

than speak. I am sure that Parliament has been enriched in many ways by the new blood, and many of our new members give promise of occupying perhaps foremost positions in Parliamentary life in the years to come when some of the older stagers may have passed out. As the father of the House, Mr. Speaker, presiding as you do over its deliberations and being the oldest member of the Assembly, close on to the 20-year mark I believe, I wish you the compliments of the season and a very happy and enjoyable Christmas time. I hope that the clerk, the clerk assistant and the officers of the House will enjoy their brief respite from Parliamentary labours. We are all indebted to the officers of the House for the kindness, courtesy, and helpfulness they have extended to us on all occasions. I hope we shall begin the new year in a kindly spirit and will terminate the session as early as possible—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier would like that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Consistent of course with a proper examination of the work to be laid before us and a conscientious discharge of duty. I wish members a very happy Christmas and an enjoyable new year.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [10-35]: In the absence of the Leader of the Country Party and the Deputy Leader and at the request of the Leader of the Country Party, I have pleasure in joining in the felicitations so ably and fully expressed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. I think members generally may congratulate themselves on the good feeling which has existed in the House during the session. With the exception of the experience of the last day or two, there has been little which has given cause for any feeling other than that which we would desire. We can congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the generous treatment he has accorded the Government side of the House, and I think he will agree that the Country Party have conceded to the Opposition every consideration in connection with business introduced by his side of the House. On behalf of the Country Party, Mr. Speaker, I convey to your good self our sincere wishes for a pleasant Christmas and a happy new year, and thank you for the kind consideration you have extended to us at all times during the session. I would like to convey to the clerk, the clerk assistant and the officers of the House, including the "Hansard" staff, our appreciation of the consideration shown to us throughout the session, and to the whole of the members of the House our sincere wishes for Christmas and the coming year.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [10-37]: As almost the equal of you, Mr. Speaker, the father of the House, in years of membership here, may I add my quota to the good wishes which have been expressed to yourself and to all members.

Mrs. COWAN (West Perth) [10-38]: May I be allowed to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members for the consideration they have extended to me during the time I have been in the House. It has been a little trying sometimes I must admit, but one

expects to get a little opposition when coming into a body such as this, and one accepts it, I hope, in the right spirit. I thank those who have been so kind and considerate to me and reciprocate the good wishes. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all other members of the House for the spirit in which they have received the only woman member. It must be sometimes extremely trying for them to have a woman amongst them, but I have done my best to make it as little trying as possible and I think they too have done their best in the same way. I wish all a happy Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Mr. SPEAKER [10-39]: I wish to thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Sussex and other speakers for their kind expressions with reference to myself, the clerks, and the staff generally, in wishing us a pleasant Christmas and a prosperous new year, and on behalf of the staff and myself I reciprocate their hearty wishes. Members will be able to go to their homes earlier to-night than has been the case for some time past in order to prepare for their Christmas holidays. I hope when members return, although they appear to be in very fine temper to-night, that they will be even improved in temper to continue the arduous task still before them to complete the work of the session.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are always in good temper.

Mr. SPEAKER: On behalf of the staff and myself I thank you all.

*House adjourned at 10-40 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 3rd January, 1922.*

	Page
Assent to Bills	2619
Select Committee: Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment Bill, Extension of Time	2619
Wyndham Meat Works and State Shipping Service, to adopt Reports	2620
Bills: Architects, 2R.	2619
Workers Homes Act Amendment, Comm. report	2619
Permanent Reserves (No. 2), 2R., Com.	2622
Land Agents, 2R.	2622
Inspection of Machinery, Assembly's Message	2630
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2R.	2635
Nurses Registration, 2R.	2640
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R.	2644
Motions: Education Commission Report	2626
Government's Financial Position	2628
University Fees, to disallow Senate Statute	2630

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3.0 p.m., and read prayers.

# ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Auctioneers.
- 2, North Fremantle Rates Validation.
- 3, Supply (No. 4), £1,030,000.
- 4, General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment.
- 5, Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance.
- 6, Constitution Act Amendment.

## SELECT COMMITTEE—LAND AND INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT BILL.

Extension of time.

On motion by Minister for Education, the time for bringing up the report of the select committee on the Land and Income Tax Assessment Amendment Bill was extended until Tuesday, the 10th January.

## BILL—ARCHITECTS.

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

## BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 22nd December. Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 24:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The clause needs a considerable amount of explanation. If it is passed the board may buy land, and may erect houses upon it, and may sell those dwellings to individual applicants. The section that it is proposed to amend provides that the applicant must have a freehold block before the board will entertain his application to build a home upon it, and may either regard that block of land as sufficient security or require the applicant to provide further security. The clause under review will throw open the freehold section of the Act to all the advantages of the leasehold section, except that eventually the applicant will acquire the freehold of the property. If the Government intend to depart from the principle of the Act in one particular, it is only fair that they should do so in another, and that the leaseholder should be given an opportunity to convert his property into freehold.

The Minister for Education: Do you think the leaseholder should have the right of conversion?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Undoubtedly he should have it.

The Minister for Education: I quite agree with you.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The applicant under the leasehold section may have had nothing whatever behind him, but the applicant under the freehold section must have some security.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Cannot the owner dispose of his leasehold property?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Only to the board, and even then, unless the improvements that the leaseholder has made to his property are greater in value in the eyes of the board than the depreciation of the property, he will not be deemed to have any equity in it. Under a previous clause it is evidently the intention of the Government to carry on the leasehold principle. Therefore the board has been given discretion to build further on the leasehold system. This clause provides for the same thing on the leasehold principle. Thus the Bill is practically an acknowledgment by the Government that the board cannot carry on with the funds available. The Premier and the Minister for Education have expressed themselves in favour of the principle of conversion of leasehold homes into freehold homes. It is said that Mr. Scaddan, who introduced this legislation, alone in the Cabinet opposes the principle.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am in general accord with what Mr. Cornell has said. However, those people who took up workers' homes under the leasehold principle have certain privileges.

Hon. J. Cornell: What are they?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: One important privilege is conferred by Section 17 of the principal Act, under which the title to a leasehold worker's home remains personal, absolute, indefeasible, and unaffected, notwithstanding the holder of the home becoming insolvent or bankrupt, or making a composition or arrangement with his creditors. That is a very valuable protection. I am in accord with giving the holder of a worker's home under the leasehold system the opportunity of coming under the freehold system if he likes; but he must understand that in such a case he is surrendering the special privilege to which I have referred. Clause 4 allows the Government to do under the freehold system what at present they can only do under the leasehold system. It is not my intention to say one word against the leasehold system, which has turned out fairly satisfactorily as regards workers' homes. However, better results have been obtained from the freehold system, which I believe is the one that will permanently succeed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The privilege under Section 17 of the principal Act amounts really to nothing. Of course, bailiffs cannot come in during the course of payment for the leasehold home, any more than during the course of payment for the freehold home. But assume that a worker owes the full amount of capital and interest owing on his home; then the home does not become

his own property, for he cannot sell it without the sanction of the board.

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have a worker's home myself, and speaking for the leaseholders as a body I say they are not satisfied.

The Minister for Education: They would like the freehold?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes; and the more so because this Bill proposes to extend the principal Act to freehold homes. When a worker leaves a home, he should have the right to sell it without reference to the board. Eighty per cent. of the leaseholders would sign a petition to-day for the right of converting their homes into freehold. No doubt the leaseholders would be satisfied for the present if the Government promised to bring down a Bill for that purpose next session.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am entirely opposed to the clause, if only because it represents an extension of that State trading which has already brought disaster on Western Australia. The clause will allow the Government to become a speculative builder, with the Public Works Department as a building contractor; and no doubt we shall have Government rent collectors, with the State likewise usurping the functions of building societies. Something might possibly be said in favour of the Government building houses on 99-years lease, the State remaining the owner of such properties and thus participating in any profits which might arise. This, however, is a proposal for the Government to build houses to be sold to private persons. We know the disastrous results which have attended every scrap of business so far undertaken by the Government. I hope the clause will be rejected.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	8
Noes	..	..	..	6
Majority for	..	..	..	2

#### AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. E. H. Harris
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. C. McKenzie	Hon. H. Stewart
	(Teller.)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

### SELECT COMMITTEE — WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS AND STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

To adopt reports.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.30]: 1 move—

That the reports of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Wyndham meat works and the State Shipping Service be adopted.

In moving the adoption of the report, I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House. Both reports regarding the Wyndham Meat Works and the State Shipping Service are fairly exhaustive, and have been before members for some time. Regarding the Wyndham Meat Works, the committee found that there has been a tremendous amount of money expended upon the undertaking and that it is practically at a dead end. The committee considered the matter of so much importance that they departed from the ordinary procedure and some time ago brought forward an interim report dealing with the meat works only. I am inclined to think that the committee over-estimated the importance of the works because, while we hurried up the presentation of the interim report to the House, nothing has been done or said by the Government in that regard. So far as the country is concerned, nothing is known of the Government's intentions. At all events, nothing has been said as to the Government's proposals regarding the future of the meat works. Such an announcement is of importance from the financial aspect, which has been disastrous, if for no other reason. A definite announcement from the Government was important at the time the report was presented, that being due to the fact that if the works are to operate this year, either by the State or by private enterprise, by the cattle owners, or by any other person or persons, the organisation should be well in hand at the present juncture. If the works are to operate in March, the organisation should be well in hand. If private enterprise is to operate the works, they cannot organise in order to be ready in March. Cattle have to be bought; the whole staff has to be engaged; markets have to be located and ships have to be arranged for. Yet on January 3, so far as the people are aware, nothing has been done. The committee are not to blame for that position. It was suggested at the first meeting of the committee, when the question was raised as to what was to be done this season, that the appointment of the committee prevented anything being done. The general manager, Mr. McGhie, was then told that the appointment of the committee had nothing to do with the carrying on of the works; that the committee were appointed to inquire and Mr. McGhie was to take his instructions from his Minister and not from the committee. So far as the committee knew, the report might finish in the waste

paper basket. In order to clear up the matter, I came to the House and announced through you, Mr. President, that what we had told the general manager was that he was to proceed in the ordinary way and not hang up his operations on account of the committee. That raises a point, to my mind, regarding the delay which has occurred. The Leader of the House, of course, may tell us that everything has been arranged, but so far as the committee are aware, there has been some unnecessary delay for which the committee are not responsible. There is another question I desire to raise which does not appear in the evidence. When the Government decided in March last that they would not operate the works, some of the cattle purchased were on the way to the works. They had to travel some hundreds of miles and could only travel a comparatively few miles per day. I introduced a deputation representing cattle owners to the Premier. In answer to our representations the Premier said: "The position is this: If we operate this year, we shall lose £169,000. If we do not operate, we shall get out of it with a loss of £75,000." When the Premier made that announcement, I told Sir James Mitchell that I did not know if his figures were correct, but that if they were, I had nothing further to say regarding operating that season. I told the deputation that I could not proceed any further in connection with their representations, if operating meant an additional loss of £100,000. The Premier very frankly, as he always is, rang the bell and told Mr Shapcott to tell Mr. McGhie to let me have access to all the figures and information he had in his possession regarding the operating of the works, etc. In due course, I had access to those figures and Mr. McGhie convinced me, as he convinced other members of the deputation, that his estimate was correct. As a result of the investigations by the committee we find, however, that, although the works were closed down, the actual loss has been £150,000 and not £75,000. If the deputation had been told that with operating, the loss would be £169,000 and without operating, the loss would be £150,000, we would have said to the Government: "You have led the cattle-owners into a dead-end. In the circumstances, you should take a sporting chance and operate." I raise this aspect to show what control the Government or their administrative officers have over the position. Although the works did not operate, the Government officials were £75,000 out in estimating the anticipated loss. Had the works operated I could understand that, owing to the state of the market or from other causes, they would have been out in their calculations; but the works did not operate!

The Minister for Education: A good deal of that loss is on account of the previous years' realisations.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know anything about that. I am going on the figures which came under my notice.

Hon. H. Stewart: You had access to everything, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I had access to the figures dealing with the operations of the works.

The Minister for Education: Those figures show that a lot of the £150,000 concerns the realisations on the previous year's transactions and not on this year's operations.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not right.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The frozen meat was sold to the Imperial Government so far as we know, and it was held at the Wyndham works at the expense of the Imperial Government. So far as the committee are aware, very little tinned meat has been sold. Although the Minister may enlighten us on this aspect, I point it out in order to show that departmental officers and the Ministers concerned do not know the position, and as evidence of that, I quote their estimate of the loss on works if closed down. The deputation referred to waited on the Premier in March last, only six months before the committee met, and they must have known what the market would have been, enabling them to estimate what the loss would be. Although that should be so, they estimated, as I have already indicated, a loss of £169,000, with operating, or £75,000, without operating. Yet the net result shows that the loss has been £150,000, without operating. There is no need to elaborate on the report regarding the meat works. The report speaks for itself. The committee went out of their way to simplify matters for the House, both in regard to the report dealing with the meat works and that referring to the State steamers. So that hon. members might know the position and realise that the committee came to conclusions on facts, we went out of our way to refer in our reports to specific questions and answers, upon which we based our report. That is a departure from the usual procedure, and it is a departure—

Hon. J. Duffell: Based on evidence.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Does not the hon. member understand? I say the report is based on the evidence.

