost.

(4.) The provisions of this section are without prejudice to any power vested in a local authority by or under its local government Act.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The amendment will meet requirements fairly well. The Wagin people desire to erect a hospital that will cost about £4,500, and a suitable tender has been received. The Wagin Road Board and the Wagin Municipality will each pay 25 per

cent. and the Government will pay 50 per cent. towards the cost of constructing the hospital. The 10 per cent. per annum is expected to meet requirements.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Unless Clause 28, which has been struck out, is reinstated, I do not see how the authorities mentioned by Mr. Burvill will be able to work in conjunction. I do not see how the people are going to take a vote to bring any two adjoining districts into the scheme.

Hon. J. EWING: I shall be glad if the Honorary Minister will satisfy me that he has made provision for validating what has been done at Collie.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is in the Bill, in a separate clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause 1 of the proposed new Clause 27, the words "annual revenue" be struck out, and "general rate" be inserted in lieu.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is proposed to construct a hospital at Wagin for £5,000. It will, however, take five years to complete the construction, for the local authorities cannot spend more than £500 in any one year.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The construction comes out of loan.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Certain words should be inserted in the first proviso relating to the expenditure of money. I move an amendment—

That in the first proviso after the word "that" in line 1 the words "no portion of the general rate shall be expended or applied as aforesaid and" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That at the end of the first proviso the following words be added "but so that no such sum shall exceed in any year the sum of £500."

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: A further addition to the printed copy should here be made. The amendment is that in the second proviso after "renewed" the words "during the last year thereof" be inserted.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Mr. Burvill has mentioned two particular local authorities in

the Wagin district who wish to construct a hospital. Subclause 2 implies that two local authorities can subscribe funds to erect one hospital within the area of only one local authority. I should like that point to be cleared up. As the subclause is worded any amount of litigation may ensue.

Hon. A. BURVILL: In this instance two local authorities have agreed to build a hospital. I suggest that the subclause be amended by the insertion after the word "authority" of the words "or authorities."

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Clause 28 gave local authorities power to come together. Now that it has been struck out no power is given to them to unite for an object of this kind.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The point is an important one. It may be desired to erect a hospital on either municipal or road board ground, but no road board has power to raise money that is to be spent within a municipality. I suggest that we report progress and that the conference should reconsider the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This matter has been thrashed out time and again. The local authorities should be able to come together if they so desire.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But they cannot do so under this clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There should not be much difficulty about the matter.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The point should be cleared up before the Bill is sent back to another place. Nothing has been inserted to take the place of Clause 28, which empowered the local authorities to come together. It is highly necessary that the power should be given on a similar basis to that contained in Clause 28.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am inclined to think there is some such power in the Road Districts Act, but I cannot put my finger on it at the moment.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That power relates only to roads, not to hospitals.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If it is in the Road Districts Act, it cannot apply to municipalities.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If it is in the Road Districts Act, it is probably in the Municipalities Act as well. Clause 27 has nothing to do with Clause 28. Having passed Clause 27 we could report progress, and later, if necessary, restore a paragraph of Clause 28 dealing with this point.

Hon. H. STEWART: Is the Honorary Minister going to report progress? If so, I hope that when the Bill comes before the Chamber again we shall know definitely whether Subclause 3 provides that the Government shall bear 50 per cent. of the expense.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I realise the difficulty which has been created by the proposal emanating from Wagin. There is need for restoring to the Bill a provision dealing with that difficulty. I am not aware of any section in either the Road Districts Act or the Municipalities Act which covers the position. Clause 28 having been struck out, the proposed new Clause 27 creates a liability on road boards for their share of the cost without creating any liability on the Government. The position is complicated, and needs consideration.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Can this Chamber, by Subclause 3 of the proposed new clause, require the Government to bear 50 per cent. of the capital cost?

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Minister has moved the amendment, and this is not an appropriation of revenue.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Even if the Minister has moved the new clause, can the Chamber include such a provision in the Bill?

Hon. A. BURVILL: A great deal is being made of a small error. It had not been foreseen that two or more authorities would come together. The clause should be altered to read "It shall be lawful for any local authorities" instead of "local authority." Another amendment required is that the hospital should be built in a place decided on by the Government.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: There is great difficulty in getting an agreement between a road board and a municipality. As regards a recreation ground on the borders of a municipality and a road board, although the two local bodies are prepared to come to an agreement, the matter requires an Act of Parliament. Two such bodies have not legal power to agree.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There does seem to be doubt about the matter which has been raised relatively to the new clause.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Potter has suggested to me that the difficulty might be overcome by amending Subclause 2 to read, "It shall be lawful for any local authority, or

any local authority in combination with any other local authority or authorities."

