

and by experience of the advantages or disadvantages that may accrue to the returned man can we measure its effect in the development that follows initial settlement on his block.

I hope that, as a result of our having given expression to the views of this Parliament, the Commonwealth will realise that it is anticipated that a full review of that aspect shall be made at an appropriate time. If the Leader of the Opposition would agree to the insertion of a proviso to the effect that the matter be reviewed at the end of a period, which would meet the position with all its implications, I would have little objection to the proposal, but I am confident that the amendment before us would be wholly unacceptable to the Commonwealth and would lead us into the position indicated by the member for West Perth if alterations in policy were insisted upon by us. If the Leader of the Opposition will move that this be made subject to review at a particular date, I, and I think the Minister for Lands, would be prepared to accept the amendment, but to fly in the face of the avowed and pronounced policy of the Commonwealth would be seeking trouble over the ratification of the agreement.

Mr. WATTS: I shall be delighted to accede to the Premier's request. If the Minister will now report progress, I will get an amendment drafted and submit it to-morrow.

Progress reported.

#### **BILL—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (RESUMPTION OF LAND).**

##### *Message.*

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

#### **BILL—SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

##### *Council's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Council received and read requesting a conference on amendment No. 2 insisted on by the Assembly

and notifying that, should a conference be agreed to, the Council would be represented by three managers.

*House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.*

## **Legislative Council.**

*Wednesday, 28th November, 1945.*

	PAGE
Question: Mount Hospital, as to closing of children's ward	2244
Bills: Local Authorities (Reserve Funds) Act	
Amendment, 3R.	2245
Justices Act Amendment, 3R.	2245
South-West State Power Scheme, report	2245
State Electricity Commission, recom.	2245
Public Works Act Amendment, 1R.	2253
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 1R.	2253
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, Assembly's further Message	2253
Child Welfare Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., Com., report	2253
Building Operations and Building Materials Control, 2R.	2260
Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board), Assembly's request for Conference	2264
Criminal Code Amendment, 2R.	2264

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

### **QUESTION.**

#### **MOUNT HOSPITAL.**

##### *As to Closing of Children's Ward.*

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT (for Hon. J. G. Hislop) asked the Chief Secretary:

1, Is the Government aware that the Mount Hospital has closed its children's ward?

2, In view of the fact that this was the only hospital, apart from the Children's Hospital, which set aside accommodation especially for children and that the closure of this ward means that there is now no accommodation for sick children in the metropolitan area, what steps does the Government intend to take in order to meet this need?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, and 2, The Mount Hospital is an institution controlled as a self-contained private enterprise. Inquiry from the hospital indicates that the closure of this ward is tem-

porary, due to special difficulties, and it is hoped that the position will improve in a few weeks' time when the children's ward will be re-opened.

### **BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.**

- 1, Local Authorities (Reserve Funds) Act Amendment.
  - 2, Justices Act Amendment.
- Transmitted to the Assembly.

### **BILL—SOUTH-WEST STATE POWER SCHEME.**

Report of Committee adopted.

### **BILL—STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION.**

*Recommittal.*

On motion by Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 7, 8, 23 and 32, and a proposed new clause.

*In Committee.*

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

Clause 7—Interpretation:

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I move an amendment—

That after the definition of "Commissioner" the following definition be inserted:—" 'Comprehensive policy or scheme' means a policy or scheme prepared by the Commission and approved by Parliament."

The two amendments of which I have given notice are so closely interlaced that it is necessary to refer to both of them. I would direct members' attention to the memorandum attached to the Bill. It is important to point out that it is unusual, but by no means improper or undesirable, to attach a memorandum to a Bill. We do not consider it; we do not alter it; we do not want to alter it; but I think it is a good thing to have a memorandum because it makes clear the purposes of a Bill. If members will look at the first page of the memorandum they will find that the Bill is stated to have two major purposes including the following:—

(b) The establishment of the State Electricity Commission with rights and powers which will enable that body—

I will quote now paragraphs (iii) and (iv)—

(iii) to investigate and report to the Government upon all matters pertaining to the production and supply of electricity for the various purposes for which it is and can be used with a view to a comprehensive policy and scheme of co-ordination; and

(iv) to acquire by voluntary sale or resumption the undertakings of any supply authorities and to incorporate the same with other Government electric works in pursuance of any comprehensive policy or scheme aforesaid.

I have no objection to the Bill so far as it carries out those purposes; but the fact is that the commission is given practically unlimited powers and could go anywhere in the State and acquire or purchase electricity undertakings that have nothing to do with any comprehensive scheme or policy. For that reason I move the first amendment on the notice paper defining "comprehensive policy or scheme." If that is agreed to, I shall later move the proviso to Clause 32, appearing on the notice paper. We have considered a Bill for the establishment of a South-West power scheme, and that Bill was passed, I think without important amendments. That embodies a comprehensive scheme which the gentlemen who are to form the commission, inquired into. They submitted the proposal to the Government, which approved it and submitted it, in turn, to Parliament.

If the intention of this Bill is to enable the commission to carry out all sorts of works without the approval of Parliament, I do not know why the South-West power scheme was submitted to Parliament. The Chief Secretary suggested that there would be objection to the course I propose because some locality might want the commission to extend electricity undertakings there. But suppose it did. What reason is there that the commission should not prepare a scheme and submit it to the Government for subsequent submission to Parliament? The suggestion of the delay that would occur is outside the question. We know that the demand for electrical appliances all the world over is going to be so intense for a considerable period that it is certain the Government will have to tell people in the South-West that the scheme cannot be gone on with at the moment. I can see no objection whatever to our proceeding slowly in this matter, but there is this objection to the contrary policy, which is possible under the Bill:

That the commission might go anywhere and acquire or purchase—compulsorily acquire—any electrical undertaking working at a profit; and it would be left to the commission whether it supplied consumers at a lower or higher rate than before. There is no reason to give the commission power of that kind.

The amendment will simply mean that when the commission conceives some other scheme, all it will have to do is to prepare it, as in the case of the South-West power scheme, and present it to the Government and Parliament; and then it will have all the powers conferred on it by the electricity commission measure. I think the commission should have very wide powers in connection with any scheme of which Parliament has approved; and if that were agree with the hon. member's contentions, approved schemes, I would be willing to give further consideration to some of the amendments I have supported. Many of them I supported because the commission's powers were unlimited.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot agree with the hon. member's contentions. In the first place; I would point out that the Commissioner of Railways has the right to carry out extensions of electricity supply outside a radius of five miles of the metropolitan area. If we agreed to the amendment, even those extensions, which might be desirable, would have to come to Parliament for approval. Again, the idea of this commission is that within the funds that might be available to it, it will extend its operations from time to time to various country towns and rural areas; if the commission had to wait every time until such extensions were approved by Parliament it would be unworkable. So far as larger schemes are concerned, it is only reasonable to expect that a scheme of the magnitude of the South-West power scheme would be brought to Parliament so that Parliament would know to what extent the commission was desirous of carrying out Government policy which would have the effect of costing the Treasury of this State many thousands of pounds.

The fact that the South-West power scheme has been considered in a separate Bill is an indication that the Government, if it had a similar scheme for some other

part of the State, would not hesitate to bring it to Parliament first. But there are many smaller schemes—and I am assuming that any decision to extend the power to any particular district would be called a scheme—and one can quite understand the great delay that would take place in regard to matters of that kind if this amendment were carried. Since the Victorian Electricity Commission has been appointed it has absorbed, or acquired, on the average about 30 schemes each year. It has been requested to extend its operations, and has done so, and the same will apply here unless there is something wrong with our scheme. This amendment must be read in conjunction with the second amendment proposed as a proviso to Clause 32. While the hon. member fears that the power to be given to this commission might be abused, I think that fear is ill-founded.

