

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: His findings must be made public through the Minister. If the commissioner should engage upon a fishing expedition, irrespective of whether the expedition has anything to do with his real job or not, he could publish information without being responsible to anyone, not even to the Minister.

The Minister for Justice: I cannot read that into the clause.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The commissioner's job is to see that the people pay the proper price for a commodity. Should he make any discovery in the exercise of his functions, he could publish the information, although it may be quite outside his job.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The idea underlying the Bill is that an inquiry shall be made as required should there be discontent, for instance, regarding the price of any particular commodity. It might be bread. If the people concerned in the making of bread satisfied the commissioner by evidence that they were acting reasonably and were not profiteering, the commissioner, to satisfy the public, might cause the evidence to be published if he saw fit. He would not publish information regarding a person's private affairs.

Mr. DAVY: The whole duty of the commissioner appears to be, when required by the Minister, to investigate and report to him.

The Minister for Justice: Publicly if necessary.

Mr. DAVY: Yes, or privately. What conceivable reason is there for the publication of such information, not evidence nor finding of fact or of opinion, that may come to him in the exercise of his duties. There can be no argument in favour of that. It is for the Minister, not the commissioner, to publish information from the report submitted to him. The commissioner is not a publicity agent nor yet an educational authority that he should decide what should be published. He should merely carry out his investigations and submit his report to the Minister.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 24th October, 1928.

	PAGE
Question: Apprentices Indentured ...	1388
Bills: Abattoirs Act Amendment, Assembly's Message, Com. ...	1388
Lunacy Act Amendment, Com. ...	1386
Dog Act Amendment, Com., recom. ...	1397, 1404
Motion: Main Roads Board administration, to inquire by Select Committee ...	1386

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

QUESTION—APPRENTICES INDENTURED.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many boys, over 14 years of age, left school in the years 1925, 1926, and 1927 respectively? 2, How many boys were indentured under the Apprentices Act for 1925, 1926, and 1927, respectively?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Statistics are not available. 2, Apprentices indentured under the Industrial Arbitration Act numbered:—1925, 363; 1926, 406; 1927, 387.

BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

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

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. H. Kitson) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4, Subclause (1).—Delete the proposed new paragraph (c2).

The CHAIRMAN: The reason given by the Assembly for disagreeing to the amendment is, that the provision in the proposed new paragraph is the practice in every capital city in Australia, and is necessary properly to regulate and supervise the sale of stock for slaughter in the metropolitan abattoirs district.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted upon.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know whether we are inclined to turn a complete somersault without any reasons being given by the Minister. This amendment was carried by a majority of 20 to four. I pointed out previously that if the proposed new paragraph were agreed to it would create in the metropolitan area a monopoly for the saleyards conducted on behalf of the Government, which might even be turned into a revenue-producing concern.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: It would be something new if they were.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Where there is a monopoly of that description and very little labour is employed, it could be made a revenue-producing concern. Of course it is quite a different matter to run a trading concern where a lot of labour is employed. It would be quite easy to turn these saleyards into a revenue-producing concern. But I do not think the Committee should give to the Government a monopoly of this kind. Apart from the saleyards at Robb's Jetty, which are privately owned, the Government own the saleyards in the metropolitan area. I presume the owner of the saleyards at Robb's Jetty has been put to considerable expense in providing those yards. If we give the Government the sole right to sell stock in the metropolitan area, that vested interest will be considerably depreciated. I do not care much about that, but it is not right to prevent anybody else, no matter what charges the Government may impose, from ever establishing saleyards in the metropolitan area. The Assembly's message states that in all the other Australian cities the respective State Governments have this monopoly. I do not know that that influences me much or will influence the House. I do know that in the other States the people have not had the bitter experience of State trading concerns that we have had in this State. This is one of the links in the chain of trading concerns the Government are building up. They have at present the saleyards at Midland Junction, and they lease the saleyards at Fremantle. They have a sole monopoly of the abattoirs, and without the consent of the Minister nothing can be killed except at the abattoirs. As I pointed out on the second reading, the Government are working their charges in such a way as to show that they want to get

the whole of the slaughtering done by Government employees, instead of by the butchers. Having succeeded in that, their next step will be to get the distribution of the meat from the abattoirs to the butchers' shops and so build up this chain of labour, which will become another State trading concern. They are not likely to start butchers' shops, for already they have had experience in that direction. I do not think we should grant the Government a monopoly for all time to conduct saleyards in the metropolitan area. For once we in this House pass anything we can never get it back. If, subsequently, we ask for an amendment in another place they do not understand it and they look upon it with suspicion as coming from this place, and so they are likely to object, no matter how reasonable the proposition may be. I do not think the Committee should agree to give the State a monopoly, which is the object of the proposed new paragraph.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Holmes is rather drawing on his imagination.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: On his vast experience.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think so. All sales of stock, with the exception of horses and milch cows, are held in saleyards either owned or leased by the Government. Every satisfaction is given by those in control of the yards. The powers asked for in this clause are given in the other States. In New South Wales, for instance, no person shall establish, conduct, or maintain any saleyards or markets for the sale of cattle within the metropolitan area except with the consent of, and under the conditions prescribed by, the board. The clause struck out by this Chamber prohibits the sale by auction of stock except milch cows or horses, elsewhere than in saleyards established under the Act, or without a license in writing from the Minister. The regulations, however, will not apply to sales by auction on the premises of the owners of the stock. People also have the right to erect saleyards of their own, provided they can secure a license from the Minister. Mr. Holmes was trying to draw a red herring across the trail. The charges for slaughtering have nothing to do with the case. Everything in connection with the abattoirs has been agreed to by this Chamber, so that it must accept some responsibility for what has been done. Until it can be shown that the department has

failed in some respect, there is no reason why the power sought here should not be given. I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I admit that there is at present satisfaction with respect to the conduct of the saleyards, but I am thinking of the future. The Government have now no monopoly, and have not begun to raise the charges. If, however, other people are prevented from erecting saleyards, there will be no redress, no matter how exorbitant the charges may be. I cannot imagine any Minister, who has a monopoly of this sort, granting a permit to someone else to compete with him. If we insist upon the amendment, things will remain as they are, but otherwise we shall be creating a monopoly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No Government department would be prepared to do anything that would lead to raising the price of meat. On the contrary, every effort would be made to cheapen it. There is no ground for this Chamber thinking that if the Government are given these powers they will make a revenue-producing concern out of the saleyards. If heavy charges were imposed they would naturally be passed on to the consumer. No adequate reason has been given why those powers should not be accorded to the Government.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If we give the Government a monopoly, they can put up prices to any amount they like. In their endeavour to make trading concerns pay, they do as other people do. The State Sawmills were created to cheapen the price of timber, but they had not been trading long before they joined with others in a pool. If a person wants a quote from the State Sawmills, and has already obtained one from another source, the Government concern refuses to quote, on the ground that a price has already been put in by another member of the association. When a monopoly is created prices invariably go up. For that reason I must vote to insist upon the amendment.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I support Mr. Holmes' remarks. Some time in last year the Bruce Rock club applied for a liquor license for their premises. Because a State hotel has been established there the police opposed the application, which was refused. This is an instance of the Government holding the monopoly they already enjoy. To say that the Government will not extend their trading concerns

is beyond my belief. Anything the Government can get hold of in this way, they do get hold of. Whether they make a success or not of the business is another matter. I shall oppose the extension of any organisation which will give the Government further powers to enter into State trading.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: I have a vivid recollection of a discussion that took place in this Chamber upon the charges imposed for the slaughtering of stock at Midland Junction. They were very exorbitant. I think it was due to this Chamber that a reduction was brought about.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Quite right.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: The charges went up as soon as the Government obtained control. If we give them this monopoly there is nothing to prevent them from adopting the same tactics again. We should be wise if we left well alone.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Does Sir William Lathlain suggest that the licensing bench is a Government department, and is influenced by the Government?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Police Department are.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I take it that the Bruce Rock club applied to the licensing bench for a license and that, on the case put up by the police, the application was refused. If Sir William has any complaint to make against the bench, suggestive of its being a partisan bench, he should adopt a more straightforward way of bringing the matter forward. There is no connection between the granting of a club or hotel license and the matter under discussion. The Government are spending considerable sums of money in making the saleyards second to none in the Commonwealth. All they ask is that they shall have the right sought in this clause.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: The right to get back to the old conditions!

