

Legislative Council,

Friday, 10th December, 1926.

	PAGE
Questions: Calyx Porcelain Co., Ltd. ...	2884
Railways, coal supplies ...	2884
Motion: Statutes consolidation ...	2884
Bills: Timber Industry Regulation, 3a. ...	2885
Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders	
Act Amendment, discharged ...	2885
University Colleges, 2a., Com., 3a. ...	2885
Loan, £4,370,000 ...	2901
Public Works Act Amendment, 2a. ...	2898
Appropriation, 2a. ...	2901
Constitution Act Amendment, 2a., defeated ...	2904
Metropolitan Market, Com., etc. ...	2908
Health Act Amendment, 2a. ...	2918
Papers: Worker's Home, J. E. Davis ...	2921

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

QUESTION—CALYX PORCELAIN CO.,

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have the works of the Calyx Porcelain Co., Ltd., been sold, as reported in the "West Australian" of 20th October, 1926, for £20,000? 2, Who were the principal people in the purchasing syndicate? 3, What was the capital cost of the works to the date of the purchase? 4, What amount was advanced to the company by the Government? 5, What was the profit or loss during the period the company were operating?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, Information not available. The offer to purchase was made to the liquidator of the company and not to the Government. 3, Works not sold. 4, £13,506 14s. 6d. 5, Information not available, as the works are under the control of the liquidator.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COAL SUPPLIES.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Do the Government hold sufficient stocks of Newcastle coal to ensure the running of railways throughout the wheat belt exclusively on that coal during the months of danger from fires caused by sparks? 2, If not, how do the Government intend to ensure supplies? 3, When the Railway Department decide to revert to the use of Collie coal in the areas liable to fire outbreaks, will the Government give timely warning by advertisement?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2, Sufficient Newcastle coal is available at depots in wheat areas for the working of all engines when and where it is deemed advisable. 3, Answered by No. 2.

MOTION—STATUTES CONSOLIDATION.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan)

[3.4]: I move—

That, in the best interests of the people, it is desirable that the statutes of this State be immediately consolidated.

I do not propose to labour this question because members have only to look at one of the indices to our statutes to see the number of Acts recorded on various subjects that in each case are numerous. It is all very well for us who have facilities to turn up the amendments and ascertain what the law on the subject is, but it is very difficult for the outside public to do so. For instance, if anyone wishes to look up a point under the Land Act he has to consult 18 or 19 different Acts. Even yesterday when we were discussing the Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, I was at a loss for a moment to ascertain the exact position. The Acts of this State have not been consolidated since 1895 when the late Mr. J. C. H. James undertook the task. That consolidation is to be found in the first three volumes of the statutes. Nowadays, the consolidation takes place from time to time. In Victoria the statutes were consolidated on one occasion by Mr. Justice Higinbotham, and in England Lord Halsbury's "Laws of England" are practically a consolidation of the various Acts. If our Acts were now consolidated, future consolidation would occur automatically in accordance with the Act passed a session or two ago, which provided that when an Act is reprinted it shall be reprinted with all its amendments incorporated. The cost of the work might be a little, seeing that there is so much back work to be done, but it should not take long, especially if the Government divided the Acts into groups and divided the groups amongst members of the legal profession. The consolidation of the groups having been completed, the whole could then be brought together. If we thus expunged all the obsolete matter and confined ourselves to current matter I should say that only about half of the printing would be necessary in future.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.7]: I have no objection to offer to the motion, in fact I am in sympathy with it. This morning I communicated with the Minister for Justice and asked him to supply me with any comments he desired to make on Mr. Lovekin's motion. This afternoon I received a minute as follows:—

It is of course desirable that the statutes of the State should be consolidated. It is not possible for the Parliamentary draftsman to undertake this work during the time the House is sitting, but it has been and will continue to be proceeded with during recess. When the consolidation of the more important and lengthy Acts have been completed, in pursuance of the above policy, the desirability of printing the whole of the consolidated statutes may be considered. I forward you herewith a copy of a minute from the Parliamentary draftsman prepared for me last year on this subject.

Members must realise that the list is not up-to-date; if there had been time it might have been brought up to date, but it will give some indication of what has been done:—

A compilation of the Land Act with its amendments to the 31st December, 1923, was prepared and published in 1924 in book form, with the regulations and the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act and Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act. If it is desired that the Land Acts as consolidated should be obtainable apart from that volume, it can be printed and issued as such. A consolidation of the Mining Acts is in print, and will be issued shortly. A consolidation of the Companies Acts is in print, but as there is a doubt as to the effect of one of the amending Acts, this consolidation must be submitted to Parliament. If the amendments of the Public Service Act desired by the Civil Service Association are introduced and passed, that Act with its amendments will necessarily be reprinted in a consolidated form and bound up as an appendix to the statutes of the year. The following consolidations have recently been made and will be found in the appendices to the statute-book for the years mentioned: Workers' Compensation, 1924; Pearlring, 1924; Land and Income Tax Assessment, 1924; Life Insurance, 1924; Friendly Societies, 1923; Lunacy, 1923; Dividend Duties, 1923; State Children, 1921-2; Justices, 1920; Lunacy, 1920; Health, 1919. Since then the work has been going on. I am only sorry that I cannot supply an additional list showing the advancement made during the present year.

Question put and passed.

[100]

BILL—TIMBER INDUSTRY REGULATION.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Order Discharged.

Order of the day read for the moving of the second reading.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [3.12]: I move—

That the order be discharged.

In doing so I ask leave of the House to give notice of motion for the next sitting, "That in the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Government at the earliest possible moment to bring in a Bill to amend the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, 1921-23."

Question put and passed; order discharged.

BILL—UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.13] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill that has been prepared and drafted by the Senate of the University. The Government introduced it in another place at the request of the University authorities, and it was not found necessary to make any alterations to the draft. The measure seeks to give power to any body of persons, corporate or not corporate, to obtain an area of land for the purpose of establishing a college under the provisions of the measure, and to empower the Senate to set aside for the purposes of such college part of the University land. The constitution of the college will provide that it shall always be governed by a council, and that within five years the trustees shall have available the sum of at least £15,000 for the purpose of erecting the necessary buildings and improving the land desired. When that work is completed the Senate may, with the consent of the Governor, set apart a portion of the University land not exceeding five acres in extent, for the purposes of the college. That land may be

granted in fee simple. The council of the college must comply with certain conditions that are set out in Clause 4, and must provide students with satisfactory supervision, tuition, and opportunities for study. Those conditions being complied with, the Senate will recommend the area in question to be granted in fee simple to the trustees of the college. The need for the Bill arose out of the Hackett bequest. A considerable sum of money has been made available to the Anglican Church, as the result of the will of the late Sir Winthrop Hackett. The church trustees are anxious to erect a college on the University grounds, and other religious bodies have a similar intention. In the Eastern States and elsewhere, these religious bodies have colleges attached to the universities. They are known as Wesley College, Trinity College, or as the Anglican or Roman Catholic Colleges. As funds are now available, the Anglican Church people are anxious to get on with the building straight away. There is ample space within the University grounds not only for the Anglican Church college, but for the colleges that may be erected by other religious denominations. This proposal merely follows along well-established lines in the Eastern States and other parts of the world. Experience extending over many generations has proved that residential colleges are of great value to university students. They are especially valuable to those who are obliged to board away from home. It is recognised that the ordinary boarding-house, no matter how well conducted, does not give opportunity to study owing to the many distractions inseparable from such an establishment; nor is it altogether desirable that the young men and young women should be living in lodgings without any oversight or advice from responsible persons. The absence of such safeguards and guidance would no doubt prove a source of anxiety to many parents. In a college, proper provision is made for study and assistance, and there is reasonable control and supervision. Apart from this, much of the value of university life consists of personal contact and discussion with others. By this means character is built up, and praiseworthy ambition is stimulated. Life in a solitary lodging is a poor substitute for corporate life in a college. What a student gains from rubbing shoulders with others and learning their points of view, is often as valuable to him as that which he gains

from lectures or from study. It may mean to him the difference between success and failure in life. In the older Australian universities, as I have already indicated, colleges are established, and it is generally recognised that they are amongst the most important features of the universities. It has always been taken for granted that they would be established in Western Australia in connection with our institution. The original plan of the Crawley site set apart certain areas of land for these religious bodies, and no good reason would appear to exist for a departure from that original intention. As I have already said, at least one church is now prepared to build. I understand that others have proposals in hand. No church or other corporate body is prepared, or should be expected, to spend large sums of money on buildings unless its title to the land is secure. Hence the necessity for this Bill. The University is protected by adequate safeguards against giving away its land except for University purposes. No land is to be set apart unless a large sum for building purposes is already in sight. The title will not be handed out until the applicants are ready to build. Unless satisfactory buildings are erected within five years, the grant is cancelled. The grant cannot be transferred, leased, or mortgaged. All plans and designs are subject to the approval of the Senate, and must be approved by the Senate, so that any buildings erected shall be in keeping with the dignity of the University. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.21]: I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, and congratulate the Government on having brought it forward. As the Chief Secretary has indicated, the urgent necessity for the Bill has arisen through the munificent bequest of the late Sir Winthrop Hackett. The Anglican Church now finds itself in possession of a sum which I suppose will be in the neighbourhood of £140,000. This was expressly left by the first Chancellor of the University to the Anglican Church for the building of an Anglican College in connection with the University, and a chapel attached thereto. When a body proposes to spend a sum of that magnitude, the greater part of which, I suppose, will be spent on the buildings, and another part set aside for maintenance, because every building must be maintained,

it is necessary for it to see that it has a title to the land on which it is going to build. Nobody would perhaps put up a building costing a large sum of money without a perfectly clear title. The University at present can only lease its land up to 25 years without the consent of Cabinet, and over that period up to 99 years with the consent of Cabinet. A period of 99 years is a very short one in the life of a university or a college. Any body that is going to erect a college requires a clear title to the land. From the earliest beginnings of the University it was contemplated that colleges of this kind should be erected. As the Chief Secretary has said, one of the first things the Senate did when it took possession of Crawley was to allocate a certain portion of the land there for college purposes. There is an area on the right-hand side of the road going to Fremantle, just beyond the bend as one gets to Matilda Bay, and further on than the present biology and geology building is, which it is thought would be suitable for the erection of colleges. There are also other areas of university land beside this, which at some future date, if required, can be devoted to the same purpose. I hope these colleges will not be confined to the various religious bodies. I have no doubt a start will be made by the religious bodies, because they are in a position to make a start. I hope as time goes on other societies will erect colleges, and that women's colleges will also be established. Perhaps in course of time, and the Senate are prepared for this, something less pretentious than a college, something in the nature of a hostel, will be built to cater for those students who may, perhaps, not be able to pay for the advantages they would get within a college of the kind indicated in the Bill. That is for the future. The fear has been expressed in certain quarters that a religious test may be applied for entry to these colleges. In other parts of the world, and the other States of Australia, as well as in the Old Country, there is power to impose a religious test, if required, or if deemed necessary; but I believe that is something which is never exercised. At my old college, Trinity, and other colleges at Cambridge, with the exception of one which was devoted entirely to students belonging to the Anglican Church who were in preparation for the Anglican ministry, I never heard of any religious test being imposed. Although it may be possible for the authorities, if they

require to do so, to impose a religious test, I feel sure that such will never require to be imposed. I sincerely hope it never will. Speaking as one who numbers amongst his friends many people of all shades of religious thought, I consider that the very best thing that could happen is that the barriers between the different communities should be broken down, and that an intimate knowledge, one with the other, should prevail. Nothing promotes sectarian animosity and prejudice more than the mist of ignorance of each other's beliefs. We all remember the old and wise precept "Know thyself": and I think we might well add another, "Know thy neighbour." Inside these colleges the students will undoubtedly have an opportunity of close intimacy, and, as the Chief Secretary has said, of rubbing shoulders, all to their mutual advantage. We who have had an opportunity of being educated in colleges where the residential system is in vogue, know that it is inside the colleges that the greatest university spirit prevails. There is a greater community of interest amongst those belonging to the college, and they are also more attached to the University as a whole than those who have not such an advantage. There are also other advantages in connection with the establishment of colleges. There is the healthy spirit of emulation which springs up between the different colleges, both with reference to their attainments in learning and with reference to their sport and to the other activities of the human mind. We know that colleges are undoubtedly of advantage to a university. At many of the old universities, which did not start with any idea of having a college community, there is now a very strong feeling springing up—I may mention Adelaide as one—where the need for colleges is being emphasised by some connected with that University. I trust that the Bill will go through without any alteration. It represents the considered views of the Senate of the University, who have acted in consultation and in agreement with the heads and governing bodies of the various communities that are likely at present to start colleges. There will be no confinement on the part of the Senate to colleges connected with religious bodies. We all hope that in the course of time other parts of the University lands may be applied for by sections of the community who wish to start colleges, either for women or for other sections of men. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.31]: I also have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill. Having lived in Melbourne in close proximity to the University colleges erected there, I have an intimate knowledge of everything that has taken place, from the building of the first college—Trinity—to the building of the last, which is in connection with the Roman Catholic denomination. The area reserved close to the Melbourne University for the erection of colleges was vacant during the whole of my boyhood days, and it remained vacant until the generosity of the late Sir William Clarke enabled Trinity College to be established.

Hon. A. Lovekin: When was that?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I cannot say exactly.

Hon. H. Stewart: About 50 years ago.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Not quite so long as that, I think.