The commission will only have the fund—made available to it with which to operate, and the Government will be limited as to the amount of money available. The commission will take over the responsibility of the present Commissioner of Railways for the supply of electricity in the metropolitan area, and will carry out the duties involved. If we restrict the operations of the commission in the way suggested we will make it impossible for it to carry on in a reasonable manner. I again stress the standing and reputation of the technical members of the commission, who are not likely to commit the commission to anything unreasonable or unjustified. The Government is not likely to call on the commission to do things that it does not want to do. I think the fears are groundless and the amendment unnecessary, and I hope the Committee will not agree to it.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	12
Noes	..	..	..	13
				—
Majority against	..	..	..	1
				—

#### AYES.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Oimitt.	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. H. S. W. Parker	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. H. L. Roche	Hon. C. F. Baxter
	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Hon. O. R. Cornish	Hon. W. R. Hall.
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. H. H. Hall.	{Teller.}

AYE.	PAIR.	No.
Hon. L. B. Bolton		Hon. T. Moore

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—Establishment of commission:

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) of Sub-clause (3) the words "nominated by the Minister" be struck out.

This amendment is really substituted for the one moved by Mr. Parker a little while ago, when he suggested that the correct procedure for the representation of the consumers would be to have the representatives elected by those who could be classed as consumers, rather than that they should be nominated by the Minister. I did not like that amendment, because there was a possibility that there would be elected as consumers' representatives persons with no special qualifications. I think the two consumers representatives should represent the two classes of consumers to be supplied under the Bill. The first is the consumer who will take current in bulk. I will suggest, in a later amendment, that we should provide for a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures, who would represent those who would take current in bulk, and who would be materially concerned with the policy of the commission. The other nominee should be elected by the local authorities. It is first necessary to strike out the words "nominated by the Minister", so that we may have elected persons included on the board.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I strongly oppose the amendment. It is easy to understand that the Chamber of Manufactures would be representative of the larger consumers, but there are many more people to be considered than the manufacturers.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They would be ordinary consumers as well.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In a very limited way, so far as numbers are concerned. I do not see that it has any special right to nominate a representative on the Commission. I will say the same of the

Road Board Association. The Government feels it is necessary to have the right to appoint these members in order that it may be sure that the representatives of the consumers are men of responsibility, and have some knowledge of the kind of undertaking with which they are going to be associated. I made that point before, and made it successfully.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I think because no-one called for a division.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was made successfully. I have here a copy of the New South Wales Parliamentary debates No. 13, including a speech by the Minister for Public Works and Local Government on the Electricity Development Bill on the 23rd October last. That Bill is somewhat similar to this one. It provides for the constitution of the electricity authority of New South Wales, and defines its powers, authorities, duties and functions; provides for the regulation of the sale of electrical apparatus and the licensing of electrical contractors and electricians; and amends the Local Government Act 1919 and certain other Acts in certain respects; and is for purposes connected therewith. In asking for leave to introduce the Bill the Minister said—

The principal object of this Bill is to provide for the constitution of an authority to be known as the Electricity Authority of New South Wales, which will be charged with the duty of developing and expanding the supply of electricity within the State of New South Wales. The authority will consist of seven members appointed by the Governor, one of whom will be the chairman who will be appointed on a full-time basis; the other members will be appointed on a part-time basis. The chairman will hold office for a term of seven years, and each other member will be entitled to hold office for a term not exceeding that period.

This indicates that even the New South Wales Government considers it should have the right to nominate every member of the authority.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: From what class of people do the nominees come?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There would be included an engineer having special knowledge of the generation, transmission and supply of electricity, two members being members of a council, one member being the manager, general manager, or person in charge of the electricity undertaking of a

council, and another member who will be a person appointed to represent the interests of employees in the electrical industry. The authority will in the exercise of its powers be subject to the control and direction of the Minister.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Who are the other three?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have quoted from "Hansard" all that appears here on this subject. Even New South Wales has adopted the same attitude as we have in regard to the extension of electricity. We should now leave things well alone. This will be a new commission carrying great responsibilities. Members may rest assured that the Government will see that whoever is appointed will be capable of carrying those responsibilities. I do not see why the Road Board Association should have the right to nominate a member, and I see less reason why the Chamber of Manufactures should have it.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I support the amendment. It seems to me that the consumers or some organisation which may be held, broadly, to represent them, should have the right to nominate members in cases of the kind. I am not altogether in favour of the idea of the Chamber of Manufactures having the right to nominate, but the Road Board Association in the circumstances I think can be held to represent the consumers. In legislation such as this there is a tendency for the Government or the Minister to take the responsibility not only for appointing but nominating the consumers' representatives and, in other cases dealing with private producers, to nominate and appoint the producers' representatives. This is done notwithstanding that there are organisations available which can be held to represent either the consumers or the producers. Some right should be conferred upon them to nominate the people they want to represent them.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I listened with interest to the Chief Secretary's remarks. He said the Government should nominate these members and should take care to see that such people were capable of carrying out their duties. It is for this reason I have moved the amendment. I cannot imagine anyone more competent to discuss the question of power from the standpoint of the

consumer than the man who is accustomed to deal with power costs, a most vital factor. Such a person would be the right type of man to represent consumers on the commission. Mr. Roche made the point that local authorities are the true representatives of the consumers in the relationship between them and the commission.

The Chief Secretary: I wonder!

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Chief Secretary referred to the fact that the New South Wales Government had adopted the same policy as the State had. That is not surprising seeing that in both cases they are Labour Governments.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: There are municipal representatives on that board.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The policy of nomination is obviously part of Labour's policy. It is characteristic of the totalitarian approach to many of these questions that Labour makes use of the power of nomination in every possible position. By my amendment there is an attempt to get back to the democratic principle of electing representatives, a principle which has shown to be used so little in practice.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I should like to have seen a municipal representative appointed instead of one from the Chamber of Manufactures. No-one is more able to represent the consumers than are the local authorities. Of the 119 country road boards, 118 are members of the association. The adoption of such a principle would make for smooth running, and I wonder the Government does not welcome the suggestion. We want co-operation; not bickering. It would be a step in the right direction that consumers should be represented in this way. Unsuitable people are unlikely to be chosen. No responsible body such as a local authority would select unsuitable people. The amendment would improve the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That reminds us amount of money will be involved in the operations of the commission. No Government could delegate to other people the right to appoint those who might detrimentally affect the activities of the commission.

Hon. H. Seddon: The two consumer representatives are to be Yes men, are they?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not at all!

Hon. H. Seddon: That is what you are saying.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That reminds me of the more recent remarks of Mr. Seddon when he referred to the totalitarian policy of the Labour Government. I take strong exception to that. The hon. member had no right to use such an expression concerning the Labour Government. If I put the construction upon it that it usually bears, he has no ground for such a description. It is an indication that the hon. member is actuated not so much by a desire to give some advantage to the commission but perhaps more for political reasons than anything else.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chief Secretary is making things worse.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I may be, but I am making them worse in a nice way. This commission will be operating on behalf of the Government. It will be disappointing if it does not turn out in the way we desire. It will also be disappointing if we do not reap a great reward in years to come as a result of its operations. The Government should have the right to nominate these representatives, if we are to have them. We cannot afford to take risks, and we would be taking them if we accepted the ideas advanced in this Chamber. We would have no control over those who would be aspirants for the position, and of those who might be selected from the aspirants.