Hon. J. Nicholson: The words "within the area of any local authority" should be deleted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: One needs time to draft the amendment desired. Perhaps the Honorary Minister will report progress.

Progress reported.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. A. BURVILL (South-East) [10.28]: While supporting the second reading of the Bill, I think certain amendments are required. Especially do I disagree to Subclause 3 of Clause 12, which reads—

No payment or remuneration of any kind for or in respect of any hiring or attempted hiring shall be directly or indirectly charged by any employment broker to or against any servant, and it shall not be lawful for any employment broker to accept any reward or gratuity whatsoever for or in respect of the services rendered by him as such broker to any person who has obtained or sought to obtain any position as employee through his intervention or with his assistance.

If we pass that provision, it will mean the end of all the employment brokers in the State; and then there will remain only the Labour Bureau. In this regard the Labour Bureau itself is not consistent, since a charge is made to every man who is found employment through the bureau. There have been complaints on the subject published in the Press. If a man does get work through the Labour Bureau, he has to pay a fee either to the bureau or to some local union. If private employment brokers are to be stopped from charging fees, equally should the unions be asked to stop, especially in the case of men who are hard up. I have no set on unionism; I believe in unionism; but I also believe in fair play. The subclause will cut both ways. Most people looking for employment are perfectly willing to pay fair remuneration to those helping them to obtain work. I have been out of work myself, and at one period had to chase work for months on end. I had great difficulty in finding suitable employment, and when I did get it I was deceived. As a consequence I felt no great love for some of the employ-

ment offices I had consulted. At the same time there are other bureaux quite different. I think the matter should be done on a fifty-fifty basis. The Government bureau should be perfectly free. No restrictions should be placed on a man, except that the man with a family should have the first chance of getting work. But he should not be asked to pay fees, either to the bureau or to a union beforehand. It is the union secretary's job to collect union fees after a man receives his payment from an employer, and not before. I will support the second reading, but I think the Bill requires drastic amendment in Committee.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central—in reply) [10.31]: It is not necessary for me to say much at this stage for I understand that members propose to agree to the second reading and amend the Bill in Committee. Most of those who spoke on the second reading failed to touch the kernel of the whole business. One of the objections to the Bill has been to the provision that the whole of the fees shall be paid by the employer. Another has been to the proposed inspection of correspondence, and still a third has been to the limitation of the fees to be charged by private exchanges. As to the payment of fees by employers, that provision arose virtually out of the remarks of members of both Houses when a similar Bill was brought down on a previous occasion. Many members then declared that the whole of the fees should be paid by the employer and that they would support a Bill containing that provision. The existing Act provides that the employer shall be charged a fee. In some instances he is charged a fee, but it is very seldom that any attempt is made to collect the fee from him. On the other hand, the employee has to pay a fee every time.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Why do you not prosecute the employer?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: That cannot be done. It is one thing to charge a person a fee and quite another to collect it. The inspectors have not any power to insist upon a fee being collected from the employer. Some of the exchanges collect those fees, but others do not. As for the provision for inspection of correspondence, some of the more reputable firms welcome it, recognising in it a protection for themselves. Some members have expressed a fear that the regulation of fees

to be charged means that the private brokers will be abolished. But the Bill does not propose to abolish the private brokers. Nothing is further from our intention. I do not think I need say any more at this stage. Any further remarks I may have to make I will reserve for the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—LEIGHTON-ROBB'S JETTY RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [10.37] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to authorise the construction of a railway from Leighton to Robb's Jetty. It seems an insignificant measure, but in reality it is one of great importance. It is one which has a big issue involved. In effect, this Bill gives authority for the commencement of the scheme of improved harbour accommodation at Fremantle prepared by the Engineer-in-Chief. That scheme is clearly set forth and justified in the comprehensive report on the question submitted to Parliament some weeks ago. Members no doubt have studied the report, and, although it may be difficult for the lay mind to grasp its technical side, yet the matter contained in the report relieves me of the necessity for attempting to explain the scheme in introducing the Bill to the House. The necessity for the Bill at this late stage of the session requires explanation. If the scheme is to be proceeded with, extensive resummptions of land will have to be made, and sufficient time should not be permitted to pass which would enable unscrupulous speculators to engage in plots that would have the effect of inflating the value of the land it is proposed to resume. To prevent this it will be necessary to effect the resummptions before the end of this year.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If we pass this we commit ourselves to the Stileman scheme.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: To some extent, which I will explain later on. If that be done, the value of the land as at 30th June last will be the basis of the award of the compensation court under the Public Works Amendment Act of 1902, as amended during last session. The Government have the power to resume land with-