Hon. J. Duffell: Exactly.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We carry that further and give hon. members the number of the questions and answers.

Hon. H. Stewart: A very good way too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If it is contended that our report is biased or wrong, it will not be necessary for hon. members to read the whole of the evidence but merely to peruse the questions and answers on which we say we have based our report. As to the State Shipping Service, that is a going concern. When one says that, it is about all that can be said. It is going—

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is on the rocks.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have got down to this in connection with the State Shipping Service, that we have got the "Kangaroo" and the "Eucla." We have also the "Bambra" on loan from the Common-

wealth Government, for which vessel we pay no rent. We have to insure her and keep her in repair. These three ships represent the whole of the State Shipping Service. I do not say anything about the capital accounts, as they stand now. I do not say anything about the expenditure on the "Kangaroo," because I am in hopes that the ships will be on the market at an early date, in which case I would not like to say anything to discount them in the eyes of the purchasing public. The report goes on to show that it is absolutely impossible to run any State trading concern, whether it be the State Shipping Service, the Wyndham meat works, or any other concern, as a State enterprise under political control. We have to remember, so far as the recommendations are concerned in connection with the meat works, that we had four distinct sets of political opinion represented on the committee of five. Yet the committee are unanimous as to the report and recommendations regarding the meat works. We differ only on a question of policy, where we would be expected to differ, namely, shall the works be carried on by the State or by private enterprise? Two members of the committee held the view that the works should be carried on as a State trading concern. The other three members of the committee held that the functions of the Government are to legislate for the health and protection of life and property and so on, and leave such undertakings to private enterprise. I desire to point out that it was only on a question of policy that the members of the committee differed regarding the Wyndham meat works. In connection with the State Shipping Service, it will be noticed that we arrived at certain conclusions. Our reason for doing that was that it was a very mixed question and we wanted to be unanimous. It was no use coming to the House as five men constituting a select committee only to squabble on the floor of the House. We wanted unanimity and we got it. We arrived at certain conclusions which I hope the House will approve of. In justice to those with whom I was associated on the committee, I thought it right that I should make these brief remarks. I move—

That the report of the committee be adopted.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

## BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES

(No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 22nd December.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [3.46]: When last the Bill was before us, I moved the adjournment so that members might have an opportunity for reading the Minister's speech. Personally I see nothing in the Bill to object to. The provisions deal-

ing with the Kimberley district are, I think quite in order. For many years past the land has been reserved for the protection of the natives, and it is now proposed to cut up certain portions of it for settlement by returned soldiers. With that I am in accord I will support the second reading.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOO (North) [3.47]: I will support the second reading. I have gone carefully through the Bill, and I see in it nothing objectionable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Schedule:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: A 1 mentioned on the second reading, there is an error in the description given in Part II of the schedule, where "Ord River" should read "Cambridge Gulf." I move an amendment—

That in line 5 "Ord River" be struck out and "Cambridge Gulf" inserted.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

## BILL—LAND AGENTS.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [3.50] in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to provide for the licensing of land agents. It was requested of the Government by a number of land agents that legislation of the kind should be introduced. The request, in its original form, was that a board should be established somewhat on the line of the dentists' board and other boards of the kind, and it was pointed out that a Bill on those lines was at present before the Parliament of New South Wales. The Government looked into the matter and found that since 1913 there had been in New Zealand legislation regarding land agents, but that there they had not done as was proposed in New South Wales, had not established a board or given a combination of land agents special power and authority; that what they had done was to provide that any person desiring to operate as a land agent should go to the court and get his license just as an auctioneer does, and that he should also put up a fidelity bond. The Government thought it would be inadvisable to comply with the wishes of the land agents, but decided to follow the legislation in force in New Zealand. The Bill is on those lines. I

was intended that it should operate from the 1st January of this year but, of course, owing to the delay which has occurred, it will now be necessary to fix some later date. The chief feature of the Bill is that it provides for an application to the court, as set out in Clause 4. Such application shall state the principal place of business of the applicant, and shall be accompanied by testimonials from three reputable persons as to the personal character of the applicant; and the court, on the payment by the applicant of a fee of £5, and the deposit of a fidelity bond of £200, shall issue the license. That is the main provision of the Bill. In the New Zealand Act the amount of the fidelity bond is £500, which was the amount in the Bill as originally introduced.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why was it cut down?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In another place the amount was reduced to £200. The necessity for this legislation arises from the fact that there have been many cases of persons setting up in business as land agents and eventually defrauding those who sold and those who purchased land through their agency. It is considered that the Bill will impose no hardship whatever on any reputable person desiring to establish himself as a land agent. Provision is made that licenses may be held on behalf of incorporated companies, and that if several partners are joined in one business, the license can be issued on behalf of the firm. Provision is also made that money received by an agent in respect of the sale of land must be treated as trust money and paid into the bank to the credit of a trust account. The license is cancelled on the conviction of the agent of certain offences, and is liable to cancellation in the discretion of the court on a second conviction for other lesser offences against the Act. From the commencement of the Act it will be a condition for the recovery of commission by the land agent that he is licensed and holds a memorandum in writing of his employment as agent for the sale of the land in question. Clause 15, which was inserted in the Bill in another place, provides that whenever, on the sale of land, the agent receives the purchase money, it shall be such agent's duty to ascertain that all rates and taxes payable by the vendor have been paid by him. It was thought that the inclusion of such a clause would avoid a great deal of misunderstanding and annoyance. Those are the main principles of the Bill.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What about the charges of the agents? Are they not to be controlled?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no provision as to the charges they shall make.

Hon. V. Hamersley: You are going to give them a monopoly without controlling them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no suggestion of a monopoly. It will be competent for anybody to go before

the court, comply with the provisions of the Bill, and get his license as a matter of right. Had we introduced legislation on the lines asked for by the agents, there might have been a monopoly, but under the Bill there cannot be. In Committee I will propose one or two small amendments. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [3.58]: I am not against the principle of the Bill, but to my thinking the Bill is only tinkering with the question. At present a man may set up as a land agent, and there is no specific legislation governing his operations. He may start without capital and may, as some have done, rob his clients. The remedy is under statutory law. Those clients need special protection. Some firms previously regarded as reputable have eventually defrauded their clients. It is now proposed to pass legislation under which no person can set up as a land agent unless he has a license from the court and puts up a fidelity bond of £200. There is similar procedure to license people who keep hotels, but all who succeed in getting such licenses are not angels. They commit breaches of the law and are fined. I venture to say that mistakes will be made by the court in granting licenses. All the court will have to do will be to satisfy itself that the applicant is of good character; it will be no business of the court to inquire into his financial standing. The only protection the public will receive under this measure is the bond of £200.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And the criminal law.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That applies to-day. If a land agent failed to the extent of £400, how would the fidelity bond of £200 be distributed amongst the clients? Would they take order according to the priority of their business or how would it be arranged? If the court is going to vouch for the character of a land agent, the measure should go further and stipulate the scale of commissions and charges. One clause of the Bill provides that any person who engages in this business without a license shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £50. In Committee I intend to move that the fine be £50. More people are taken down in the course of business of this nature than any other business I know of. If members cast their memories back a week or two, they will recollect what happened to the soldiers in connection with their gratuity bonds. I venture to say that not one of the land agents concerned has come out of that business too well, and I hope that those concerned will be refused a license under this measure. This proposal may be considered somewhat harsh, but I think such men should not be permitted to be licensed under this measure.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.4]: Here we are sitting in the month of January still without the Appropriation Bill, the Licensing Act Amendment Bill,

and other contentious measures which should be occupying the best of our thoughts, and dealing with a Bill which, to say the least, is of a trivial nature.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is to keep us occupied until the others come along.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And we are meeting at 3 o'clock for that purpose!

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Why we should be meeting at 3 p.m. daily from Tuesday to Friday inclusive, to deal with important legislation and should have to give attention to a Bill of this description, passes my comprehension. The functions of the Mitchell Government during the present session appear to have been to introduce such measures as will conduce to the happy co-operation of certain professions and callings, without giving due attention to the more important questions affecting the finances of the State, which is fast drifting on to the rocks of bankruptcy. The present is no time to be dealing with a trivial Bill of this kind. I hope members will urge the need for the Government hastening forward that legislation which we are so anxious to receive, in order if possible, to stem the present financial drift of the State. This Bill provides for certain persons entering into the business of land agents and for those already engaged in this profitable business getting licenses from the court, which will enable them to make charges which are not specified for the work they perform. The measure will not be complete unless it contains a clause specifying the amount of commission which land agents are entitled to charge for their work. When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I shall move an amendment to rectify this omission. The Bill provides for a guarantee to safeguard the people who entrust their business to these agents, but a bond of £200 is not sufficient. Considering that some of the transactions in land are very large, a substantial bond should be required, so that people will have some guarantee that an agent is solid and bona fide. I hope the amount of £500 will be reinstated, as a guarantee of that sum is little enough. I shall support the second reading, reserving to myself the right to move certain amendments in Committee.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [4.10]: I have given some attention to this Bill and have resolved to support it. While I agree to a very large extent with some of the remarks of the previous speaker regarding the time for introducing measures of this description, I think this Bill is of sufficient importance to merit its consideration and passage by this House. There seems to be an unseemly haste on the part of the Government at present to rush down several Bills of this description. I cannot understand why the present time should be occupied with the consideration of such Bills. Further down on the Notice Paper are the Architects Bill and the Nurses Registration Bill. These

three measures should have been introduced three or four months ago when we had ample time to consider them, or they could wait until next session. Perhaps the Leader of the House will be able to explain the reason why they are brought down at this stage, when we should be in recess. I see nothing objectionable in this Bill. There is no doubt that Clause 8 is stringent. Most agents are good honest men, and it may be awkward for them to pay money into trust accounts when they are accustomed to paying it into their ordinary accounts on which they draw a cheque which is good. It is impossible to make provision to safeguard the public against every class of agent. No doubt the previous speakers were quite right in their remarks; we know of many instances of the public having suffered at the hands of dishonest dealers, but it is impossible to legislate against every possible delinquency on the part of every human being. If people are such fools as to do business with a class of agent who has insufficient financial backing, they must take the responsibility for their actions. Many people have been swindled simply because they were too green. They have been offered this, that and the other, and naturally they thought they were going to get a good thing, whereas the agent got it and they fell in. But we cannot provide against these things. The Bill itself is a fair one. As to providing for the exact amount of the commission, what measure ever does that? It is a matter of competition amongst the different agents. It is not likely that the land agents will be able to form a ring and thus keep up their rates of commission.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You are fairly optimistic.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I have had a good deal to do with business and I have not found such a great lot of rogues among business people. Those who get taken in generally suffer because they choose to deal with the wrong people.

Hon. J. Duffell: The Commissioner of Taxation does not think so.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: That is a different matter. The Bill is a fair and reasonable one, and I intend to support the second reading. If any good amendments are proposed in Committee, they will receive my most favourable consideration. As we intend to pass legislation for the nurses and for the architects, and as last year we passed a Bill for the dentists, I think we might presently consider the advisableness of doing something for the squatters.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.15]: I support the second reading of this Bill as a step in the right direction, though I hardly think it goes quite far enough. It is questionable as to how far we can carry this principle. Mr. Cornell referred to the question of fixing the sum which would cover the responsibility of the agent. The responsibility may be anything, and the embezzlement may be anything. I think we should

insist upon rents being paid into a trust account, but I do not know that it is possible to insist that everything shall be paid into a trust account. We had a difficulty in connection with the Auctioneers Bill. The person who pays money into a trust account is the person who operates on that account, so that this does not afford much protection to the client. If we insist that rents be paid into a trust account and the owner, in due course, gets a cheque from the agent and this cheque is dishonoured—this happened in my own case—it is positive proof that the rents have not been paid into the trust account. If they had been so paid in the money would have been there to meet the cheque. If the cheque is dishonoured the penalty should be enforced without further ado. At present there is no protection afforded to the public, and even this method would be of some benefit. I do not know that there is any enactment to cover the point raised by Mr. Cornell as to commission.

Hon. J. Duffell: There is a scale.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think there is a scale that is approved by the Supreme Court.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is a Chamber of Commerce scale.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In addition to the scale which is recognised, and is compiled on a fair basis, there is also the element of competition. The scale of charges cannot be exceeded, but if an agent desires to effect a sale at a lesser rate, his client should be entitled to receive the benefit of the reduction. We cannot make people honourable by Act of Parliament, nor can we protect everyone by means of a Bill. I know of a case of a woman who was about to marry and had a little money of her own. She told me she intended to purchase a cottage quite close to Perth for £150. I said I did not think she could possibly do that, but she replied that it was all right. At my instigation a search was made and it was found there was a mortgage of £200 on the property. All that she was buying was the equity in it. This shows what goes on in the community at times. If we can by some means protect people who do not know any better it is our duty to do so. Because I think the Bill is a step in that direction I intend to support it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [4.18]: Mr. Cornell seems to think that the Bill does not afford sufficient protection to the public, because the amount by which the land agent may not be able to meet his obligations may not be covered by the guarantee. The guarantee is not intended so much to cover that amount as it is to ensure that the person obtaining the license shall be a person of some repute. The guarantee company, before guaranteeing a man for even £200, would make inquiries concerning him, and, if there was anything against his character, would not give the guarantee.