Hon. H. Tuckey: The Government would have five out of seven all the time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not a question of the Government having five nominees out of the seven. I am looking at the matter both from the Government's point of view and the consumers'. The Government is quite justified and entitled to claim the right to nominate, and not to delegate that authority to anybody else.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: The Chief Secretary keeps reminding the Committee of the necessity to support the technical advisers on this proposed commission, and I think members have paid a great deal of attention to him. When Sir Hal Colebatch moved his amendment I supported the Chief Secretary because of his common-sense attitude. On this occasion, however, I think our democratic method of life entitles me to support Mr. Seddon's amendment. The people who are vitally concerned should be granted the right to nominate a representative.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I support the amendment. I admit that the Chief Secretary has put forward an excellent case. However, I point to the example of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. The Government has the right to nominate all the members of that trust, a right which is denied to the primary producers of the State, who supply a very large proportion of the trade dealt with at the port. I also point to the Fremantle Tramways Board, which has done excellent work and the representatives of which are nominated by the people. Another example is the Licensing Court. To a huge undertaking such as this commission will ultimately be, we ought to apply our democratic principles and provide that the consumers' representatives should be nominated by the consumers.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	19
Noes	..	..	..	..	7

Majority against .. .. 12

#### AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. O. R. Cornish	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. E. Gibson
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. E. M. Heenan	(Teller.)

#### PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Hon. L. B. Belton	Hon. T. Moore

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (a) of Sub-clause (3) the following words be added:—  
“such nominations to be made in the case of the Metropolitan area by the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures, Incorporated, and in the case of the remaining part of the State by the Executive Committee of the Road Board Association of Western Australia.”

I think the ground has already been covered. On the point raised by the Chief Secretary, I am sorry if I hurt his feelings. I was simply drawing a contrast between the method of nomination and the method of election.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that incident is past.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out the words "The West Australian Chamber of Manufactures, Incorporated," with a view to inserting other words.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Mr. Tuckey would have achieved his objective had he allowed the words proposed to be struck out to remain, but added after them the words, "and the Municipal Association." In that way, both would jointly nominate one representative. These large consumers of current should be entitled to a say.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I think Mr. Thomson's idea is right. He is expressing what several members want. Road boards are not going to be distributors of current. In my opinion local authorities should be represented. Mr. Tuckey's amendment will leave the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures out altogether. I think that is undesirable.

The Chief Secretary: I think it is very desirable.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will ask Mr. Seddon to withdraw his amendment for the time being to let members sort themselves out in regard to paragraph (a).

Hon. H. SEDDON: Very well, if that will facilitate the business of the Committee. I ask leave accordingly.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: How does paragraph (a) stand now?

The CHAIRMAN: It provides for one representative from the metropolitan area and one from the remaining part of the State. The suggestion is that we have a sort of shandy-gaff. By making both commissioners representatives of the whole State, we will make a mixed grill.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: If we left it to the Municipal Association and the Road Board Association to elect a representative each, no more would be required. The inclusion of the Chamber of Manufactures is another matter. Personally, I do not think it is necessary.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: It would be much better, if Mr. Tuckey is desirous of obtaining representation of local authorities, to designate the organisations that he wants represented as being the local authorities within the metropolitan area and those out-

side. Inside the metropolitan area there would be municipalities and road boards and outside, where many road boards operate, there are some municipalities.

The CHAIRMAN: If members want the municipalities to elect one representative and the road boards another, I suggest the Committee knock out the words after the word "consumers."

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: It would be much better to provide for the local authorities within the metropolitan area to elect one representative and for those outside to elect the other. The Fire Brigades Board has representatives of local authorities in certain districts, but those authorities are the road boards and the municipalities. I would like local authorities to have representation and not the Chamber of Manufactures.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: That would complicate the matter. The Road Board Association would not be able to do anything without the support of certain municipalities. That would cause a good deal of inconvenience. It would be easier and more satisfactory for each association to do its own job.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I suggest to Mr. Tuckey that he consider an amendment along these lines, namely, that two shall be persons as representatives of the consumers, one of whom shall be elected by the local authorities in the metropolitan area and the other elected by local authorities in the remaining part of the State.

The CHAIRMAN: That would get over the difficulty.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Would I be in order in moving the amendment which originally stood in Mr. Seddon's name, with an alteration to overcome the difficulty?

The CHAIRMAN: What is the hon. member's suggestion?

Hon. A. THOMSON: That the amendment be made to read as follows:—

At the end of the same paragraph add the words, "Such nominations, to be made in the case of the metropolitan area by the West Australian Chamber of Manufactures, Inc., and in the case of the remaining part of the State by the executive committee of the Road Board Association and the Municipalities Association of Western Australia."

That would cover the municipalities and the road boards throughout the State.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: There is no executive committee of the Local Government Association operating.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I wish to move the following amendment:—

Such nominations to be made, in the case of the metropolitan area, by the executive committee of the Local Government Association of Western Australia and in the case of the remaining part of the State by the executive committee of the Road Board Association of Western Australia.

That is what several members have asked for and it will suit me.

Hon. G. Fraser: Something will have to be struck out of the clause if this is included.

The CHAIRMAN: It will first be necessary to strike out all the words after the word "consumer".

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I move an amendment—

That in lines 2 to 4 of paragraph (a) of Subclause (3) the words "one for the metropolitan area, and one for the remaining part of the State" be struck out and the words "one of whom shall be elected by the executive of the local authorities in the metropolitan area and the other by the executive of the local authorities in the remaining part of the State" inserted in lieu.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I prefer the amendment that I have on the notice paper, but this does provide for the election of the representatives.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of the proviso to Subclause (5), after the word "commissioner", the words "other than representatives of the consumers" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of the proviso to Subclause (5) the words "the consumers or" be struck out.

Obviously the idea is that when a vacancy occurs in the case of the representatives of the employees, a person shall be nominated by the Minister, but where a vacancy occurs in the case of the consumers' representative, someone would have to be elected to the position.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member makes no provision for that.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The other amendment would cover it.

The CHAIRMAN: No. This would be all right if we provided machinery in the case of a vacancy.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Would not the former provision apply? These representatives are to be elected, and in the case of a vacancy there would be another election.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Government nominates a chairman, he stays there all the time. Where vacancies occur it is provided that the Governor shall have power to fill them, but no provision is made in that respect regarding vacancies in connection with consumers' representatives.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will be necessary to add some additional words setting out that vacancies in connection with consumers' representatives shall be provided for by way of election as originally. If Mr. Seddon has no amendment to move at the moment one could be inserted at a later stage. Personally I think some very radical alterations will have to be made in the Bill before we finish with it.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of the proviso to Subclause (5) the words and parentheses "(as the case may be)" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: Provision will now have to be made to ensure that in the case of a vacancy occurring in connection with the consumers' representatives, the new commissioner will be elected as originally provided.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 23—Certain powers, obligations and rights transferred to the Commission.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (a) of Subclause (1) the following proviso be added:—  
"Provided that the powers of the Commission under this Act (with the exception of those powers exercised by the Commissioner of Railways) shall be limited to the South-West Land Division of the State."