out reference to Parliament, but when the land is required for the purpose of carrying out a scheme of great magnitude it would be wrong of a Government to effect a resumption of that character without first consulting Parliament on the question as a whole. The need for further harbour accommodation at Fremantle must be apparent to every one who has followed the progress of the State and who is acquainted with what is going on. In fact steps should have been taken to supply that need long before this, but the demands on the finances in other directions hindered action. Before the war the position was recognised, and since hostilities ceased the necessity has been frequently admitted. The time has now come when action cannot any longer be deferred, if delay in accommodating ships and congestion from time to time are to be avoided. Taking the export of wheat: During the last seven years there has been an additional 200,000 acres under crop each year. The increase is perceptibly growing, and this year it is anticipated that there will be an additional 300,000 acres under cultivation, and that is a very conservative estimate. Should we continue to progress in wheat production even only to the extent we have done since 1919, we shall have at the end of ten years an average yield of 12 bushels to the acre, or an output of 55 million bushels. There has also been an enormous increase in the wool yield. Not only are the farmers going in extensively for sheep raising, but large areas of pastoral country are being taken up or acquired for that purpose, and in many instances cattle-breeding is being superseded for what is considered the more profitable kind of stock-raising. In the last five years the number of sheep has increased by over a million, and our wool output has gone up by 10 million lbs. weight in 10 years. There are indications of a far greater proportionate increase during the next five years. Of course, as Mr. Burvill will understand, all of this primary produce will not go to Fremantle. There are other ports to assist in providing the outlet. Still, Fremantle is the principal port of the State. Figures prove that between 93 and 96 per cent. of the imports into the State are landed at Fremantle, while for the last six years the exports from Fremantle represented from 76 to 89 per cent. of the whole from Western Aus-

tralia. At the present time, Fremantle is the nearest shipping port for 42 per cent. of our agricultural products. Investigation has shown that only about 10 per cent. of the cultivable land within the Fremantle zone has been developed, and 90 per cent remains to be brought under production. As the years go by and with great rapidity if the price of wheat keeps at a decent figure, this land will reach the producing stage.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Everyone agrees it should be extended; the only question is the site.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At Fremantle the experience has been that for every ton of wheat handled, three tons of other cargo have to be dealt with. If that margin continues, it means that in 10 years the Fremantle Harbour will require to have made provision for accommodation which will facilitate the handling of something like three million tons of cargo as against 1¼ millions last year. In other words, it will have to provide for more than double the business it is doing at the present time. It would be utterly impossible for this to be done under existing conditions. By extending the harbour up the river, an additional wharf accommodation of 5,750 feet will be afforded, making the total available accommodation 15,890 feet, or approximately a third more than exists now. We shall need all that space within 10 years. It is not proposed to go any further up the river than is shown in Mr. Stileman's report, and on the map which is attached to that report. There is good reason for not going further up the river. Mr. Stileman has had records taken of the tidal conditions of the Swan River, as far as Guildford, and from these records he is convinced that if the harbour were taken up the river much further beyond the site he proposes, tidal difficulties would arise, and that at high tides the Esplanade would be flooded. It would also, in his opinion, render useless at certain times, the wharves and jetties which have been built along the river, for they would be flooded periodically. That is a matter which was not taken into consideration by propounders of the up-the-river scheme. But provision for ten years would be insufficient. The Engineer-in-Chief realises that, and his proposal for further accommodation is to go on the North side of the

present harbour and to build along the back of the North Wharf.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He does not give any estimate in his report in that regard.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under this proposal the harbour in process of time could be extended along the coast as far as Cottesloe Beach. A steelwork bridge at the spot indicated by Mr. Stileman in his report is one of the first big works to be undertaken in connection with the scheme. The foundations for this bridge have to be thoroughly tested, and an expenditure of £2,000 will be necessary for the purpose. No further expenditure, apart from the resumption of land, will be undertaken without first consulting Parliament.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have they tested the foundations at this particular site?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not yet. It is proposed to do so. In reference to the north side, it is proposed, as set forth in the Bill, to deviate the railway so as to relieve the existing line and cross over to meet the bridge site.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What is the estimate in regard to the resumption of land?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have no information on the subject. On the other side the railway from Jandakot is also to be deviated to meet the bridge site. The object is that when, later on, the Brookton-Armadale railway is completed and a trunk line to Kondinin has become an established fact, a considerable quantity of wheat which now comes via Spencer's Brook and Perth, creating congestion, can be brought by this proposed line over the bridge to the North Wharf. This of course is looking ahead—which it is advisable to do in a scheme of this description.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are not looking far enough ahead.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is expected that the construction of the bridge alone will involve the expenditure of a million pounds. But in any case a bridge—and a costly bridge—would have to be built. For the last 20 years the Railway Department has been pressing for it. Owing to the washaways last year £14,433 was spent in the reconstruction of the Fremantle railway bridge. That expenditure was unavoidable as traffic had to be maintained. Just after the washaway that occurred in 1926, the Railway Department, who are in charge of the railway bridge, examined the

whole position, and the Engineer for Ways and Works, who is the responsible officer, put up to the Commissioner of Railways a long report on the bridge. After he had dealt with the repairs, he concluded his minute by stating—

I cannot undertake to maintain the present bridge in safe working order for more than about three years longer, and it will probably take all that time before a new bridge will be ready, even if a start is made at once.