Hon. J. Cornell: Each accommodation has to be paid for.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, but although the agent has to pay, the company would not give the guarantee without satisfying itself as to the character of the individual. The fact that this accommodation will have to be paid for is the reason why the amount was reduced from £500 to £200. I believe the rate is £3 per hundred pounds.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is very small for a year.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not much. The Bill imposes a license fee of £5, which was not paid before, and provides for a guarantee of £200, making another £6 a year, or a total of £11 which was not charged before. If the amount is put up to £500 it will raise the payment to £20.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: And the agent would naturally put up his commission.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think it is right to say that the only protection afforded to the public is the guarantee of £200, for there is the additional protection afforded by the fact that the guarantee company would make inquiries regarding the character of the agent. So far as the charges are concerned, the charge may be one that has been mutually agreed upon between the two parties by way of commission, and if there is no agreement there remains the recognised scale of charges, and no one can recover more.

Hon. J. Duffell: Why not embody a schedule of these charges in the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know that there is any necessity for that.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The court would look at the matter judicially.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Court would only award the commission in accordance with the scale and the circumstances. I do not think we can do any good by altering that position so far as the court is concerned. It is optional for the parties concerned to make any agreement they like between themselves. I regret the Bill was not brought down earlier. It was presented in another place in the early stages of the session, and discussed there at great length. It is necessary that some Bills should be the last to come down. Some of those members who have taken exception to unimportant Bills coming down at the end of the session always allege that the important ones ought to have come at the beginning.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: We can never get them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Personally, I think there is very little to complain about if Bills which are not of a very contentious nature do come forward a little later than those which are important. In reply to Mr. Holmes I would point out that this Bill does not apply to rent collecting. There is nothing about that in the Bill, nor



is there in the New Zealand Act, from which this is taken.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## MOTION—EDUCATION COMMISSION REPORT.

Debate resumed from 8th December on the following motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom:—

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Royal Commission on Education laid on the Table of the House is unsatisfactory.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM (North—in reply) [4.25]: There is one thing for which I must give the Leader of the House a good deal of credit, and it is that he has been good enough to keep this motion on the Notice Paper almost ever since the beginning of the session. Everyone, therefore, has had an opportunity of knowing that there has been some publicity given to this education question. From the time when the motion was introduced up to the present this question has been before the House. I trust that when I have replied to certain remarks which have been made, the motion will then disappear from the Notice Paper. I approach this question with some diffidence. I have felt that members have not taken much interest in it and are really tired of it. I arrived at that conclusion when listening to Dr. Saw in his admirable speech, and noticed that there was rarely a quorum in the House during the whole of the time that he was speaking. Seeing that he was replying as one of the members of the Commission I can hardly expect that very much interest will be taken in my reply to previous speakers on this subject. I have to reiterate what I said before, namely, that I am opposed to the Government carrying on this higher class of education. It is not part of the duty of the Government to do so. I am continually being reported as having said I am opposed to education. That is entirely incorrect. I am no more opposed to education than anyone else, but I am opposed to the State carrying on a secondary higher class of education, for two reasons. One is that the State cannot afford to spend half a million of money on education when we have only a population of about 330,000, and the next is that in my opinion, which is shared by a good many people, higher education is leading people into positions in which they will not be able to do the best for themselves during their lives. My motion is to the effect that the report of the Commission was unsatisfactory. I am of opinion that it was unsatisfactory in that it did not deal with the education questions that we all wanted dealt with. Certain categorical questions were asked, but instead of receiving definite replies to them we had

long rambling statements showing how the preparatory school system was carried out, and how the preliminary teaching was conducted. One question was as to whether the State had obtained adequate value for its expenditure on education. We had no definite reply to that, but my reply would be that it has not. Another question was as to whether the system could be improved upon, and if so in what way in order to make it more fitting to the requirements of the State. My answer to that would be in the affirmative. Another question was as to whether the schools in the rural districts could be made more useful to the settlers. From what I have heard I do not think they could be rendered more useful to the settlers. Our primary education is of a first class nature and is carried out well. The primary education that young people receive to-day is as good as the secondary education that was given in my young days. The teaching given in the schools up to the age of 14 is as good as anyone could expect. Another question asked was as to whether there were extravagances, defects or deficiencies in the system followed that could be remedied. I do not think anyone would be safe in saying "no" to this question. We must, therefore, say there are some. Again it was asked, whether the administration was defective, and if so in what particulars. I should be inclined to say the administration was not defective but that the principle was defective. Dr. Saw was quite right in what he said about the question of whether or not secondary education in our higher schools was a matter for the Commission to consider. In my evidence I distinctly stated that it was the policy of the Government and not the work of the Commission to say whether education should be carried on beyond its elementary stages. I am still of the opinion that it is a matter for the Government more than it was for the Commission. With regard to the composition of the Royal Commission, I still say it was academic instead of being practical. Dr. Saw said he was not one of the men whom I described. My reply is that if a man who has had Dr. Saw's advantages, has gained his scholarships, and has been to Cambridge University like he has, and done all he has done, must in fairness be described as academic. With Dr. Saw there have been associated Mr. Board, and also the Leader of the House, although the latter did not actually sit on the Commission. These three gentlemen are of the type which one cannot help describing as academic. That term has been resented by Dr. Saw. I asked a highly educated man whether he could say offhand what the term "academic" meant. He replied, "A person is academic who is always either teaching, preaching, or demonstrating, and never doing anything." However, Dr. Saw has made a great name for himself as a physician and surgeon. Therefore I hope I may say he is even more than I have said he is. In the circumstances I

consider I am justified in saying that three men connected with the Royal Commission were in effect academic, and that they looked at the education question purely from an academic point of view. I still maintain that this excessive education is not the best thing we can have for Western Australia. I reiterate, and with considerable feeling, that we are educating a lot of our young people beyond their opportunities. If we get 400 or 500 young people into a university and bring them in contact with all the teaching the university can afford, they naturally will look round afterwards and say, "What are we going to do?" I say this without any hostility or resentment. Dr. Saw rejoins "Yes, but look how much better a farmer, or a squatter, will be if he is educated." My retort is that a man educated in that way will not become a farmer or a squatter. If I wanted an instance to show that education does not mean everything, I would thank Dr. Saw for having adduced the present Prime Minister of England, Mr. Lloyd George. He is not a university man, or even a college man, and yet he has been in the highest sense of the word successful. I suppose Mr. Lloyd George is the most successful man in the world to-day. Let me add the names of Lord Forrester and Mr. Richard Seddon. Then take our own State, take Mr. Scaddan. He is not a university man; but for five years he was accepted as the leader of the largest proportion numerically of the residents of this State, and he led that section in office successfully for five years. Thus one does not necessarily need a university education to get to the front of things. I will go a little further. There is Dr. Wilson, the late President of the United States, who went over to the Paris Conference with his 14 points, and got them adopted there, and every thing was going to be peace. Dr. Wilson, this representative of the universities, this highly educated man, goes back to his own country, and his own country repudiates his actions. The United States turned down everything Dr. Wilson had done. On the other hand, there is Mr. Lloyd George, who was never at a university, and who has been accepted by his country in every way. Again, take our members of Parliament all round; they are not university men. Thus it seems that the electors do not want the most highly educated men but practical common sense men.

Hon. A. Sanderson: These men have got the country into a nice mess, too.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: That, I am afraid, proves the truth of my remark to the effect that electors, those of New South Wales, for instance, do not always choose the best men. However, my experience tells me that the electors want common sense, practical men.

Hon. A. H. Pantou: General Smuts is a Cambridge man.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: All the better for him, then. He is the excep-

tion that proves the rule. Look round our mercantile establishments, round the pastoral companies, and tell me one of them that is headed by a university educated man? Not one. Out of our 80 members here, in the two Houses, we have three university men; and I suppose this Parliament has as much common sense as any other institution of the kind. In the circumstances I hold that the Government are wrong in carrying on the education system to too advanced a stage. It would be different if we had a large population here like that of England, or even like that of New South Wales or of Victoria, offering plentiful opportunities to persons of the highest education. I am not against education. Education is a great enjoyment to a man if only he can afford it. However, it is a luxury. But in this small community, if our university turns out 500 or 600 graduates, young men and young women, what are we to do with them? We know very well that persons educated up to the highest standard will not work. But we can only live by work. Take four of our principal products—bread, meat, fruit, and vegetables; and let me add bacon and eggs. How are they produced? Absolutely by labour. As I have said previously, one cannot produce them by electricity. We are pledged to a white Australia; we will not have anybody else in to work here, not even white foreigners. Then, who is going to do the work that is required? University people do not grow potatoes or run poultry farms. I say let us give our young people a good practical education, such as I had myself. By way of comparing the two methods of education, I will take the liberty of instancing Dr. Saw and myself. We are both Western Australians. Dr. Saw went in for his particular line of life, got a scholarship, studied here, and then went to Cambridge. He has proved very successful in his profession. He has kept on studying all the time, because no man can maintain himself in the forefront of the medical profession unless he does study all the time. Dr. Saw is successful now. I did not have the same sort of education as Dr. Saw. At the age of 15 I went out pioneering, and I worked hard. I may say I have had a fair measure of success; at all events, I am not absolutely unsuccessful. Now, Dr. Saw with my education would never have achieved what he has done; and if I had had his education I would never have attempted pioneering. There are two instances to show the difference between the two methods of education, the practical and the professional.

Hon. A. H. Pantou: But you are both very necessary to this country.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Unfortunately there are not opportunities here for hundreds of Dr. Saws, as there are for thousands of Edward Wittenooms. There are thousands of opportunities for boys to go on stations and farms, but how many opportunities are there for boys to become successful medical men like Dr. Saw? I am not

opposed to education at all. If a man has a couple of thousand a year and has a high education, nothing can be more delightful; but when one has to make one's living, one must do something that will pay. Is it better to be a University demonstrator with two or three hundred a year, or a woolpresser at £12 a week? Give me the woolpresser every time.

Hon. A. H. Panton: But he makes that for only three months in the year.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: You would not have been handicapped by having a first-class education.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I shall not take up further time. I have had my say. My opinions are no doubt different from those of most people. When I was being examined by the Royal Commission, I said that I knew my views would not be popular. I do not suppose I shall refer to this subject again. My object in bringing forward the motion was to afford every hon. member here who might wish to give an opinion on the education question an opportunity of doing so; not because that would alter the position, but because the Minister for Education might be induced to consider whether the suggestions offered here were good or not. I have had numerous letters on this subject, many agreeing with me, and some not agreeing with me. Having said so much, I think I have done all I wished in the circumstances; and therefore I do not propose to carry the matter any further. I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

#### MOTION—GOVERNMENT'S FINANCIAL PROPOSALS.

Debate resumed from the 8th November on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin:—

That the Government be requested to reconsider their financial proposals with a view to (a) bringing the expenditure within the ambit of the revenue, and (b) making provision for the extinction of the deficit within a reasonable time.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.44]: I am under the impression that notice was given of this motion shortly after the session opened, and that, like the previous motion, its discussion has been unnecessarily delayed. We find ourselves now after the close of the first half of the financial year and starting upon the second half, and we have not even seen either the Revenue Estimates or the Loan Estimates. I believe another place has not yet finished with either set of Estimates. Will this Chamber tolerate such a condition of affairs, in view of the fact that, in order to overcome this very difficulty, the House in its wisdom, like another place, thought fit to extend the life of the last Parliament by six months? That was done

in order that we might get back to normal in the matter of dealing with the State's finances. Yet we find to-day—I do not know that it has ever occurred before—Parliament meeting in January, and the financial proposals of the Government not yet completed in another place, not yet brought before this House. I can absolve myself from all responsibility, because on two occasions have I adopted perhaps revolutionary tactics and tried to refuse Supply. Until the House sees the wisdom of that proceeding, this kind of thing will go on and the Government allow things to drift. To-day in another place they have eight pages of a Notice Paper. If this House is prepared to tolerate that sort of thing at this period of the year, I do not propose to waste time discussing abstract motions such as this.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY (Central) [4.48]: I do not view this as an abstract motion. I regret that the hon. member who secured the adjournment of the debate is not here to resume it. Each succeeding session Bills come down in the small hours of the last morning, and apparently we are to have the same thing again. This motion is really the outcome of replies to Mr. Kirwan's questions dealing with finance, replies which Mr. Kirwan rightly characterised as flippant. I agree with Mr. Holmes that perhaps a protest will not have very much effect, bearing in mind what is occurring in another place. However, we cannot sit idly by and allow the occasion to go without any protest from us. I will support the motion.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.50]: No hon. member can oppose the motion, although we can approach it in a spirit either of piety or of practicability. Another place looks on this august Chamber much as a country yokel looks on the Zoo. They say we may not interfere with questions of finance, but must pass without demur whatever they send along to us. They claim to represent the whole of the people, while we represent but some of them. The time has arrived when the Council must ask whether we are not part and parcel of the Constitution of the State. In theory it may be our prerogative to reduce taxation, but thus far we have not succeeded in practice, although year after year we are aiding and abetting another place in the imposition of increased taxation. The motion, I take it, will be carried, but as to its practical utility in another place I have strong doubts. If, at a later stage of this session, I can get a sufficient number of members to take a practical and definite stand, I shall be prepared to lead the band and put it to the test whether or not we are merely the knob on the top of the Parliamentary mast, or part and parcel of the mast itself. The proper opportunity for the test will be on Supply. If we cannot create interest in Parliament itself, we may succeed in creating interest outside of Parliament and in demonstrating to the many anxious

to follow a lead that at least one section of the Legislature is seized of the seriousness of the position. It has been pointed out that the estimated deficit for the current financial year has been exceeded already. There is a story of a celebrated free-thinker who, at the graveside of a child, asked, "Whence, and whither?" I want to know whither this State is drifting financially. I only wish I were optimistic enough to think that in the course of the next 10 years the country would resume its buoyancy; but I venture to say that unless we can force the country ahead, as was done in the early nineties, by the discovery of new goldfields, we are not going to reach financial buoyancy within the next decade.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It can be done, if properly handled.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I agree with that.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is it not our duty to so handle it?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Another place says it is not.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why not shift the Government?