In view of the statements made by Sir Harold Colebatch and the Chief Secretary yesterday that the commission's powers extend to taking over any local authority or electrical concern, it is desirable that for the time being the power of the commission shall be confined to the area for which the



scheme is devised. In the areas outside that particular part of the State electrical matters and control are already adequately provided for and the amendment will remove any temptation on the part of the commission to extend its operations elsewhere.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment. The position is somewhat different today from what it was when I earlier opposed another amendment having the same objective. Since then we have passed the Electricity Bill one of the provisions of which had the effect of repealing the Electricity Act of 1937, under which an advisory committee was able to exercise a certain amount of authority throughout the whole State. If we accept the amendment now moved by Mr. Seddon, there will be absolutely no authority controlling electrical matters outside the South-West Land Division other than the Commissioner of Railways whose authority will be very little indeed. I believe there are three concerns in the goldfields, areas that generate and distribute electricity, in addition to which the mines develop their own supplies of electric power. If the amendment be agreed to, sooner or later we will strike considerable trouble in that part of the State where I understand they are not too happy at present. The authority of the commission should be exercisable throughout the whole State not necessarily for the acquiring or establishing of a scheme but for the many other purposes for which it is to be appointed. If the amendment be agreed to, no controlling authority will be in existence and each of the concerns I refer to will be a law unto itself. That is a state of affairs I do not care to contemplate, especially with regard to electricity.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The Minister is not quite correct in saying that the concerns he referred to will be a law unto themselves. The Underwriters' Association lays down conditions whereby premises can be insured only if the electrical installations are up to a certain standard. That was the governing factor for many years. The local authorities have power regarding electricity supplies and they are just as responsible as the proposed commission will be, and they get along quite satisfactorily, meeting the requirements of the insurance companies in every respect. Thus if the

amendment be agreed to and the power of the commission will not extend to the areas of which I speak, the required standard will have to be complied with on the Goldfields, for which reason I feel quite safe in moving the amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I know very little about the Underwriters' Association but I can quite imagine that that body would not be prepared to effect insurances unless electrical installations were up to a required standard and there is nothing to guarantee that the installations on the Goldfields will be on the specified standard.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes, in the underwriters' specifications.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Perhaps it might apply in that way, but there will be no legal authority in the matter at all. It will be just a question of the Underwriters' Association not insuring unless the electrical equipment is up to its required standard. Not everyone insures with the underwriters. Quite apart from that, what was the reason for the introduction of the Electricity Act of 1937, which covered the whole of the State? Was it not that in various parts of Western Australia different standards prevailed and it became necessary for some authority to be constituted to advise the Government in respect of such matters? Surely in view of that, we will not exclude certain areas from the ambit of the commission. I cannot for one moment imagine an electrical authority which does not cover the whole State, being acceptable to the Government.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have pointed out that the underwriters' will not insure and the inspectors of the local governing authority will not permit connections to the local electrical scheme, unless the standards required are met. The same thing applies in the outback wherever there is a power station supplying current to the local residents.

Hon. F. E. GIBSON: I cannot support the amendment because I regard it as absolutely essential for the commission to have control over the whole of the electrical installations operating throughout the State. We are faced with the expenditure of approximately £800,000 to convert the East Perth Power House from the 40 cycle to the 50 cycle basis. I can imagine some local authority in the outback, which Mr. Seddon seeks to eliminate from the control of the commission, arranging to spend money on

the provision of a generating plant that will not be in conformity with the standard set for the Commonwealth and for Western Australia in particular. The commission should have power to control such matters.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	7
Noes	..	..	..	15
				—
Majority against	..			8
				—

# AYES.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch.	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. A. Blomfield	Hon. F. E. Welsh
Hon. H. Seddon	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. A. Thomson	(Teller.)

# NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. G. Hilslop
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kilson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. C. B. Williams.
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller.)

# PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Hon. L. B. Bolton.	Hon. T. Moore.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 32—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—

30. The price of electricity supplied or sold by the commission shall be uniform to all consumers having regard to the purposes for and the quantities in which the same is supplied or sold.

This measure will operate throughout the State and I see no reason why the price of current should vary in the different districts, especially as one of the objects is to make the amenities of the city available in rural areas. Otherwise the price at Narrogin might be 4d. because that town happened to be close to the generating station whereas at Katanning, another 60 miles away, it would probably be 5d. or at Albany, 90 miles still further, it might be 9d. or 10d. a unit. If the charges are to be governed by proximity to the generating station, the scheme can be successful only when population and industries are crowded out of a certain area and it is necessary to move further afield. I do not think that is the intention of the measure. As the industrial pro-

gress of the State is dependent upon the production and development of rural areas and as electricity is to play a part in such development, I am of opinion that the whole State should share the responsibility equally.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the new clause. In effect it says that, notwithstanding what the cost of generation and distribution might be, the price shall be the same. That might be well enough in most places where the commission will be operating. The general policy will be to make the price as uniform as possible under the South-West scheme, but there will have to be some variations. Under the new clause the commission could not quote a lower rate if it desired to assist a particular industry in furtherance of the policy of decentralisation.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Would consideration of decentralisation be a responsibility of the commission?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the commission does not encourage decentralisation it will be slipping. At Bunbury there are various small industries and the commission might desire, in order to encourage one of them, to quote a lower rate for current of a quantity. That would not be possible under the proposed new clause. The general idea is that the commission, more particularly under the South-West scheme, shall make its charges uniform as far as possible, but there must be exceptions. The new clause, however, would permit of no exceptions. When the commission happened to be interested in the metropolitan area, the price there would be the price for all its activities, regardless of where they might be or the conditions under which they might be operating. When speaking to the South-West State Power Scheme Bill I quoted figures that we hoped the commission will be able to apply and if so, the Government will have to bear a loss of £30,000 a year. Under the new clause, the loss to the Government would probably be much greater.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Seemingly it is idle for anyone to talk of the desirability of decentralisation when, in dealing with this measure under which the major portion of electrical power will be provided for industry, there is a desire to preserve the order so that people who may desire to establish industries in areas remote from the

generating station will be handicapped by having to pay a higher rate. All organisations that talk of progress are yelling for decentralisation and improved conditions in the country areas. This is an important way in which we might assist. In Victoria a flat rate is proposed for power. Anyone who establishes an industry in the country remote from the generating station will have enough disadvantages without having to pay a higher rate for power.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I feel great sympathy for the proposed new clause but it is just not practicable.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Why?

Hon. L. CRAIG: What would the Collie people say if power costs there were lifted to the average of the South-West? If the cost at the point of generation were raised above the rate being paid today, the scheme would not be acceptable to the people at Collie. The commission will have authority to quote special rates to meet special circumstances, but to argue that no matter how distant an industry may be from the point of generation, it should be entitled to a standard rate is wrong. One might just as well apply the principle to the railways.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Would there be anything wrong in doing so?

Hon. L. CRAIG: And for a trip from Perth to South Perth, charge as much as for a trip to London! Under the South-West scheme it is proposed to have a standard rate, which is a great concession from my point of view. To bind the commission to raising rates to a higher level than they are today would damn the whole scheme in certain areas.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Chief Secretary and Mr. Craig have contended that a uniform charge would be impracticable. Why not say the same thing about postal charges?

