

is not playing the game, political or otherwise, to lead the people to believe that an oligarchic Government were acting against the interests of the people themselves. As a matter of fact, the best interests of the community generally will be served.

Mr. Thorn: Is that the attitude always adopted in Subiaco?

Mr. MOLONEY: Opposition members seem particularly anxious to assist me to place the affairs of Subiaco before Parliament. If they will assist me to persuade the Ministers concerned to agree to certain undertakings I desire, I shall welcome their help. Last year I mentioned the necessity for a bridge at Daglish. That may be regarded as parochial, but it is a matter of great importance to the people who live on the Daglish side of the Perth-Fremantle railway line. I want that bridge, and I will have it constructed before my term expires, if it is at all possible. There are one or two other matters regarding which I would welcome the assistance of Opposition members. The Governor's Speech, if lengthy, contained matter of great promise. It is a tale different from that which has been preached for some years past. It breathes with a certain amount of restraint the spirit of optimism, and it will engender hope in the minds of the people to know that even though there is still a long way to go and many things to do, we are attempting to bring about an improvement above that which has made itself slightly manifest in recent months. So I join with His Excellency in his expressed hope, and I sincerely trust that when the next session of this Parliament meets the things we hope for and desire will be capable of fulfillment. There is only one way in which the people of this State in common with those in other parts of the world will be able to solve existing difficulties and that will be when they receive the full benefit from the assets they hold and produce. I agree with the member for Claremont when he says that a new method of finance is required. I support the motion.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.18 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th August, 1934.

	PAGE
Motion: State Transport Co-ordination Act, to disallow regulation	64
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,200,000, Standing Order suspension, remaining stages	65

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

MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East)
{4.35}: I move—

That Regulation No. 48, made under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933, as published in the *Government Gazette* on 16th March, 1934, and laid on the Table of the House on 7th August, 1934, be and is hereby disallowed.

It is unfortunate that members are not in a position to amend regulations, and the only way by which they can overcome difficulties that arise is to move for the disallowance of them. When the Bill was before Parliament, I know many members held the opinion that if the board refused to renew a license, the truck owner would be entitled to appeal to a stipendiary magistrate. I do not think any member thought for one moment that, under the regulations that were to be drafted in connection with the Act, the appeal would be limited to the stipendiary magistrate at Perth. The Act provides that a truck owner, the renewal of whose license has been refused, shall have the right to appeal at any time during the ensuing three years. It would be hard luck for such a man if he were forced to appeal to the identical magistrate who had already refused him his license. The most important point to which I desire to draw attention is that under the present regulations, a man whose headquarters are in the country, and who desires to appeal against a decision of the Transport Board, is compelled not only to deposit £10 on account of the appeal, but he has to go to Perth to have the appeal heard, and to pay the expenses of witnesses

he has to call to substantiate his claim. That was not the intention of this House. If it were possible for me to amend the regulation, I would do so by striking out the limitation, thereby permitting appeals to be lodged with any stipendiary magistrate, and not confine the appeals to the magistrate in Perth.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,200,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew (Central) [4.40]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill to pass through its remaining stages at one sitting.

The object of the motion should be clearly understood. I explained yesterday the urgency of the matter. The Supply Bill must be passed as quickly as possible in view of the fact that the month of July and portion of the present month have already passed, and money has been, and is being, expended without the necessary statutory authority.

Question put and passed.

In Committee, etc.

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 1.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 9th August, 1934.

	PAGE
Question: Wheat, bulk, in transit	65
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	65
Address-in-Reply, fourth day	66
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,200,000, returned	71

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

QUESTION—WHEAT, BULK IN TRANSIT.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1. How many trucks of bulk wheat were condemned on the North Wharf, Fremantle, on Tuesday, 7th August, 1934? 2. How many trucks of bulk wheat have been condemned at the same place since the 1st January, 1934? 3. How many trucks of bulk wheat have been put into ships by night after having been previously condemned? 4. How many trucks of bulk wheat from Leighton—where wheat is supposed to be reconditioned—have been condemned? 5. How much wheat was shipped from this State to Japan last year? 6. How many shipments of bulk wheat have been shipped to Japan since January this year? 7. What percentage of wheat shipped from this State is sent with a certificated cargo? 8. Will he have strict supervision kept over wheat leaving this State so that our wheat trade with other countries will not be jeopardised?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, 13½ trucks. 2, 213 trucks. 3, There is no official record. 4, 11 trucks were rejected by merchants. 5, 2,368,821 bushels in bags. 6, None. 7, Last year 36.87 per cent. 8, The department can exercise supervision only when requested to do so by merchants and when the latter require a Government certificate as to the quality of the cargo.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have appointed the members for Bunbury (Mr. Withers), Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney), and Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) to be temporary Chairmen of Committees during the present session.