Hon. H. Stewart: When I was there 30 years ago, Trinity College was old-established.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: In addition, a hostel has been founded for women. More lately that magnificent edifice known as Ormonde College was established, thanks to the benefactions of the late Sir Francis Ormonde. That is in connection with the Presbyterian Church. There is also Queen's College, representing the Methodist denomination. Each of these colleges is a magnificent building. Recently the Roman Catholic denomination have erected fine buildings on the area allotted to them. All these colleges take the form of an oval, and at the rear of all of them there is what is known as the University sports ground. Thus there is first of all what I may term the intercourse of study among the students, and then in a general way the intercourse on the sports ground. These things have done a great deal towards producing that fine feeling which exists among many prominent men in the public affairs of Australia to-day. One point which I have no doubt is borne in mind by the Senate is that sufficient area shall be allowed to each of the denominations. What to some of us might seem to-day a large college is likely to be inadequate to the requirements of even the near future. The important fact, as the Chief Secretary has remarked, is that all the students living in colleges are in close proximity to the University, or, as they themselves call it, "the shop." The very fine example which is now being set by the Anglican people in

erecting the first college is due to the generosity of the late Sir Winthrop Hackett. I feel sure that as other citizens realise how much they owe to Western Australia, other denominations will receive generous benefactions for the same purpose, though possibly not in single amounts sufficiently large to meet all the requirements of a college. I cordially support Dr. Saw's remarks, inasmuch as I feel that the college system ought not to be confined to the religious denominations, but should be extended to students in less fortunate circumstances than those whose parents are able to provide them with a university education. My desire is that the less fortunately circumstanced should also be given a chance to fit them for the great work that lies before this community.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [3.36]: I feel sure every member of this House will accord his hearty support to the Bill; it is a measure that every member should welcome sincerely. The admirable introduction of the Chief Secretary in presenting the Bill and the support accorded to it by Dr. Saw must commend the measure to hon. members. If any hon. member should have any hesitation, then, if he reflects on the words of the Chief Secretary and Dr. Saw, any view he may have had against the Bill must at once disappear. As has been explained, the measure is rendered necessary owing to the tenure on which the University lands are held. We realise that the University authorities are under a great disability by reason of the leasehold conditions under which they hold their lands. There is no gainsaying the fact that our educational institutions are able to progress only if the road is rendered as easy and not as difficult as possible. The Bill will achieve the removal of some of the obstacles in the way of aiding education and raising its standard in Western Australia. What is better than to provide for our young men fitting institutions wherein they can acquire the knowledge that is essential to enable them to fill the higher positions in life? The difficulties are becoming greater and greater as the years progress, because other nations are progressing on the highway of education. We ought not to be lacking in this respect, and I trust sincerely that ere long Western Australia will hold her place worthily amongst the other States of Australia as well as the nations of the world. The establishment of

colleges, which has been referred to by the Chief Secretary and Dr. Saw, is an essential adjunct to university life. Colleges create an atmosphere which is at once wholesome in itself and beneficial to such a great institution. Not only do they provide an atmosphere that prompts the desire for study, but they remove the risks that many young men and young women would be exposed to if they had to reside in places outside the University. In the colleges they will be under control, and will be provided with those safeguards that are desirable, and, what is even greater, the atmosphere of study that is necessary to aid young people in their progress.

HON. W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [3.39]: It seems certain that this Bill will pass unanimously. That being so, I shall not take up the time of the House at length. It appears to be absolutely necessary that corporate bodies wishing to expend large sums of money in building should have the title deeds of the land. There is, happily, a safeguard that proper provisions will be made by bodies wishing to engage in this work, because of the fact that a certain amount of money must be at their disposal for the erection of college buildings before titles are granted. The Chief Secretary said that this was a small Bill. I can hardly agree with that contention, in view of the remarks which the hon. gentleman made later. He went on to say, and quite rightly, that a college is of grave importance to students because of its high value to the community spirit. That being so, the citizens of to-morrow will, as the Chief Secretary says, have their minds moulded and their characters influenced by the establishment of colleges; and that is no small matter. Mention has been made by Dr. Saw of the great value of these institutions in the breaking down of that deplorable thing called sectarianism. In passing may I mention that at present I have a boy attending a college which has been erected and is controlled by a religious body. Were any casual observer to go to that institution to-morrow and try to judge of its denomination by the religion of the pupils attending it, he would not have any idea what body was controlling it. All kinds of religious beliefs are represented among the pupils. That fact in itself, I contend, tends in a greater measure than any other feature to break down what Dr. Saw referred to as

the sectarian spirit. I am sure that the passing of this Bill will have the effect of encouraging parents in country districts to send their children to Perth for advanced education, whereas they would not think of doing so but for the assurance that the child after pursuing his or her studies at the University, will be cared for in a college, religious or otherwise. Country parents would not allow their children to break the home associations were it not for the assurance that in these colleges there is a guiding hand always upon them as regards their conduct after school or lecture hours. Such care and watchfulness could not be secured if the children lived in an ordinary boarding house. Because of that feature I especially welcome this legislation on behalf of country parents, and I hope no objection will be offered to its passage.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [3.43]: Like other members I feel sure that this Bill will pass without any opposition. There is one point, however, to which I desire to call attention, because I do like to see in legislation, as well as in everything else, that which appears to me as perfectly equitable. Under this Bill any corporate body can apply to the Senate for a grant of land for the purpose of erecting a college, but there is a stipulation that that must be done within five years.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Within five years of what?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Five years from the date of the Governor's assent.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Not of the Governor's assent to this Bill.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Consent to the application.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: An area of land is set apart with the Governor's consent, and within five years the building must be completed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: May I ask Dr. Saw through you, Mr. President, whether such application must be made immediately or can be made at any time in the future?

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: At any time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That gets rid of the point I was going to make. It seemed to me, as I read the Bill, that one denomination only could take advantage of it, that denomination which has had the good fortune to receive a bequest, while other denominations would be debarred, after

five years, from coming in. The other denominations, we know, would not be in a position within five years to undertake the work, much as they would like to do so. For instance, the Roman Catholics, I believe, have on hand the renovation of their cathedral at a cost of between £60,000 and £70,000. The Methodists have in hand the building of a hall. Therefore neither of those two churches can afford to put up £15,000 in order to proceed with the erection of its college at the present time. As Dr. Saw assures me that applications for land can be made at any time, and as it is within five years of the time when those applications are made that the course outlined in the Bill must be completed, I can see no objection to the Bill. In those circumstances my point falls to the ground. There is one other matter to which I desire to draw attention. The Bill provides that the Senate may grant areas of five acres for the purposes of colleges. At least ten acres are required for playing ground purposes. There should be ample reserves made to allow for the physical exercise of the students, for it is important that they should benefit in body as well as in mind. Perhaps there could be an extensive general ground that might be used by the students attending all the colleges, but if each college is to have the area that I consider necessary for playground purposes, it means that each should have 15 acres instead of five acres. That is a matter, however, that we can trust the Senate to consider. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Rules:

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I am wondering whether the expenditure in connection with the University is wise. It is useless educating people beyond their opportunities. In this instance we are accepting a grave responsibility in what I regard as educating people to the stage I suggest. In the circumstances I do not know that we should pass the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon member may proceed with his remarks at the third reading stage.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.50]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [3.51]: I regret that we did not hear the whole of the remarks that seemed likely to come from Sir Edward Wittenoom.

The PRESIDENT: Order! No references can be made in the House to remarks made in another place.

Hon. H. STEWART: I was not referring to another place, but to remarks made by Sir Edward Wittenoom.

The PRESIDENT: Order! No references can be made in the House to remarks made in Committee. It was the Committee that I referred to as another place.

Hon. H. STEWART: I did not speak on the second reading because it seemed that the ground had been fully covered by a number of speakers. There was one phase that leads me to anticipate that perhaps some of the main benefits to be derived from University colleges are not realised by some hon. members. In dealing with such a Bill, we are not considering academic legislation or academic attainments. The establishment of colleges in connection with our University will, as time goes on, lead to a fuller development in the life of the students. One of the advantages of residential colleges is that the students attending them become conversant with phases of thought in professions other than their own.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What do they do for a living?

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Shear sheep!

Hon. H. STEWART: I understand that Oxford graduates have been known to sell goods over the counter. That, however, is no argument against students having the advantage of a fuller outlook on life.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Can they sell goods better over the counter after going to a University?

Hon. H. STEWART: I cannot answer such a question.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I don't think you can.

Hon. H. STEWART: The University of Western Australia is particularly lacking in the true University spirit. The undergraduates do not come together and gain the advantage that close contact with other students assures. The advantages at present are to a great extent educational only. There is absent the element of inter-college sport and community work from our University. Sooner or later, when the University colleges are established, that position will be rectified. At present the students attending the engineering school and the agricultural course, for instance, are not brought into contact with other sections of the University. In many instances those students are cadets in Government departments and cannot spend much of the time in the enjoyment of the fuller University life. With the establishment of residential colleges and an increase in the number of students, we will see the growth of a different spirit. Contact with fellow students in the common room, on the sports ground, and particularly at meal time, will widen views and broaden outlooks. In that social intercourse there will meet the engineers, the law students, those who are taking philosophy or natural science. Medical students will mix with those taking other subjects and there will be that interchange of thought and play of wit that is so essential, and tends so much to broaden the mind and extend the knowledge of those who will have the benefit of a period spent in the residential colleges.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: And who will do the work of the country?

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—LOAN, £4,370,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.57] : Opportunities present themselves to hon. members periodically to draw attention to the finances of the State. Such an opportunity occurs with the Loan Bill now before us. We can deal with these matters either on the Loan Bill or the Appropriation Bill.

As the Appropriation Bill is generally about the last to be passed, and as time is somewhat limited when we reach that stage, the present, I think, is the better opportunity to review the financial position. I am not going to apologise for my remarks this afternoon. I shall be as brief as possible. For several days we have been discussing matters of detail as to what is a dangerous tree and what is not a dangerous tree; whether fly-proof safes should be put in the kitchen or in the dining-room.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What about the lighting?

Hon. E. H. Gray: And those other matters we were discussing.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: While that was going on, we could have been better employed analysing the financial position of the State and drawing attention to how the money was being spent, whether well or otherwise. It may be too late to take a stand this session, but I respectfully suggest to hon. members that their clear duty in the early part of next session is to see how the money derived from revenue or borrowed by means of loans is being expended, and whether it is being spent judiciously or otherwise. The Bill before us proposes the raising of a further loan of £4,370,000. Appearing attached thereto is the schedule of the works it is proposed to carry out. I respectfully suggest that some of those works will not be gone on with for years. What the money will be used for will be to do work for which money has been borrowed already, but has been spent for some other purposes. I am not blaming any particular Government, but we know that six millions of loan money has been taken to pay revenue accounts. That six millions was borrowed for a specific purpose, but it has been taken from loan money to pay revenue accounts, and the works for which that money was borrowed have not been carried out. The money to be borrowed for the schedule of works attached to the Loan Bill will be used to carry out those earlier works. That system of finance has been going on for some time but, in my opinion, it can continue for only a little while longer. When we remember that during last year we collected in revenue £8,800,000 from 375,000 people and spent £8,900,000 in administering the affairs of the country; and that in addition we spent £5,000,000 of loan money, or £14,000,000 in all last year, we realise that for 375,000 people it is a pretty handsome

sum. In 1925 the net indebtedness of the State was £54,000,000—that is after allowing for sinking fund—but in 1926 the net indebtedness was £59,000,000 or an increase of £5,000,000 in one year. In 1925 we had 368,000 people, and in 1926 we had 375,000 people. So there was an increase of £5,000,000 in the net indebtedness and an increase of 7,000 in the population. And more than half that increase is due to the excess of births over deaths. One of the problems worrying me is what becomes of the people we bring in? They must come and go, or alternatively somebody else must be going. For with all our efforts the population increased only 7,000, and the greater part of that increase was represented by the excess of births over deaths. When we analyse those figures we find that, taking £54,000,000 and 368,000 people, the loan expenditure averaged £147 per head. But with the additional 7,000 people, the greater portion of whom were born here, and the increase of £5,000,000 in the indebtedness during the year it figures out at £714 per head. So, while 368,000 people cost £147 per head in loan money, the 7,000 people cost £714 per head. These are figures well worth remembering. When we come to the Auditor General's report and analyse it as to how this money is expended, we find we finished up with a nominal deficit of £100,000 when we really finished up with considerably more. I draw attention to page 5 of the Auditor General's report. There we find that the Fremantle Harbour Trust borrowed £18,000 for certain works on the understanding that £4,500 per annum was to be repaid until the amount was paid off. When the first £4,500 became due it was not used against the indebtedness of £18,000, but was taken into revenue. This is only a small matter, but all these small matters total up into a big thing. Again, on the same page, respecting the Wyndham Meat Works we find that the excess earnings—we know there has been a loss of half a million on the trading at Wyndham, and that that half million has been added to the capital account, with the result that the works appear as having cost their original cost plus the loss. Instead of taking the loss to profit and loss account they have added the loss to the capital account. However, this year the excess earnings over expenditure have been £19,000. But that was not set off against previous losses; it was taken into revenue. These

chickens are always coming home to roost. Mr. Miles, who talks in hundreds of millions, says I am always looking at the pessimistic side of things. I claim that I look at the commonsense side. The State or the Commonwealth or the Empire is only a combination of individuals, and what the private individual cannot do the State cannot do. Any private individual juggling the finances, sooner or later meets trouble. The only difference between the private individual and the State or the Empire is that the private individual can seek the protection of the bankruptcy court, whereas the State or the Empire cannot do so, but has to bankrupt its industries by taxation in order to liquidate the liabilities.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You do not suggest that Western Australia is doing that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There is a point worth noting. Surely when losses are added to capital account, and when profits are taken into general revenue—

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Do they contribute anything to sinking fund?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When I was chairman of the Royal Commission on the Wyndham Meat Works several years ago, a discussion was going on as to whether the depreciation was to be 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. There has never been any depreciation, because they have never been able to decide it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you think the Wyndham Meat Works will be closed?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They might just as well be closed for all the good they are, except for the work they find for the people whom Mr. Gray represents in this House and the additional convenience they may be this time; because under the new definition of the Electoral Act they may be used for the convenient purpose of allowing those people to be added to the Kimberley roll instead of being on the roll down here to which they rightly belong.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: It is said it costs £5 12s. to skin a beast up there.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Chief Secretary boasted of it. It was published in the Press. The Honorary Minister said it was wrong. The statement was that during a given period they had paid the men who handled the cattle a sum of money considerably more than the cattle owners got.

The Chief Secretary interjected.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know what the men get, and what the cattle owner gets.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But you exaggerate the position.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It would require exaggeration to make the people believe the hon. member was endowed with more than ordinary intelligence. Generally I do not mind interruption, and even when dealing with figures an interjection to the point is always acceptable; but these silly interjections emanating from the hon. member—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will ask the hon. member to proceed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will if Mr. Gray will let me; if not I will sit down and ask for your protection.

Hon. E. H. Gray interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member has asked to be allowed to proceed without interjections, and I think the House ought to extend to him that courtesy.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Now we come to some remarks by the Auditor General, as follows:—

In respect to certain works and services, as detailed below, the expenditure on which is met from the Loan Fund, interest on the net expenditure has been charged to the Loan Fund and credited to the Revenue Fund, purporting to recoup the latter for interest paid. In the first three cases the works have not become revenue-producing. The provision in the various Loan Acts relating to interest states that it shall be charged upon and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and assets of the Government of Western Australia.