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

Hon. A. THOMSON: I was replying to Mr. Craig, who had pointed out how absurd it would be that the people in Collie should have to pay more for current than was paid, say at Narrogin, Albany, or Wagin. I would draw attention to the fact that if a letter in Collie is addressed only to the next street and delivered by the post office it costs 2½d. If a letter is

sent from Collie to Darwin or even Great Britain the cost is still 2½d. Yet people say it is impossible and impracticable for a flat rate to be charged in regard to this scheme, although this is to be a commission allegedly brought into being with the idea of fostering secondary industries in the country areas. The Chief Secretary said that the price must naturally be cheaper in the metropolitan area than in outback country. I take exception to that statement. Because a principle has been in existence for so long, that is no reason why it should not be changed.

Suppose somebody goes to the electricity commission and says that he proposes to establish an industry in the metropolitan area, and asks at what rate power can be supplied to him. He will probably get it at 2d. per unit. If the same man wished to establish an industry at, say, Narrogin, he would probably be told he must pay 5d. a unit. Even suppose it were only 4d. Where would he be most likely to establish that industry—in the country or in the metropolitan area? If the Government is sincere in its desire to decentralise and encourage industries in the country, I think Mr. Loton's amendment will go a long way towards achieving that end. I listened to the evidence submitted to the commissioners when they visited Katanning; and every witness stressed the point that if the electricity commission were brought into being, and if it were to be successful in the country, there must be a flat rate.

I want to disabuse the minds of members who think it is impracticable to send current further out and charge a flat rate. I know the position today is that the further out a man goes the more he must pay for every commodity he requires, but we must endeavour to break down that principle. People in country areas for many years have been urging that they should be able to obtain petrol or oil for tractors and motors at a flat rate. I do not see why that cannot be done. Surely the huge oil companies should be in a position to say that the whole output in Western Australia is so much, and the cost of distribution is so much, and so arrive at a flat rate. Why should we always grease the fatted pig?

Hon. H. Tuekey: It would not make any difference to the oil companies.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No, not a bit.

Hon. H. Tuckey: I thought you were attacking the oil companies.

Hon. A. THOMSON: No. I am saying they could do it if they wished to and place all consumers on the same basis. Coming nearer home, we find that the license fee for a motorcar is a little cheaper in the country areas, with the idea of assisting the people. Why should not the same apply to all commodities?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I wonder whether the amendment will really improve matters for people in outlying districts! We know the scheme will take years to establish. In time to come, the commission will extend the scheme to remote areas after a full investigation of the circumstances, if satisfied that the loss to the scheme would not be increased too much thereby. If a flat rate were imposed and the commission could charge only from 2d. to 3d. a unit, it would probably find great difficulty in extending the scheme to some of the small centres. It looks very well on paper, but it is something that will not work out in practice.

Hon. A. Thomson: Why?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: We cannot take Victoria as a criterion altogether, but the price of current varies considerably between different places there. I think it would be a pity if the scheme were to reach a place like Boyup Brook and it was desired to extend it to the next town 12 miles away, but the commission was unable to do that because it could only charge 2d. a unit and the result of extension of the transmission line would be too great a loss. If that occurred, the people concerned would feel that they had been left out because of the provisions of this measure.

Hon. A. Thomson: Could they not even it up and make a flat rate?

Hon. H. TUCKEY: It would be a big job.

Hon. A. L. Loton: Big jobs require big minds.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I want something suggested that could be carried out. I represent country areas, and I am very much concerned about getting a cheap rate. But I do not want to ask for something that cannot be brought about and thereby hold up the scheme.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I support the new clause, and I hope the Committee will see

it is inserted in the Bill as an indication that the method adopted in the past must be altered if there is to be decentralisation and if people in the back country are to be given a chance to live. This applies not only to electric power but also to water rates. Why should people in the back country pay more for water—two or three times as much as is paid in the metropolitan area?

Hon. L. Craig: Why should beer be dearer at Port Hedland than in Perth?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The Army has demonstrated that it can frame a price at which to sell to all alike. The same price is charged in Darwin as in Perth.

Hon. L. Craig: They make a profit.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, and there is about £1,000,000 in canteen funds. I have mentioned the matter of the water rates for years. I have said before that the country is being held back by the Government, the banks and the insurance companies. All have adopted the same method: the further one goes out the higher the tax. Why should the banks not have a flat rate for exchange of 1s. or half a crown? In the past they have had a rate of 6d. in the metropolitan area, 2s. 6d. in the South-West and £1 in the North-West. I do not know whether that has been reduced, or not.

Hon. L. Craig: You are a long way out.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Mr. Craig spoke the other day about affording people inducements to go to the North-West, but now he says the man outback should be penalised. That is the idea of the bank and of the insurance companies. The insurance companies charge 2s. 6d. per cent in the city and from 50s. to 90s. outback. Some years ago an estimate was got out for a water scheme for Port Hedland.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Was that to be run by electricity?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No, but the same argument applies. The estimate was £35,000, and the idea was scrapped because the Government wanted the people of the district to pay the interest and sinking fund on it. The general taxpayers of the State pay the interest and sinking fund on the irrigation schemes supplying water in the South-West to enable my dairy friends to build up their values to £40 per acre. At Port Hedland water is brought 60 miles by train and costs 3s. per 100 gallons after people have carted it from the

station. Such matters should be tackled by the Government in order to help the people in the back country. This amendment will bring to the notice of the Government the fact that this state of affairs must be altered. At Onslow people have to catch rainwater or drink brackish water because no water scheme is provided. This argument affects not only the Great Southern, but the whole of the State. This amendment would indicate to the Government that we wish to encourage decentralisation instead of the opposite policy, which has existed throughout Australia.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: It has been worth while coming back to listen to Mr. Miles, and I am delighted with his speech. He has been here for many years and he sees the light where many younger men remain in darkness. The party to which I belong stands for decentralisation, in deed as well as in words, and this amendment is in line with the party's pledged platform. Mr. Miles is not a member of the Country and Democratic League but the fact that he agrees with the principle leads me to hope that other members will fall into line and break down the policy of centralisation that has existed for so long. It is no use public men saying they stand for decentralisation if their actions do not square with their words. Pastoralists and others in the province I represent have had a devastating experience during the last ten years, and the time has come when they should no longer have to pay exorbitantly high rail freights and other Government charges, while receiving no rebate on income that they earned in good years to help them over bad years. Members must realise that the country in the North is slowly but certainly being denuded of population, because the attractions of the metropolitan area are too great by comparison. The people in that area are realising that the game is not worth while. If we are to balance our budget, strong inducements must be afforded to people to live in the outback and bring into full production the areas which are now being neglected. I support the new clause.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It may not be unfitting for a member from the Metropolitan Province to be in full support of the spirit behind the proposed new clause. When driving to distant parts of the State I have always wondered why I could buy an article in

such places for the same price as I could buy it in the metropolitan area, when supplied by a private organisation capable of handling its affairs efficiently. I have bought cigarettes in the furthest corner of the southern portion of the State for the same price as in the metropolitan area, but had to pay twice as much there for my petrol. That type of economy must go if the State is to progress. The Bill says people can have electricity provided they are willing to pay perhaps twice as much for it, but we must submit to the Constitution which says that no distinction must be made in taxation between the different parts of the State. I doubt if we can alter the position by the addition of a clause of this sort. I see the difficulties, but I think they can be straightened out. When this commission spreads its work into the outback, it will want to do so at the most attractive rate possible. From the commencement the commission should be given power to establish a sinking fund, by charging a higher price than is actually necessary at the beginning, so that that fund could be used to stabilise the price of electricity throughout the State. I think that is the best method by which it could be done, and money must be set aside in order to achieve that object.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Unless that provision is made the commission will not be able to do it.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not know whether the Bill at present gives the commission that power, but unless that is done, I feel sure the whole State will not be able to make full use of electricity. It is interesting to hear members of other parties giving advice on socialism to a Government which is pledged to it. This is practical socialism of a kind that is best for the members of the community. I believe the same principle should be extended to other measures.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope other members will keep a bit closer to the matter in hand than have previous speakers.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am wondering if the amendment does not carry into effect the recommendations in the report. There the cost of current to consumers is set out at various rates, from 5d. to 1s. 1d., according to the consumption. I think the amendment means that those rates would be adopted.