Hon. J. CORNELL: One of the main contributing factors to the deficit is that all the Government services are over-manned. Yet men on the Golden Mile are looking for work day after day, while other men there are day after day being put off. I am not going to stand for a system that keeps a section of the community in easy and assured positions at the expense of the workers on the mines. Retrenchment may be hard, but in my experience nobody ever kept me for five minutes longer than there was work for me to do.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then you have never been a public servant?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The time is overdue when men sent here to represent the opinions of the electors will have to decide for themselves what are the best interests of the country, and take the chance and vote accordingly, putting aside all questions of how it will affect them when they go before their electors. Until we have a return to that feeling of independence, we shall be battenning on the general community, which is not to the betterment of the country. The financial drift of this State must be debarred by all sane men. Over and over again have I said that the Government are the lineal descendants of that Government which ousted the Labour Government when the Labour Government were gone one and a quarter millions. The whole battle cry of the incomers was that the financial position must be put right. Yet to-day the deficit is, not 1¼ millions, but getting on to six millions.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And it is not going to stop at that!

Hon. J. CORNELL: It will only cease when the bailiffs are put in. The Leader of the House is always reminding us that if we consider our sinking fund, and then make a comparison with the Eastern States, we shall find we come out of it very well. But

the provision of a sinking fund for the redemption of loans is the established law of the country. Prior to 1914 that principle was honourably observed. However, the Scaddan Government went behind it; and where the Scaddan Government were delinquents to a small degree, those who supplanted them, together with their lineal descendants have gone the limit. They now argue that if we compare our deficit with those of the Eastern States together with our sinking fund we come out of it well.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We have been dodging the sinking fund for the last five years.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The people of this country are of opinion that a sinking fund must be provided for the redemption of our loans, under the law of the land. Why do not the Government, if they would be honest, repeal the sinking fund and carry on as Governments are doing in the Eastern States? So long as the statute provides that we shall pay into this sinking fund, that constitutes a legitimate charge upon our income. Whatever we go behind, that should not be set off against our income. After all, it is like beating the air.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The motion is doing that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am prepared to take the lead, and I think other members will follow me, in order to test our position and to focus, even more strongly than at present, public opinion upon the Government and Parliament. The public are only waiting for someone to take the lead. We can probably best force the issue towards defining our position by some such means as this, and if we have to back down we can do so with honour. We can say to the people that if this goes on in the future they must not blame one branch of the legislature, for it will have done its best to bring the position to a climax and have the matter put right. I hope members will test the principle right out when they come to deal with the Supply Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [5.3]: I support the motion. It is time the country took some stand, as another place does not appear to do so, in attempting to straighten out the finances of this State. This motion may not have the desired effect, but we shall have an opportunity later on of doing something to show the Government that we are not going to stand by while they allow the State to drift upon the rocks. I shall reserve any further remarks I have to make upon the financial position to a later date.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.4]: I intend to support the motion. I have repeatedly pointed out in this House directions in which the Government might reasonably effect economy, but the only answer I have ever had to these suggestions had been that the few thousand pounds involved were too small to bother about. At different times as a private member the Leader of the House

must have deprecated the state of the finances under previous Governments, but to-day he offers plausible explanations for the position and cites the sinking fund as a remedial factor. He has stated he would not be a party to the suggested economies and retrenchments. Items have been pointed to dealing with the cost of Government, showing where savings could be effected, but his answer has invariably been that the saving would not amount to more than a few thousand pounds. If all these small sums had been saved during the last few years they would have amounted to something very substantial by this time. If the economies had been effected they would have had considerable influence upon the community. I can recall to mind the expression of opinion of the Leader of the House in which he showed that he was determinedly opposed to any step being taken in regard to justifiable economies and the cutting down of expenditure. The most prosperous and best governed State in the Commonwealth is Victoria. When that State was in a serious position, untried men came along and remedied it, and the mere fact that retrenchment was necessary led to the re-habilitation of the State and to the development of its natural resources. For instance, it meant the inauguration of a prosperous butter industry, which brought millions to that State. The Leader of the House seems determined to set his face against any such retrenchment in Western Australia, or anything which might throw people out of work. In Victoria it meant that a great many people had to rely upon their own strength of character, their backbone, and their own resources. They went outside the city and took part in work which they never expected to have to do. They took part in prospecting, in agricultural pursuits and in other things, and ultimately Victoria was so well developed that it has never looked back since. Holding the views that I do, that we must endeavour to make revenue and expenditure meet, I feel I cannot give a silent vote upon this motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan—in reply) [5.7]: Although the motion may be looked upon as a pious one, it expresses my views, and I believe the views that are held by a great body of the people of Western Australia. I must, therefore, allow it to go to the vote of the House. I agree that later on perhaps we shall have a better opportunity of taking certain steps which may have more practical effect. Mr. Cornell says he is prepared to lead the way. If that way is one that I consider right I shall be prepared to follow him. I would say this to him, if he wants me to join with him in the fight, he must go on to the finish. Personally, I shall not be disposed to retire. Even if he meets the enemy in stronger force from another place than he anticipates, he must go on. If we go into the fight we must

stand to the finish. In taking that course we shall be serving the best interests of the country. The position we are drifting into is perhaps not so serious to us here as it is to people outside. It is a position, however, that we should all do our best to check. If we take a step which may not be altogether palatable to another place, and even if another place asserts that this step infringes upon their prerogatives, it is our duty to take such step at a time like this.

Question put and passed.

#### MOTION—UNIVERSITY FEES.

To disallow Senate Statute.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 6th December on motion by Hon. E. H. HARRIS: "That the scale of fees and bursaries established by the University Senate, under Statute No. 19 of the University of Western Australia, for attendance of the students at lectures and classes be disallowed."

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East [5.8]): In view of the decision of another place in regard to this matter, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

#### BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to 12 amendments, disagreed with 12 and had agreed to six subject to further amendments, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 1—add the words "provided that such proclamation shall not issue before the 1st July, 1922."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: With this amendment the Assembly disagrees. I opposed this at the time it was put forward. The Bill provided that the Act should come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation, but the Bill was amended to provide that the proclamation should not issue before the 1st July, 1922. I move—

That the Council's amendment be not insisted upon.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: When I moved this amendment I explained that as half the year had already gone very little damage would be done to the finances of the State by postponing the date of proclamation. This Chamber has come to the conclusion that it is not wise to give the Government any increased financial assistance because there is no attempt disclosed on the part of the Government to judiciously expend the money. The

drift that is going on at present must lead to disaster sooner or later. Until the Government show some judicious economy, they should not get another penny more than they have now. I am not disposed to allow them to secure more taxation through the present Bill and if we do not insist upon the amendments, we shall have a scale of charges levied by the Government and collected before the Committee will have an opportunity of considering the charges. The effect of the amendment will be to bring the scale of charges before the House, before they are levied.

**Hon. A. LOVEKIN:** This is an instance in which the Council should insist upon the amendment. There are only a few months to run during the present financial year and that interval will be required to frame the regulations. If we have the Bill ready on the 1st July, it may be brought before Parliament next session and we will then know what scale of fees are to be charged. We will know where we stand and know what we are doing. I think we should insist on the amendment, even if it means sacrificing the Bill until next session.

**Hon. H. STEWART:** I cannot see that any difficulty at all will be experienced by the Government if we insist upon the amendment. It will give the department time to prepare their scale of charges and give adequate thought to this matter in the new year. Why is there any necessity to change the methods during the currency of the financial year? The Government are already collecting fees under the existing legislation. The Leader of the House informed members that the Bill was brought forward in order to bring about some uniformity regarding this type of legislation, which decision had been arrived at as a result of a conference in the Eastern States. He cannot tell us what States have been ahead of us in the past regarding this legislation. In the circumstances, why all this hurry?

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

Ayes	..	..	4
Noes	..	..	13

Majority against .. 9

#### AYES.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. C. McKenzie	(Teller.)
Hon. A. J. H. Saw	

#### NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. F. A. Baglin
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)

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

No. 2. Clause 2.—Definition of "boiler," paragraph (a): After the word "any," in line one, insert "closed":

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

I understand that the word "closed" was inserted with a view to making the position absolutely clear. I am now told, however, that there is no necessity for the word, as it is redundant. Only closed vessels can generate steam and therefore the amendment is not necessary. I understand that a bath-heater was quoted in the House as an example but I am informed that that appliance cannot generate steam.

**Hon. H. Stewart:** It does not get above atmospheric pressure.

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

No. 3. Clause 3.—Definition of "Winding-engine."—In line two, strike out "or material."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

When the clause was under consideration, it was contended that by deleting the words "or material," winding engines might be used in connection with mining shafts or winzes where men were working underneath, and yet the engines would be exempt because they were used for hauling material. Although they would be exempt, the risk to the men would be just as great. There is power to provide for the necessary safety appliances. In the circumstances the amendment should not be insisted upon.

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

No. 4. Clause 4.—Add a paragraph to stand as (7):—Of any machinery driven by oil or petrol of which the power is less than eight horse power.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The amendment was included at the instance of Mr. Baxter. It is contended that engines proposed to be exempted in the amendment are already embraced under the 1904 Act. There is nothing new regarding their inspection. The exemption of these engines means the exemption of the whole of the machinery by which they are driven. I do not know whether it will be possible to agree to some modification which will be acceptable to members of another place.

**Hon. C. F. BAXTER:** On looking further into this question, I find it goes beyond what I intended. I do not like to make it a class matter but, as the position appears now, I

think it is desirable that it should apply to the agricultural industry. I move an amendment—

That the Council's amendment be modified by deleting the words "eight horse power" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:—"six horse power used exclusively by any bona fide agriculturist."

I realise that machinery driven by oil or petrol engines have had to be registered and inspected all along, but, as I pointed out previously, the inspection is of no practical value because it cannot avert accidents.

Hon. H. Stewart: And it costs more than the revenue received.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is the ridiculous aspect. The State receives about 5s. per annum and yet the cost of the inspection and examination runs into from £3 to £4.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I would like Mr. Baxter to explain why he proposes that the amendment shall apply to the agricultural industry only and what is his definition of "bona fide agriculturist."

Hon. V. Hamersley: Does it include the man engaged in the pastoral industry?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, there is that aspect; also, does it include the man engaged in the pearling industry?

Hon. A. H. Panton: I suppose the definition would include a St. George's-terrace farmer as well.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This Bill is one which vitally affects the pearling industry quite apart from the pastoral industry, because the air supplied to the coloured men engaged in diving operations has to be sent down by engines which have to be inspected.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Is there no need for such examination.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It is necessary to protect every industry and not only the agricultural industry. While I would not support an amendment applying to only one industry, I would be in favour of reducing the horse power from eight to something which is considered reasonable, and I will support any such amendment applying to all industries and not to the agricultural industry only.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not sure that inspection is not necessary on a pearling boat where a person's life depends on machinery driven by a 6 h.p. or even a 4 h.p. engine. If the hon. member can show that inspection is unnecessary, I shall be willing to support him.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I oppose the modification. We should not indulge in class legislation. I was surprised to hear from Mr. Baxter that this measure is designed to protect life. We have been told all through that its object was to raise revenue. I do not see why the lives of workers in agricultural centres should not be protected, just as much as those on the mining fields and in the factories.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Inspection would be of no value.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: If anyone wished to see dangerous machinery, I would commend him to farm machinery.

Hon. H. STEWART: I take exception to members objecting to efforts to protect an important primary industry and calling it class legislation. If there is no danger, why should not the industry be exempted? If there is danger, let members point out where it lies. There is no necessity to inspect this type of engine anywhere in the State, except possibly in the mining industry. Plenty of agricultural machinery driven by horses is far more dangerous than that driven by a petrol engine.

Modification on Council's amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes ...	...	10
Noes ...	...	8
Majority for	...	2

#### AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. H. Harris
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. R. G. Ardagh
	(Teller.)

Modification thus passed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move—

That the Council's amendment be further modified by adding the words "Pastoralist, pearler, orchardist or dairyman."

This will bring these four primary industries on to the same footing, and make the position much more reasonable.