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. Private people may still apply to establish their own saleyards. If we are going to decide questions of this kind on illustrations such as that quoted by Sir William Lathlain, that the Bruce Rock club was refused a license, I do not know where we shall land ourselves. Sir William Lathlain's argument was a most ridiculous one to advance, and should carry no weight.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I assure the Committee that Sir William Lathlain's illustration will carry no weight with me. As things are at the present time, everything is going along satisfactorily, therefore why should we be asked to give the Government a monopoly?

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

Ayes	5
Noes	16

Majority against .. 11

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. J. T. Franklin
	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

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

BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

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

Clauses 1 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Power to vary order for maintenance of a divorced patient:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: According to the clause, the husband is compelled to contribute towards his divorced wife's maintenance in the asylum, but if the husband is in the asylum and the wife happens to be possessed of an income, no obligation to contribute rests on her. In these days when we hear so much about the equality of the sexes, and women are so keen on being placed on the same footing as men, a clause like this should not appear in any of our statutes. Here then is the opportunity to place the sexes on an equality.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The reason for the clause having been drafted as it appears is, I suppose, that there are so few instances of women being in a position to contribute as has been suggested. There is no reason, however, why the clause should not be amended in the direction suggested, and if an amendment is submitted I shall not oppose it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We can attain the desired end by striking out the words "the husband" which appear in lines 3 and 6 and inserting in their place "either party to such marriage."

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Perhaps the words "husband or wife" would be preferable to those suggested by Mr. Lovekin.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not mind what words are inserted in place of "the husband," but I think the words I suggested would be better. I move an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 6 the words "the husband" be struck out, and "either party to such marriage" be inserted in lieu.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

MOTION—MAIN ROADS BOARD, ADMINISTRATION.

To inquire by Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the 17th October on the following motion by Hon. H. Stewart:—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the provisions of the Main Roads Act, 1925, and the administration thereof.

HON. G. A. KEMPTON (Central): [5.15]: I wish to support the motion moved by Mr. Stewart that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the provisions of the Main Roads Act and the administration thereof. I should first like to direct attention to a remark made by the Chief Secretary. He said—

The whole thing is too funny for words, and a select committee based on such trivialities, and especially if presided over by any member who has taken up the attitude of a partisan on the question, would carry no weight at all.

If I remember rightly, the Chief Secretary several times accused Mr. Stewart of bias, and said his mind was warped on the mat-

ter of the Main Roads Act and its administration. Mr. Stewart has the right of reply, and I have no doubt he will defend himself and show that he is not biased. What I wish to point out is this: Some members of this House have spoken on the motion and others, I suppose, will speak. If they show where wasteful and extravagant work has been done and where money has been squandered, will they be told they are biased? I for one am not biased. It is the duty of any member of Parliament who thinks that large sums of money are being spent in a very haphazard way and not in the best interests of the State to try to remedy matters. That is one of the reasons why members are returned to Parliament. The question to be considered is, "Is the country getting value for its money?" In such a huge State with such a small population, we really cannot afford to waste one penny. For my part I should be glad if, after a thorough investigation by a select committee, the Main Roads Board could show that it has administered the Act satisfactorily. Then it would be the work of Parliament to amend the Act and improve it, and so lead to a better feeling between the board and the local authorities. When speaking on the Address-in-Reply I tried to make it clear that I had no desire in any way to hit the members of the Main Roads Board below the belt, but while I admit they have had a hard row to hoe, one must take notice when so many of the local authorities in one's province are constantly asking for an investigation. The Main Roads Board should welcome an inquiry so that the whole business could be placed on a sound footing and render its work much more satisfactory both for its members and for the local authorities. I am convinced that, unless a sound and honest inquiry takes place, there will be constant bickering and unrest. I consider it best for us to investigate the matter like straight, honest business men, wipe out the whole trouble, and so get a clean fresh start.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You will need a good wipe.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: That is so. Unfortunately, it is necessary to advance reasons why the inquiry should be held. It would have been better had it been possible simply to appoint a select committee to investigate the whole question without dragging all the different matters before the public. Knowing the Chief Secretary as I

do, I am firmly convinced that in his heart he is satisfied an inquiry is necessary. A few years ago he would have said in connection with local affairs, "Go into the matter thoroughly and put it on a proper footing." That is just what is necessary. The Chief Secretary, when replying to Mr. Stewart, is reported to have said that a select committee based on trivialities would carry no weight. A few days ago I was motored along the Canning-road. I think the Honorary Minister, Mr. Fraser and Mr. Gray represent that province in this House. Work that I understood was to cost £35,000—I admit the difficulty of arriving at the exact cost of the work—from what one can gather is likely to cost between £130,000 and £140,000. A writer to yesterday's "West Australian," signing himself "Economy," put the amount down at £150,000, and from what I read of his letter, I think he has certainly some good and solid information. He said the cost was £150,000 for the eight miles.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the original estimate was £35,000?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Yes. I think the Premier said in another place that it was costing three times more than the estimate. I understand that the engineer in charge of the work was dismissed. It is necessary to bear in mind that the road in question is only a few miles from the head office of the Main Roads Board. Surely over a road so close to headquarters as that, there should have been more supervision! If that road had been constructed a few hundred miles away in the country, there might have been some small excuse for overcharging, for the squandering of money and for trouble cropping up in connection with its construction. Anyhow, for the money spent, there is not the slightest doubt that a railway on the south side of the river could have been built and thoroughly equipped.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Two railways.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Probably two railways could have been built for the money; the £35,000 might have built one railway. So far as I can judge, there were no particular engineering difficulties in constructing that road. Yet, after it was made, rolled and metalled, it was found necessary to pull up parts of it and put in new culverts. This helps us to understand why the road has cost so much; the explanation is that work has been done over and over again. During the winter men have been at work raising the kerbing. They have gone along

with their tools and raised it stone by stone, and I understand that the Municipal Roads Ltd., which is doing the work, is putting about three feet of gravel on either side and a rough kerbing again on the outside of that. Lord only knows why it has been put there! The road was quite wide enough in the first place, but apparently the company had to raise the kerbing right along and it has been necessary to put in the extra gravel as a retaining formation. The company, I suppose, will do the bitumen blanket work and probably it has been found necessary to incur the extra expense. One big trouble connected with the Canning-road is that whereas formerly the grades were quite satisfactory—in some places perhaps they were a little difficult for horses, but in these days of motors they certainly presented no great difficulty—in many places embankments and in other places cuttings have been made. Right along the Canning-road and more particularly in the Melville Road Board district, big embankments and cuttings have been made and many of the blocks are now absolutely unfit for use. Quite a number of ratepayers are applying to the Melville Road Board to have cuttings made from the side roads into Canning-road so that they can obtain egress. At Money-street, for instance, the embankment is probably nearly as high as the low part of the gallery running around this Chamber—perhaps not quite so high—and a cutting is needed from Canning-road to give access to the house built on the corner of Money-street and Canning-road. The question that now arises is, “Who is to do the work?” The Melville Road Board has applied to the Main Roads Board and has been unable to get any satisfactory reply. I am satisfied that when the Canning-road is handed over to the Melville Road Board and other local boards, it will be a wonderful legacy for them. Just what will happen in connection with the drainage is another trouble. The drainage is very bad. Quite a number of people have approached the Melville Road Board and asked what they are to do in connection with the drainage. Damage has been done to their separate holdings and they are asking on whom they will serve writs.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why not serve them on Money-street? That is a good name.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: The drainage problem is exceedingly serious. There is an old lady who has made a living by selling

vegetables, keeping a few fowls, etc. Perhaps this is a small matter to mention, but she is well respected because of her independent ways and industrious life. Because of the bad drainage her house is surrounded by water in winter time, which means that her property has been rendered absolutely useless. I mention this to show that the Main Roads Board has neglected to observe proper engineering precautions when constructing the road. The Premier is reported to have said, “We were led to believe from the estimates submitted that the road would cost one-third of what it has cost, and that it will be completed for something under £140,000. It is a very big jump from the original estimate of £35,000 to £140,000. Surely that is sufficient warrant for appointing a select committee to investigate the administration of the Main Roads Act. The board seems to be particularly unfortunate in its choice of engineers. It is claimed that one of its principal engineers was responsible for the Canning-road fiasco. The Chief Secretary said the board was unfortunate in its engineer in the northern districts and that he was dismissed for the inefficient and generally unsatisfactory character of his work. I am glad the Chief Secretary admits that the work was sometimes unsatisfactory. When speaking on the Address-in-Reply I mentioned that 209 chains of the Moora-Geraldton-road in the Greenough district had cost £14,635 6s. 7d., or £70 per chain. By the way, I notice that “Economy,” in yesterday’s “West Australian,” put the cost of that road at £5,612 per mile, or £16,836 for the three miles.