ed as the standard throughout the area of the commission's operations. I am in accord with the speeches made in support of the amendment.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I did not think any member would agree with some of the arguments put forward on this matter. I think they have made use of this amendment to argue principles which have little application to it. I believe everyone is in favour of decentralisation and of giving encouragement and assistance to those who are developing the far distant parts of the State, but at the same time we must have some commonsense and appreciation of realities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mr. Heenan does not infer that a lot of members of the Committee are deficient in commonsense?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: No. It would be a great mistake if we tied the hands of the commission in the way proposed by this new clause. It would have the effect of defeating the very purpose which Mr. Loton has in mind. As the Chief Secretary says, the commission will undoubtedly do its best to support industries in the scattered portions of the State, and I hope it will be able to make current available there at rates cheaper than those charged to ordinary consumers. Mr. Loton and other members have seized on this new clause to argue the principle of decentralisation, to which every member subscribes. It is, however, not applicable to this Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am wondering whether my remarks have been understood. I certainly tried to make it clear that the idea underlying the South-West power scheme was that uniform rates should be charged throughout the whole of the South-West and Great Southern districts. I quoted from the report the rates which Mr. Seddon mentioned this evening. These are the rates which the compilers of the report estimate they will be able to charge; they are less than those now being paid by the people who will be served by the scheme when it comes into operation. We have reached the stage where the policy of the commission will be to charge a flat rate as near as possible to the figures which have been quoted; but if we say to the commission "You cannot charge any other rates except those rates in the South-West

district or in any part of Western Australia where you may be established," —

Hon. H. Seddon: That means throughout Western Australia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes—well, may be defeating the object for which the commission is being created. If we were anxious to attract a particular industry to some country centre and desired that the commission might charge a lower rate, it could not do so if this new clause were passed.

Hon. L. Craig: That would be bad business.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. The Government is prepared to stand a loss of £30,000 per year for a few years in order to establish the scheme and so that a uniform rate might be charged throughout the Great Southern and South-West districts. I do not think members should ask for more, because, if they do, the activities of the commission might be stultified in certain directions. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not agree with the Chief Secretary's argument. The rate in the metropolitan area could be increased by a fraction, and a reduction could be made in the rate charged in the back country.

Hon. F. E. Gibson: But the Government has no power over that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is time the Government had. At Fremantle the charge is 5½d. per unit.

Hon. G. Fraser: Would you tear up contract?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No, but it would be an indication that the people of the metropolitan area could pay a little more in order to give people in the back country the benefit of a cheaper rate. The same thing applies to railway charges. The further the people are in the back country the lower should be the rate they are charged. The same remark applies to water supplied to Goldfields residents.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Are we dealing with water or with electricity?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is a great pity that we did not confine the scope of the Bill to the South-West district, as Mr. Seddon suggested.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes .. .. .	10
Noes .. .. .	12

Majority against .. .. 2

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. V. Hamersley

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Tucker
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. G. Fraser

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. B. Wood	Hon. F. E. Gibson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. T. Moore

New clause thus negatived.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

**BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.**

- 1, Public Works Act Amendment.
- 2, Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

**BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Assembly's Further Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it no longer disagreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 6 insisted on by the Legislative Council.

**BILL—CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 14th November.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [8.17]:

The purposes of this Bill are similar to those prompting the recently considered amendments to the Justices Act. In that measure Mr. Heenan started on the grandfathers and now he is after the grandmothers! He laid down in the Bill just passed that no justices over the age of 70 should adjudicate. The proposal here is that no member of the Children's Court—I do not know whether this will include Mr. Schroeder—

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No.

Hon. J. CORNELL: He comes under the 70 years of age provision. The measure will be mainly concerned with women because the majority of cases in the Children's Court are tried by women. The object of the Bill is to disqualify them. A curious circumstance of Mr. Heenan's amendment of the Justice's Act is that an acting coroner can preside over a coroner's jury even if he is over 70 years of age. I hope that Mr. Heenan will correct that position. The reasons he put forward for disqualifying justices from sitting in court, when over 70 years of age, will apply, I presume, to the Children's Court, and that is that such people have reached the stage of "dodderism." If that be so I hope that not only Mr. Heenan, but this House will go all the way and will later agree that no legal practitioner over 70 years of age shall appear in court.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: He does not get much chance with the competition.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, but he would be eligible. If a man or a woman is 70 years of age and has reached the stage when his or her intelligence is not sufficient to try a case, then a lawyer of that age would not be intelligent enough to plead or defend a case. I would go further than Mr. Heenan and make 70 years of age the limit for a juror.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It is 60 years now.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then I shall not deal with them. I will mention the medical profession and say that no medical practitioner or surgeon should practice after reaching the age of 70. We could continue through the whole gamut. There are many cases where age is a factor likely to be more detrimental than it is in the case of justices. I do not know why this House should take up the attitude that it has. If there is one vote that I regret, after the display in the House last evening when there was an absolute majority, it was when I recorded my vote to refuse to give Mr. Craig permission to introduce a Bill to limit the extreme age of entry into this House to 70. We have arrived at the burlesque situation of saying that men and women justices who have reached 70 years of age should be disqualified from acting on the bench, but there are at least nine or 10 members of this House who are over 70 years of age and

they are here to make and to frame laws under which our justices are appointed. When Mr. Craig asked for leave to introduce his Bill my contention was that the matter of disqualification was one entirely for the electors. If they wanted to return Methuselah to this House they could.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the Bill before the House.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill is to disqualify people over 70 years of age, from sitting on the Children's Court.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member knows that he must not allude to a Bill not before the House.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not, but to the refusal of the House to allow Mr. Craig to bring the matter forward. I point out the Gilbertian side of the whole situation. People of any age can sit here while—

Hon. A. L. Loton: You have to be over a certain age.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know if the hon. member is yet of age, but he will be if he remains here long enough.