Hon. H. Stewart: "Dairymen" is redundant.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: What about horticulturist?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then I will content myself with moving for the addition of the words "pastoralist or pearler."

Modification put and passed; the Council's amendment as modified insisted on.

No. 10. Clause 53, Subclause (1) line 3—Strike out "or any crane or hoist."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: A number of electric cranes are at Fremantle and the total number in the State is 20. With regard to steam cranes, it is necessary to have certificated drivers. In the past there has been no statutory authority to insist on certificates for drivers of electric cranes and that is what the Bill proposes to do. I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I understand that this amendment was agreed to after a conference with the Minister and the Inspector of Machinery, and therefore I think the Minister should stick to the decision arrived at by that conference. What utility will be served by bringing crane drivers under this provision? We may get a little revenue, but nothing else.

**Hon. H. STEWART:** We all have some acquaintance with the operating of electric power, and seeing that the amount involved in pounds shillings and pence in connection with the mechanism of a hoist would cause an owner to take every precaution, and seeing also how simple it is to operate electric machinery, I think the Committee would be well advised not to vary the decision of the conference which took place.

**Hon. A. H. PANTON:** I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment. At the Fremantle wharf there are large electric cranes used and many men work under loads that those cranes hoist. The cranes have been on the Fremantle wharf for a number of years, and the men in charge of them have become expert. I have no doubt that they would be able to secure certificates by virtue of the practical experience they have had. So far as the conference is concerned there seems to be a growing tendency in this House to refer Bills to people outside the Chamber. I do not intend to be led away by any conference with anyone outside this House.

**Hon. J. J. Holmes:** Did not the conference consist of members of this House?

**Hon. A. H. PANTON:** I understood it was with the Inspector of Machinery. However, I object to these conferences.

Question put and passed, the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 12. Clause 53, Subclause (3), paragraph (a). In line three, before the word "farm," insert "one," and strike out all the words after the word "purposes," in line four.

**The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** The objection raised against this amendment is that it would mean that any farmer could not lend his steam engine to a neighbour. The question is whether that is desirable. I do not think it is.

**Hon. T. Moore:** Is it customary?

Members: Yes, quite customary.

**The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

**Hon. A. H. PANTON:** It is a common occurrence to find a contractor with a portable engine going around farms cutting chaff for many farmers. I contend that the men who are employed on that class of engine should be protected. When the matter was before the Committee previously I compromised with the members representing agricultural provinces by agreeing to confine the work to one farm. If the word "one" is taken out the chaff-cutting contractor will have a free hand. I hope that the action of workers who are affected will be afforded protection. The argument here seems to be, "When it comes to the agricultural industry, hands off!"

**Hon. V. HAMERSLEY:** I see no reason for the retention of the words, which were included owing to the Committee being over-persuaded by Mr. Panton. Let us not penalise the whole agricultural industry for the sake of one contractor. Farmers occasionally find themselves in the position of having to move chaff-cutting machinery from one piece of country to

another, not being fortunate enough to have the whole of their land in one area. The chaff-cutting contractor represents a distinct advantage to the farmers.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	...	6
Majority for				5

#### AYES.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Cunningham	(Teller.)
Hon. E. H. Harris	

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 13—Clause 53, Subclause 3, paragraph (b), strike out "three" and insert "six":

**The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I am informed that under our proposed exemption we should be exempting a number of boilers under six horse-power which are used in hotels, butchers' shops, hospitals, and other places, many of them working up to 100 lbs. pressure. Moreover, it is stated that in many cases the maintenance is unsatisfactory, although so far there has been no accident. The Chief Inspector of Machinery has expressed the opinion that an engine of this class should be under the holder of a boiler attendant's certificate. I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

**Hon. J. CORNELL:** I understand that the Minister's opinion is really that of Mr. Mathews. What kind of work are the boilers in question doing? I believe there are dangerous machines in dentists' establishments employed in vulcanising artificial teeth. Should they not come under this Bill? A three horse-power engine can be just as dangerous as a six horse-power engine. Let us have a sliding scale of given pressure.

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

No. 15—Clause 54, Subclause 4, strike out paragraph (f) (consequential on No. 10):

No. 16—Clause 55, line 4, strike out "or a crane or hoist driver's certificate" (consequential on No. 10):

No. 20—Clause 56, Subclause 6, strike out this subclause:

No. 26—Clause 65, Subclause 1, line 2, strike out "crane or hoist" (consequential on No. 10):

On motions by the Minister for Education, the above amendments were, consequentially, not insisted on.

No. 27—Clause 79, strike out this clause:



The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Clause 79 was debated here at great length, and I very strongly opposed the striking out of the clause, going so far as to recommit. However, on a very close division the Committee insisted upon deleting the clause. It should certainly be left in the Bill, in order to safeguard the inspector and the Crown. The provision is in the existing Act, and in the corresponding legislation of Eastern States. The striking out of the clause will result in a great deal of confusion. Any inspector acting bona fide in the execution of his duty should be protected. I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I hope the Committee will insist upon the amendment. Instances were given in the previous debate of inspectors doing very serious damage to machinery.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Only one exaggerated instance was given.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The insertion of this provision would prevent redress being obtained. In any case, who can obtain redress from the Government? The Railway Department, for instance, are exempt from all liability, so much so that a railway traveller hardly dares hand over his baggage, fearing that he will never see it again and that the department will successfully disclaim all liability.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I disagree with the motion. The Committee should insist upon the amendment. If we send a qualified officer to do certain work, he should be held responsible for any damage accruing as the result of his visit.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I hope the Committee will not insist upon the amendment. This is the most amateurish piece of legislation I have had the misfortune to peruse. We cast on the inspectors the duty to go and inspect certain machinery. So long as their actions are taken bona fide in the execution of their duty, they should have protection. I take it that if anybody is aggrieved by damage done, he will have the right to go to court; but if in the opinion of the judge the defence is established that the damage resulted from action taken by the inspector in the bona fide execution of his duty, the inspector will not be liable. If we do not have some protection of the sort, the inspector will always have hanging over him the risk of being held responsible for unforeseen damage. I hope the Committee will not insist on the amendment.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Some of our legislation might be amateurish, but undoubtedly the Government have some amateurish experts going about the country. Men in the guise of qualified inspectors have come on our premises and declared that our floors should not be put down in clay or timber, but must be put down in granolithic; then along comes another so-called expert who says it is all a mistake, and that the floor must be pulled up and put down in another way. We should not countenance that kind of thing too far. The Government should be just as much responsible as any private firm. Frequently private persons are penalised

through the incompetence of Government officials, who are not held to be responsible. Such a provision as this will have the effect of deterring people from putting money into industry and also from going to law for the recovery of damages.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: After 17 years experience of this provision one can hardly believe it has been responsible for keeping capital out of industry. A Government inspector should be free to fearlessly carry out his duty. Seemingly in 17 years the only instance of damage on record is that mentioned by Mr. Lynn on the second reading, the occasion when an inspector tickled up a boiler which badly required ticking. Without the protection of Clause 79, that inspector would not have taken the chance of penetrating the boiler with a hammer. I hope the Committee will reinstate the clause.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I should like an opinion from the Minister as to whether, under existing legislation, people have redress against damage caused by an inspector.

The Minister for Education: Of course, this does not take away their redress.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think it does. I do not think people have any legal rights under existing legislation. Surely the owner has the right to follow the inspector round and see to it that no damage is done. The sooner we have legislation which will put the inspector in his place, the better.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There can be no doubt that the owner has redress in the event of any damage being done. All that the clause provides is that it shall be a good defence that the inspector acted in the bona fide execution of his duty. Having discussed the matter fully with the Solicitor General, I do not think the striking out of the clause will impose any obligation on the inspector or on the Crown if the inspector, in the bona fide execution of his duty, does any damage, whereas the taking out of the clause will lead to misunderstanding and deprive the inspector of the expressed power and privilege which he ought to have.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then all the redress the owner has, is that if the department sets up the defence that the inspector acted bona fide, it is a good defence.

The Minister for Education: No, only if the department can establish it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It will be very easy to establish it, and very hard to disprove it. So, in the broad sense, the owner has not the protection suggested.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	5

Majority for .. 6

#### AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. F. A. Baglin
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	[	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes		Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. H. Stewart		(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 18.—[Council's amendment—Clause 55, paragraph (c).—Strike out this paragraph.] [Assembly's modification — Substitute "amend" for "strike out," and add after "paragraph" the words "by omitting the word 'continuously,' in line 2, and substituting 'five' for 'two' in line five."]

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This amendment in a sense arises out of the amendment we agreed to in regard to cranes or hoists. Having struck out the reference to crane or hoist in a previous portion of the Bill, we naturally struck out this part of it. Now "crane or hoist" has been restored and something of this nature has to go in. The amendment of the Assembly proposes to make things easier than this paragraph would make it by striking out the word "continuously," and altering the period from two years prior to the commencement of the Act to any time within five years. I think this is a satisfactory alteration and move—

That the modification be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's modification agreed to.

No. 19. [Council's amendment—Clause 56, Subclause (1).—Add the following at the end:—"but the holder of an unrestricted first-class certificate granted under any Act in force before the commencement of this Act shall be entitled to drive any engine other than a locomotive or traction engine." [Assembly's modification—Omit the words "or traction engine" in the last line.]

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This liberalises the Bill so far as engine-drivers' certificates are concerned, and I move—

That the modification be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's modification agreed to.

No. 21. [Council's amendment—Clause 56, Subclause (7).—Strike out "solely," in line one, and "materials," in line two.] [Assembly's modification—Omit the words "and 'material' in line two."]

No. 22. [Council's amendment—Clause 56.—Insert the following, to stand as Subclause (8):—(8.) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section to the contrary, the holder of an unrestricted first or second class steam engine-driver's certificate granted under any Act in operation at any time before the commencement of this Act may, by virtue of such certificate drive and have charge of any engine to which, except for this Act, such certificate would have applied, including an internal combustion engine, other than a locomotive or traction engine.] [Assembly's

modification—Omit the words "or traction engine," in the last line.]

No. 23. [Council's amendment—Clause 62, Subclause (2).—Strike out this subclause.] [Assembly's modification — Substitute "amend" for "strike out," and add after "subclause" "by substituting 'five' for 'two' in line four."]

No. 24. [Council's amendment—Clause 62. —Add at the end the following:—(3.) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section to the contrary, the holder of an unrestricted first or second class steam engine-driver's certificate granted under any Act in operation at any time before the commencement of this Act may, by virtue of such certificate, drive and have charge of any engine to which except for this Act such certificate would have applied, including an internal combustion engine, other than a locomotive or traction engine.] [Assembly's modification—Omit the words "or traction engine," in the last line.]

On motions by the Minister for Education the foregoing modifications made by the Assembly to the Council's amendments were agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

## BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.55] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill making three necessary amendments in the Agricultural Bank Act of 1906. The first amendment, in Clause 2, provides that the funds of the bank, to an amount not exceeding £10,000 in the aggregate, may, if the trustees see fit, or the Governor approves, be applied to providing premises for the purposes of the bank or residential quarters for the officers of the bank, and any money so applied shall be chargeable with the interest and contributions to the redemption account at the prescribed rate. The necessity for the clause arises out of the fact that in many parts of the country it is practically impossible to get office accommodation for the bank. Under the system of decentralisation, which is very necessary for the effective working of the bank, a chief inspector is stationed at a certain locality, and has five or six inspectors working under him. It is necessary that they should have suitable office accommodation in which to transact their business. The amount is limited to £10,000 and no building can be erected for the purpose of office accommodation for the bank, or for residential quarters for an official, except on the recommendation of the trustees, and endorsed by the Governor-in-Council.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: Are they paying rent now?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They would have to pay rent. It is not intended to make use of this in the city but in the country centres, where a central office of the bank is established.

Hon. J. Ewing: Have they many in the country?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. Bruce Rock and Kununoppin are outstanding instances where the bank has important centres, and where it is impossible to obtain accommodation. At such centres as Northam it is possible to obtain accommodation, for the bank actually has it there. The second provision of the Bill is to enable the bank ex-soldier officials to secure advances under ex-soldier conditions. Section 13, Sub-section 2, of the Act provides that no advance shall be made under the provisions of this Act to any trustee, deputy trustee or officer of the bank, or in respect of any lands or other security in which any trustee, deputy trustee, or officer has any interest. There are at present certain officers of the bank who are purely temporary officers, returned soldiers, and it is considered there is no reason why they should not have the advantages of the Returned Soldiers Act, which includes advances from the bank. It is only to apply to those temporarily employed by the bank and who propose to make farming their permanent avocation. I see no reason why these temporary officers should not be allowed to have the advantages of the bank. The third provision is to enable the bank to advance money on group settlement operations before the security is registered. The present system is for the bank to advance money to the individual settler. Several group settlements have been and are now being established. It is necessary that the money for the clearing and general development of these group settlements should be obtained from the Agricultural Bank. This cannot be done except in the case of the individual. Under settlements and that when the blocks are not allocated until the improvements are carried out, which may take two or more years. The opinion is that the bank may advance money in connection with the group settlements and that when the blocks are allocated, the proportion of the bank's advances may be set against the various blocks and will become a debt by the individual in the ordinary way in which the individual does obtain an advance from the bank. The interest on the outlay on each block will be capitalised until the successful applicant is established. When this is done the blocks will become ordinary Agricultural Bank mortgages. The provision is a proper one and I do not see how group settlements can be advanced in any other way. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.0]: I have no objection to the Agricultural Bank having power to erect suitable premises for its own requirements in different centres, but I see an element of danger in connec-

tion with the amount fixed, namely £10,000. Bearing in mind the manner in which our public works are constructed, I consider that if the Public Works Department started to erect premises, say, at Bruce Rock, for the purposes of the bank, it would probably take the whole of the £10,000 to provide the necessary accommodation in that one centre. Rather than have the amount fixed at £10,000, I think there should be some provision made to the effect that not more than £1,000 should be spent in any one centre. I consider £1,000 would be a liberal amount to provide for necessary banking accommodation at the several country centres. We are led to believe that these branches will increase and multiply, and, in the circumstances, the sum should be fixed for the expenditure in each locality. The other matter to which I desire to refer relates to Clause 4. In the past I understand the advances have been made to the individual, the security being the property and the individual. In this case, however, it is proposed that the security will be as against the property, and it remains to be seen whether the individual will accept the responsibility later on. Despite that, however, until he has accepted that responsibility the money can be drawn from the bank. It strikes me that such a man, interested in a group settlement, may not give the same service, as if he were putting in his work on his own particular block.