The Honorary Minister: Who is “Economy”?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I do not know.

The Honorary Minister: I thought you might know.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I think I probably understated the amount. As I said before, “Economy” seems to have some very useful information. In one of the Geraldton papers I read a remark by the Chief Secretary that mine was a misleading statement because the whole cost of that road, including overhead charges, was £12,285, or £58 per chain, and that I had tried to mislead the House over the cost. I have here a circular from the Main Roads Board stating that 209 chains of forming, clearing, metalling, drains, earthworks and culverts cost £6,272 5s. 8d. That represents the 15s. of the £1 15s. The Chief Secretary

admitted that. The Federal portion of the cost, therefore, must be £8,363 0s. 11d., or a total of £14,635 6s. 7d. That is, taking the Main Roads Board's figures, just over £70 per chain. The Chief Secretary said I should have gone to the Main Roads Board for this information. Surely there would not be anything misleading in a circular signed and sent out by the Main Roads Board. If it is so, the only conclusion is that the local authorities are being overcharged.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: This is a further justification for the appointment of a select committee.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: If the Chief Secretary's figures are right, surely even £58 per chain is absurdly high for a country road. However, I must be just to the Main Roads Board. This was not all their fault. The men who built the 209 chains of road were rushed to the spot in time to enrol for the general election. Their fares were paid over the Midland railway when they could just as well have been taken over the Wangan Hills line, and have been landed at no expense on account of railage. However, that route would have landed them a day too late to be enrolled for the general election. I have here a letter which has a bearing on that aspect. I think it well to read the letter to the House. It came to me only a day or two ago. It says—

Dear Kempton,—Talking to Mr. Vernon Connolly to-day—

Mr. Vernon Connolly is well and favourably known to northern members—

—re the Main Roads Board men arriving at Greenough, he states that 120 men arrived at Crampton without provisions and tools of any description. The drays arrived also, but the horses were consigned to Mullewa, and when they were re-consigned they were sent to Bookara instead of Crampton. The men were camped at the siding for several days, and then shifted alongside the road adjoining the Anglican church at South Greenough. This was too open, and they again shifted camp among the hills. The macadamised road close to the church was torn up for several chains and re-made. The work of construction from Duncan's to the church which was made last year has now cost the road board £100 for gravel alone, as supplied by Connolly this month, and the road board have had to put a man on to spread same. Strange to say, the road torn up some 14 years ago was made by Mr. Connolly, and is still a monument to the work put in, which cost £7 to £8 per chain.

That road costing £7 or £8 per chain carried the whole of the heavy traffic in the district, and we all know that Greenough is a farm-

ing district with a great deal of heavy wheat carting.

It makes him smile to think that the cost of the new work has amounted to something like £70 per chain, and he doesn't wonder that it cost twice as much. He is quite satisfied that a bigger imposition on the district could not be imposed.

The Honorary Minister: Who is the writer of that letter?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Mr. Meadowcroft, of Geraldton.

Hon. J. R. Brown: He has a grievance.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I listened with interest to some figures given by the Chief Secretary regarding men who Mr. Stewart said were dumped at Armadale. The Chief Secretary tried to prove by statistics from the last two general elections that those men were not sent to Armadale to be placed on the roll. I also tried my hand at those statistics, and I obtained some figures which are rather interesting. We on our side say that men were sent just before the last general election to three places in the Greenough electorate—Ajana, Mullewa, and South Greenough. If there are two places in Greenough where the population has not grown, they are Ajana and South Greenough. Mr. Hall knows that. South Greenough is a place that has not grown in population.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Is it in your province?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Yes. The figures which I have obtained from the 1924 and 1927 election returns for the three places in question are as follows:—

Greenough Electorate.

		Ajana.	
1924—			
Kennedy	10	
Maley	13	
Patrick	15	
Informal	0	
			38
1927—			
Kennedy	32	
Maley	8	
Smith	18	
Informal	1	
			59
		South Greenough.	
1924—			
Kennedy	11	
Maley	20	
Patrick	3	
Informal	0	
			34

1927—			
Kennedy	66
Maley	15
Smith	11
Informal	7
			—
			99
			—

Mullewa.

1924—			
Kennedy	117
Maley	16
Patrick	16
Informal	2
			—
			217
			—

1927—			
Kennedy	191
Maley	105
Smith	43
Informal	6
			—
			345
			—

Hon. J. R. Brown: This has nothing to do with the select committee you are advocating.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I am merely following the example set by the hon. member's leader, the Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary's figures were taken from the table from which I got mine. If the Chief Secretary can adopt that course in order to show that men were not sent to Arnadale, I can adduce figures to show that men were sent to South Greenough and other places.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you suggest that the higher numbers are due to the men sent out to be put on the roll?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: There is not the slightest doubt about it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They were sent out to vote, not to work.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Another place to which I wish to refer is Tardun, near Mullewa.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you want to shift all casual labourers into one electorate at election time?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: No. We want them to work for their money.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I object, for instance, to money being squandered by reason of men being sent over a private railway when they could be sent over a Government railway. At Tardun there was no booth in 1924. The Tardun figures for the 1927 election were—Kennedy 16, Maley 9, Smith 3, informal 0; total, 19. Kennedy got 16 out of 19 votes.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Kennedy got very popular up there.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Yes, with the men who were sent up there, the money of the State being squandered in sending them up.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You took no steps to stop the work from being done; you welcomed it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There was no work.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I think I am perfectly in order in giving particulars of various roads. After I had referred to this subject on the Address-in-reply, the Chief Secretary hit back very hard at me, and represented that I had made many wrong statements. I was not here when the Chief Secretary spoke, but I read the Press reports of his utterances, particularly in the Geraldton newspapers. The hon. gentleman complained that I had not gone to the Main Roads Board to obtain information. My information was obtained from the local authorities.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you suggest that the Chief Secretary gave wrong information to this House?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I say he stated that I had given wrong information. If he wanted to check my statement or to verify the information he obtained from the Main Roads Board, why did not he go to the local authorities? I spoke only of places in his own province, places that he knows as well as I do. In fact, he has lived there longer than I have. My information was given by men like Mr. Duncan, of Greenough, one of the straightest men on earth, whom Mr. Drew has known for many years. Certainly I did not give the House any misleading information. Speaking on the Address-in-reply with regard to Georgina-road 13Q, I said that the Main Roads Board's letter of the 4th July, this year, stated that 127 chains of roadway cost £956 8s. 7d., or £7 10s. per chain. When measured by the officer of the local road board, however, the length was found to be only 78 chains, a difference of 49 chains, making the cost £12 5s. per chain instead of £7 10s. According to the newspaper report, the Chief Secretary said the Main Roads Board had "treated" 127 chains.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Will not all this come out before the select committee when formed?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: The Main Roads Board's circular speaks of 127 chains of roadway "constructed," not "treated," at a cost of £956 8s. 7d. I say without hesitation that the Main Roads Board neither treated nor constructed 127 chains. After reading the report I motored out to Greenough with a certificated engineer. We picked up the Greenough road board's secretary, Mr. Jack Maley, and chained the road—not by the speedometer, but by walking the distance and passing the chain over it. We found the distance to be only 79 chains. I will not say the Chief Secretary gave me the lie direct, but I will say he got wrong information from somebody. Somebody put up a big bluff. Not the Chief Secretary, but someone from the Main Roads Board tried to show that the board had done a greater length of road so that the cost should be kept down.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You arrived at the measurement by just stepping the distance?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: No. He chained it.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: We got out of the car and walked along the road. With the certificated engineer, a man who has been connected with the Perth City Council, we chained the distance, and found it to be absolutely wrong so far as the Main Roads Board's statement was concerned. There was certainly a little done beyond the 79 chains of road. There was a little clearing extending over about a chain and a small quantity of earthworks that a boy could have done with a spade for about £1.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Then the Chief Secretary gave to the House information that was incorrect?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Yes. I do not say that the Chief Secretary was responsible, but he should have verified his figures by conferring with people in the country, of whom I told him.

Hon. E. H. Harris: If we appoint a select committee, can we find out who did the bluffing?

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I am sure we can. There are people who can be asked to help us, and they will say exactly what has been done. They will not hedge, and they will say that money has been squandered and spent recklessly in their district.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And the same thing applies all over the State.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: Then there is the McCartney-road. The Main Roads Board

intimated that a certain length of that road had been constructed for £1,027 5s. 4d. They said that the length of road constructed was 74 chains, but we found when we chained it off that the length constructed was 20 chains short of what the Main Roads Board had stated. That brought the cost of the road from £13 17s. 6d. per chain to £19 per chain. On that point I have received the following letter from the secretary of the Greenough District Road Board:—

Confirming my wire of even date regarding the length of road completed on Georgina-road, No. 13Q, the Main Roads Board quote £956 8s. 7d. expenditure, and length of roadway constructed, 127 chains. This measured actually 78 chains. McCartney-road, No. 13R, expenditure £1,027 5s. 6d., length of roadway constructed, 74 chains. This measured actually 38 chains of gravel and 17½ chains of stonework—55 chains. I am prepared to take any independent nominee of the Government and re-measure the works.