Those items referred to represent a capital expenditure of £5,124,233, and the interest transferred to revenue during 1925-26 is £256,479. That interest has been credited to revenue and charged to the various works. But the Loan Act sets out that that shall not be done until the works referred to are revenue-producing. They are not revenue-producing. Here we get another £256,479, or the greater portion of it, charged to loan and credited to revenue. It is merely a book entry to swell loan on the one side and swell revenue on the other. On page 6 of his report, the Auditor General sets out the issues that carried no sinking fund contribution at the close of the year. Then he says—

The original Act provides that a sinking fund shall be accumulated to repay loans raised for deficiency purposes within a period of 30 years. The first issues were made in

July, 1917, and as the earlier issues carry no sinking fund, and where a fund is being set aside it is only at the rate of 10s. per cent. per annum, it is evident that the original intention of redemption from a sinking fund within 30 years will not be given effect to unless contributions are considerably augmented.

Hon. H. Seddon: The 10s. per cent. is too low.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes. It is bad enough when we borrow money for public works and dodge the sinking fund by borrowing on Treasury Bills, or any way we can get the money; because immediately it becomes inscribed stock we have to provide sinking fund. But when we borrow money to finance our deficits and then provide a special sinking fund for the purpose, the sinking fund should meet that loan when it falls due, because there is no asset to represent the amount. We seem to borrow money from anywhere and everywhere, and we sometimes make promises as to how we shall repay it and do not keep those promises. In July, 1925, the Commonwealth raised a loan in New York on behalf of the Commonwealth and the States of Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. At about that time there was an intimation from the Home Office that Australia was going a bit too fast in the matter of expenditure, and so an amount was borrowed in New York. Our quota was £1,541,000. The expenses in connection with that loan amounted to £53,285, so that even though we are getting it at a slightly lower rate of interest, the expenses make the loan most costly than if it had been borrowed within the Empire. The Auditor-General on page 10 of his report deals with Commonwealth advances, £215,050 as follows:—

This money was received from the Commonwealth in June, 1926. The file on the matter indicates that the amount is Western Australia's share of a loan of £1,700,000 at 5¼ per cent. issued by the Commonwealth for various States. The prospectus and cost of raising the loan have not yet been seen. The money was applied towards the repayment of a debenture for £550,000. It is proposed to issue a debenture to the Commonwealth to fall due in 1941.

The State Government will issue debentures for that amount of £215,050 and thus evade the responsibility of providing a sinking fund to meet the loan when it becomes due in 1941. With all these postponements, members will realise that sooner or later we shall be in difficulties unless we pay greater attention to

the finances of the State. It is argued that this House has nothing to do with finance. I have never subscribed to that doctrine. As a matter of fact we represent the people who have to foot the bill when the day of reckoning comes, as undoubtedly it will come. For that, if for no other reason, we should keep a watchful eye upon what is being done in the realm of finance. The Auditor-General proceeds to deal with deficiency bonds, £386,755, as follows:—

Bonds were issued during the year to the extent of £389,455, towards funding the deficit, and one bond for £2,700 was paid off, leaving an increase in the public debt as shown above.

There, again, we issued bonds to the amount of £389,455 and paid one bond of £2,700. I want members to realise that those are the Auditor-General's figures, not mine. On page 12 I find the following paragraph:—

Local inscribed stock totalling £1,922,305 matured on 1st January, 1926. The nominal value of the sinking funds held on 31st December, 1925, on account of this stock was £481,655 15s. 8d. The amount was not used, and it is proposed, in accordance with the provisions of the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act, 1910, to obtain the approval of the Governor to hold the funds on account of the loans issued for redemption purposes.

Hon. H. Seddon: I presume that part was converted.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. Inscribed stock totalling £1,922,000 fell due and £1,500,000 should have been added to the £481,000 to liquidate the liability. In other words, £1,922,305 should have been available to meet the liability, but it was not. Only £481,655 had been provided, or £1,500,000 short of the required total. The Government negotiated to renew the loan, and the £481,000 is to be set aside as a first quota to meet the new loan when it becomes due. It is just another instance of the postponing of a liability. Where we shall end with all these postponements is beyond my comprehension. The Auditor-General further observes—

Under Clause 6 of the migration agreement, dated 19th October, 1925, the State has agreed to pay the Commonwealth a sinking fund at the rate of 10s. per cent. annually on each £100 or portion of £100 of the money issued to the State. No charge has yet been made against the Revenue Fund on account of any portion of the £2,250,000 already received from the Commonwealth in regard to migration. If the clause is to be applied retrospectively, the accrued liability of the State will be considerable. The only information available upon the matter is a statement by the Under Treasurer on the file to the

effect that the Commonwealth Government are to be asked to forego the sinking fund charge.

Once more we are not living up to our obligations with the Commonwealth. Matters are drifting on. The sinking fund, if paid, would be a charge on the revenue, and the Auditor General points out that the sinking fund that should have been charged against the revenue each year is not being paid. If the Commonwealth demand the money, it will mean a tremendous charge on the revenue in one year. We do not want to find ourselves faced with a difficulty of that description. If that money is due under the agreement, it should be paid. We should not be told that the Commonwealth Government are to be approached to forego the charge. Dealing with trust funds I pointed out at the close of last session or early in the present session that the Auditor-General had directed attention to the fact that approximately three-quarters of a million pounds of trust funds had been taken to finance the State trading concerns. The Honorary Minister said that if any member, who had given less attention to the finances than I had, had made that statement he could forgive him, but as I had followed up the question of finance for years I could not be forgiven.

The Chief Secretary: How long has that been going on?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Trust funds have been drawn on to the extent, not of three quarters of a million but of £936,000, and the Auditor-General says that no provision has been made for those overdrawn accounts. Included in the £936,000 is an amount of £53,766 advanced to the State Implements and Engineering Works. Let me remind members that a sum of £100,000 was written off the capital of the Implement Works, an interest is paid only on the lesser amount.

The Chief Secretary: Do you know the nature of the fund?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is a trust fund and I know how it should be handled. There is a proper way to deal with State trading concerns. The Act limits not only the number of trading concerns but the amount of capital to be used in them. Owing to the way the country has been run, not only by the present Government but by most of the Governments of recent years, they, instead of approaching Parliament for an increase of amount to carry on the State trading concerns, have taken money from the trust fund, £53,766 on account of the State Implements and Engineering Works, £159,216 on account

of the State Sawmills, £447,082 on account of the State Shipping Service, and £238,569 on account of the Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Export Works. What is the use of Parliament limiting the number of State trading concerns and the amount of capital to be invested in them if the Government, by helping themselves to trust funds, can defeat the aim and object of Parliament? The Auditor-General remarks:—

As regards two of the trading concerns (State Implement and Engineering Works and State Sawmills) the reason for the overdraft is that sufficient capital has not been provided. In other cases, apart from any shortage of capital, the earnings have not been sufficient to meet working expenses, interest, etc.

There we have the statement of the Auditor General quoting the reason given to him for taking all these trust funds, approximately £900,000, for State trading concerns. The reason given by the Auditor General is that the capital is not sufficient. If that is so, the Government should come to Parliament for an increase in capital, and should not help themselves as has been done in this case. We get the balance sheets of these trading concerns only once a year, and I do not know that they are all here yet. I find from the quarterly Statistical Abstract that during the first nine months of the year the debits on account of State trading concerns amounted to £2,300,000, and the credits to approximately £2,000,000, so that during the nine months of the year there is a deficit on account of these trading concerns of £300,000.

The Chief Secretary: Is that the correct method of debiting?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Instead of the House and the country being given debits and credits we should be given profit and loss accounts, but in the absence of these documents we can only deal with the figures at our disposal.

Hon. G. W. Miles: When you come back next time you should start out on business lines.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Government were not satisfied with State trading concerns. There have been a few other outside ventures to which I should like to draw attention. They pay more at Wyndham for the handling of the cattle than they pay to the grower who has to nurse them for four years, and yet I find there was a venture with some Wyndham meat. The Government thought they would

bring some down to the metropolitan market. The meat cost £7,100, and the sales realised £6,100, so that there was a loss of £1,000 on that little venture.

Hon. H. Seddon: What about the meat from the Eastern States?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: On page 14 of the report mention is made of the Kalgoorlie Mechanics' Institute. I would draw Mr. Seddon's attention to that, hoping he can afford some explanation of the item. It is too confusing for me. The Government have also been mixed up in the butter factory at Northam. After losing £4,500 upon the venture, it was handed over to the Westralian Farmers Ltd. That organisation must have seen an opportunity to make a profit, where the Government were making a loss, otherwise they would not have taken it over. We now come to the experiment in vine cuttings. I am pointing out how all this money has been frittered away. There was a loss of £562 on vine cuttings at Spearwood. Mr. Gray ought to know about that.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Where is that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I said I did not mind pertinent remarks, but I do object to silly interjections. The Auditor General says that practically the whole amount represents a loss. The cuttings were planted on private property and when the tenancy ceased the cuttings that remained were abandoned, as being of no value. The next item deals with 328 sheep that were purchased in 1925 to eat out the Kennedyia creeper on the groups. The sheep were sold in August, 1925, and the sum of £314 represents the loss. Kennedyia grass is good cattle feed but it is a nuisance to group settlers. Some brilliant mind conceived the idea of purchasing these sheep. They were left there for about six months, and were sold at a loss of £314. There was another venture connected with the making of purchases for group settlers, which resulted in a loss of £200. A number of cows were purchased for group settlers. The total stock acquired in New South Wales represented 1,781 head, but only about 1,600 reached here. Apparently 90 cows were sold, for I suppose it was found they were not suitable, but that should have been discovered beforehand. Deaths accounted for 27, and one cow was left behind. Three properties were leased in New South Wales as holding grounds. At one of these there was a shortage of 18 cows. The value of

six animals was recovered by the State and the remaining 12 were stated to be a reasonable allowance for mortality. On page 25 the Auditor General deals with abandoned properties, carrying a liability to the Agricultural Bank. He says—

Returns prepared by the bank showed the following in regard to abandoned properties:—375 properties came into the bank's possession during the year, carrying bank debts of £349,474; 414 properties were sold and 12 partly sold, and £59,357 was written off.

There is worse to come. The Auditor General says—

726 properties were on hand at the close of the year carrying bank debts of £450,348; five properties carrying bank debts of £268 were taken over by group settlements.

We thus have 726 abandoned properties in the hands of the Agricultural Bank at the end of the year carrying a liability of £450,348. These properties are unoccupied. We are setting up a number of new farms in the South-West, expending more money, and bringing people out to make a success of them. Everyone knows that in group settlement a man must know his job, or he will fail. The man who knows his job well will succeed on inferior land, but the man who does not know it will fail on the best of land. Up to the 30th June last there was invested in group settlements capital to the amount of 3½ million pounds, and according to the Loan Bill another 1½ million pounds will be spent this year on the scheme. We shall thus have five millions of money invested in group settlement. There is very little production from it. If we are going on spending money like this, and endeavouring to spoon-feed people into prosperity, when they do not know their job, we are looking for trouble. The Auditor General says that £108,000, representing interest, is charged to group settlements, and taken to the credit of revenue account. It has not been allocated to the respective settlements or individuals. If it had been allocated to the respective individuals the Government would have been entitled to credit revenue with the amount. If it is going to be put into the pool and added to the loan account there is no justification for debits and credits of that description. Now we come to the Mines Department. There was a debit on mining development of £51,000. This was charged against the loan vote and paid to the credit of revenue account. The

loan vote was debited with the loss and revenue was credited. The loan has to be paid, and how can the Government get a credit for £51,000 if they are not entitled to it? The Auditor General says the amount was charged against the vote and paid to the revenue fund to compensate for the loss in revenue in regard to water supplied to mines. I now come to page 29, where I see the item "Allowance to a representative of the Australian Workers' Union £34 10s. 11d." I wonder what would have been said if some other Government had given such an allowance to members of the consultative council, or to some primary producer.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is a political body.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Are any particulars given?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No. The Auditor General simply says that the amount has been expended. Now I come to page 33, where it is shown the State had nearly £80,000 worth of horses according to book value at the 30th June, 1926. On that subject the Auditor General writes—

Stock was taken of the horses in the stables at 30th June, 1926, but the list could not be produced for inspection. A later stocktaking, dated 1st September, 1926, was, however, made available, and upon comparing this with the movement sheets it was found that 98 horses marked to the stables on dates from May, 1924, were not there. In addition 31 horses marked out to various works were shown to be missing, and for these hire charges had not been raised for periods from January, 1925—18 recorded as sent for agistment were also not located. In all, therefore, on 21st September, 1926, there were 147 animals not accounted for, with a book valuation (last recorded chiefly in 1924 and 1925) of approximately £5,900.

Surely this should be somebody's business. Apparently it is, because the Auditor General also reports—

On branding a newly purchased horse received into the stables on 25th August, 1926, it was discovered to be identical with "Horse 1093," the last recorded movement of which was to the stables on 11th December, 1925.