Hon. J. Duffell: This is a sort of joint and several guarantee.

The Minister for Education: Only at the initial stage.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The only security the Government have is in the property which they had at the start. The settler may do as much or as little as he likes on the property and if he does not like the property, he may pull out, and the Government are left with the land they originally held. In such circumstances, it may be easily understood that the State may not secure value for the money expended. I mention these two points so that during the Committee stage we may have an opportunity of dealing with those aspects by way of amendment. In the circumstances, I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [8.3]: It seems to me that the remarks by Mr. Holmes regarding the limitation of the amount in any particular locality, embody a very wise suggestion. Particularly is this so in view of what we have seen in recent years, regarding the carrying out of public works. From the reading of Clause 4, one gets the impression that the Government are going to lend Agricultural Bank funds in connection with the South-West. I understand that the Agricultural Bank Act, with which I am not thoroughly conversant, makes no provision to enable money to be lent to agriculturists in the south-western agricultural areas which are now being settled for

dairying and intense cultivation purposes. It seems to me that there is no logical reason why money on adequate security should not be advanced in the south-western parts of the State just as money is lent in the wheat areas. If such a provision does not exist in the Agricultural Bank Act at present, if the Committee stage were left over till tomorrow we could look into that aspect and draft an amendment which would enable such advances to be made.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [8.6]: Mr. Stewart is in error regarding the ability of the trustees of the Agricultural Bank to advance money in the South-West.

Hon. H. Stewart: If they have the power, they do not do it.

Hon. J. EWING: Not to a very great extent.

The Minister for Education: The necessary power is provided under the Act.

Hon. J. EWING: From my own knowledge, I know that money is advanced in connection with the development of the South-West. I have been able to get money advanced by the bank for development in that part of the State. Hon. members connected with the South-West Province, however, will know that very small amounts of money have been loaned by the Agricultural Bank for the development of the South-West. I am pleased to support the second reading of the Bill, however, because practically the whole of the closer settlement which the Government are undertaking is in the South-West. It demonstrates that the Government have altered their policy and now intend to advance money for agricultural development in that part of the State. Why they have not done so in the past I cannot understand. Evidently, the Government have now awakened to the great importance of the South-West. The trouble in the past has been that the Agricultural Bank authorities have not seen eye to eye with those who have been settled in the South-West. As a matter of fact, the Agricultural Bank trustees did not think the security was good enough, with the result that money has been devoted to the development of the wheat areas, and the South-West has not received its just share. I am gratified, however, to see that the policy of the Government has been altered and that the development of the South-West will in future be assisted through the Agricultural Bank. I think only a small amount will be required for buildings because in most of the towns in the South-Western parts of the State there are already land offices, and I suppose the Government will take advantage of the existence of those buildings. Regarding group settlements, there is no doubt that when a man gets away from the group he should take over his own responsibilities. That is a first class idea. Every man who takes over a block of land should have his improvements capitalised and placed against the land. Then with the land, besides him-

self, there is ample security to the Government for funds advanced.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.8]: This Bill opens up important questions regarding the practice of the Agricultural Bank. I was one of the earliest clients of the bank, and I followed its operations with much approval and the greatest interest until 1914. Of all the banking institutions of Australia, when the great strain and stress came in 1914, the Agricultural Bank of Western Australia was the only institution that failed to meet its obligations in this country. I do not wish to be hard on any institution or individual who failed to stand up to obligations in 1914, but if the Government of that day had brought down a Bill similar to that before us, containing two or three clauses and empowering the Agricultural Bank to advance a million of money, it would have probably done away with the Industries Assistance Board, and all our troubles which arose in that direction might have been avoided. I am speaking only from recollection, seeing that for two years the Agricultural Bank did not produce the necessary reports as required by statute. At any rate, the institution got into serious difficulties. What was the next step? I draw a veil over the 1914 lapse and recognise the difficulties of the position. I have indicated how that trouble should have been met by providing a million of money for the bank, thus recognising the good work they were doing, and the care, skill, and sympathy of those in charge of the institution. As I have said, I pass a veil over that aspect and come to another important development in connection with the bank. Here again I am not quite clear of the position. We are all acquainted with the outline of that position, however, and I see that it partly affects Clause 3, and partly Clause 4, of the present Bill. When the repatriation scheme for settling soldiers on the land was brought before the people of Australia, what was the position of affairs? The Commonwealth Government recognised to the full their obligation to find the money to put the men on the land. What did the State Government do? The Federal Government came to the States, indicating that they would find the money if the States would find the land. The States were compelled to, and gladly found the land. There was a very interesting position. The Commonwealth recognised their full obligation to the soldiers, and here were the States, ready and willing to find the land, especially Western Australia! What did we do, however? I forget which Government were in power at the time, but that aspect does not matter, because the effect on the people was the same.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Lefroy Government were in power at that time.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Federal Government had the audacity to ask Western Australia and the other States to guarantee

the principle and interest on the money advanced! Let us leave the other States out of the question altogether. Surely, if the Government of Western Australia had recognised their duty to our own people, they would have said "certainly not."

Hon. J. Cornell: If Australia were unified, it would be better for the soldiers and others as well.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I will not be led astray to discuss that aspect. We are not unified; our chief work is to look after the interests of Western Australia, and no one is more anxious to do that than I am. The Federal Government asked the Lefroy Government to guarantee the principle and interest, and to my amazement, the Lefroy Government accepted that liability, a liability which they should never have undertaken. The Lefroy Government should have said they would give every possible assistance to the Commonwealth authorities regarding the settlement of soldiers on the land. They should have indicated that we, as a State, were anxious to settle the soldiers here and as many of them as possible. We should have indicated that our expert officers would have been placed at their disposal, but to accept the Federal Government's proposal to guarantee the principle and interest, was a blunder of the first magnitude. This is the most suitable time at which we may put this proposition: Whose is the liability, the Agricultural Bank's or the State's? It certainly should not be a liability of the Agricultural Bank.

The Minister for Education: No, not the Commonwealth portion of it.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Then it is the liability of the State. The Agricultural Bank is acting as agent for the advancing of money from the Commonwealth Government, the interest and principle of which is guaranteed by the State Government. It does not require much examination to see what position we get into, from either the State or the bank point of view. What is the position if the bank have advanced £500? Through no fault of anybody—these things will happen in even the most carefully guarded institutions—there is a complete failure and a complete loss. Where does the responsibility go? The Federal Government come along and say to the State, "You guaranteed the principle and interest on this amount."

Hon. J. Cornell: The responsibility would be with the State, because they have the administration.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And the Federal people get the profits.

Hon. J. Cornell: Nothing of the sort.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am not a hostile critic of the Agricultural Bank; very much the reverse. I was one of its earliest clients; I have followed its workings closely and no doubt it has done good work. It certainly was engaged on a dangerous path, but we undertook that with our eyes open.

When the Commonwealth Government came into the question and the Agricultural Bank became only the agent and not the principal in this matter, it made the position more dangerous so far as the bank and the State were concerned. One of the contributing causes of the crisis in Victoria in 1892 was the fact that people in England sent out money to private individuals, who guaranteed principal and interest, and when a sudden call was made for the money, trouble resulted. If we are to treat the Federal Government seriously and if we are to consider that we should make provision for the interest and sinking fund on the money advanced to the soldiers, we should consider the bank and our own financial position. The proposal to make advances for premises is interesting. I thought those premises were to be in Perth.

The Minister for Education: No.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If we wish to see an institution which has the confidence of the country, and has been well managed, let us go to the Bank of Australasia and see its property account which stands at about £22,000 for the whole of Australasia.

The Minister for Education: That is by writing down the amount.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Quite so. The Bank of England account shows no amount for premises at all, although their premises must represent a million of money. Anyone knows that the building premises are absolutely valueless for banking purposes.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Sydney premises of the Bank of Australasia are worth a quarter of a million of money.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If it is considered advisable for the Agricultural Bank to have these premises, surely it would be wise to spread the provision over a period of years. The trouble is there is very little continuity or foresight in the management of State institutions. Therefore, the provision of £10,000 for premises seems inadequate.

The Minister for Education: That is purely for country centres where it is impossible to get premises.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: These assurances are given us off hand, but in a few years we may find that this departure has developed into something of very considerable proportions. If this matter is allowed to go without the close supervision and management of the bank authorities, the premises account will probably grow to a large figure.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Are you opposing that particular clause?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am uttering a note of warning regarding the whole position. I consider that a fatal error was made by the Government in guaranteeing one penny piece in connection with soldier settlement.

The Minister for Education: I am afraid we would not have got the money without it.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If we had been in a strong and an independent financial position, we would have told the Commonwealth Government that we did not want the money. The money was for the purpose of the soldiers and the duty which the Federal Government owed to those soldiers.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member connect his remarks with the Bill?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I intended to do so. The Bill should not be passed until we have had an opportunity to digest the latest report of the Agricultural Bank. I have called for the latest accounts, and I have been handed a typewritten statement. The report is numbered 181 and should be on the Table of the House. I refuse to vote for the Bill until the report is printed—it should have been printed three months ago—and circulated amongst members. It would not hang up the premises account because owing to present prices of building, it will be impossible to undertake building for some months. Clause 3 is of very little importance. Clause 4 is of considerable importance, because it deals with group settlement. Instead of getting individual members to take up individual blocks, as has been the custom in the past, and advancing the money partly on the land and partly on the character of the man managing the block, the bank is going to start a little cultivation of its own.

Hon. H. Stewart: To pay sustenance while the work is going on.

Hon. V. Hamersley: To solve an unemployed difficulty.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: My explanation is that the bank intend to take up a portion of country and develop it to a certain point, and then try to get rid of it to returned soldiers or to other people. If this is so, it will be more difficult and dangerous than the ordinary work of the bank. I would have no hesitation in turning this Bill down and letting it come up again six months hence, when a printed copy of the bank's accounts could be circulated amongst members.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [8.25]: There is one phase of the question touched on by Mr. Sanderson in which he appeared to be rather wide of the mark. This was with regard to the guarantee of £625 per soldier. I think the Commonwealth acted very fairly in the matter and the same can be said of the Lefroy Government. The Commonwealth and the State Governments were alive to the necessity for settling soldiers on the land, and the response has been gratifying to all. If the States had been prepared to surrender their land and their prerogatives in connection with it, I believe the Federal Government would have shouldered the obligation, but the States could not have done so without an amendment of the Constitution.

Hon. T. Moore: So we borrowed some cheap money from the Federal Government.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Commonwealth advanced £625 per soldier, at 3 per cent., the interest rising after five years until it reached the rate which the money cost. That was a concession.

The PRESIDENT: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that that money was borrowed under an amendment of the Land Act and has nothing whatever to do with this measure.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Regarding the group settlement system, there must be some machinery provided to make funds available for this work. If any man deserves the Victoria Cross or the Order of the British Empire, it is the man who goes out and subdues the forest of the South-West. If we can induce groups of men to co-operate, we are more likely to succeed in getting that land made habitable than by placing individuals there indiscriminately. Combined effort will produce better results than individual effort. But money has to be found to enable this to be done, and is it not better that it should be advanced by an institution but for which there would never have been such wonderful development in our agricultural areas? I think that similarly good results will be achieved in the South-West, I invariably judge a government institution applying for new powers by the individual at the head of them. It is unnecessary for me to eulogise the capabilities of the managing trustee of the Agricultural Bank. With regard to extending the provision of the measure to returned soldiers, I take it that a discharged soldier who has received assistance under the soldier settlement scheme is not to be debarred from appointment as a temporary employee.

The Minister for Education: That is right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: But if a man is a temporary employee, he must be dismissed before he can enjoy the benefit. This is an anomaly which must be removed.

The Minister for Education: It will be removed.

Hon. J. CORNELL: A discharged soldier who is under the Public Service Act, and who is an employee of the bank and desires to avail himself under the soldiers' settlement scheme, is ruled out of court. I think that the Public Service Act should be so stretched that such an officer should not be ruled out of court until his application is approved.