That should be sufficient. I am giving these particulars to the House in order to show that I did not make rash statements when I spoke about the Main Roads Board on a former occasion. The Chief Secretary said that my allegations were tantamount to a charge of fraud against the Main Roads Board. As I said before, someone was putting up a bluff, although I know it was not the Chief Secretary. The Leader of the House wondered why I had a grievance in connection with the expenditure of £640, the amount allocated to the Greenough Road Board. He said that the money had been spent, and he wanted to know what my grievance was. The point was that after the Main Roads Board had constructed the road at a cost of £70 per chain, the road board found it necessary, after the road had been constructed for a few months only, to spend £100 per mile to put it in order again. Surely that is a good reason why we should have a select committee to inquire into the administration of the Main Roads Board. There is another little point I can refer to, and it has reference to the Swan bridge. I stated that the bridge cost £43,246, but the Chief Secretary said that the bridge cost £10,000 odd, and that I had over-stated the amount by £33,000. Of course I did not refer to the bridge alone. When a bridge is constructed there must be approaches to it. We cannot have a house without an entrance, and so it is necessary to build approaches to a bridge. The fact remains that the cost for the whole of the work in connection with the

bridge amounted to £43,246. Let us consider the figures that the Chief Secretary gave. He did not deny that the cost of the whole of the work amounted to £43,000, but stressed the point that the bridge cost £10,000 only. If we take the Minister's figures, the approaches to the bridge cost something like £33,149. Thus for the 408 chains of clearing, forming and metalling, with the necessary drains, culverts and fences, we have approaches that cost £81 5s. per chain. I think members will agree that that represented rather an expensive piece of road and bridge work! Then, again, I mentioned that £5,000 had been spent by the Main Roads Board on the Yalgoo-road. The Minister said that the money represented State funds and not the funds at the disposal of the Main Roads Board. The fact remains that the Main Roads Board constructed the road, and that money was absolutely wasted. On that point the Yalgoo people wrote me as follows:—

The £5,000 recently spent considered a waste of money; had half that amount been placed in the hands of the Magnet and Yalgoo boards, a new road could have been cut and the travelling public would have had no complaint. In many instances the local governing authorities could have carried out the work far better for half the cost.

This is rather scathing on the Main Roads Board! I also mentioned that in the Yalgoo district the Main Roads Board had cleared 2080 chains of road. I mentioned that the work had cost far more than any road the Yalgoo people had constructed, and the Minister asked what they were to do, as they had given the work to the lowest tenderer! I can quite understand the difficulty the Government experienced in getting a decent tender. Probably the tenderers had to wade through the 22 pages of specifications, and to pay a lawyer a retaining fee in order to see that they did not break any of the many clauses. Indeed, it is quite possible that they had to take a course in law before commencing the contract! The specifications were absolutely ridiculous. I think it very important to refer to the letter signed "Economy," which appeared in the "West Australian." I presume that hon. members read that letter. The writer did not make any charges against the Main Roads Board, the Government, or anyone else. The letter read as follows:—

In a recent publication of the "West Australian" it was stated that Mr. Stewart, M.L.C., moved for a select committee to in-

quire into the administration of the Main Roads Board. At the time of writing the Minister for Works, Mr. A. McCallum, had issued instructions for a special audit to carry out an investigation relative to the construction of the Canning-road, the cost of which was £150,000 for eight miles of roadway. In addition to this special audit, might I direct the attention of the Minister to the following items:—Trunk roads—the Bunbury-Busselton-road, cost £7,140 per mile; the Coolgardie-Esperance, £1,900; the Rockingham-Mandurah-road, £2,311; the Moora-Geraldton (Crampton section), £5,612; the Moora-Geraldton-road (sandplain section), £1,900. Arterial roads:—Perth-Albany-road — Perth-Armadale section, £8,532 per mile; Armadale-Williams, £6,200. Mt. Barker-Albany, £3,732. Midland Junction-Merredin:—Baker's Hill section, £4,281 per mile; Wooroloo section £3,380. Midland Junction-Meekatharra-road:—Upper Swan-Bullsbrook section, £4,810 per mile.

Hon members will agree that those represent quite decent costs for country roads!

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: The writer got some good information from some person.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: During the course of his speech, Mr. Stewart dealt with the Act. The Chief Secretary and Ministers in another place seem to lay all the blame on the Act as amended in this House. They severely criticised the amendments suggested by the select committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Stewart. I was not then a member of the House, but I have looked up the "Hansard" reports and at the finish of the debate I read with interest some remarks by the Chief Secretary. At the conclusion of the consideration of the Bill in Committee, the Chief Secretary said—

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the work carried out by the select committee. I have not offered my congratulations to the members of that committee previously. They put in good work, and exhausted every avenue from which they could produce useful information. In my view the result of their work is that we have an excellent Bill.

Then, according to the report in "Hansard," members interjected "Hear, hear!" Apparently the Chief Secretary was quite satisfied the select committee had done good work. I was also blamed by the Minister, who said that after I had been the head of an important local authority, I had had nothing constructive to offer. The same old taunt is heard when anyone dares to criticise. We have heard it time after time. All we ask now is that a select committee shall be appointed to clean up the mess, so that we may have more harmonious

working between the Main Roads Board and the local authorities. If that is done, we shall not then have motions such as have been passed at public meetings and at other gatherings. Here are a few of the motions to which I refer. The following motion was passed by the Mingenew board:—

In the opinion of this board the work generally as specified is unduly elaborate and costly, and inapplicable to local conditions and requirements, which would be better served if cheaper methods of construction were adopted and a greater length of road made for the same expenditure.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You ought to rouse upon members of the Bruce-Page Government for that, not upon the State Government.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: I am not speaking about the Government but about the Main Roads Board.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But the specifications were drawn up by the Federal Government. The resolution you have quoted refers to the specifications.

Hon. G. A. KEMPTON: The specifications are certainly elaborate and the Chief Secretary said they could not be defended in any way. The Greenough Road Board, in their criticism, contended that the cost of construction was too high. Then there was the following motion passed at a conference of the Road Boards Association of Western Australia:—

That we, the representatives of the roads boards here assembled, emphatically protest against the amount charged as being out of all proportion to the benefit conferred upon the ratepayers concerned, and respectfully ask the Government to review the position and to amend the Main Roads Act so as to relieve road boards of these charges and to write off all amounts so charged up to date.

Conferences of local authorities have been held at Bridgetown, Beverley and Geraldton, and at each conference resolutions were passed strongly criticising the administration of the Main Roads Board, under which the money made available under the Federal aid roads agreement had been expended. For the most part it was contended that the cost of the roads constructed by the Main Roads Board was excessive, that the roads were not satisfactorily built, and that the local authorities were being saddled with construction and maintenance charges that they would be unable to bear. I do not wish to weary the House by going into a

mass of details. I could continue for quite a long time dealing with extracts from the reports of various conferences, and from communications received from local authorities. I certainly think the time has arrived when we should hold an inquiry such as is now suggested. Surely the three members of this Chamber who represent the province through which the Canning-road has been built, must realise that money has been absolutely squandered there, and I think it is up to us to appoint a select committee to go into the whole question, wipe out the existing troubles, and get a good clean start again. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [6.0]: I do not desire to delay the House more than a few moments. I do not want to bring up familiar cases relating to the Main Roads Board. But I do think the House would be lacking in its duty if it failed to pass the motion moved by Mr. Stewart. For this reason: The Premier himself, on his return from the Eastern States some time ago, threw down the gauntlet to this House when he claimed that all the letters that were then appearing in the Press, and the outcry against the Main Roads Board were due entirely to the Act under which the board had to work, and that the Act had been amended in the Legislative Council until it was quite different from the one the Assembly had sent here. He said it was not the Government measure, but was something very different and quite contrary to the intentions of the Government. Since the Premier threw down the gauntlet to us, it is up to us to accept it. It is for this House at least to inquire into the working of the Main Roads Act, as requested in the motion put up by Mr. Stewart, which is for a select committee to inquire into the working of the Act itself and the administration thereof. I hope the House will agree to the motion. Personally I do not wish to criticise either the board or its administration. I claim that is for a select committee to do. It is due to the House that the proposed inquiry should be held.