Not satisfied with getting away with 147 horses, they brought one along and sold him back. It is no laughing matter. The State is supposed to have £80,000 in horses, and on analysis this is what we find. Now I wish to draw attention to Appendix 5 of the Auditor General, headed "Amounts written off which have come under notice since publication of previous return." The total of these amounts written off is some

£228,000. It appears that £3,185 has been written off an advance to the Kalgoorlie Mechanics' Institute, and £4,273 off "freights, fares, electricity supply accounts, etc." I do not know what that item can refer to, unless it be the experts who have been trying to work out the Collie power scheme. Other amounts written off are "Advances through Council of Industrial Development (assistance to industries) £12,683," "maintenance, monetary, assistance, and rail fares £1,559," "Health, unrecoverable rail fares 1924-25 £796," "Agricultural Bank, ordinary clients, advances and interest £29,686," "Agricultural Bank, soldier settlers, advances and interests £61,299," "Industries Assistance Board, advances and interest £85,064." It is simply stated that these amounts are written off. Then I find that two trucks of chaff sent in 1923 to the Peel Estate and not traced have been written off, the amount being £51 0s. 6d. Apparently they are not satisfied with taking the horses, but also take two trucks of chaff to feed them. Another amount written off is "Sundry loans to settlers £672." The total, I repeat, is some £228,000. It is my duty to draw the attention of hon. members to these things. One cannot do more. In the first stages of group settlement I practically insisted upon inquiry in the form of a Royal Commission—a Royal Commission without pay. The Commission put up a report which predicted what was going to happen, but no notice was taken of it. I cannot help that. At the end of this financial year, according to the figures before us, we shall have at least £5,000,000 in group settlements. If a man puts £5,000,000, or £1,000,000, or £500 into a concern, he wants to see something come out of it. Every housewife in the metropolitan area knows that fruit, vegetables and so forth are dearer and scarcer now than they have been for years.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You do not blame group settlement for that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, but I say it is time the group settlers came to light with some evidence of production.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Give them time. You have been here for 40 years, and you want the group settlers to do as much in five years.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When we put millions into a concern, we want to see something come out of it.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Many millions were put into Western Australia previously.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Some of them were not wisely expended, but we have never before put 3½ millions into such a bad proposition as group settlement; and nobody knows that better than the hon. member interjecting.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You know better.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In the South-West there is no question about the land or the rainfall, which are the two essentials. There is, however, this difficulty, that the men sent there do not know their job. As we all know, the man who knows his job will succeed on inferior land, whereas the man who does not know his job will fail on the best land. I sound this note of warning, that if we are not very careful our loss on group settlement will be not tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of pounds, but may run into one, two or three millions. A sum of £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 may have to be written off if we go on with the present expenditure upon group settlement. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. Mr. Angwin has been battling with the concern in a manner that does credit to him. I know the officers are battling with it. There is nothing more disheartening, nothing that will more quickly put a man out of action, than battling with a proposition in which a huge sum of money is involved and he cannot see his way out. If from no other aspect, Mr. Angwin's trip to London will be beneficial from a health point of view. If he battles with group settlement much longer, the possibilities are that he will find it too much for him. I sound this note of warning. It is time we called a halt on group settlement and ceased putting in millions of money without first having some idea as to what we are going to get out of the concern. Up to date we have got very little out.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [4.54]: I rise to request the Chief Secretary to give me some information concerning an item appearing in the First Schedule—"Dwarda Eastward Railway, £23,000." I would like to know the nature of the proposed expenditure in that connection.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.55]: This measure is intended to effect material alteration of the law regulating compensation for lands resumed under the provisions of the Public Works Act. It is proposed by this Bill to amend Section 63 of the principal Act. That section has, I think, stood the test of many years. It is not as liberal as corresponding sections in the corresponding Acts of other countries. At the same time an effort has been made to accord a certain amount of compensation where property has been resumed under our Public Works Act. The Bill proposes that in place of compensation being payable as at the date on which the land is resumed or taken, the valuation of the land shall be determined by its value on the 1st January last preceding the notice in the "Gazette," or in the case of land acquired for a railway or other work authorised by a special Act, on the 1st January last preceding the first day of the session of Parliament in which the Act was introduced. It may be contended—indeed, I think it was urged by the Chief Secretary when introducing the Bill—that the Government are seeking to bring our law into line with the Federal Act; but I ask hon. members to reflect whether or not that is a good reason why we should amend our Act. I advance this argument, that if we amend the law to the extent proposed, grave injustice may be done to many people. The Chief Secretary has explained that it is necessary to maintain absolute secrecy regarding purchase of lands. When the Government determine upon resuming certain properties, the information somehow or other leaks out.

Hon. J. Ewing: A very sad thing, too.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is a very sad admission to make.

Hon. J. Ewing: It does not apply to only one department.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am sorry to think there should be even the possibility of leakage of information, because officers into whose hands such information comes should regard it as absolutely sacred. In order to guard against the chance of leakage of information, we are asked to impose obvious

hardship and injustice on persons whose lands may be resumed. I will give an instance. We know that in this State we are passing through a certain phase that is common to all new countries. There is a rapid movement that has lasted for some time past in the direction of increased land values. From newspaper reports and other sources of information we learn that land in the central part of the city and in some towns that was sold some time ago for certain amounts has been sold at enhanced prices. The changes in values have been recorded with a rapidity that has been hardly credible. Values have altered and mounted up to an extraordinary degree and properties that were sold a few months before have changed hands at figures largely in excess of an earlier purchase price. The first subclause of Clause 2 of the Bill deals with the value that is to be attached to land to be resumed in a way that is unjust. It provides that the value to be placed on the land is to be fixed as from the 1st January preceding the date of the resumption. Let us assume that the Bill will be passed. In December, 1927, some land may be resumed by the Government in the central part of the city. The value of that land will be determined as at the previous January. I will again remind hon. members of the repeated instances we have heard during the last 12 months of the values of properties advancing enormously.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: They are advancing month by month.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is so.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Some have doubled their value.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There have been repeated instances of properties changing hands and being sold at advanced prices on each occasion. Notwithstanding that the latest buyer may have purchased the property in December at the enhanced value, the effect of this legislation will be that the value at which the Government will be able to acquire, and will insist upon resuming that property will be that obtaining in the previous January. That, too, notwithstanding that the land has changed hands two or three times in the interim at enhanced prices. It will be seen that the latest purchaser may suffer the loss of many thousands of pounds in connection with any valuable purchase he may have made.

Hon. V. Hamersley: If we pass the Bill the Government will not be able to allow anything on account of that increased value.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Quite so. The Government could not possibly do so, because they will be bound by this legislation and the land will be valued as at the previous January. In certain well established and stable communities, where changes are not experienced with that rapidity we see in this State, there might be some reason in suggesting a provision such as that included in the Bill. At any rate there would not be the same argument that can be advanced in this instance. Are we as a Chamber intended to mete out justice or to provide for injustice? If we pass the Bill I maintain that instead of legislating in the interests of justice, we will undoubtedly be acting in a contrary direction.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How could you counteract the leakages that have gone on?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I admit that question is one of great importance. I deplore the fact that those leakages have occurred. I am sure that honest and worthy members of the Government service through whose hands information regarding properties may pass, deplore the fact as much as we do. We will readily admit that there are honest civil servants.

Hon. J. Ewing: Are they all honest?

Hon. V. Hamersley: No.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is evident owing to the fact that there are leakages, and it is essential to introduce some methods whereby those leakages will be stopped.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But is this the way to do it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is the question! Should we endeavour to stop those leakages in this way, or should they be controlled by other means? I would pass a law that would make disclosure of any information on the part of any employee of the Government punishable in such a drastic way that it would probably help to stay the leakages. I would far rather do that, than help to place on the statute-book a measure that will result in grave injustice.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would it not be very difficult to prove a charge regarding leakages from a Government office?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would be necessary to devise proper means of doing so and to sift the problem from every possible standpoint. I have no doubt that the

Minister, in collaboration with departmental officers who are desirous of seeing that these matters shall be held sacred, would be able to draft legislation and adopt methods calculated to stop those leakages. That, I consider, would be the proper method of dealing with the difficulty.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What about making you Crown Solicitor?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not think that is a pertinent interjection. I do not ask for the position nor have I ever sought it!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the hon. member proceed with his speech?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the proviso that is included in the clause. That, too, may result in injustice because it is to the effect that if any buildings are erected on, or improvements made in respect of the land between the 1st January and the date of the gazettal of the notice of resumption, then only the actual cost of the buildings or improvements will be paid by way of compensation. We know that there are frequent changes in the market value of materials and in the cost of buildings. At the present time those costs are inclined to be increased rather than decreased.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The State Sawmills increased their prices last week.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The same applies to all building materials, practically without exception. It is seldom that we hear of any decrease in the price of materials necessary for building operations. As some one may be unfortunate enough to acquire a property in December, the purchase price, no doubt, being fixed on the basis of the increased value of the building quite apart from the question of the land at all, that individual, should his property be resumed by the Government, would stand to lose a large sum indeed. Can anything be suggested to support such a proviso? It would be wiser for the Government to use every effort to stop these leakages and to liberalise, instead of restricting as they are doing, the conditions governing compensation payable in connection with resumptions. Under the existing Act compensation conditions are materially restricted in comparison with those operating in other countries. That being so, I cannot see my way clear to support the second reading of the Bill. I hope the Chief Secretary, in conjunction with his colleagues,

will consider the wisdom of adopting some other methods that will correct and obviate the leakages concerning which he so justly complained.

HON. J. E. DODD (South) [5.12]: While I shall support the second reading of the Bill I shall do so with a good deal of hesitancy. I agree with much that Mr. Nicholson has said. I support the Bill because I know from experience that Governments have had to pay much higher sums than they should have done for land that has been resumed. I know, too, that information has leaked out concerning the projected purchases. Leakages occur that should not occur, and it is very difficult for any Government to stop them.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: They will never be stopped.

Hon. J. E. DODD: Having regard to the large number of public works about to be undertaken, I shall support the Bill although, as I have indicated, with great hesitancy indeed. The Bill proposes that land shall be taken at its value in the January preceding the date of the notice in the "Government Gazette" respecting the land to be resumed by the Government. Let us suppose that the Government resumed some land in December. During the preceding 11 months that land may have increased in value to a very considerable extent. Land is increasing in value as Mr. Nicholson has already pointed out. That increase may be accounted for by several reasons. There may be some economic factor causing an increase in the value of land. There may be some Government activity or some municipal enterprise that brings it about, and there may be some discovery to greatly enhance the value of the land. Yet the owner of the land to be resumed for public purposes is not to receive any benefit because of those natural increases, which should come to him. I remember when Mr. Boan, then a member of this House, was speaking on the question of land values taxation. I have been very keen on that subject for a great many years. Mr. Boan said that when first he started business in Perth he thought he had all the land he required for his premises, but that he afterwards found there was a little bit he wanted that was not included in the land he had bought. He offered £200 for that small piece of land, but the owners would not sell it, and eventually he had to pay

£6,000 for it. The increased value of that land was brought about by the goldfields boom, by the population that was coming here and passing on to the goldfields, and of course Mr. Boan had to pay. But had it been the Government, instead of Mr. Boan, the Government might have got that land for £2,000 or £3,000 when it was worth £5,000 or £6,000. While I believe the State has a right to the community value of land, until we get some law making the valuations uniform, we may be doing some injustice by such a Bill as this. However the position, as explained by the Chief Secretary, appeals to me; because I have had experience and I know the Government have been bled time after time because of leakages that have occurred as to land that was likely to be wanted for public purposes. I am sorry the Government could not bring forward some other scheme that would be more just in the acquiring of land than what is proposed in the Bill. If only we could get a really good valuation of land Act, with proper classification, it would do much to obviate the difficulties with which the Government are confronted. I will support the second reading.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.17]: I regard the Bill as one of those unjust measures that we are here to look out for. I cannot help considering the Bill from the point of view of the person who owns a block of land that may be resumed by the Government, and who has spent a large sum of money in having plans and schemes drawn up for the utilisation of that land. The owner may have held that land for a number of years, not having been in a position when he acquired it to carry out his proposed scheme. In the meantime he has paid for expert advice and has devoted weeks and months of his own time upon his plans regarding the land. It may be land in the city or in the country, but he has devoted years of attention to it and has brought his knowledge to bear and has paid for the knowledge of others in his efforts to do the best possible with that land. Then all his plans are scrapped because the land is suddenly taken from him on a valuation made as in the previous January. As Mr. Nicholson has pointed out, since the preceding January the land might have appreciated very greatly in value. Clearly, then, it is unjust for the Government to

resume that land at its earlier valuation. Then I look at the Bill from another angle. What would happen if the value of the land had receded, as it sometimes will? Under the Bill, would the Government give the owner the valuation as in the preceding January, when perhaps the land was worth twice as much as on the day of resumption? Would they give the higher price? No. Of course they would wait until the following January and then resume it. I cannot see anything wrong in the existing Act. The method there prescribed is a fair one. The only value for the Government to pay for land resumed is the value, determined after due inquiry, at the time the land is taken. I cannot agree that we should go back on a system that has been accepted for so many years past, nor can I agree that the suggested departure from that system is a fair one. I hope the House will not pass the second reading.

HON. H. A. STEPHENSON (Metropolitan) [5.23]: I regret I cannot support the second reading. I realise the difficulties with which on many occasions the Government are faced, and I appreciate what these leakages mentioned by the Chief Secretary cost the country. It is a deplorable state of affairs, but I know that such leakages do occur in respect not only of land but of many other things. I could name a good many that, no doubt, would surprise members. Whilst I sympathise with the Government, I do not think the Bill is the correct remedy. In many instances it would inflict grave injustice on the owners of land. In a young, thriving, prosperous country like Western Australia land values are increasing from week to week, especially in the city and the suburbs. There is in Howard-street a small piece of land that, during the last six months, has been sold four times, each of the sales being a genuine one. That is only one instance out of many. If, under the Bill, that land had been resumed by the Government a very grave injustice would have been done to somebody. I cannot see my way clear to supporting a measure that would impose injustice. I agree with Mr. Nicholson that there ought to be some other means by which the Government could be protected. It will be difficult to stop these leakages, for it is almost impossible to secure convictions. Still, the Bill before us does not meet the case, and so I cannot support the second reading.