That was dated the 14th October, 1926. Over a year has gone by since then. There is the declaration by a responsible engineer that he cannot guarantee the safety of the bridge for more than another two years. And it will take at least two years—provided the money is found to the extent the Engineer-in-Chief has asked for—to build the bridge as suggested. In his last annual report, which has been laid on the Table of the House, the Commissioner of Railways makes the following statement:—

The question of a new steel railway bridge at Fremantle is still in abeyance, but the order of its urgency has in no way diminished. While the reconstructed portion of the old bridge is in very good condition, the whole structure is antiquated, and the annual cost of maintenance is becoming increasingly and excessively heavy.

The Chief Harbour Master and the pilots of the Fremantle Harbour Trust have criticised some aspects of the scheme. They consider that a width of 1,400 feet instead of a width of 800 feet should be provided for the river and that the depth should be 36 feet instead of 32 feet.

Hon. A. Burvill: Will not that add considerably to the cost?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Engineer-in-Chief is dealing with that matter. There is also comment on the outer harbour proposals. The Engineer-in-Chief has dealt with these criticisms, and I have laid on the Table of the House copies of the whole correspondence, so that hon. members will be in a position intelligently to grasp the whole position. The bridge, the railway from North Fremantle through to Robb's Jetty, and the connection with the present Fremantle yards, together with road approaches to the bridge on each side of the river and other contingent works, are estimated to cost £1,200,000, while the harbour extension up to the bridge with necessary equipments, is estimated to run into £2,000,000. It is a big expenditure, but it has to be faced. Hon.

members will recognise the futility of trying to encourage primary production unless provision is made for getting the surplus to the overseas markets. Unless an extension of the Fremantle Harbour Works is undertaken, without unnecessary delay, a heavy responsibility will rest upon the Government and Parliament will be guilty of the vacillation. The Government realise their obligations in this matter, and, in submitting this Bill, are guided by the advice of the Engineer-in-Chief in whose qualifications to direct them it has the greatest confidence. He has devoted a year to the consideration and formation of the scheme. Every source of information available has been at his command, and every one who has read his report must admit that he has studied his question from every point of view. I trust the Bill will receive the endorsement of this House, so that preliminary action can be taken by the Government towards the carrying out of the proposals. I shall be glad to have the criticisms of hon. members, but I trust they will be made in good time so that I may have the opportunity to submit them to the Engineer-in-Chief for his remarks. I shall then be in the position to reply to hon. members. I must, of course, submit the views and adverse comments by hon. members here to the Engineer-in-Chief and whatever line of action he advises I will intimate to hon. members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.2 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 1st December, 1927.

	PAGE
Questions: Traffic Fees, distribution	2316
State Insurance, profit	2316
Sheep disease, investigation	2316
Railway project, Lake Grace-Kalgarin	2317
Industrial Unions, prosecutions	2317
Bills: Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 3a.	2317
Bridgetown Lot 39A, returned	2357
State Children Act Amendment, Council's Message	2357
Loan Estimates	2317
Assent to Bills	2357

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

QUESTION—TRAFFIC FEES, DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Works: Has he any objection to copies of the statement showing the distribution of traffic fees being forwarded to the various local bodies concerned in the Claremont electorate?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (for the Minister for Works) replied: No, and instructions have been given for a return showing distribution of traffic fees to be forwarded to each local authority within the metropolitan area.

QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE, PROFIT.

Mr. MANN (for Mr. Richardson) asked the Premier: 1, Did the employer's liability insurance carried on by the State result in a profit as at 30th June, 1927, after allowing for the liability under the unexpired period of the policies? 2, If so, what was the profit?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, £1,418 0s. 9d. on general accident business, £19,934 3s. 7d., including general accident and industrial diseases, but all the profit on the latter has been placed to reserve.

QUESTION—SHEEP DISEASE, INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Agriculture: Owing to the serious loss to sheep owners in the State caused by the braxy-like disease, will the Government take immediate steps to appoint an assistant to Mr.