HON. H. A. STEPHENSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [6.2]: As one of those who served on the select committee dealing with main roads, I should like to say the chairman, Mr. Stewart, proved to be very capable indeed. I was very much impressed

with the able manner in which he conducted the business of that committee. The committee travelled right down to Albany and took evidence from nearly all the local authorities, and went into various questions about operations in the other States. After a considerable amount of work we had several conferences with Mr. McCallum, the Minister for Works, and finally, when we prepared our report, everybody concerned seemed well satisfied with it and with the Bill. As Mr. Kempton has already said, the Leader of this House congratulated the committee on their good work. In all seriousness I say it is not altogether the Act that is at fault, but the administration of it which has been proved to be very inefficient. As to the squandering of money, every member who has travelled over the various roads handled by the Main Roads Board, and seen them under construction, can come to no other conclusion than that thousands of pounds have been wasted throughout the length and breadth of the State.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask members not to hold committee meetings in the Chamber while a member is speaking.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Sir. If we want a sample of the work that has been done, we do not need to go any further than the south road from Perth to Fremantle. It has a length of eight miles or thereabouts, and I understand it has cost something like £140,000 to date, although not nearly finished. There are hundreds of tons of coarse metal thrown on the side of the road. What is going to be done with it I do not know, but I suppose it has to be paid for. Quite a fair length of the road is working into holes already, although it has scarcely been completed. To my mind that work alone has shown gross incompetence on the part of those responsible for it. The time has arrived when a full inquiry should be made, either by a select committee or by a Royal Commission. I do not know of anything that is doing more to bring about the insolvency of Western Australia than is the administration of the Main Roads Board. We have a large amount of money subscribed by the Federal Government, but for every pound we expend of that money we have to find 15s. of local money, on which the taxpayers of Western Australia have to pay interest. This must

stop. The time has arrived when the squandering of money must cease. That can only be brought about by a competent body that will go thoroughly into the matter and put their finger on the weakness in the position and so prevent the waste from going any further. I will support the motion.

HON. W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [6.7]: I am not going to labour this question. I am going to vote for the motion. Our experience of select committees has not been a happy one, and I have very little faith in them. But I am hoping that in this instance we shall get some practical benefit from the appointment of such a committee.

Hon. E. H. Harris You suggest that it should be a Royal Commission?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: We have had Royal Commissions by the dozen, particularly in the Federal sphere. Such bodies, after exhaustive inquiries submit their reports, which are considered by Parliament. Then after much time has been spent in the making of speeches on those reports, members have passed on to the next Order of the Day, and practically nothing further has been heard of the Royal Commissions' reports. Of that we have a splendid illustration in the select committee appointed by this Parliament to inquire into group settlement. That committee did excellent practical work, and if to-day anybody would take the trouble to peruse the report submitted by that committee to the House, he would find in it recommendations that, if adopted, would have provided effective safeguards against the outstanding anomalies existing in group settlement. But that committee submitted its report, summing up its exhaustive labours. The report was thrashed out here in the House, item by item, after which we passed on to other subjects and have heard but little of that report ever since. One thing that has brought home to me the necessity for this proposed select committee is the fact that from the inauguration of the Main Roads Board it was thought we did not know all we might know about the construction of roads. So the chairman of the Main Roads Board was sent on a tour round the world in order to find out how roads were made in other countries. That was an extraordinary thing to do, for prior to that time the Victorian authority had sent an officer around the

world for exactly the same purpose. One of the most comprehensive reports on road construction I have ever been privileged to read was duly presented by that officer to the Victorian Parliament. So all that we had to do was to ask for a copy of that report, wherein we should have found all the information that the chairman of the Main Roads Board in our own State could possibly secure in a tour of the world. Then there is this remarkable thing: the chairman of the Main Roads Board, after having visited Merredin, where he saw some practical road construction in conditions similar to those of our South-West, came back and made a very memorable statement. He did not say directly, but by implication he very clearly said that at Merredin he had learned more in one day than he had learned in the whole course of his world tour. That was a truly remarkable statement to make. I do not know who paid the cost of that tour. I presume it came out of the Main Roads Board's funds and that that charge, like others, has helped to heap up the excessive cost of administration. Here is another case I have in mind: a road board in the territory I have the honour to represent made application to get some work done in their area. They were privileged to contract for the work. They had prepared a very accurate estimate of the cost of that work in order that they might tender to the Main Roads Board with a prospect of success. They went so far as to ask for the Main Roads Board's estimate of the value of the work. The reply was that a tender that might be accepted would be £10s. per chain for the road. That road board tendered to do the work for £7 10s. per chain, and they got the job. They immediately called tenders to sublet the work, and a sublet it at a price of £2 10s. per chain. The man who took the job made an excellent profit from it. There is in the Main Roads Bill a provision prescribing that any profit made by a local authority on road work must be expended on the same road. The board which I refer made a profit of £400 on that job, and because of that provision were compelled to expend that £400 on a road that did not even need repairing. That is another instance of maladministration. I do hope the appointment of this select committee will be agreed to. Following on the last elections I was amazed at the statements broadcast from public platforms and from the Press to the effect that a campaign

had been carried out for the packing of certain electorates. I was one of the very few, perhaps I was the only one, who when speaking on the Address-in-reply subsequent to the last elections, said that in the light of the statements that had been made about the packing of electorates there appeared to me to be nothing else to do but to appoint a select committee to inquire into the truth of those statements. I said I had my doubts as to whether those statements were fact or fiction; that I was only certain they all were made by public speakers or by leading articles in the Press. Also I said that whether or not there was any foundation of truth in them, the Main Roads Board and the Government and any other person concerned should welcome the appointment of a select committee to find out whether or not the statements were authentic. Although many members of the House had made such statements outside, they did not support the idea of a select committee at that time.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Did anybody move for one?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: No, and apart from me, nobody spoke of it, despite all the noise being made in the street. In my view this belated motion for a select committee should have been moved soon after the last elections. However, I hope the motion will now be agreed to and that we shall have a better result from the select committee's inquiry than we have had in the majority of instances in the past. I will support the motion.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [7.30]: All I have to say on this question will be said in a few words. As a member of the original select committee I well remember the trouble we had in arriving at the difficulty that evidently confronted the Minister. After evidence had been taken from the various road boards, it was recognised that the great problem facing the successful operations under the Main Roads Bill was that of finance. When eventually Clause 30 was embodied in the Bill, it was done with the idea of overcoming as far as it was possible the difficulty confronting road boards in carrying out their operations, and at the same time reserving to the Government those powers that were thought necessary in order that the Main Roads Board might function. Much of the discussion that

has taken place, not only at road board conferences, but through the Press, has been due to the fact that people have failed to recognise the difficulty that we endeavoured to overcome. Reference has been made to the introduction of political issues. Politics have certainly been introduced, not only on the occasion of the last general elections, but immediately prior to the Legislative Council elections of this year. Seeing that political issues have been raised, in the interests of all concerned the matter should be thrashed out and investigated, so that the public may have evidence placed before them upon which they may form their own conclusions as to what is at the back of these allegations. A tremendous amount of money has been spent in the construction of these main roads. In the interests of the department itself an investigation should be made into this expenditure. In the circumstances I intend to support the motion for the appointment of a select committee in order that the whole matter may be thoroughly gone into. The Government would be well advised to take it into their own hands and appoint a Royal Commission, consisting of a judge, who would investigate every aspect of the question and make a report to the country. That is the only method by which all the circumstances may be thoroughly investigated and a satisfactory settlement arrived at. A Royal Commission would present a report that would commend itself to the people as being entirely impartial. The investigation would disclose the truth underlying all the controversy that has taken place, and make clear to the people the difficulties under which the Main Roads Board are at present operating.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [7.33]: It will be admitted that a *prima facie* case has been made out for the appointment of a select committee. I do not propose to say anything as to whether or not the evidence collected will justify the statements that have been made in the House. We must all agree from the speeches we have heard that a *prima facie* case has been made out for this investigation. I, therefore, propose to vote for the motion. I think it was Mr. Kempton who made a reference to some remark of the Minister this afternoon to the effect that either Mr. Stewart or some other member had put up something that was ridiculous or absurd. The Government have been trying to treat the whole matter as a joke. I look upon it

as a serious question. Immediately after the general elections, despite what Mr. Glasheen has said, I stood on the floor of the House and demanded that an inquiry should be made into the question of men being put out to make roads, when rumours were afloat that they were sent out to vote, but not to work. I do not claim that such a thing did happen.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Neither do I.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It was in the atmosphere, and it was therefore the duty of the Government to clear the matter up. I demanded that it should be cleared up.