The Minister for Education: We cannot deal with that under this Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I hope, however, the position will be rectified. I hope, too, that there will not be any cases of an Agricultural Bank inspector who has had an advance made to him under the soldiers' settlement scheme inspecting and reporting on his own property. I know that the inspectors are conscientious men, but if the opportunity presented itself and they had to report on their own property, however honest they might be we do not know what might

occur. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [8.33]: Whilst I support the second reading of the Bill, I think that perhaps when the Minister is replying he may be able to give me some information. I approve of the idea of owning these buildings and of providing the officials with decent accommodation. We have had everything of our own in Perth, and now I am pleased that the Government have decided to provide the proposed accommodation outbreak. With regard to Clause 4 which deals with group settlement, I have been wondering whether the Bill is 12 months old, and whether it should not have been introduced 12 months ago. If this Bill be not passed now what will be the position of group settlements? Who will pay? It seems to me that Bills are frequently brought down after the work is well advanced, and after sales have been actually effected, such as in the case of the Wheat Marketing Bill. It certainly appears to me that the Bill before us should have been dealt with a year ago, and that whatever happens we are committed to the expenditure of a certain amount of money.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [8.35]: I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee to-night and therefore any points that I am not able to clear up now, I shall be able to explain at a later stage. As I have already said, it is not intended to use any of this money for the building of premises in Perth. The decentralisation policy of the bank, which is undoubtedly proving satisfactory, necessitates the provision of suitable accommodation in some of the country centres, where that accommodation does not exist at the present time. Bruce Rock and Kununoppin are two centres which have been selected by the bank. With regard to the matter mentioned by Mr. Cornell, I will have it looked into, but it has nothing to do with this Bill. He is right in what he says regarding ex-soldiers who were clients of the Agricultural Bank and who have become inspectors, but the Solicitor General has held that the position they occupy is quite in order. Those who are desirous of obtaining advances cannot get advances until the provisions of the present Bill become law. I do not think the security under the group settlement scheme is inferior to the ordinary security of the bank. The work of these people is always supervised, and if as some hon. member suggests, they do not carry on fair work they go out. The inducement is there for them to give full value for the money spent. I will obtain for Mr. Moore the information he desires as to the methods with which group settlements have been financed, but I assure him that it is only recently that the necessity for this amendment has arisen.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.40] in moving the second reading said: I hope this Bill will receive the favourable consideration of hon. members. A Bill on almost similar lines passed through the Legislative Council last session, but it was ruled out of order in the Legislative Assembly because it made certain incidental provisions for the imposition of fees and for the appropriation of funds for services. This session the Bill was introduced in another place and it has come to us from that Chamber. In the essential parts it is similar to the Bill we had before us last year, but it does not make registration compulsory. Nurses can continue to practise without registration, but it does provide a means by which all nurses who come up to a certain standard of training may obtain registration by the recognition of their status as nurses. It also gives them the exclusive right to wear certain badges. The Bill we passed last session gave the exclusive right in regard to badges and uniforms, but the provision regarding uniforms is not included in this Bill. Legislation very similar to this has been in force in New Zealand and Queensland for many years and it recently became operative in South Australia. The Bill sets out as a standard for registration, three years' training, that being the period recognised not only throughout Australia, but throughout the world. It makes provision for women who were trained at the time when two years was the recognised period being registered under the Bill. The appointment of a board is provided for, and it is to consist of five members, two medical men and three nurses, the registered nurses having the right to nominate two out of the three. The Bill does not exclude any person from practising as a nurse, but it does give those who have obtained the necessary qualifications a status that they did not possess before. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West) [8.48]: I support the second reading of the Bill, but I should like to have heard from the Leader of the House something more in regard to the nurses. The Bill deals with the registration of nurses, but it does seem to me an extraordinary fact that after a nurse has served her time in a hospital and passed the examinations set out by the principal medical officer, and has received her certificate, and has to all intents and purposes become a fully qualified nurse, we should find the A.T.N.A. coming along and entirely overriding everything done by the principal medical officer. The A.T.N.A. may say,

"The examination you have passed may be all right, but before we will recognise you, you will have to pass an examination set up by us and you must pay a certain fee before you can sit." That is a most extraordinary position.

The Minister for Education: The Bill will not permit that.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The Bill will strengthen the association. It seems extraordinary that any outside association should have the power to override the decision of the Government institution, and in a case like this to refuse to recognise certificates issued by the principal medical officer until the holders of those certificates have passed an examination set up by that association.

Hon. J. Ewing: What is their status?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: A status set up by themselves. They can do what they like. In fact they are the only people. A board is to be appointed. Are we to see the same thing happen as in the past? I ask this question of hon. members, if it is right for strong, able-bodied men to work only 44 hours per week—and even that is claimed to be too much—is it right for girls and women, who are called the weaker vessels, to work 12 hours per day on six days per week?

Hon. A. H. Panton: Who is responsible for that?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Each and everyone of us, and we all ought to be ashamed of ourselves. I have the very greatest contempt for myself because I have not looked into this matter before. In hospitals in Perth to-day girls go on at six in the morning and work till eight at night, and for what? For £1 or 30s. per week.

Hon. T. Moore: For a good deal less.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Yes; I believe there are such cases. The position is absolutely scandalous. If an engine-driver stays on a locomotive for more than a certain number of hours, we are told there is danger not only to his own health but to the lives of the passengers. If that is so, how much more serious is it to think that a nurse is left for 11 or 12 hours at a stretch in charge of a ward containing, say, 30 or 40 patients—not railway passengers with health and strength, but helpless sick people! Surely we are straining at a gnat in the case of the engine-driver and swallowing a camel in the case of the nurse.

The PRESIDENT: I must point out to the hon. member that this is a Bill for the registration of trained nurses, and for other relative purposes.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I quite know that, Mr. President, and I would point out that the board are going to have great powers, including, I believe, the determination of the hours of work.

The PRESIDENT: That is not so.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Then I hope that power will be included.

The PRESIDENT: The Bill is for the registration of nurses, and the hon. member will confine himself to that subject.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: Under your ruling, Sir, I will. If the hours of work are not shortened, there soon will be no nurses to register, because girls will not be sufficiently weak-minded to take on the training for such an arduous calling—

Member: They rush it.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They might rush even the hon. member, but they would very quickly feel sorry after, having caught him. Under the present system we shall not get nurses registered in sufficient numbers, because 50 per cent. of the girls will break down during their training. I hope the House will look into the matter of the hours, so that we may get nurses registered. That matter, I am told, does not fall within the purview of the Bill. However, I am glad I got my few words in; and I thank you, Mr. President, for having afforded me the chance. I recommend hon. members to make inquiry in private and public hospitals regarding the hours of nurses, and learn what is to be learnt. The nurses, I am glad to see, are waking up and are recognising the manner in which they are treated as compared with all other sections of the community.

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West) [8.51]: I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the last speaker. I am sorry he did not hold similar views a couple of years ago, when I was fighting the question of nursing without getting much assistance. The Bill, however, does not touch the question of hours. The only thing I regret in connection with the measure is that under it the Australian Trained Nurses' Association will not be given greater powers. In fact, the measure does not give them any power. My knowledge of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association is fairly considerable, and I say that the association represent the organisation which has grown up to take charge of nursing work, in the same way as some such organisation has become established in every other walk of life. Only during this session we have had an Architects Bill and an Auctioneers Bill. The A.T.N.A. has had charge of the profession of nursing in the same way.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The association has not much to be proud of, then.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The association has something to be proud of in the fact that it supplied the greatest number of ministering angels to the Australian forces during the war. The association cannot become registered and cannot take direct action. As regards the examination paper for nurses, that has been set by the A.T.N.A. and very properly so. If the medical officer in each district were to set an examination paper of his own, there would be chaos, quite inevitably. The medical officer in the Bunbury hospital might set an examination which would not suit the medical officer in charge



of the Perth Hospital, or vice versa. That is why the A.T.N.A. have had charge of the matter. I only regret that under this Bill the association will not have full charge of the appointment of the board. Personally I disagree altogether with the idea of a board, because I fail to see the need for two doctors on it, to begin with. At present Dr. Officer is president of the A.T.N.A., and I quite agree that that gentleman would be in a position to give the board technical advice; but I fail to see why there should be two doctors on the board, as against three nurses. Why should not there be four nurses and one doctor? I trust that before long the A.T.N.A. will have full charge.

Hon. J. Ewing: They probably will get it.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I fear it may not be so. Up to the present we have had registered nurses only under the A.T.N.A. If and when this Bill becomes an Act there will be no registered nurses. The three nurses on the board are to be appointed by the Governor-in-Council. It would be interesting to know whence they are to be appointed. In connection with the Architects Bill I drew attention to the probability that the provisional board would be appointed from well known architects. Under this measure the provisional board will probably be drawn from matrons in well-known hospitals. In my opinion it would be far better if the provisional board were constituted from members of the A.T.N.A. All nurses of standing in Australia, not only in Western Australia, are members of the A.T.N.A.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why do you suppose the Government will not follow the course you have indicated?

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I am now suggesting that the Government should follow that course. I do not know whether or not they will do so. I fear that the manner in which the last speaker addressed himself to the subject may have frightened the Government away from the A.T.N.A.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: There is a dual control now.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: No. There is a standard set up by the A.T.N.A. From my position on the board of the Perth Public Hospital, I know something of that association. Mr. Willmott said, and quite rightly, that there was difficulty in getting nurses. That difficulty arises, not from any shirking but from the fact that a girl desirous of taking up the nursing profession must be over 21 years of age and must pass an educational test, and then must work for a salary of £18 per annum during her first year, rising to £36 in the second year. It is difficult to get girls to accept such terms. Lately the Perth Public Hospital has taken on girls of 19 and 20 who were physically fit. Considerable numbers have come forward. However, every girl is not fit for the life of a nurse. Many of the girls who enter the Perth Public Hospital for training do not remain very long. Still, although that hospital has 70

sisters, it is very difficult for any trained nurse to obtain a position as a sister in the Perth Public Hospital. I would like an assurance from the Leader of the House, when he replies, that the A.T.N.A. will be asked to supply the members of the professional board. When the board are elected for three years, the A.T.N.A. should be given the opportunity of appointing the members, since the A.T.N.A. are the recognised governing body of the nursing profession. In my opinion, the best course would be to hand over the board to the A.T.N.A., thus encouraging the nurses to take an interest in the board, which will more particularly control their profession.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [9.0]: I should like to know what benefit the trained nurses are to get from the Bill. Right through the measure can be seen the hand of the Principal Medical Officer. The Government are to appoint three members of the board and determine the manner in which the nurses shall appoint their representative. In the Architects Bill it was provided that the Government should appoint three members out of nine, while due recognition was given to the organisation of the architects. Here, however, we have a camouflaged position, with the Principal Medical Officer as chairman of the board. If nurses expect any benefit from registration or legislation, they must have an organisation, and that organisation must be duly recognised. In addition to registering nurses, this board may take away their registration and, of course, with it their livelihood. What method have the nurses of electing their representative? Two years ago I had a consultation with returned sisters and Dr. Bentley on this very question. The nurses' own organisation ought to appoint their representative to the board. The Minister said that under the Bill registration is optional. It is a remarkable contradiction of the powers given in the Architects Bill. To my thinking the Bill will be valueless to the sisters, and it would be in their interests if we were to throw it out and demand a more comprehensive one.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [9.4]: Under Clause 14 the Governor may make regulations. I agree with Mr. Willmott that another clause should be added prescribing the hours of employment of nurses. If I may follow Mr. Willmott in that—

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the hon. member would be in order, because if such an amendment were made it would necessitate an amendment of the Title. Therefore the proper place in which to consider such an amendment is in Committee.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If I were to move such an amendment in Committee, I would be ruled out of order on the score that it was not in accordance with the Title.