On motion by Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.27] in moving the second reading said: I very much regret to state that in the presentation of the Revenue Estimates in another place an unfortunate error occurred. A recommendation was made to the Government for an increase in salaries of officers of the Legislative Assembly, but through an oversight the officers of the Legislative Council were passed by. This, as members know, is contrary to the provisions of the Constitution Act, which prescribes that the salaries of officers of both Houses shall be uniform. I got into communication with the Premier about the matter yesterday. He also expressed regret at the oversight, and stated that the officers of the Council will automatically receive the same increases as those granted to the officers of the Assembly. Coming to the Bill, I am pleased to be able to say the position disclosed by the Revenue Estimates appears to be satisfactory, especially after such a long period of deficits. It is expected that this year will show a small surplus, the first for 16 years. Last year proved scarcely as satisfactory as was hoped when the Budget was presented. That was due, however, to the season not turning out as well as was expected. It had a prejudicial effect in many ways, but more particularly in the Railways. The receipts from the Railways were £182,860 below the estimate for the year, and £16,818 below the receipts for the previous year. The net financial result, after allowing for interest and sinking fund, was a loss of £188,797, as compared with a profit of £5,789 in 1924-25. Another circumstance that appeared to affect the finances was the British seamen's strike. Revenue on the whole was buoyant, showing increases under many heads. This is the more satisfactory as they were not the result in any way of increased taxation or charges. On the other hand, taxation has been reduced. The super-tax of 15 per cent on income taxation and land taxation, which existed for some years, was reduced in the previous year by 7½ per cent., and last year was completely wiped off. The Commissioner of Taxation estimates that the reduction resulted in a saving to the taxpayers in the two years of £80,000. It is true that the tax on unimproved

land values was increased in the previous year, but the increase was compensated for by the reduction of railway freights. This all-round increase of revenue in the circumstances was very satisfactory for it indicates the growing prosperity of the State. In fact, never in the history of the State has there been such a feeling of optimism and confidence as exists at present. Increasing land values in both country and city and the amount of money available for investment in that direction supply proof of the statement. Revenue on the whole, however, was over-estimated by £24,565, the general increases not being sufficient to counteract the decrease of £182,860 in the railways. Expenditure was also over-estimated, the result being £23,501 less than was provided for. Great care was taken throughout the year to keep the expenditure below the estimate. Although there were small excesses in many directions the result of the whole proves that those efforts were successful. As compared with the previous year, there is a considerable increase, which is only to be expected as the State grows. The principal increase was under the head of interest and sinking fund—£201,665, and then came railways—£157,952. Interest is a continuously increasing item, due principally to much money being borrowed for advances to settlers and for land development. Recoup of interest on this expenditure has the effect of swelling the revenue returns also. This year's Budget follows the lines of that of last year so far as general revenue and expenditure are concerned. The inclusion of the two years' grants by the Commonwealth to the State, following on the Disabilities Commission, although not affecting the estimated results for the year, gives this Budget a large degree of importance. The grant for last year was £450,000, less the amount of the special payment to the State in that year, £96,888, so that the net grant to the State last year was £353,112. The grant for this year is £300,000, less the amount due under the special payment, £212,812. There was a further grant of £150,000 but that was contingent on the transfer of the north-west portion of the State to the Commonwealth. The two grants totalled £565,924. Careful consideration was given by the Government to the question of the expenditure of that money, in order that the State should derive the greatest benefit possible. Finally it was decided that the state of the mining industry warranted some special assistance, and £165,924 out of last year's grant was set

aside for that purpose. It has not been definitely decided what lines the assistance will follow, but the money will probably be devoted principally towards reorganisation of the plant and methods generally of the mines at the Boulder. The balance of last year's grant was devoted towards wiping out the unfunded deficits for the previous two years. It was considered unreasonable to borrow money to fund those deficits and to spend the balance of the Commonwealth grant in other directions. It would have been impossible to apply the grant to a reduction of charges, because the grant was for one year only and the charges would have had to be reinstated in the following year. It was impossible, therefore, to use the money for the purpose of reducing taxation. The grant for this year, however, was on a different footing. Provided the Bill is passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, the grant is to be continued for a period of five years. Therefore it was possible to utilise it for the reduction of charges or taxation. It has long been recognised that our high rate of taxation has had a very serious effect on our development, through hampering the investment of capital here, while investors were transferring their money to other States where taxation was lighter. Our high rates of taxation had been forced upon a previous Government by the necessity for squaring the finances, and when the opportunity came to give a substantial measure of relief, the Government decided to take advantage of it. A reduction of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent in the rate of income tax was made. This brings the State's maximum rate of tax more nearly on a level with the rates of the Eastern States. The maximum rate of tax when the present Government took office was 4s. 7d. in the pound. The abolition of the super-tax of 15 per cent. reduced that amount to 4s., and the further reduction of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. brings it down to 2s. 8d. That is still above the maximum rate in Victoria and New South Wales, but it is below the maximum of Tasmania, South Australia, and Queensland, though I understand the rate in Tasmania is being reduced. I think there can be no two opinions about the methods adopted to deal with this grant, and there has been very little adverse criticism of them. It will be seen that the two grants received from the Commonwealth are not responsible in any way for the anticipated surplus this year. The whole of the special grant has

been devoted to special purposes, and none of it has been placed to general revenue account. It is estimated that the revenue will again show satisfactory increases for the year, apart of course from income tax, which will fall as a result of the rebate of $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. A large number of heads of revenue show increases and there are a few decreases. The principal increase is railways, based on the expectation of a greatly increased harvest. To date the reports from the wheat areas have been most satisfactory, and there seems every probability of the expectation being realised. Departmental collections also show an increase, which is largely the result of the heavy advances made in the past for land development. The metropolitan water supply, partly as a result of a higher rate, and partly on account of increased consumption, is expected to return £40,000 more than last year. The electricity supply is expected to return £21,000 more. That concern shows continuous expansion, and at present the plant is being increased to cope with the growing demands. Expenditure shows a total increase over last year of £873,343, of which £365,924 is the result of appropriating portion of the disabilities grant. The net expenditure increase is therefore £507,419. Special Acts account for £220,859 of that amount, ordinary governmental for £46,271, and public utilities for £240,289. It will be seen that the increase under ordinary governmental is negligible, whilst the increases under the other two heads are beyond our control. While we borrow money for the purpose of development we are bound to face an increased interest bill. As the demands on the public utilities grow, so the expenses must grow, and we cannot do more than see that all possible economy is practised. A reclassification has been granted to the public service, more money has had to be provided for the Education Department, the Mines Department expenditure is greater than that of last year owing to the increased payments under the Miners' Phthisis Act, and both the Agricultural Department and the College of Agriculture show increases. A reclassification of the teachers has just been completed and accepted by the Government, the cost of which will be £42,000 a year. This expenditure was not known when the Estimates were being prepared and, therefore, could not be provided for. Loan expenditure last year

amounted to £4,078,686, of which 50 per cent. was for development of agriculture. In addition to the direct expenditure for that purpose, the bulk of the balance of the expenditure was indirectly for the assistance and development of agriculture also, such as the provision of roads, railways, water supplies, etc. In the metropolitan area a fairly large sum was spent on water supply and on the installation of the sewerage system at Subiaco. The extension of the plant at the electric power house, already approved of, was proceeded with and a small sum was expended on the tramway system. As already stated, however, nearly all the expenditure was for the development of the country areas, and the provision of harbours, etc. The expenditure under the various heads was—

	£
Railways, tramways, etc.	769,774
Harbours	219,303
Water supplies and sewerage	678,461
Mining development	84,079
Development of agriculture	2,033,920
Miscellaneous	293,149
Total	£4,078,686

The amount asked for on loan account this year is £4,832,347, as compared with the amount of £4,748,775 provided last year and £4,078,686 spent. That is a large sum, but consideration of the Estimates will prove that all the works provided for are justified, and that many of them are overdue. Again, development of agriculture claims the bulk of the money asked for, the direct provision exceeding £2,000,000. Railways, including rolling stock, require over £1,000,000, and harbours £233,280. Provision has been made for several lines of railway that have been under consideration for some years past, and for the completion of others already in hand. The construction of those lines cannot longer be delayed as settlement and production are proceeding so fast that transport facilities must be provided. Rolling stock is rapidly becoming insufficient to cope with the increase of traffic, and both locomotives and trucks must be augmented as rapidly as circumstances permit. Approval was given last year to a programme of works considered sufficient to meet the requirements in this direction, but the coal strike in England delayed delivery of the material ordered and held up the work. As soon as the material comes to hand the work

will be rapidly pushed on, and everything will be done to relieve the position. If next year turns out favourably an increased area will be put under crop, and that will render the rolling stock problem a very acute one indeed. We are bound to provide transport facilities for the suburban population so long as we continue to control this undertaking, and the growth of the suburbs has been so great that the present system cannot cope with the traffic at peak periods. I should like to refer to a subject of great public interest, which must come up for consideration very shortly. I allude to the new road and railway bridges at Fremantle. Members will notice that a sum of £5,000 appears for this work. This is for preliminary work only, such as the preparation of plans, estimates, etc. The Engineer-in-Chief has been going into the question thoroughly, and will shortly be in a position to present his report and recommendation to the Government. When that has been done the matter will receive very serious consideration. It is most important that the best site should be chosen, one that will allow the harbour to expand as the shipping grows, as we know it must grow in the future. When the site has been finally chosen a large sum of money must be provided to erect the bridge and reorganise the railway and road traffic. In all probability that expenditure will be spread over several years. It will, therefore, be seen that only the preliminary work can be carried out this year. During the last financial year £4,451,148 was raised overseas as under: by Commonwealth, London, £1,541,148 at five per cent., £99 10s., and New York £500,000 at five per cent., £99 10s. By the State, London, £2,000,500 at five per cent., £98. The Commonwealth loan was portion of a loan of £20,000,000 raised for the States. The State loan was the only one issued by us in London since February, 1924, and was considered very satisfactory. It was fully subscribed. We were financed, pending the issue of the loan, by the London and Westminster Bank, and the loan was utilised to pay off the overdraft. We also raised in Australia through the Commonwealth £1,873,590 for migration and other purposes. Our sinking fund had on the 31st March last reached the large sum of £10,654,493. Our credit in London stands high, as high at least as that of any of the Eastern States. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the 3rd December.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [5.47]: This is a short Bill. It is destined to give justice to a large number of people who have hitherto been denied it. I listened with interest to Dr. Saw's address. I think his speeches at all times are excellent and well worth listening to and taking notice of.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You were impressed by what he said.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, but—

Hon. J. Cornell: A big "but."

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Dr. Saw based his arguments upon an unfortunate foundation. I could not, therefore, take as much notice of his speech on that occasion as I have done on other occasions. His reference to the redistribution of seats had nothing to do with the Bill. This Chamber possesses power which no other Chamber in the British Dominions possesses. During recent years the powers of even the House of Lords have been severely restricted at times. The franchise for this Chamber should be amended so that a large proportion of very honourable and desirable citizens should be allowed to vote for members who are elected to it.

Hon. J. Cornell: What is the franchise for the House of Lords?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: There is none, but that House has had its powers very much curtailed. It may be said that the object of the Labour Party is to abolish the Legislative Council.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is it not?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, it is one of our foremost planks.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought it had been abandoned.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I was pleased that Dr. Saw gave us credit for sincerity in that matter.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: There was never any doubt about that.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I would rather lose the excellent companionship of members of the Chamber and all the privileges that membership means than lose my honour and break my word. When the time comes—and

I think it will come in our time—the present Labour representatives in this Chamber will not fail in their duty no matter what loss they may incur.

Hon. J. Cornell: When the time comes we shall all be in it.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. members must allow Mr. Gray to proceed with his speech without interjections.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not mind interjections. I am rather prone to make them myself. I never get out of temper when speaking in this Chamber.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The interjections are made to help you.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Dr. Saw put up a case for plural voting. I think he remarked that it was not extensively taken advantage of. He is quite wrong in his contention. At every contest where Labour has had a chance, our representatives have been defeated through the exercise of the plural and absentee votes. That can best be illustrated by quoting the West Province, which is our bugbear at all times. If it rains we are in trouble, because our opponents have means of transport to enable them to reach the polling booth and record their plural votes. At every contest where Labour has been defeated in that province, it has happened through the extensive use of plural votes. In actual fact there is a big majority of Labour votes in that province.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: But they have not taken enough interest in the result to record their votes.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The present franchise is founded upon the wrong basis, the money basis. The statement is repeatedly made that everyone who pays 6s. 6d. per week rent can claim a vote for the Legislative Council. Upon examination that statement is found to be hardly correct. The present franchise gives rise to all sorts of anomalies. Even well educated people, unless they are well posted in the matter, do not know that they have a vote.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Then they do not take much interest in the franchise.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Very often the system enables undesirable people to vote, while it shuts out first-class and honourable citizens.

Hon. A. Burvill: Even the Minister for Works is shut out.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Dr. Saw claimed that the system was right, on the ground that the man who had a stake in the country was

most likely to take an interest in its development and general welfare. The various Commonwealth referenda that have been taken prove that the statement is hardly correct. People with no money and no property, the working classes generally, are the most conservative. That is not a bad trait in their characters. The British and Australian people can be trusted to look after their own affairs, as is proved by the results of the Federal referenda. No danger would follow the abolition of the second chamber.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The people themselves can be trusted to vote while the Legislative Council is in existence, and if it were abolished it would be found that the general community was so conservative that it could well look after the interests of the country and protect its rights.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you believe in half you say?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I believe in everything I say. I am not putting up Aunt Sallies. Who has the biggest stake in the country, the man with property interests in every province to the value of £50 or over, or the married man with a family? For example, the man and his wife who are, with their children, working on a farm have the biggest stake in the country. The biggest stake any man can have is the welfare and the future of his children. He has a larger stake than the rapacious land jobber who may, through the force of his business ramifications, have a vote in every province. The man on the farm is helping to develop the resources of the country. If he happens to be working for another man, then because his boss is living in the same house, he is denied the franchise. Is that sensible? Is it just?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Only one man in the State has a vote for each province.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Many people have votes in more than one of the metropolitan provinces. I have two votes, and I do vote in each province.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: You would not use your two votes?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The qualification causes a good deal of confusion. It gives votes to people who should not have them, and denies the franchise to people who are desirable.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You are not ashamed of your two votes, are you?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I use them, and I do not blame anybody else for doing so; but it is wrong, all the same. If a man's wife owns a block of land or a house, she can claim the vote in respect of the property, and the husband can claim a vote as occupier.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But you do not do that, do you?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I take full advantage of the law. If the husband alone owns the property, the wife having no interest in it, there is only one vote for it. In the one case, therefore, we find two excellent people with votes, and in the other case we find only one vote.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The wife can pay the rates and so get a vote.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The law is little known, and much confusion exists. Thousands of people are disfranchised. Take the case of a widow who looks upon her eldest son as the head of the house. He can get the vote if the mother owns the property, and the widow also can enrol.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How is it the Minister for Works has no vote?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If the lady believes in being head of the house, then, although the son has to look after the home and is practically in the place of the father, she can deny him the franchise. She can do that by merely saying so.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is not the Minister for Works looked upon as head of the house in his family?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not know anything about that. I get as many votes in my family as I can. Nevertheless, the present position is unjustifiable. Take the case of a shopkeeper. If he leases a shop of the required rental value, he can claim the vote. If a married man pays rent for a shop and lives in it, the vote can be claimed for it; and if the rent is 35s. per week, two votes can be claimed by the husband and the wife as joint tenants. But if the shopkeeper has some regard for decent ideals and for the feelings of his customers, and decides to live away from the shop in rooms, the franchise in respect of the shop is lost. Is not that ridiculous? The more desirable citizen, one who wants to conduct his business properly, cannot claim the franchise.

Hon. H. Stewart: Does the shopkeeper hurt the hardware by sleeping amongst it?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The shop might be a grocery or a small-goods shop. The occupier can make living accommodation in it by merely putting up a screen. In suburban localities the inspection is so bad that a man can do just as he likes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The factory inspector cannot be doing his work, then.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: A shop is not a factory. The municipal by-laws are all right, but they are not always carried out. The things I have described actually exist, and the franchise is the basis of the trouble. Will any member contend that the great body of workers should be disfranchised as they are to-day.