Hon. J. R. Brown: There was nothing to clear up.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That kind of thing affects the political life of the country. It was suggested that the Government were brought into power by means such as this. That was a reflection upon both Parliament and the country. I do not say anything of the kind actually happened.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Then what are you growling about?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But it was said. In their own interests the Government should have instituted a full inquiry without delay.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: So they should.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If this matter goes before a select committee it cannot be dealt with in any half-hearted manner. It must be thoroughly investigated. I make this suggestion, and I ask the Minister to see that the Government agree to it. The select committee cannot finish their investigations by the end of the present session.

The Honorary Minister: Are they going to travel all over the country?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The investigation cannot be completed before Parliament adjourns. If that is so, the select committee will automatically cease to exist when the House rises. We were faced with the same position in connection with the select committee appointed to make inquiries into the Peel Estate. The Mitchell Government were in power at the time. It was pointed out to them that we could not complete our labours in time, but that we would be prepared to act as an honorary Royal Commission. I cannot see why the Government should object to an honorary Royal Commission. I claim that when a man volunteers to give service to the country as a member of Parliament, he should be prepared to carry out, in an honorary capacity,

any public duties he is fitted for. The Government should therefore agree if this select committee is appointed, and does not conclude its labours in time, to convert it into an honorary Royal Commission. They should desire the fullest investigation into this matter.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Do you mean they should pay their own out of pocket expenses?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I mean that they should give their services without any payment. If it should be necessary for the honorary Royal Commission, in the course of their investigations, to travel somewhere by train, they should travel free. If they have to hire a motor car for inspection purposes, that should be hired without charge to them.

The Chief Secretary: Can they accept payment?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Of course they can.

The Chief Secretary: It is news to me that members of Parliament can accept payment for that class of work.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Does the Chief Secretary mean payment per sitting?

The Chief Secretary: Yes.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: They can accept payment, but I do not think they should.

The Chief Secretary: I think it is risky.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Risky for them to accept?

The Chief Secretary: To accept payment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is done elsewhere.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not an office of profit under the Crown.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am sorry to say it is done all over Australia. Huge sums of money are split up amongst members of Parliament who have offered their services to the country. This select committee should automatically become an honorary Royal Commission. The only objection the Government would have to the appointment of a Royal Commission would be in respect to the payment of members. If the Commission acted in an honorary capacity, that objection would be removed. Not only does this matter concern the political life of the country, but it concerns its welfare and development. In America, immediately the President came into office, he called his men together from all parts of the United States. He urged upon them that the development of the country depended upon the means

of transport, and that there was a special strain upon the roads of America in order that efficient means of transport might be provided. In Western Australia this question crops up everywhere. Millions of acres of country require to be reached from long distances. If we are paying 50 per cent. or 100 per cent. more for our roads than we should pay, it follows that we are getting only a part of the work done that should be done. The Government should court an inquiry in order that we might get the roads of the country put into order, and the State developed as it should be.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: The select committee could not finish its work by the end of the session?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If that is the case it should be turned into an honorary Royal Commission when its labours could be completed by the ensuing session. The Government should court the fullest inquiry into this matter. The country demands it. They should not therefore object to the appointment of a Royal Commission. The House would then understand that it would be left to the Governor on the recommendation of Ministers that this select committee should be appointed an honorary Royal Commission.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT

In Committee.

Resumed from 18th October; the Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; Hon. C. F. Baxter in charge of the Bill.

Clause 8—Application of Sections 6A, 22A, 83A, and 34A:

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment before the Chair is that all the words after "Act" in line 5 be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The effect of this amendment would be that Sections 6 (a), 22 (a), 23 (a), and 34 (a) would not have effect in the metropolitan area, but would have effect in other municipal areas. There will be a very big risk if the amendment is carried. It will then be possible to lay poison in backyards, main roads, and anywhere at all, with the consequent result that the lives of all animals will be endangered. The Bill provides that

any municipality may be brought within its scope and consequently there is no need for the amendment. If there should be in the municipality a number of dogs that are looked upon as a danger, it will be possible to have that municipality brought under the Bill, but if the amendment is carried every municipality will be brought within its scope. The clause should be permitted to remain as it is and if necessity should arise, to add the name of a particular district to the list of those brought under the operations of the Bill, then that could be done. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Honorary Minister is quite wrong in his arguments for the reason that stock are not depastured in a person's back-yard. The amendment is necessary because our worst trouble is in the municipalities in any districts. I do not see why we should exempt particular towns in the country when smaller towns which are under road board jurisdiction are brought under the operations of the Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the amendment is agreed to, it will be necessary for the owners of dogs in various country municipalities to keep those dogs constantly on the chain.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: And a good thing, too.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That may be the hon. member's opinion. Under Mr. Baxter's amendment it will be possible for any person evilly disposed towards his neighbour to get even with his neighbour by laying poison for the dog.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What is to prevent any person doing that now?

The HONORARY MINISTER: If poison is laid in back-yards where stock is sometimes kept, or in paddocks, there is always the danger of a valuable dog being destroyed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Which is the more valuable, dogs or stock? We have to depend upon stock for our living. Not one municipality that is likely to be affected has entered a protest against any of the provisions of the Bill. The Bill has been before Parliament for a considerable time and all have had an opportunity to study it. As a matter of fact, all country municipalities welcome it so that they may be able to protect their stock to a greater extent than is possible to-day.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: The amendment is quite necessary, and it will

place everybody on the same footing. At Kalgoorlie there is a municipality and the road board, with practically only a hundred yards dividing them. Take the municipality of Collie, and a smaller place like Donnybrook which has only a road board. There we have two towns of small status, one of which would be exempt whilst the other would come under the provisions of the Bill.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It is time Parliament took some action to compel people living in municipalities to exercise more control over all dogs. Having had eight years' experience of municipal work I can truthfully say that most of the dogs in a municipality are looked upon by a majority of the ratepayers as a great nuisance. Everybody regards his dog as being valuable, but everybody does not take out a license for his dog until he is compelled to do so. Municipalities have great difficulty in dealing with dogs. Everywhere one goes there is to be found a great number of mongrels that are ill-fed, and those are the dogs that go out into sheep paddocks and help themselves.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: This House owes a duty to all country people, not alone farmers. We are dealing with a Bill that is supposed to be for the control of domestic dogs, but it seems to me that the desire is to exterminate dogs altogether. Mr. Baxter asked which was the more valuable, stock or dogs. That is not the question at all. It is absurd to put all dogs into the one group. The faithful dog is the best companion, apart from a human being, that a man can have. Good dogs require to be protected as well as sheep, and to say that every dog will go out and kill sheep is absurd. The powers suggested are too great. Every town should be exempt from the operations of the Bill.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That would make the Bill useless.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If in a town it was found that dogs wandered into farmers' paddocks, it would be possible, under the powers conferred by the Act, to bring the township within the operations of the statute. The Bill goes too far and will encourage farmers to be on the lazy side. Moreover, the Bill will be an injustice to prospectors, and also to those who own dogs for hunting. It will also be an injustice to women and children out in the bush who invariably require dogs for their protection.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What kind of prospector are you referring to?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Any prospector. If I went out I should first of all see that I had a good dog.

Hon. G. W. Miles: In the old days prospectors found it hard enough to carry their own tucker, let alone food for a dog.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I can see that the hon. member is no lover of dogs. It can also truthfully be said that dogs have saved farmers thousands of pounds. If the Bill is carried it will mean the extermination of dogs, good, bad and indifferent. I ask Mr. Baxter not to press the amendment, but to let the Bill go as it is, and try it out. I make that suggestion knowing what great service good dogs have rendered to mankind.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I support the amendment. It is absurd to exempt municipalities. The Bill would apply to a place like Broomehill and not to Katanning. It would apply to Kojonup, Pingelly and Beverley, and not to York. It would apply to Toodyay and not to Northam. There are paddocks right up to those townships. The members for the districts desire this protection and so do the people interested in stock. If members opposing the amendment had any interest in stock, they would know what a menace roaming dogs are to stock breeders.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the position at Geraldton is as was mentioned by Mr. Hall, there should be no difficulty in getting Geraldton brought under the measure. Mr. Miles's remarks are hardly to the point. There are only half a dozen municipalities outside the metropolitan area.

Hon. E. H. Harris: There are a few in my district.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There are Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And only four others?

The HONORARY MINISTER: How many are there?

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: About 16 outside the metropolitan area.