Hon. A. L. Loton: I will be eligible until I am 70.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The reason why I oppose any limiting of the age of entry to this House is that such a matter is one for the electors. The age qualification is a matter for those who make the appointments.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What about the Judges' Retirement Act and the Stipendiary Magistrates' Act?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Government brought down a Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser: This House passed it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Parliament approved of it.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Do you argue that that was wrong?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, Some men I would never sack and others I would not employ. It is not so much age as ability that is important. I know many justices and professional men in their early 40's whom I would not touch with a pole. I oppose the Bill.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [8.24]: Mr. Cornell mentioned various occupations in which people should not be employed after

reaching the age of 70 years. I do not agree with that, and he exploded the reasons in his next few words when he referred to members here. It is a case of the public's choice. Where the public choose a man over 70 years of age it is the public's funeral, but in this matter the people have no option. The public has no power to appoint a magistrate under, or over, 70 years of age. We are making a declaration that the officer before whom the public will appear in court shall be under 70. The public need not go to the other persons over 70 years of age, mentioned by Mr. Cornell, but to someone else, but in this instance there is no choice.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East—in reply) [8.26]: There is little that I can add. Mr. Fraser has just cleared up one point. If a person wants to consult a doctor who is 80 or 90 years of age, or engage a lawyer of the same age, that is his business. If people want to elect a person of that age to Parliament this Bill does not permit us to decide anything about it. But justices of the peace, and particularly those who sit in the Children's Court, are like judges and magistrates and they need to possess certain qualifications. It is reasonable that a justice dispensing justice in the Children's Court shall, when he has attained the age of 70 years, retire from the bench after having given honourable service. If the principle is good in the case of judges and magistrates, I cannot see why it should not apply to justices. We will be doing them no harm; this is nothing against their character and it is not taking away their living. The job of a justice is a responsible one and a person of 70 years of age should retire from the bench. This Bill is simply applying that principle to the justices in the Children's Court. If we were depriving them of their livelihood, we would be inflicting some hardship on them, but that is not the position.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	9
Majority for	..	..	..	2



## AYES.

Hon. L. Craig  
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt  
Hon. J. M. Drew.  
Hon. G. Fraser  
Hon. E. M. Heenan  
Hon. J. G. Hilslop

Hon. W. H. Kitson  
Hon. A. L. Loton  
Hon. H. S. W. Parker.  
Hon. H. L. Roche  
Hon. G. W. Miles  
(Teller.)

## NOES.

Hon. Sir Hal Cookbatch  
Hon. J. Cornhill  
Hon. E. H. Gray  
Hon. V. Hamersley.  
Hon. W. J. Mann

Hon. A. Thomson  
Hon. H. Tuckey  
Hon. F. R. Welsh  
Hon. H. Seddon  
(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

# **BILL—BUILDING OPERATIONS AND BUILDING MATERIALS CONTROL.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [8.35] in moving the second reading said: This is an important Bill and it is to be regretted that its introduction has become necessary. The attitude of this House in relation to it will have a tremendous effect on the people of the State. The Bill seeks to provide authority for the exercise of control over building operations and building materials, which until recently was the prerogative of the Commonwealth Government. It has been necessitated by the decision of the Commonwealth Government to relinquish its control not only over building materials but also over the issue of permits for houses costing more than £1,200, and for factory and other industrial buildings the cost of which would exceed £25. The Commonwealth indicated that it was desirous of surrendering these powers at the earliest opportunity.

This sudden decision was most embarrassing to Western Australia, particularly in view of the fact that a few days previously the Commonwealth Government had announced that building permits would no longer be required for dwellings costing less than £1,200. This earlier announcement was the subject of a strong protest by the State Government, although other States appeared to consider that the repeal of the restrictions was warranted, indicating that supplies were not so short elsewhere as they have been in Western Australia. The immediate con-

sequence in this State was a tremendously accelerated demand for building materials at a time when these articles were still in short supply. It also allowed persons who were suffering no hardships to compete on at least equal grounds with those who were genuinely in need of homes.

The further sudden intimation by the Commonwealth Government that it intended to withdraw completely its control of building permits and materials has aggravated the position, and it is considered undeniable that unless the State assumes these controls, a chaotic condition will arise. The purpose of controlling permits and building materials was to ensure that from the limited available quantity of manpower and materials, those whose needs were most desperate should receive priority. If all controls are withdrawn this priority will disappear, and those people enjoying the best financial position will have an unfair advantage.

A tremendous scope for black marketing in building materials will be available if people are free to buy when or where they like on a hopelessly understocked market. This is borne out by the number of requests for building permits that have been received in this State recently. For the year ended the 30th June, 1945, 4,350 applications were submitted, of which only 2,810, or 65 per cent. could be approved. Of these, 1,560 of the permits granted, or 55 per cent. of the total, were for homes, and the balance included shops, factories and other buildings. For the four months ended the 31st October, 1945, 1,066 applications were received of which 650, or 61 per cent., were granted. Of the approvals 393, or 60 per cent., were for houses. It cannot be too strongly stressed that the number of applications I have mentioned represents a tremendous number of men, women and children who are at present living in very unsatisfactory conditions that may have a very deleterious effect upon their health and also upon their conduct in the city.

One of my greatest pleasures in life has been my association with the infant welfare movement. It is undeniable that thousands of people are living in crowded flats and tenements, particularly in the city, which must have a disastrous effect upon the health of the rising generation. That is a factor that should dominate our consideration of this legislation. The already large

number of people awaiting homes throughout Western Australia, and particularly in the metropolitan area, will, within the next 12 months, be increased by many thousands. That in itself demands the serious attention of this House.

There is at present a general feeling of bewilderment amongst the people. Unless we are very careful, instead of their entering into a joyous period of peace and prosperity there is danger to be feared because of the large number of people who apparently have forgotten that we have been saved from a terrible plight. They lose sight of the fact that many thousands of lads who went to the war have returned as men who now want their own homes—and too many people are absolutely indifferent to the future well-being of those war-tried lads. That is one reason why this Chamber should set an example to all sections of the community and recognise the conditions that prevail and the parlous state of many people deserving of homes and a happier future.

Hon. J. Cornell: Will the Bill give them more homes?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes.

Hon. J. Cornell: How?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Unless we can exercise the control that is contemplated under the Bill, a tremendous quantity of materials will be wasted by selfish people enlarging their existing homes or building more extensive dwellings.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would appear from the Bill that the Workers' Homes Board will be granted a monopoly.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The officers associated with the Workers' Homes Board have done a wonderful job for the Commonwealth Government to date. It is obvious from the figures that a continuance of control is essential until such time as an adequate supply of materials and manpower is available to meet all demands. A further most interesting and instructive table of figures relates to the number of houses built in Australia annually. At the outbreak of war this yearly number exceeded 40,000. The rate of progressive decline during the war was:—

1938-39	..	..	..	40,000
1939-40	..	..	..	37,000
1940-41	..	..	..	38,000
1941-42	..	..	..	20,000
1942-43	..	..	..	4,000
1943-44	..	..	..	5,000

It is estimated that in 1944-45, 10,000 new homes will have been erected, and that in the following year 24,000 will be built. The objective for 1947 is 50,000, and then between 60,000 and 80,000 annually until the housing position is once again stable.

Houses are not the only requirements although they are the most important. Hospitals, schools, factories and public buildings are also needed, and it is anticipated that the materials available for new buildings are at present approximately one-third of what is required. In addition, repair and maintenance to homes and other buildings constitute another grave and pressing problem. Under the National Security Regulations, permits were issued on a basis of hardship, and the essentiality of the project. Each application was investigated by the Workers' Homes Board and the decision rested with the Deputy Director of the War Organisation of Industry Directorate. This post was for some considerable time occupied by Mr. S. A. Taylor, who rendered signal services to the Commonwealth during the war, and, following that officer's recent appointment as Public Service Commissioner, Mr. R. J. Bond, the Secretary of the Workers' Homes Board was allotted the responsibility.

Releases of materials were approved by Mr. P. V. Andrews, formerly Supplies Officer of the State Saw Mills, who, as representative of the Materials Supply Directorate, was working by delegated authority under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Munitions. This gentleman has carried out his duties in a very creditable manner, and the State proposes to employ him as an essential member of his staff in the positions they occupied under Commonwealth control. Mr. Andrews is well acquainted with all aspects of the building trade and possesses the confidence of the Building Industry Congress of Western Australia.