Hon. H. Stewart: They need not be.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: In the majority of cases they are disfranchised through living on leaseholds.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Then landlords are too liberal.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Under the present law men living on leaseholds cannot claim the Legislative Council vote.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why should not they offer to pay a bigger rent?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The result of the present law is that a huge army of men are disfranchised whereas they should be fully entitled to a voice in the election of this Chamber.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you believe half of what you are saying?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The object of the Bill is to give an opportunity of enfranchisement to thousands of people who now are denied a vote for this Chamber. As Australian citizens they are, in my opinion, entitled to a vote. The franchise should be extended so as to give every adult citizen, man or woman, a full voice in the affairs of the country. The House therefore might well pass this little Bill, which will not take long. I assure hon. members that the passage of the measure will be greeted with expressions of gratitude by a large number of deserving citizens. I support the second reading.

Member: Why waste more time?

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [6.9]: I am not surprised at that interjection, but I am rather surprised that other members are not prepared to give expression to their opinions.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They endorse views already expressed, and excellently expressed, by Dr. Saw.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: At the risk of flogging a dead horse I will urge the passage of the Bill, even though this may involve to some extent a repetition of arguments used by previous speakers, and I may add, arguments used in previous sessions.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why make superfluous remarks?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I regard this measure as of the utmost importance from the point of view of large numbers of people who are fully entitled to express, through the ballot-box, their desires as to who shall deal with the business of the country in this Chamber. We talk about having representative government. I do not think that by the widest stretch of imagination it could be said that this Chamber represents what is commonly known as representative government. For the Legislative Assembly there are 220,000 electors, and for this Chamber there are only about 69,000.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There are 307 voters at Menzies.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: In some electorates there are thousands of electors for the Legislative Assembly and only hundreds for the Legislative Council. Is that representative government? It is not. What is the reason of the disparity? Simply that for the Legislative Council we have a franchise which demands that the voter must live in a house of a clear annual value of £17 or must be possessed of freehold property of a certain value. I consider that is a most unfair basis for the franchise. The annual value of £17 may be all right in some districts, but it is wrong in others.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You know perfectly well that that is not the meaning of the qualification.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That is what the qualification states. We know that there are in various parts of this State numbers of people occupying dwellings which do not qualify them to vote for the Legislative Council. On the other hand, if those people were living in similar dwellings in, say, the metropolitan area, they would have the vote. Such a position is entirely wrong. We should have something far more uniform. The district in which a person lives should not be a deciding factor, and in the cases I have quoted it is the deciding factor. By far the better course would be to adopt household

franchise, as proposed by the Bill. Moreover, the time is long past when we should tolerate the system of plural voting. There is a good deal of talk about democracy, and about the progress we have made during the past quarter of a century; but so far as this State is concerned, we have the crying shame that such a measure as this has not been passed long ago. As pointed out by Mr. Gray, this Chamber has more drastic powers than even the House of Lords.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Quite right, too!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is quite wrong. Every adult has a moral right to a voice in the election of this Chamber. However, the Bill does not go so far as that. It goes only part of the way. A system that denies the Council franchise to thousands of voters for the Legislative Assembly is radically wrong and should be altered.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What about the numbers of people who never pay a penny of taxation and yet have a vote with other people who pay taxation?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am not at present concerned with the question of taxation. Many people who do not pay taxation do not pay it because they are entitled to certain exemptions. If those people were in the same position as the hon. member interjecting, they would have to pay taxation. How is it that members of this Chamber draw a distinction between the rights of the people of Western Australia so far as this Chamber is concerned and their rights so far as the Federal Parliament is concerned? Every adult in this State has the right to vote for the Senate.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is not a fair analogy.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is distinctly fair. It is the only analogy that can be drawn.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why should New South Wales, with 2,000,000 people, have only six representatives in the Senate, while this State, with 360,000 people, has six Senators?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That question refers to the number of members in the Senate. I am speaking of the right of the people to have representation in this Chamber. I disagree with the Bill inasmuch as it does not go far enough. The Constitution should be altered so as to give every Western Australian adult the Council franchise. I do not wish to delay the House. In my opinion the time has arrived when we

should take a much more democratic view of the subject. I may quote the words of an eminent Australian statesman when dealing with the Federal Constitution many years ago. "We need not be afraid of the majority of the people." It appears to me, from the discussions which have taken place from time to time in this Chamber, that that is what is wrong with some hon. members. They are afraid that their representation would finish if it came to a decision by the majority of the people through an adult or household franchise.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Then you want to abolish this House?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I quite agree with the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. A. Burvill: What about the Queensland referendum?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I consider the Legislative Council an excrescence. There is no need for it. The experience of this session proves my contention. Here we have a Government elected by the majority of the people bringing forward legislation to which the people have given their assent.

Hon. H. Stewart: The majority of the electors, not the majority of the people.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member is only quibbling. He knows full well that in the case of a large number of seats—11, I think—there was no contest at the last general election.

Hon. H. Stewart: We know the numbers from previous contests in those constituencies.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am not desirous of prolonging the argument. The Bill does not go so far as I would like it to go. The household franchise, in my opinion, is fair, and should be put into operation. I wish to utter my protest against the system of plural voting which exists here but which has been abolished in the Old Country and in most other States. During this century Western Australia has made progress in many respects, but it is a long way behind the times as regards the Legislative Council franchise. I realise that this Bill is not likely to pass here at present, but I hope it will do so before long.

The PRESIDENT: Under the Constitution it is mandatory that a division should take place on this Bill, so that it will be necessary to ring the bells.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	15

Majority against .. 10

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey

Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. R. Brown
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. W. T. Glasbeem
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. Sir W. Latblain
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. W. J. Mann

Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. Ewing
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. E. Dodd
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. H. Seddon

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. H. J. Yelland

Question thus negatived; Bill defeated.

Sitting suspended from 6.20 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—METROPOLITAN MARKET.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 3 to which Mr. Lovekin had moved an amendment to add the following words at the end of the clause:—"Such trust shall (a) do all things as provided by Section 11 hereof; (b) carry on and conduct its business and hold any profits arising therefrom, for and on behalf of the State of Western Australia."

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Does not Mr. Lovekin think that the trust is a public authority? I appreciate the point raised by that hon. member when he referred to the position of those who had contributed towards the funds of Muresk College and the attitude of the Federal Taxation Department. I understand the object of the amendment is to definitely establish the board as a public authority and that Mr. Lovekin was prompted in the action he took because of the refusal of the Taxation Department

to recognise the contributions made by citizens towards the funds of Muresk College, as deductions from income.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I mentioned that to show how the Taxation Department construe these things.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The question is whether the trust will be a public authority or not. It can be argued strongly that it will be a public authority, but is it wise to include such a provision in the Bill as that embodied in the amendment? I am inclined to regard the trust in the same light as a harbour trust.

Hon. A. Lovekin: In that case the revenue would go into Consolidated Revenue.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Would it not be better to add another subclause to Clause 14 to provide that any balance after the trust had provided for ordinary expenses and sinking fund payments should be paid into Consolidated Revenue?

Hon. A. Lovekin: That amounts to the same thing.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In view of the wording of the amendment, it should be remembered that the powers conferred upon the trust in Clause 11 are permissive. I think it would be better to make some provision in Clause 14 along the lines suggested.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would not cover the position.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is questionable whether it is wise to insert the amendment in Clause 3.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Evidently Mr. Nicholson agrees that some amendment should be included to protect the trust against the encroachment by the Federal authorities. The difference between us is that I suggest that the amendment should be inserted in an early clause in which we say what the trust is and what the purposes of the trust shall be, whereas he suggests it should be included later on. I consider it should be inserted at the start, so that there shall be no mistake about it. I agree that a good argument can be put up to prove that the trust will be a public authority, but why run the risk of having that argument ruled out by the Federal authorities, when we can make certain of the position by means of a short amendment? Mr. Nicholson referred to the powers being permissive, whereas the amendment is made mandatory, but that does not affect the position, because it merely means that if the trust does certain things it shall carry on its business and hold

profits arising therefrom for the State. I want to make certain that this comes within Section 114 of the Federal Constitution Act, under which the Federal people cannot tax any of the profits of the State.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: The Bill does not provide for that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: But is it not a public concern? The trustees are not to get any money out of it. So let us prevent this Federal octopus coming in and taxing our producers and consumers. There are quite a lot of rulings by the Taxation Department that will be brought into the argument by the Commissioner when he comes to deal with this. I am certain the Commissioner, Mr. Ewing, has never had this Bill before him. He does not realise that at present there is no way in which the profits arising from this concern are to be disposed of. When he finds out that the profits, after the working expenses and interest and sinking fund have been paid, are to be the profits of the trust, he will say, "This is not a public authority, any more than the Muresk College is a public authority, and so it comes within the purview of the Taxation Act."

Hon. V. Hamersley: Does he say that of the Fremantle Harbour Trust?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The profits of the Fremantle Harbour Trust are brought into Consolidated Revenue, and so cannot be taxed by the Federal authorities. The Bill itself points to the fact that this trust is not a public authority. Subclause 3 of Clause 11 virtually says so, because it says the Public Works Act may be availed of by the trust, as if the trust were a local authority. The corollary of that is that it is not a local authority, but that under the Public Works Act it will be deemed to be such. The Federal Taxation Commissioner, when he sees the Bill, will say it is not a public authority, and that therefore it is taxable. And if it be taxable, not only will the valuable land upon which the buildings shall stand be taxable, but the income, including the money to be set aside for sinking fund, also will be taxable. The amendment, if it does no good, can do no harm to the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am merely trying to help Mr. Lovekin to deal with this question. This trust has to find certain moneys for its operations, and has to set aside out of profits so much for the payment of interest and so much by way of sinking fund. The amendment provides that

the trust shall carry on and conduct its business, and hold any profits arising therefrom, for and on behalf of the State of Western Australia.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Because I do not want the profits to go into Consolidated Revenue. My desire is that they should be held by the trust and used for the State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But the State, as constituted here, could demand the profits.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes, the Government could pass another Act.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But even without another Act, the State could demand the profits. The amendment might create legal difficulties for the trust. Each year's profits might be taken as complete by themselves. That is to say, the trust would be trustees for each completed year's profits, and would have to hold them in trust, and would perhaps require to go back again and borrow its own money again and pay interest on that money again. That is the legal view. The difficulty arises that each year's profits might be regarded as a complete fund, and would pass over to the Government or be held by the trust for the time being in trust for the Government, and a double line drawn, so to speak. In order that the trust might again resort to this fund, it might have to re-borrow the very money that represents its actual profits; because it is stated here that the profits arising therefrom shall be held really in trust for the State of Western Australia.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It does not say one year's profits.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I appreciate what Mr. Lovekin desires, which is to protect this fund from taxation, but I am sure he will appreciate the difficulties that might be occasioned by the amendment. Suppose I were constituted trustee of a fund assigned to me for the purposing of investing it in a certain way. I would be required to hold that fund in trust and invest it and pay the income arising therefrom to someone or other. As the income was derived, it would become the property of the person entitled to receive it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You do not say that that is parallel with the trust under the Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, I do, because the profits arising from the operations of the trust would become the property of the Government of Western Australia.

Hon. A. Lovekin: To be held for the State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is where I see the difficulty. If I saw that it could be done without difficulty, I would support Mr. Lovekin because of the object he has in view.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Can the amendment do any harm?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would tie up the trustees so awkwardly that they would not know whether or not they were acting legally.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is to say, the Government might take their moneys.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, and say, "The whole of these profits are ours." Also it might prevent the trustees from using those various moneys as they were earned each year, for unless the power were specifically given them, they would have no power to reinvest those moneys.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is nothing about re-investing the profits; the trust would merely hold them.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: To hold them would not be sufficient. Unless the power were widened the trust could not use the moneys, as they would be the property of the State.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The amendment says that they shall be held for the State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: All the profits in hand at the end of the year would have to be held in trust for the State, and power would be required from the State before the trust could apply the moneys in some other way.

Hon. J. Ewing: The money would be taken into Consolidated Revenue?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What would the trust do if the Government did that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Wind up straight away. The trust, in order to perform its functions, should have power to use all moneys for the objects of the Bill.

Hon. J. Ewing: Would not the trust have that power under the Bill?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Under the amendment any profits would become the property of the State.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The State would not rob the trust.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The trust should not be placed in an awkward position. I do not offer opposition to the amendment,

but I considered it my duty to point out the difficulties.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not like to run after shadows; I like to get hold of the substance if possible. I am not interested in hypothetical cases as to whether the Government might confiscate the few pounds that the trust might earn. If the Government did so, I suppose there would be good reason for it and the trust could look after itself. What concerns me is that there is no provision in the Federal Taxation Acts to protect the income of the trust. I want to preserve the funds of the trust from taxation so that producers and consumers may get the benefit of the measure. Mr. Nicholson spoke of the profits being ruled off at the end of each year and paid into Consolidated Revenue. There is nothing in the Bill to that effect, but there is something to show that the intention is the reverse. The Bill contemplates the trust being a continuing body. The amendment can only protect our people, especially as it seems impossible to find an interpretation of "public authority."

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is very difficult to get one.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The whole question will be left to the discretion of the Commissioner of Taxation, and when he finds there is no disposal of the profits, he will treat it as an ordinary trading concern and assess it under the Taxation Act. I have employed in the amendment words from the Constitution Act in order that the funds shall be the property of the State and not liable to be taxed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You say you are asking the State to agree to another trading concern.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It looks like authorising another trading concern, but this is not a trading concern in the light that the others are. If we describe it as a trading concern, we shall be giving the show away.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is that the clause as amended be agreed to.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I wish to speak to that question and direct attention to a number of amendments I have placed on the Notice Paper with the object of vesting control of the market in the City Council instead of a trust. If a trust is constituted, the Government will have to find the money to establish the market.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is opposing the clause as amended?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: No amendment can be moved to the question before the Chair.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the clause be struck out we shall be able to substitute "City Council" for "trust." The Government have many obligations, and it will be concerned that the City Council have fewer and would be able to find the money more readily than the State.