The HONORARY MINISTER: If that be so, what harm is there in exempting them unless they desire to be brought within the scope of the measure? Surely the local governing bodies have the interests of their districts at heart! It is not fair to include the whole of the municipalities and make it compulsory for them, when any one of them that desires may be brought within the scope of the measure.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: All municipalities are exempt from the payment of the

vermin rate. Unless the amendment be carried, we shall be further exempting them, so that the dogs may continue to roam at large and menace people who are trying to stock the country. Many sheep are carried in the districts mentioned by Mr. Miles, and dogs are permitted to roam at large through the carelessness of their owners. Recently a man found several dogs destroying his sheep. One of the dogs belonged to the bank manager, and the other to the lawyer in the adjacent municipality. What chance had he of getting redress against his own bank manager? That is the kind of thing stock owners are up against. I support the amendment in the hope that such people will help to keep the dogs in check. Around the centres of population much destruction is done by domestic dogs.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I support the amendment. This is a House of equity and justice.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is not giving the dogs much of a go.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is surprising that, in a democratic country with a Labour Government in power, we should be asked to set up two classes in the community, one in the municipality that may keep dogs and one in the road districts that may not do so. It is absurd. At Shark Bay there is a road board, at Carnarvon a municipality, Onslow a road board, Roebourne a road board, Tableland a road board, Nullagine a road board, Marble Bar a road board, Port Hedland a road board, Broome a municipality, Derby a road board, Fitzroy a road board, and Wyndham a road board. Why should the people who live in the Carnarvon and Broome municipalities have a different set of conditions as against those who live in road boards? The Minister said that any municipality could be brought within the scope of the Act on application being made. Why not go further and allow the road boards to apply to come in?

The Honorary Minister: There is a big difference.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Many places that at one time were municipalities are now road boards because it is more economical to administer a road board than a municipality. I think the only difference is there is more frill about a municipality than a road board. Yet a democratic Government

proposes to add more frill, and people living in road districts are to be under different conditions as compared with the silver-tails that live in municipalities. Dogs lie up during the day and go abroad at night. When we meet a man of the world who is accustomed to break out occasionally, he is referred to as an old dog. That comes from the historic dog that perpetrates all its devilment and mischief at night. I guarantee that Act or no Act, if I so desired, I could poison every dog in Perth and no one would know who had done it.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You could do it easier under this measure.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Such a thing has not been done because the people as a whole are lovers of dogs. Let us treat everyone fairly. I agree to the exemption of the metropolitan area because the fields and paddocks do not come up to the borders of the towns, but when we have municipalities in the centre of agricultural and pastoral districts with fields extending right up to the back doors of hotels, etc., the municipalities should be put on the same footing as are road boards.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not impressed with the arguments of the Honorary Minister in his desire to discriminate between road boards and municipalities. On the goldfields we have a road board sandwiched between two municipalities. If it is right to lay poison in a road board area, it is right to lay it in a municipality that is only 100 yards away.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is an argument against the Bill.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am dealing with the amendment. Mr. Gray appealed for protection against unscrupulous persons. If there are unscrupulous persons they may be found in municipalities as well as in road districts, and vicious dogs are likewise to be found in municipalities as well as in road districts. During election campaigns, when feeling is running rather high, some of us have seen notices on gates "Beware of the dog," and there have not been wanting suggestions that the dog would be sooled on directly the caller intimated for whom he was canvassing. Consequently, one feels inclined, when dealing with vicious dogs, to have the provisions applied to municipalities as well as to road boards.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Bill does not set out to destroy dogs, but to control them; regulations are necessary to limit the number of dogs that may be kept, and to have dogs chained up from sunset to sunrise. The owner of a valuable dog will take care of it. I could quote dozens of instances where owners of dogs would have taken an oath that the dog did not leave the homestead at all, whereas the fact was that the dog left after dark and returned before morning. Dogs will travel 20 or 25 miles in a night to destroy sheep, and then return before daylight. The objection to differentiation between municipalities and road districts would, if carried to its logical conclusion, mean the exclusion of all small towns, whereby the Bill would be rendered useless.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I fully recognise that it is as a dog-lover Mr. Gray appeals to the Committee not to carry the amendment. I am certainly not a dog-hater, but there is another phase of the question. I happen to live next door to a private hospital, and I am frequently compelled to get out of bed in the middle of the night in order to cope with the very prevalent nuisance of dogs leaving home to disturb the night's rest of people elsewhere. Sick people especially should be given consideration. I regret that there is not a law, including also the metropolitan area, to provide that dogs should be kept chained up from sunset to sunrise. Then the dog that makes itself objectionable at night time would annoy his owner, and not other people. As evidence of the fact that municipalities are reluctant to deal with a dog nuisance, I may point out that no municipality has ever instituted proceedings under Section 21 of the principal Act, which enables them to prosecute the owner of a bitch dog who permits disgusting exhibitions.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	5

Majority for .. 6

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. E. R. Harris
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. G. Fraser	(Teller.)

PAIR.

ATH.	No.
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom

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

Clause 9—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following clause be added to the Bill:—"Section 24 of the principal Act is repealed and a new section substituted therefor, as follows:—24. Whenever a dog has actually bitten or worried any person, or any horse, cattle, sheep, poultry, or any domestic animal other than those trespassing, it shall be destroyed forthwith without cruelty by some speedy means. Any owner of a dog who keeps a dog after it has bitten or worried any person or animal as aforesaid shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £20: Provided that the owner, in addition, shall be liable in damages for injury done by his dog, and it shall not be necessary for the party seeking damages to show a previous mischievous propensity in such dog, or the owner's knowledge of such mischievous propensity, or that the injury was attributable to neglect on the part of the owner of the dog."

Only the first part of the clause is new; the rest represents Section 24 of the Act as it now stands. In England and in Europe the dog days begin in August, when owing to climatic conditions dogs get hydrophobia and run amok and bite people. Under the law of England and the Continent, any person may kill a dog that is mad and running after human beings. It is part of the duty of the police to destroy such dogs. In this country we are getting a class of dog that we never had before. Especially in municipalities, we are getting dogs with a propensity for biting human beings. I could tell of quite a number of such cases that occurred in West Perth recently. Under no provision of the principal Act can such a dog be destroyed. I consider that once a dog has exhibited a propensity to bite or worry persons, that dog should cease to exist. In connection with Clause 8 Mr. Baxter pertinently asked which was the more valuable, the dogs or the stock; and I go one further and ask which is more valuable, a dog or a human being. The clause would not, of course, apply to a dog that bit a burglar.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Who is to destroy the dog?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The police or any person.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Does the principal Act say so?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No; this says so.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No one would destroy the dog unless given power to destroy it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: How would Mr. Lovekin interpret "worrying" a person?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Tearing the clothes of a person, for instance. Several cases of that have occurred in West Perth during the last three or four weeks. Section 22 of the Act provides that where stock are concerned, a dog may be destroyed. If that is the penalty where stock are affected, it is little consolation to a human being who is attacked, to know that if the offence is proved, the owner of the dog gets off with a mere fine of up to £5. That would be no consolation to the mother whose child had its scalp torn by a pet dog the other day! Such a dog should be destroyed at once. I can mention three incidents with dogs that happened in West Perth within the last few weeks. In one instance a lady was walking by when a dog rushed out, tore her stocking and left its teeth marks on her leg. There was no redress at all. I want to make it lawful for that lady, should she have a walking stick in her hand, to hit the dog on the head and kill it, as a man would do. We should give some protection to human beings as well as to sheep and cattle.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. If we accept it, the next thing required will be a law to protect dogs. Mr. Lovekin has suggested that a dog should be destroyed if it attacked or worried a person, but it would be no satisfaction to an owner of a dog so destroyed if it were proved subsequently that the worrying or the attack had not actually occurred. The amendment is too far reaching. We know that many docile dogs are worried by tradesmen, and should such a dog get one back on the tradesman it will have to be destroyed! That would not be just.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The amendment is certainly far-reaching. While Mr. Lovekin is actuated by the best of motives in seeking to protect human beings, particularly

children, we must recognise that some protection has to be afforded dumb animals. If we do not do that, it will be easy for injustice to be done by a person who may believe he has been worried, whereas a dog has merely been frolicsome. Mr. Lovekin will concede that there must be some means provided of determining whether allegations made against a dog are correct.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If a dog bites me, I will pretty soon determine that point for myself.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then again, who is to destroy the dog? The amendment says that the dog shall be destroyed forthwith. If a court were to determine whether the dog had actually attacked a person, then the court could order the animal to be destroyed, and impose an additional penalty upon the owner of the dog.