The PRESIDENT: No, the amendment would be accepted and, if it were carried, it would be necessary to alter the Title. At

the present juncture the hon. member may discuss the subjects dealt with in the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Then I will leave my remarks until we reach the Committee stage.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.4]: The Bill seems to be on parallel lines with that which passed the House last session and which subsequently got mixed up with some other Bill, another place imagining that it was a money Bill, and as a result it was lost. It seems to me a perfectly harmless Bill. It does not go very far. The only privileges it gives to nurses registered under it is that they will be able to wear a badge and will have preferential right of employment in Government hospitals. It does not interfere in the least with anybody who requires employment as a nurse in other than a Government hospital obtaining that employment. Consequently it does not take away the means of livelihood from anybody. The nurses who do not register under it will not be entitled to wear the badge. I will support the second reading. It is not necessary to labour the discussion, for the Bill was fairly well discussed last session. I think on the whole it will do a certain amount of good. It is well that there should be a uniform standard of registered nurses. The Bill will bring that about.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is, for Government institutions.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Not only will Government institutions get the benefit of the services of the nurses, but the registration of the nurses will insure an improvement in their status. I think also it will confer a certain benefit in protecting the public. The profession of nursing is an honourable one, and we cannot be too careful in safeguarding the public so that the employer may know that the person he has in his house as a nurse has undergone suitable training. The wearing of the badge will prove that the nurse has those qualifications which only training in a hospital can confer.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East—in reply) [9.7]: Mr. Cornell was somewhat inconsistent in telling the House in one breath that the Bill would be of no use to the nurses, and pointing out in the next that the board might take away the registration of a nurse and so take away her livelihood. Surely that is an inconsistent attitude! Had the Bill gone further and prevented anybody acting as a nurse unless registered, it would not have secured the sanction of Parliament. So we are giving to the nurses as much as Parliament is at present prepared to give them. I am not going to discuss the question of hours and conditions of labour, except as it relates to the Bill. If by the passing of the Bill we can give to the nurses a higher status than they have previously enjoyed, it will be taking the first step to so strengthen them that they will be able to

demand reasonable conditions of employment. Nor do I intend to enter upon a controversy between the A.T.N.A. and other nurses. I can assure Mr. Panton, not that the A.T.N.A. will be empowered to nominate the whole of the members of the provisional board, but that the interests of that organisation will be considered. I point out that the provisional board is to be appointed for one year only, and that in the appointment of the board the A.T.N.A. will undoubtedly be considered.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Ewing in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Appointment of examiners:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Bill, as originally introduced, made provision in Clause 11 that any person not being registered under the Act and falsely pretending to be so registered, or wearing a badge or uniform in the prescribed form etc. In another place "uniform" was struck out. I think the same amendment ought to be made in Clause 14. I move an amendment—

That the words "uniform and" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That after the word "by" in line 8 the words "and the hours of employment of" be inserted.

I want to get back for the nurses a privilege which they enjoyed some years ago but have now lost. When I was chairman of the Children's Hospital Committee in 1913 and 1914 we decreed that no nurse in the hospital should work more than an average of eight hours a day, and we limited the number of patients which each nurse could attend to, and made other provisions for the health of the nurses. The Perth Hospital authorities resented the reduction of hours, and said we were making things rather awkward for them. After I left the children's hospital committee the nurses returned to their long hours. It is scandalous that these young girls should be worked for such long hours amongst sick people. My amendment will be an intimation to the hospital board that Parliament desires the hours of nurses to be limited.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I support the amendment, though I do not think it will have the desired effect. It will, at all events, show that we are in favour of nurses working a reasonable length of time. If we can do anything to ameliorate the conditions ap-

pertaining to nurses we should do it, and I commend the authorities of the children's hospital for what they did in this direction.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: The amendment will be an indication to the board as to the views of this Chamber. I would remind members that the nurses can join an industrial union and have their case heard before the Arbitration Court. The only nurses who belong to an industrial union are those employed at the Claremont Hospital for the Insane. These now work eight hours a day and receive better wages than before. At Woolloomooloo the nurses refused to join a union, and to-day are working under no award. Parliament should protest against the hours that nurses have to work and the wages for which they work. There is now a union which every nurse can join if such nurse is employed in a public hospital.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The nurses in our public institutions are worked too long hours and too hard. Many of them break down during the process of training while others break down after they have qualified. The amendment, however, would apply to all registered nurses, many of whom are engaged in private practice. I do not see how the latter class of nurse could be governed in that way, especially those who are engaged alone on a private case. Something should be done for the nurses in our public institutions, and if the amendment were made to apply only to public institutions, and left it to the board to make the necessary regulations, I should be inclined to support it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am in sympathy with the amendment, but doubt if this is the proper place for it. It is in fact foreign to the purpose of the Bill. If we give the Governor power to make regulations prescribing the hours of employment of registered nurses, are we not likely to subject registered nurses to unfair competition by unregistered nurses? My idea is that the Bill shall give the nurses a status that will enable them to take steps to secure their adequate protection.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: At the outset, I said that the amendment was foreign to the Bill and I am in accord with what Dr. Saw has said. The amendment would require elaborating. It has, however, served its purpose inasmuch as we have been able to indicate that, so far as this Chamber is concerned, it is the wish of hon. members that provision to limit the hours of nurses in our public institutions at any rate, should be made. In the circumstances, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

## BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

### Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [9.33]: This is a short Bill to amend the Traffic Act passed in 1919. That Act has proved a very useful piece of legislation and has justified itself in every way. When the Bill was prepared for Parliament in 1919, no reference was made for the pooling of the fees in the metropolitan area or for the maintenance of the Perth-Fremantle road. This provision was inserted in Committee and experience has shown that, as is very often the case when amendments are introduced in Committee, all that was necessary to make the will of Parliament effective was not done. The Act has been in force for two years and experience has shown that it is necessary to secure certain amendments in order that the will of Parliament, as expressed in the 1919 Act, may be carried into effect. Regarding the main road, that is, the Perth-Fremantle road, which is dealt with in Clause 2 of the Bill, it will be remembered that some years ago this road became almost impassable, to traffic. The Government had to provide funds and re-make it at a cost of £26,000. Since then it has been maintained by the Government in order to prevent it lapsing into its former state of disrepair. On three occasions, the Government have had to re-make the Perth-Fremantle road. It is not considered reasonable that the finances of the State should be called upon for the maintenance of this road, but rather that the money for maintenance should be drawn from the traffic that actually passes over that road. A conference of local governing authorities was held and this method of pooling was approved of, the only dissentient being the Perth City Council.

Member: As usual.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The Government deducted a certain percentage of the fees that would otherwise have gone to the Perth City Council for the purpose of this road. Action has been taken by the council against the Government and a certain amount has been paid into court with a defence. The matter is sub judice, however, and I do not intend to refer to the question further at this stage. A system, which it was contended was absolutely just, was adopted in arriving at the amount of money to be allocated as the share of each local governing body for the maintenance of the Perth-Fremantle road. A census of the traffic using the road from the various districts was taken and on that proportion, the cost of maintaining the road was calculated. The purpose of the Bill is to recognise that system. Some such system is undoubtedly necessary in order that the original purpose of the Act may be given effect to. The next clause strikes out the word "motor" before "vehicle" throughout Sections 26, 27, and 29 of the principal Act. The effect is that the sections will apply to all vehicles and not only to motor vehicles. Power is

given under the Bill to restrict the traffic along narrow roads in any particular direction. That is done in many places and the power will only be exercised in extreme cases. There are several amendments included in Clause 4. The first relates to the control of traffic over footpaths. There can be no doubt that the original intention of Parliament was to give full control of traffic on footpaths as well as on roads. The interpretation contained in Section 4 of the principal Act reads as follows:—

“Road” means and includes any street, road, lane, thoroughfare, footpath, or place open to or used by the public, and all bridges and culverts and other things appurtenant thereto and used in connection therewith.

The intention is perfectly clear to my mind, but in order to remove any possible doubt as to the right to control traffic on a footpath this amendment is sought. Paragraph (b) relates to the display of signs on vehicles for hire. It provides for the addition of a paragraph reading as follows, “And prescribes the manner in which such tablets and the characters thereon shall be painted and the distinguishing colours thereof for the several classes of vehicles.” This is a somewhat contentious provision. A proviso has been added as follows:—

Provided that all vehicles licensed for the carriage of passengers shall have prescribed the same distinguishing colours and characters.

There is a conflict of opinion and, I suppose, of interests, between the owners of vehicles plying for hire and using the different stands in the city, on the one hand, and on the other hand those persons who have garages to supply motor cars for the use of patrons. The latter say they should not be compelled to put up the same sign as the others who use the stands in the city.

Hon. J. Cornhill: There is a distinction without a difference.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is a matter that can be thrashed out when we are in Committee. There are, of course, two sides to the case. In the principal Act provision was made to carry on powers then existing in the Roads Act to enable a board to charge an additional fee for vehicles engaged in heavy traffic such as the cartage of sleepers, firewood and so on. In the drafting or amending of the Act it emerged with the restriction that “such additional fee should not be charged in respect of a vehicle for which another license, in addition to a vehicle license, has to be obtained.” The effect of this is that if two vehicles are engaged in heavy traffic and doing the same damage to the roads, the one engaged “for hire” will escape the heavy traffic fee because the owner has paid the nominal fee for a carrier’s license, whereas the other has to pay the traffic fee. The result has been that the owner of a private vehicle also takes out a carrier’s license at a nominal fee

and both escape the heavy traffic license. These are the only amendments contemplated by the Bill, but I may mention to the House as an indication of the value of the Traffic Act, that in the metropolitan area for the year previous to the passing of the Act, the revenue was £3,551, whereas for the current year from July last to date, the amount has been £13,344. The increase has been largely due to the fact that prior to the passing of the Act a large number of people escaped their obligations altogether. That point is very important in view of the contention raised by the city council that the revenue collected is so much larger under the Traffic Act than that which the municipalities and road boards collected when they carried on the work and is important on the question of whether the Perth City Council has been deprived of the amount of revenue which they represent. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [9.43]: I intend to support the second reading of the Bill because I have every sympathy with the Traffic Act as it stands and as it will be improved by amendments provided in the Bill. I do not intend to go into this except to say that it is right in principle that the Government should collect fees for all vehicles running along the roads. Before the Government took the matter in hand, the Perth municipality and other local governing authorities collected the fees and the result was that the Perth-Fremantle road got into a terrible state of disrepair. The consequence was that the traffic was diverted to King’s Park. The park authorities had no means of repairing their roads and they were made almost impassable as well. The Government spent money on the Perth-Fremantle road and put it into, if not first class repair, at any rate into a state of repair. The traffic, in consequence, is not so heavy in the park. I have been asked by the Perth City Council to secure the reference of the Bill to a select committee in order that the Perth representatives—I presume the Mayor and Town Clerk—may appear before the committee and present their views regarding the Bill. I have received the following letter from the Town Clerk:—

I beg to state that the Council will be glad if you can arrange to have this Bill referred to a select committee in order that the views of the Council thereon may be fully placed before the House. My letter of the 14th December will acquaint you with the gist of the Council’s objections, and I am desired by His Worship the Mayor to state that he trusts that you will be able to succeed in carrying a motion to the effect desired. Seeing that the municipality of Perth is so greatly interested in this measure it is only fair that we should hear what it has to say. It has been pointed out that if we heard the mayor and the town clerk, we might have to

hear others, but I think a select committee of three members could hear all that everyone had to say in the course of a day. I hope members will accede to the wishes of this important body, because it represents the whole of the ratepayers of Greater Perth.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.46]: I shall certainly support Mr. Lovekin in his request for the reference of this Bill to a select committee. He has dealt with the clause which affects the province he represents. Without tying myself in any way to that particular point, I think the people he is speaking for are entitled to the fullest hearing of their case. It is only fair play that they should be heard and the easiest and most effective way is before a select committee. It is rather difficult to obey, Mr. President, if not your ruling, the indication of your wishes in connection with this Bill, because the question of general principles hardly comes in. There are three provisions to which I wish to refer and it is very hard to group a criticism of them as any kind of principle. Paragraph (b) of Clause 4 proposes to insert in Section 41 of the Act the words "and prescribe the manner in which such tablets and the characters thereon shall be painted and the distinguishing colours thereof for the several classes of licenses." This is followed by a provision as follows: "Require the driver of any vehicle licensed for the carriage of passengers or goods to exhibit a prescribed sign whilst waiting for hire to indicate that such vehicle is plying for hire." I am going to make an appeal for a select committee in order that these people may be heard. I am voicing the opinion of a small minority, but they are entitled to a full hearing of their case. I am referring to motor people who ply for hire in the sense that their cars can be taken out for hire, but they do not ply for hire in the sense of standing on the ranks and picking up odd passengers. I hold in my hand the Manchester Corporation General Powers Bill, a memorandum on behalf of the motor legislation committee of the House of Commons which was drawn up with special reference to this particular point, and is well worth the attention of a select committee. Paragraph (c) of Clause 4 demands some consideration. It refers to the question of requiring and authorising each local authority to require a license to be obtained at a prescribed fee for the use of any jinker, whim, or other vehicle or trailer engaged in heavy traffic in its district. Members who are acquainted with country districts, the duties of road boards, the Road Districts Act, the work under present conditions and the proposed alteration know that this provision has aroused the greatest interest in country districts. As an instance of this, a public meeting of ratepayers of the Darling Range district called upon the whole of the board to resign, a thing which had never previously happened in the 25 years of the

board's existence. The question at issue was that of the heavy traffic. It is a matter which demands the closest attention of members before they pass this measure. If Mr. Lovekin's suggestion is not adopted, one of two things will happen; either we shall pass legislation without the full consideration which these particular points deserve, or we shall be unduly delayed in Committee in dealing with these points. To save time I trust that the Leader of the House will consent to the appointment of a select committee.

On motion by Hon. F. E. S. Willmott, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 3rd January, 1923.*

	Page
Assent to Bills	2646
Loan Estimates, 1921-22	2646
Bill: Architects, retd.	2673

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Auctioneers.
2. North Fremantle Rates Validation.
3. Supply Bill (No. 4) £1,030,000.
4. General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment.
5. Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance.
6. Constitution Act Amendment.

### LOAN ESTIMATES, 1921-22.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from 15th December; Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Colonial Treasurer in charge of the votes.

Vote—Departmental, £66,124:

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.35]: Doubtless hon. members, during their leisure hours of the holiday season, availed themselves of the opportunity to closely study the