The Honorary Minister: Why?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Because the Government have many other works to carry on. If control were vested in the City Council the completion of the markets could be expedited. It would be better to spend the money involved in the establishment of markets on such a work as the construction of a railway on the south side of the river, so that Fremantle might not again be cut off from the metropolitan area as was the case last winter.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: We will not swallow that bait.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is not a bait. The City Council have already offered to appoint to their board two representatives from the producers.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: We will not swallow that either.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I regret that members cannot accept that fair and reasonable offer, and that the same spirit is not observed towards the city by those who are concerned in the producers as is observed by men in the city towards the welfare of the country.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I trust the clause will be struck out with a view to placing the control in the hands of the City Council. The Bill takes from the civil authorities the right that was vested in them in 1906. City Council control would not prevent producers from marketing their produce where they liked. I was a little hurt by Mr. Stewart's remarks concerning the attitude of metropolitan members towards the country. I would remind him that when Mr. Stephenson and I were members of the road board select committee we did our best to retain for the road boards their traffic fees. We who represent the metropolitan area know that the prosperity of the city depends on the prosperity of the country.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The producers would rather have their interests safeguarded by the Government in this matter, than by the City Council. The municipal authorities had an opportunity to establish markets, but did not avail themselves of it. I question whether their control would be more economical than Government control. We have only to look at the enormous expenditure that is now going on in Harvest-terrace to realise what might happen with respect to city markets.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I support the remarks of Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Macfarlane and hope the clause will be struck out. No one has made a deeper study of this question during the last few years than Mr. Macfarlane.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	6

Majority for 11

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
	(Teller.)

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Remuneration of members of trust:

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The Committee should have some intimation of the emoluments. No one appears to have the faintest idea whether they are to take the form of an annual salary or of fees per sitting.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is not the slightest idea of appointing members of the trust at a yearly salary. The Government have it in mind to pay them at so much per sitting or at so much per month. The emoluments will be commensurate with the work to be done.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause should be tightened up a little. I move—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided that the total salaries or fees payable in any one year shall not exceed the sum of £600."

That will provide maximums of £200 for the chairman and of £100 for each member. In the absence of a proviso such as this, any Government in power who wanted to provide a position for a friend fallen by the wayside might make a nice billet for him. I do not refer to any particular Government. The members of the trust could, of course, cut up the money as they chose.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The amendment is so unprecedented that I hope it will not even be considered.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	19

Majority against .. 15

AYES.

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

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. G. A. Kempton
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—Quorum:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know whether this is the proper place, or whether I should wait for recommittal, to move the insertion of the word "unlimited" before "trust."

The CHAIRMAN: The better course would be to wait until the recommittal stage.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Power to establish market:

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nicholson has a number of amendments on the Notice Paper.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In view of the decision arrived at, I shall not move them.

Hon. H. A. STEPENSON: As Mr. Nicholson will not move his amendments, I shall move one standing in his name. I move an amendment—

That in lines 4 and 5 of Subclause 1 the words "grain, straw, chaff, hay," be struck out.

The inclusion of those words is unnecessary, because specific reference is made to the sale of those lines in Clause 12.

Hon. H. STEWART: I hope the amendment will be defeated because it is just as important that the trust shall have power to provide for the sale of grain, straw, chaff and hay, should it be necessary to do so, as it is that they shall be able to deal with other lines mentioned in the clause.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: The real object of the Bill is to enable the trust to deal with perishable goods such as fruit, vegetables and meat, which are retailed in the market. The lines I refer to in my amendment are not perishable goods and are disposed of wholesale. For many years those lines have been sold by auction in the railway yards in sheds provided by the Railway Department at considerable expense. If a vote were taken of those concerned, I believe 100 per cent. would favour the continuation of the present system, which is satisfactory to the producers. At many auctions there I have seen over 100 trucks of chaff and hay in the railway yards at one time. To suggest that the trust could provide for the sale of such a quantity in the markets is absurd.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I cannot read into either Clause 11 or 12 any suggestion of the closing of the railway yards against auction sales of hay, chaff, grain or straw.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Clause 12 exempts sales on Government railway premises.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Exactly. Clause 11 provides that the trust may establish branches, but if the amendment be agreed to, it will mean that these lines cannot be sold in any such branches. I should construe the clauses to mean that sales of hay, grain, chaff and straw in the railway yards are to be continued.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The clause will enable the trust to make provision for the sale of these lines if the auctions in the railway yards are not continued. I believe the defeat of the City Council's Market Bill last year was largely due to the inclusion of power to deal with the lines mentioned

by Mr. Stephenson. It simply meant that if accommodation had to be provided to enable those lines to be sold in the municipal market, the cost of the undertaking would have destroyed the object altogether. I hope the amendment will be agreed to so that the trust will not be in a position to handle these lines. The day may come very soon when the Railway Department will declare that the actions must not continue on railway property. If this provision is left in the Bill, so that the trust will be in a position to arrange for handling these lines, there will be a pretty kettle of fish.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I see no danger in the clause. The growers may wish to buy small lots of grain or chaff, and they should not be forced to buy truck lots at the auctions in the railway yards.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That subclause 4 be struck out.

The subclause provides that land vested in the trust shall be exempt from municipal and other rates. Now that it has been decided to vest the markets in the Government through a trust, there will be taken from the City Council area some eight or 12 acres necessary for the markets. The rates that are now derived from that area will be lost to the City Council and difficulty will be experienced in finding new premises for the people who will be displaced. It is unfair that the City Council should suffer such a loss of revenue. The whole of the money to be expended by the municipality has to be found by the ratepayers of Perth and Parliament does not contribute one farthing towards the upkeep of that institution, nor does the State pay a farthing in rates. At least 20 per cent. of the City of Perth is exempted from municipal taxation because it is occupied by educational establishments, churches, or Government institutions.

Hon. A. Burvill: Does that not enhance land values and bring in more rates?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is a bright idea!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If the hon. member had to pay the rates that I do, he would realise that this imposes a tremendous burden.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But you pass on the rates!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: And so do the producers.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: How do the producers pass them on?

Hon. H. Stewart: Sir William Lathlain has made a statement that is quite original!

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The Committee should extend a fair deal to the City of Perth. This proposition will benefit the producers and also the consumers throughout the metropolitan area. The City Council have already expended over £30,000 in resuming lands in anticipation of establishing markets. It has now been decided that the Government shall control the market, and so I will do all I can to make that a success. Still, in fairness to the City Council we should strike out this subclause exempting the markets from the payment of municipal rates.

Hon. H. STEWART: These markets will cover a considerable area of land, yet it will be only the streets on the outskirts of that area, the maintenance of which will impose any burden on the City Council. The people to be displaced will establish themselves in some other locality.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Which is not easy to do.

Hon. H. STEWART: I realise that. Still, wherever they establish themselves they will be liable to the payment of rates. Having regard to the comparatively large area that will be taken up by the markets, not much road maintenance outside that area will be required. The Bill authorises the trust to do all the maintenance within the area. The people to be displaced will go elsewhere, but will continue to pay rates.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: They will have to go outside the city area.

Hon. H. STEWART: Mr. Lovekin has put into the Bill an amendment that practically makes of the trust a State trading concern. That being so, no rates can be levied on the trust by the City Council, which is an answer to the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We now know where we are in regard to the Bill. The trust is to be a trust for the benefit of the producers and the consumers. Under the Bill the internal roads are to be maintained by the trust. But the roads around the market area must be constructed and maintained by the municipality. At a later stage I will

move to insert the following proviso:—"Provided the trust shall pay to the municipal corporation of Perth the cost of constructing, maintaining, and repairing all roads adjacent to the market, and also the cost of lighting, scavenging, watering, and cleaning such roads."

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I should like to add to Sir William Lathlain's appeal on behalf of the City Council by recounting just a few of the hardships the Government have imposed upon the City Council. There was the taking of the tramways from the City Council. Those tramways, within a few years of their being taken over by the Government, would have become the property of the ratepayers of Perth without purchase. Again, the Government have taken from the City Council the traffic fees, and the fees under the Weights and Measures Act, and now they propose taking the market. Then we get the Main Roads Bill, under which the Federal Government find £1 and the State 15s. for the construction of roads. Greater Perth to-day contains 50 per cent. of the population of the State. All those people will have to find their quota of each 15s. put up by the State; yet they are to get no advantage at all, for the money will be spent for the benefit of the country districts. Add these to the disadvantages recounted by Sir William Lathlain, and the Committee must recognise that in justice to the ratepayers of Perth the markets ought to pay rates, just as an ordinary business house would have to do.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: It appears to me there is no necessity for the amendment, since the Committee has already amended Subclause 2 of Clause 3 and so made of the scheme a State trading concern. That being so, the markets are necessarily exempt from the payment of municipal rates.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: If the amendment be not carried, we shall still have the opportunity to add a proviso to the effect that the Committee considers that some portion of the rates should be paid to the city. The State Sawmills constitute another burden on the City Council. In this respect the Government have treated the City of Perth disgracefully. Not only have they established sawmills within the area, but they have closed certain roads that belong to the people.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They cannot do that.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: But they did it, and that without so much as notification in the "Government Gazette." There is tremendous traffic on the roads in that locality, entailing a big cost on the City Council for maintenance. Yet the Government have not paid one penny towards the maintenance of those roads. When the Government start a State trading concern they should at least pay on the same basis as all other people. Millars Timber and Trading Company Limited have an area within the city, but they have to pay rates and taxes, and so too should the State Saw-mills. I hope the amendment will be carried.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	14

Majority against .. 6

AYES.

Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)
Hon. J. Nicholson	

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)
Hon. G. A. Kempton	

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: As a measure of justice to the City Council I suggest that the trust should pay the cost of construction and maintenance of streets around the market and also the cost of scavenging, lighting, watering and cleansing the streets adjacent to it.

Hon. A. Burvill: What about paragraph (e) which states that the trust may with the approval of the City Council constitute any portion of an adjacent street a part of the market?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is to be prescribed by the trust, and the trust might prescribe that it will not pay for those things. The trust should have to pay the actual cost of such work and it would be cheaper for the municipality than for the trust to do it.

Hon. A. Burvill: Who will prescribe the area?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Bill provides that the trust shall prescribe an area around the market. If the trust did not pay the council for lighting, the council would be arrant asses to provide lighting. Without such a provision we shall have two public bodies at loggerheads. I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added:—
"Provided that the trust shall pay to the municipal corporation of Perth the reasonable cost of constructing, maintaining, and repairing all roads immediately adjacent to the market and also the cost of lighting, scavenging, watering, and cleansing such roads."

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Members who are acquainted with the Victoria Market in Melbourne know that hundreds of carts back into the kerbs in streets surrounding the market but do not actually enter the market area. A tremendous area would be needed to accommodate all such vehicles. The same thing used to occur at Murray-street where the City Council provided kerbing and paving of stone cubes. Later on Roe-street was used in a similar way and the City Council had to bear the expense of cleansing it. The amendment is reasonable, and will give the City Council some recompense for work that they must undertake.

Hon. G. POTTER: The amendment is not only reasonable but unassailable. Surely members cannot question its inherent justice. No undue burden should be imposed upon the citizens of Perth particularly when the market is to be maintained in the interests of the producers.

Hon. H. STEWART: Paragraphs (d) and (e) of Subclause 2 contemplate the trust doing such work after coming to an arrangement with the City Council and paying for it. Lighting, scavenging and maintenance, however, are not provided for. Perhaps it would be well to add to the amendment "as mutually agreed."

Hon. A. Lovekin: I want it made obligatory on the trust to pay for it.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Much depends upon the interpretation of paragraph (e) which hinges on "the prescribed distance." Who will prescribe it? The trust should pay for lighting, but arrangements for other work should be subject to mutual agreement.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Read paragraph (b) of Clause 12.

Hon. A. BURVILL: The City Council should receive some remuneration for maintaining and lighting these streets. I am not sure whether Mr. Lovekin's amendment will cover this point.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The conditions will be prescribed by the Governor-in-Council or the trust. The City Council are in a position to construct roads at lower cost than those who will be in control of the markets, and to maintain them at a cheaper rate. If the amendment is carried, no doubt the trust will arrange the matter with the civic authorities.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: There is uncertainty about the use of the word "reasonable." It should be laid down exactly how far the streets shall be from the market before the trust is no longer responsible for them. It may be that the trust will be expected to look after all the streets of Perth because the producers will be using them in order to take their goods to market.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am opposed to the amendment. Members of the trust will see to it that all the safeguards referred to are carried out. Moreover, there will be a member of the City Council on the trust.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: This may be considered a State trading concern, and may therefore escape some of its obligations. The amendment will, however, make it mandatory upon the trust to conform to the law.

Hon. H. Stewart: The word "constructing" ought to be deleted from the amendment, because that is already provided for elsewhere.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Bill does not provide for the construction of a circular road around the market, but if one were already built, that would be the end of it.

Hon. H. STEWART: It may be that two conflicting authorities will be empowered to construct roads unless the amendment is drafted in a different manner. It should be made clear that the works are carried out only provided the parties mutually agree as to how they shall be carried out.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I have no objection to that.

Hon. H. STEWART: I should like to see the amendment amended by striking out after "Perth" the word "the," and inserting "such," and by adding at the end "as may be mutually agreed upon."

Hon. A. Lovekin: If Mr. Stewart desires to move the amendment in that form, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That the following proviso be added to Subclause 4:—"Provided that the trust pay to the Municipal Corporation of Perth such reasonable cost of constructing, maintaining, and repairing roads immediately adjacent to the market, and also such cost of lighting, scavenging, watering, and cleaning of such roads, as may be mutually agreed upon."

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am surprised that a representative of the producers should put up such an amendment. By far the better course would be to let the City Council take control of the market. In any case, the amendment could not become operative.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why not?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Because of its wording. Those who want the Bill should not support the amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I suggest that the word "footpath" be included in the amendment.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	6
Majority for					8

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. W. T. Glasheen
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)
Hon. J. Nicholson	

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller.)
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—Discontinuance of other markets in metropolitan area:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask the particular attention of the Committee to Subclause 2, which reads—

The trust may, by by-laws: (a) prohibit the sale by auction in the metropolitan area of prescribed produce, products, or provisions elsewhere than in the market established under

this Act, except sales by auction of grain, store, chaff, hay, or other produce on Government railway premises; and (b) prohibit the sale within a prescribed distance from the market or any branch thereof of prescribed produce, products, or provisions by hawkers or stall keepers, or except on the premises of the seller.