The Honorary Minister: Mr. Lovekin places the whole onus on the owner.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Not only that, but every dog will be liable, at the instigation of any person at all, to be destroyed forthwith.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Every dog will be suspect.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am afraid the proposed new clause is too wide in its application.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you think you should be on any different plane to the aboriginal who owns a vicious dog.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If a man strikes me in the street, that will not justify me in demanding damages from him without a decision of the court. There is a proper legal procedure laid down. The man who struck me might say that I had done something to provoke him and he could justify his act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: So will the owner of the dog be able to under my proposal.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But the dog will have been destroyed! It will be too late.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If a person acts wrongfully, he will be liable for damages.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is no such provision included in the suggested new clause. As a matter of fact, the second paragraph of the proposed new clause would rather indicate that he was to be released from any liability. In the form in which the proposed new clause is, I am afraid it would be unjust.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am afraid it has been assumed that the new clause contains more than it actually does. It has been assumed that under the new clause if a dog bites a man and the man hits it over the head with a stick, that is the end of the business. I cannot read that into the amendment. I take the new clause to mean that if a dog bites a man, that man has to proceed against the owner of the dog, and the magistrate, if satisfied that the offence was committed, will order the dog to be destroyed forthwith. Then if that order is not given effect to, the owner of the dog is fined £20. Mr. Nicholson says there is no authority for anybody to act. But we shall have the Dog Act, and there will be somebody to administer it. In the ordinary course I would lay a complaint against the owner of a dog that bit me. So Mr. Lovekin's new clause is not loaded to the extent he thinks it is, but only to the extent it ought to be. I think it should be accepted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There are two views of the question. If it were an ordinary case, the person would bring an action before the court and the court would make an order for the destruction of the dog. But the case I am putting up is this: if I saw a dog bite a child and I had something with which to kill the dog, I would certainly kill it, and so I want to protect myself by this new clause. But if the child were not actually bitten by the dog and I destroyed that dog, the owner would have a remedy against me for damages. On the other hand, if when the owner sued me for damages I could prove that the dog did actually bite somebody, no action would lie against me, and the owner of the dog would be fined £20. But in the ordinary case, where a dog rushes out and bites somebody, it becomes necessary for someone to invoke the aid of the court and lay an information against the owner of the dog, and if one proves to the court that the dog actually bit somebody, the dog shall be ordered to be destroyed. The onus of proving that the dog actually bit somebody would be on the man who laid the charge. There is being brought into this country at the present time a class of dog that is becoming very savage, and we shall have a lot of people maimed and wounded if some protection such as that contained in the proposed new clause is not given.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Section 23 of the principal Act largely incorporates what is

in the proposed new clause. In that section it is provided that if a dog attacks any person or any domestic animal, the owner of such dog shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £5. Mr. Lovekin would accomplish his purpose if he were to move an amendment to add to the first paragraph of Section 23 words to this effect, "and in every such case the court shall make an order that the dog shall forthwith be destroyed."

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would be going too far.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not think so. If the hon. member strikes out Section 24 of the principal Act, he will deprive every citizen of the remedy he should have; because Section 24 provides that the owner of every dog shall be liable in damages for injury done by his dog.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Read the last paragraph of the proposed new clause. I have there incorporated Section 24.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then why strike out the section at all?

Hon. A. Lovekin: To make the whole thing clear.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think it is rather confusing it. If the hon. member would leave Section 24 as it stands, and add certain words to Section 23, he would accomplish what he wants.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In order to make this quite clear I propose to repeal Section 24 and put up a new clause to stand as Section 24. Mr. Nicholson suggests another way, that of adding something to Section 23. But I do not want to have a dog destroyed if it has merely rushed out at a person. All I want is to have destroyed a dog that has actually bitten a person.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Then you require to repeal Section 23.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, there we have the provision that when a dog rushes out at a person his owner is liable to a penalty of £5. That is sufficient for such a case, but I go further and say that if the dog actually bites a person, he shall be destroyed.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I think the proposed new clause is too drastic. Under it, if a dog bites a person without doing any damage to that person it will still have to be destroyed.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Nobody would bother to lay an information in such a case.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: But the power is there. Mr. Nicholson's suggestion to incorporate part of the proposed new clause in Section 23 of the Act is a good one. In any

case, the proposed new clause ought to be modified by making it read that the dog may be destroyed, instead of shall be destroyed. I am surprised at Mr. Lovekin's antagonism to a certain class of dog being brought into the State. If he refers to the Alsatian, I can say that despite all the evidence brought against that dog, he has been proved to be a loyal, faithful servant to mankind and of great use to farmers. I should never have suspected Mr. Lovekin of displaying such murderous tendencies as he has done this evening.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I know of a nine-months-old Alsatian that knocked down a girl the other day.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Then we had the story in the papers of an Alsatian taking the scalp off a man.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The proposed new clause is too drastic. Mr. Lovekin suggests that it would be necessary for a magistrate to order the destruction of such a dog, but there is nothing to show that anyone would have the power to do that. If a dog is baited or teased it is apt to turn and bite, but the dog should not be blamed in such circumstances. In some dogs the hunting instinct is strongly developed. Fox terriers may kill poultry, but should they be destroyed for that? The Kennel Club possesses some valuable dogs. A young dog might get out and attack poultry, and it would be necessary for such a dog to be destroyed or the owner would be liable to a penalty not exceeding £20. I agree that protection against dogs should be afforded to women and children, but the right to order the destruction of a dog should rest with the court.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Members have criticised the proposed new clause but have made no attempt to improve it. Under Section 29 of the Act if an aboriginal has a dangerous dog, on representations being made to a justice of the peace, he may order its destruction.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Yes, a justice.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Then let it be put that way. All I ask is that protection be afforded. An aboriginal's dog may be destroyed if it is dangerous, but members decline to make provision for a dog that has actually worried or bitten a child. If my amendment is so crude that it is unacceptable, though the principal is correct, let it be put right. To criticise it and do nothing is utterly wrong, especially as the news-

papers have reported during the last month three or four instances of dogs having attacked human beings.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And there was a case reported in yesterday's paper of a dog having gone out into the bush to save a child's life.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Quite true. I like dogs. I have a dog and it does any amount of barking but no biting. All the protection afforded is contained in Section 23 and it is insufficient. A dog that has shown ferocity should not be given a second chance.

New clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 3 and 4 and two new clauses.

In Committee.

Clause 3—Insertion of new section after Section 6:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the following new subclause be inserted to stand as Subclause 2:—"When the dog, the registration of which is applied for, is the property of an aboriginal, registration shall not be refused except with the consent of the nearest protector of aborigines."

Rightly or wrongly it is generally considered that an aboriginal's dog is of a destructive nature in that it has been trained to hunt for food. The aboriginal depends upon the dog for his food, and if the clause remained as at present it would be quite possible for him to suffer. No one desires to deprive aborigines of the services of their dogs.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: In order to afford an opportunity to have this and other proposed amendments placed on the Notice Paper, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.14 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 24th October, 1928.

	Page
Questions: Police Promotional Board	1404
Leper accommodation, Broome Hospital	1404
Bills: Road Districts Act Amendment, 1A.	1405
Water Boards Act Amendment, Recom.	1405
Jury Act Amendment, 2A.	1406
Municipal and Road Districts Electoral Act, 2A.	1412
Abattoirs Act Amendment, Council's Message	1414
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2A.	1414
Profiteering Prevention, Com.	1418
Education, 2A.	1423
Navigation Act Amendment, 2A., Com. Report	1423
Police Offences (Drugs), 2A., Com. Report	1424

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

QUESTION—POLICE PROMOTIONAL BOARD.

Hon. G. TAYLOR asked the Minister for Police: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce this session an amendment of the Police Act to provide for the appointment of a board to deal with the promotion and punishment of members of the police force?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE: No.

Hon. G. Taylor: You did not waste many words about it.

QUESTION—LEPER ACCOMMODATION BROOME HOSPITAL.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Health: 1, Is he aware that the Commissioner for Public Health recently stated that isolation quarters for leper cases at Broome were not necessary? 2, Is he aware that an aboriginal suffering from leprosy arrived at Broome hospital on the 22nd October, 1928, from Derby, under the Commissioner's orders? 3, Will he further consider the necessity for building an isolation ward at the Broome hospital?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, The Commissioner of Public Health stated that special isolation quarters for lepers were not justified at Broome, for the reason that cases are transferred to Cossack as soon as transport can be arranged—and they occur very infrequently. 2, Yes. The aboriginal suffering from leprosy, who recently arrived at Broome, was taken there because the car which was transporting him to Cos-