The last eight words of paragraph (b) are meaningless and should be struck out, or possibly the word "or" before the word "except" has been inserted in error. Under the subclause the trust will have the right to suppress every Chinese vegetable hawker and every returned soldier who sells vegetables or fruit within the market area. The "prescribed distance" might be a mile, or a mile and a half, or two miles, as the trust chose. The trust ought to be satisfied to prohibit sales by auction, and should not extend its prohibition to retail sales two or three miles beyond the market area.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You have done very well; you might drop it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Committee cannot let the subclause go as it stands, because it is not English. Why should the people at North Perth, for instance, be compelled to come to a market in Wellington-street, instead of obtaining their requirements locally from barrows? I do not think that "the premises of the seller" would include a barrow. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) of Subclause 2 be struck out.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The powers asked for in this subclause are absolutely essential if the market is to be controlled at all. The trust will be composed of men who will study the persons referred to by Mr. Lovekin. Unless the trust have drastic powers as regards the prescribed area, a most unsatisfactory position can arise. For instance, when the City of Perth established kerbstone markets in Wellington-street, a number of people thought it quite easy to stand on the other side of the road and obtain the full advantages of the kerbstone market without paying the prescribed fees. Any man selling products on his own premises will be exempt.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The word "or" before "except" at the end of paragraph (b) must come out.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Honorary Minister object to the word "or" being treated as a typographical error? If so, the matter must be submitted to the Committee.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I regard the inclusion of the word "or" as a typographical error.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—By-laws:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask for a ruling as to whether you, Mr. Chairman, consider that the proviso to Subclause 10 will bring the clause into conformity with Section 36 of the Interpretation Act and thus ensure that the by-laws shall be laid upon the Table of the House. As I have not previously intimated my intention to ask for a ruling, I will not press for it now, but will raise the point again at a later stage so as to enable you to consider it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to consider the position.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I move an amendment—

That in lines 4 to 6 of Subclause 5 the words "and prescribing that sales by auction or otherwise may be conducted by officers of the Trust" be struck out.

I am not in favour of officers of the trust being empowered to sell produce by auction or otherwise. Those officers will have enough to do to carry out the by-laws dealing with the various matters referred to in the clause. As this will be a State trading concern, any officers of the trust who may act as auctioneers will not have to pay license fees, so that the Government will lose a certain amount of revenue in that direction.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 to 21—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central) [10.9]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the debate be adjourned till the next sitting.

In Committee I raised the question that we should further consider the wording of that clause dealing with by-laws.

The PRESIDENT: This is a motion that cannot be debated.

Motion put and passed.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [10.11]: I cannot say I favour the Bill, for in my opinion it is only putting off the day when we must provide a proper sewerage scheme for the whole of the metropolitan area. When we remember that within two years time we shall be celebrating the centenary of Perth, we realise that it is nearly time we had a proper sewerage scheme. The Chief Secretary, when moving the second reading, said the Bill was necessary owing to the fact that the places where the sewerage is deposited are getting into a bad state. Well, the onus is on the Government to rectify those conditions. The Government have been controlling the sewerage system for 20 years, and have made but little progress with it. The proposals in the Bill are only of a temporary nature. The Bill gives power to certain municipalities to assist people to construct septic tanks. In my opinion septic tanks are not all that is required. What is to be done in thickly populated areas, such as the City of Perth, where the conditions are exceptionally bad? I live within a third of a mile from Parliament House. Some 13 or 14 years ago I bought a house in what is supposed to be a good position. I know I have to pay very high rates for it. But although I was told at the time that it would be sewered within 12 months it is not sewered yet, nor is it likely to be for many years to come. So assured was I that we should have the sewerage that I had all the accessories put in 13 years ago. Septic tanks are useful in certain places, but they do not comply with all requirements, since they deal only with night soil. At my place I have three wells, one to take the stormwater from the roof, an ordinary dry well, and an auxiliary to that dry well which takes all the water from the laundries, the bath and kitchen. But those wells have been there for some years and in consequence the whole of the ground has become clogged, and so is a constant nuisance to me. The same position is to be found in

all those places where similar conditions obtain. The dry well system is all right for a few years but after that it becomes a serious menace. My ground for opposing the Bill is that it is only a temporary expedient. Surely to goodness the time has arrived when the task of sewerage the whole of the place should be taken up seriously.

Hon. H. Stewart: By a metropolitan trust.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Undoubtedly. On the Address-in-reply I drew special attention to this requirement. To-night when dealing with the establishment of markets we were told that we required markets for the whole of the metropolitan area. In my view, we require a metropolitan sewerage system still more. It is almost incredible that nearly 20 years have elapsed since the first sections of Perth were sewered and very little has been done. Recently the Government went on with a portion of the sewerage scheme in Subiaco, but I suppose funds have run out, for the work has been stopped. The Bill does not offer any proper solution of the difficulty. When the Chief Secretary mentioned their disability under which Cottesloe and Claremont are labouring I expected him to make some observations about the difficulties under which Perth is labouring. As members know, the sanitary depot in North Perth has been there for a number of years. It is a constant menace to the health of the people in that fast-growing locality and strong representations have been made to the City Council to remove it. Not only will it cost an enormous amount of money to remove it, but its removal will mean the construction of a road for three or four miles further out into the bush.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And the extra cost of delivery.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Yes, and the cost of that extra five miles for every one of the carts employed.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Let them go out in the daytime which is much the better idea.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: They do go in the daytime, notwithstanding which the drivers are paid night-time wages. However, my objection to the Bill is that I think the time has arrived when a metropolitan board of works should be established to take over this very serious question of sewerage not only in the city area, but the metropolitan area. I believe that unless something is done in the

near future we shall be faced with a very serious menace. I am well aware that the metropolitan board of works cannot be created in a moment. I should like the Chief Secretary to understand that I am not casting any special blame on the present Government. They are no better and perhaps no worse than other Governments that have preceded them. I should like members representing country districts to understand that I do not want any favours from any country constituencies in respect of this proposal. A metropolitan board of works should face the whole of the responsibility in relation to water supply, sewerage and drainage for the whole of the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. Stewart: So as to relieve the Government from their deficit?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: And to carry on a continuous policy. When the sewerage work was started at Subiaco I was filled with great hopes, for I thought the time had arrived when we were going to get some connections made. However, apparently the money has run out for the work has been stopped.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It was the cost that stopped it.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I do not know what it was. The trouble is that nothing is being done. My strong objection to the Bill is that it will be only a palliative, and will not relieve the position to any very great extent. It is quite true that it might assist certain people to get septic tanks erected on their premises, but the fact remains that in the most populous parts of Claremont and Cottesloe, and particularly Cottesloe Beach, the houses are so close together that there will not be room for septic tanks, and if they are erected, they will be a serious menace to public health. There is only one thing to be done and that is to form a metropolitan board of works to evolve a scheme. Such a scheme at the outset would necessitate the abolition of the present filter beds at Burswood that are responsible for the pollution of the river. I strongly advise the present Government to take steps to create such a board, so that whoever is returned to power in March next may take up the project seriously. If I thought the position would be relieved or that anything tangible would be accomplished by the passing of this Bill, I would support it. A somewhat similar position arose in connection with the water supply.

There are thousands of residents of the metropolitan area who incurred the expense of erecting windmills to raise water because there was not a proper metropolitan supply. That work has proved an economic loss, and the same thing will happen if the septic tank scheme be adopted. All the people who have septic tanks installed will be compelled, when the deep drainage is extended to their districts—if that should happen within the lifetime of any now living—to pay the full amount of sewerage rates, although they may continue to use their own septic tank systems. At North Perth there are people who installed septic tanks prior to the sewerage system being extended to that district. They still have their septic tanks in operation, but because the deep sewerage mains run past their premises, they are compelled to pay the full amount of sewerage rates, although their premises are not connected. The position is serious also because we have depots for the depositing of night soil situated in thickly populated neighbourhoods. Those depots are a serious menace to health, and still nothing is being done. There is no doubt that something on a gigantic scale will be required in the near future. Not only Perth but the whole of the suburbs will grow at an alarmingly rapid rate, and it is time the Government took the question into consideration. They should constitute a board on the lines of the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works, whose members are elected from local governing bodies, who have power to raise money for the necessary works and who control the whole undertaking. The people of Melbourne regard the Metropolitan Board of Works as a safe and sound investment that pays a reasonable rate of interest. One essential to success is to secure the right man as chairman. When the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works was constituted the man selected as chairman was Mr. E. G. Fitzgibbon, who was afterwards knighted and was known as the White Knight. I assure members that when I walk along St. Kilda-road and see his monument I raise my hat out of respect to a man who did such excellent work for the City of Melbourne. Although millions of pounds passed through his hands during the installation of the big sewerage scheme, not a breath of suspicion was ever raised against him. The Bill before us is merely a temporary expedient. It will not give instant relief; in fact, I do not think it will relieve

the position in any way. There are certain places, more particularly those close to the river, where it may be essential to instal septic tanks owing to the difficulty of arranging for the deep sewers to take the whole of the effluent. Be that as it may, the question as it affects the whole of the metropolitan area demands immediate attention, and for that if for no other reason, I shall oppose the Bill. To adopt that course is the only way to call the attention of the Government and the people of the metropolitan area generally to the growing menace, which I view with grave apprehension. I hope the Government will take immediate steps to constitute a board of works and give them the powers necessary to enable them to proceed with this work. It is work that must be carried on year by year owing to the ever-increasing growth of population in the city and suburbs. I should like to be able to support the Bill, but I honestly feel that it is only a temporary measure that will not to any extent alleviate the present unsatisfactory conditions in the areas to which I have alluded.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [10.27]: I hope the Bill will be passed because, if it is placed on the statute-book I think it will assist the people residing in that portion of Perth to which Sir William Lathlain has referred to be supplied more quickly with improved facilities. Anyone who has lived in the Claremont, Cottesloe, or Cottesloe Beach district knows that from North Fremantle along the beach to Swanbourne a very fine area is poisoned by the nightsoil depots. That is a disgrace to the metropolitan area. Fortunately or unfortunately, according as one might regard it, those depots are hidden from public view by a very high hill, and the people of Cottesloe are troubled every summer with a plague of flies.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: So are the people of North Perth.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Many people wonder where the flies come from, but there is no doubt that they come from the sanitary depots. Legislation of this description will be beneficial to Claremont, Peppermint Grove and Cottesloe particularly because, if the residents of those districts can get septic tanks, the sanitary depots will be abolished. It is worth while supporting the Bill in order to give a lead in that direction. If Sir William Lathlain's ideas were carried

into effect and a metropolitan board of works were constituted, how many years would it be before Cottesloe could be properly sewered? Would it be in the next 20 years? I do not think that is possible. In view of the large areas of vacant land between Nedlands and Cottesloe I do not think it will be a business proposition to sewer that part in our lifetime, at any rate. There are many portions of Fremantle, North Fremantle, as well as Perth that are not sewered, and if members support the Bill, it will permit of other portions of the metropolitan area receiving attention. I should say that Cottesloe and Claremont are suitable areas for the installation of septic tanks. The local authorities in those places are in favour of the Bill. Surely they know their own business. If I were placed in the position of a householder in Cottesloe, and found it impossible to get sewerage connection for 15 or 20 years, and had the opportunity of being assisted by the local authority in the installation of a septic tank, I think I should be only too glad to avail myself of that opportunity. These septic tanks should prove a great boon and convenience to the residents of any community, failing the inauguration of a deep drainage scheme. It is impossible, no matter what board might be formed, for the community to stand the enormous burden that would have to be carried if the whole of the metropolitan area were sewered. We should, therefore, go to the assistance of the local authorities who are prepared to assist themselves in this way. I heartily support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [10.41]: The title of this Bill, an Act to amend the Health Act, is sufficient to justify my supporting it. In matters of health, or advice concerning health, I look only in one direction, namely, towards those medical officers who are responsible for the control and administration under the Health Act. If there is one question above all others about which there can be no difference of opinion amongst laymen, or in party politics or amongst party politicians, it is with relation to the wellbeing of the community and amendments to the Health Act. I take it the Bill has been asked for by the proper official, namely, the Commissioner of Public Health. We are almost wholly guided by the medical officers of the Health

Department in such matters as the preservation of health, the prevention of disease and like questions. It would ill-become me or my colleague, Mr. Potter, to have any doubt as to any amendment of the Health Act, that is sought by the Commissioner of Public Health, being in the best interests of the community as a whole. We have both been soldiers. We know that in all matters relating to health or the medical condition of soldiers, or the hygienic and sanitary conditions of military camps, the only persons competent to give an opinion were the medical men, and they reigned supreme and all the army bowed to them. The position is the same with the Health Department. For that reason alone I support the Bill. If it were not required I am sure the medical side of the Health Department would not have asked for it. A hundred and one phases could be touched upon in dealing with the Bill. We have heard of the model municipality of Subiaco. Notwithstanding the efforts on the part of the local authority to prevent certain things, I have, adjacent to my own house, witnessed occurrences that cry aloud to heaven. That is one of the inconveniences that must of necessity follow in any city until such time as it is sewered. I know that if a private who was charged with a day duty in connection with the sanitary arrangements of a military camp committed a fourth of the offences that are committed in this model suburb, he would by the end of the year have no military pay to draw. We should pause before we vote against a measure which must bear the hall mark of the Chief Medical Officer of the State.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane, debate adjourned.

PAPERS—WORKER'S HOME, J. R. DAVIS.

Debate resumed from the 2nd December, on the following motion by Hon. G. Potter—

That the file relating the purchase, sale and transfer of worker's dwelling-house, held in the name of John Roy Davis, being piece or parcel of land Perth Lot No. 505, comprised in and the subject of lease of a worker's dwelling No. 69/12 (Crown Lease 8212/1913), be laid on the Table of the House.

HON. G. POTTER (West—in reply) [10.47]: The Chief Secretary remarked that I had not perused the file dealing with this matter up to the time he had spoken. He was perfectly correct in his statement. I had an object in not perusing the file and taking advantage of the privilege extended to me. Had I perused the file, and had then spoken, no matter how careful I might have been in my references to what was disclosed in it, I might, in reply to interjections, have disclosed certain information that appeared amongst the papers, and afterwards have been sorry that I did so. In the circumstances, therefore, I desired not only to protect myself, but the department as well. That is why I did not peruse the file beforehand. To-day I spent some time in perusing the file. Needless to say, everything that the Chief Secretary has stated is amply borne out by that file. I do hope that no remarks of mine could possibly have been construed as casting any reflection whatever upon the methods or the actual practice of the officers of the Workers' Homes Board. On the contrary, the file demonstrates conclusively that within the law which governs the operations of the Workers' Homes Board, the officers have extended to Mr. Davis everything that the Act allows, during the times when the exigencies of the Commonwealth public service compelled him to be absent from Perth. The whole question really hinged on the fact that Mr. Davies was enabled to do that which he thought he had the right to do—namely, dispose of his accrued equity in the property not at the original capital cost, but at the accrued value at the time it was offered for sale. The Workers' Homes Board have undoubtedly—it is common knowledge now—given Mr. Davis his accrued equity, which represents a considerable advance on what might have been considered the regulation amount obtainable. Therefore I take this opportunity of thanking the Chief Secretary for his courtesy in the matter, and ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

House adjourned at 10.44 p.m.