A deputation from this congress recently waited on the Premier in order to discuss the Bill. The deputation was representative of the whole of the building industry and included hardware traders and manufacturers, timber merchants, builders, master builders, plumbers, etc. The members of the deputation were Messrs. G. J. Bouche, C. J. Cornish, R. Golding, B. A. Lewis, H. Mercer, J. W. Nichols, A. G. Petterick, H. Plunkett and A. E. Sandover. At the conclusion of the interview they seemed very

well satisfied with the Bill and with the intentions of the Government. They expressed the opinion that if the future administration of the control proceeded on similar lines to those of the past, then they would be very happy to co-operate with the Government. It is a big step forward to receive such an assurance from the congress and it is an indication that the most important people in the industry recognise the necessity for control and are supporting it.

Turning now to the Bill, it follows very closely, as I have said, the existing National Security Regulations, except that it reinstates the control recently repealed by the Commonwealth Government relating to permits for houses costing less than £1,200, which repeal has had embarrassing repercussions. It will be observed that the Bill is divided into eight parts. Included in the first part is a very short clause which states that the provisions of the Bill shall apply to the Crown in the same way as it does to private persons. This will mean that Government departments will have to apply for permits to build and for material. That is an indication of the fairness of the attitude adopted by the Government. Under the Commonwealth regulations, the State did not come under such control. It can be said, therefore, that the Government is sincere in its object, and is prepared to put its own department under the same restrictions.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes, but the board is an interested party because it is building homes and is a competitor.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is not a matter of who is building the homes, so long as homes are being built. We want to control the labour and material used for the construction of homes. The passing of the Bill will not affect any permit, license, etc., which was granted under the National Security Regulations. The first part also includes a large number of definitions. It is my intention in the Committee stage to seek approval for an amendment to exempt second-hand materials from the provisions of the Bill.

Part II is very short and applies to the administration of the Act. It provides that, subject to the general control and direction of the Minister, the administration shall be the responsibility of the Workers' Homes Board, and that the cost of the administration shall be met from appropriations by Parliament. The Workers' Homes Board,

as the responsible housing authority in the State, is the logical choice as the controlling body. The officers of the board have had ample experience in the issue of permits for home building, so that the organisation for the continuance of the permit system is already in existence. The board is composed of the Under Treasurer as chairman, the Principal Architect, and Mr. Harler, the Assistant Manager of the Wyndham Meat Works.

It was suggested in another place that the board should be enlarged by the appointment of several men experienced in building matters. In reply the Premier advised that it was not desired to do this at present. The officers of the Workers' Homes Board are quite competent to deal with any problems that will arise, and, in addition, it is proposed this session to bring down a Bill to amend the Workers' Homes Act by which it is proposed to strengthen the board in a similar manner to that suggested. As I have already mentioned, the staff of the Workers' Homes Board will be augmented by officers from the Materials Supply Department. The State will be required to accept financial responsibility for these officers and for those who were previously engaged on permit work in the Workers' Homes Board. The annual costs are estimated to be:—

Materials Supply Staff .. ..	£3,000
Workers' Homes Board .. ..	£3,200
	<hr/>
	£6,200

The Commonwealth has been asked to contribute towards this expenditure, but a reply is not yet to hand. The amalgamation of the two staffs, however, should result in an overall saving in expenditure. The third part of the Bill deals with restrictions on building operations. It provides that no person shall commence or continue any building operations without either the consent of the board or a permit previously granted under the National Security Regulations. Certain exemptions from obtaining permits are allowed. It will not be necessary to apply for a permit to paint, colour whitewash or paper any residence, provided that these operations do not exceed an annual outlay of £25.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What a large sum! What could you do with £25?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not very much.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You could not paint much more than the front fence with that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is the idea of imposing the limit. It has been suggested that this amount should apply to the cost of materials only, and not to the combined cost of labour and material. If the Bill were amended in this manner, the object of the clause would be defeated. Although there is no lack of paint available, labour is scarce and an amendment of this nature would permit of large-scale painting and renovations to the detriment of more essential work. This is caused by the fact that with £25 worth of paint, work could be carried out which, including payment for labour, would cost £250. This applies also to plastering; £10 worth of plaster would entail labour costing £50 to complete the job. It was therefore considered necessary to fix as a limit a figure that would permit of an adequate control of labour and ensure that essential work would not be neglected.

It will also not be necessary to apply for a permit for building operations to a residence, the total cost of which also does not exceed £25. The amount is set as the limit to prevent the undertaking of non-essential small jobs, such as garages, brick fences, concrete work, etc. with materials that are in short supply. The limit on similar work to a business, educational or religious building is £100. At the request of the Building Industry Congress, the Bill provides that no permit shall be required for the commencement of urgent repair work, the failure of which to be performed immediately might endanger human life or property, provided the responsible person shall apply for a permit to continue or complete the work.

Provision is also made so that the board may revoke, suspend or vary any permit it has granted. This provision has been inserted to meet certain conditions. For instance, a permit may be granted to use certain materials which, before they can be obtained by the permit holder, become scarce, and it may then be necessary for an application to be submitted for a variation in the type of building previously approved. Also certain materials, that at the time of issue of the permit were in short

supply, might become more plentiful and thus require the permit to be altered to allow of the issue of these materials. The board is given power to issue directions to any persons connected with building operations regarding those operations or their suspension or discontinuance, and may request to be supplied with any information relating to the operations. All persons connected with any building, etc. for which a permit has been granted are required to make and keep proper and accurate books, accounts, stocks and costing records, and to preserve such documents until the board authorises their destruction. Provision is made for the co-operation with the board of local governing authorities and public utility undertakings in respect to any building applications they might receive, or to any illegal building that might be commenced in their district. Certain officers of the board are given authority to enter upon and inspect any premises in order to ascertain whether the provisions of the Act are being complied with.

Part IV deals with restrictions on disposal and acquisition of building materials. It provides that a licensee must be obtained to sell or dispose of building materials, that such licence may be transferred with the approval of the board, and that it may be suspended, revoked or varied by the board. Part V deals with the board's powers of administration, and authorises the board to request any person concerned in building operations or in the disposal or acquisition of building material to produce the books, accounts or documents relating to their business, to provide any information requested, and to give directions or impose conditions in connection with the storage, delivery, disposal, use or application of any building material. Certain powers of entry and search are also provided in this part. Penalties and offences are provided for in Part VI, which states that any offence against the Act shall be dealt with summarily by a stipendiary magistrate. Part VII deals with legal proceedings and evidence, and sets out that a complaint in respect of an offence against the Act or the regulations shall be laid within 12 months after the committal of the offence. Part VIII provides authority to make regulations, and gives certain legal protection to the Minister, the board and its officers.

also provides that the Act shall continue in force only until the 31st December, 1946.

In my remarks I have provided an outline of the Bill and of the relevant matter which led to its introduction. I feel that members are quite as aware, as is the Government, of the need for the extension of control for at least the period described by the Bill. The Government is fully alive to the fact that it will receive little credit in some quarters for proposing to continue this control. It is obvious, however, that control must continue to permit of persons with limited financial resources receiving a fair deal. An unfortunate aspect in the war years was the growth of black-marketing and other illegal practices which arise from a plentitude of money and a lack of necessities. There will be people prepared to pay almost any price to obtain houses, and there will be others whose needs are greater but who can afford only a reasonable price. No reflection is meant to be cast on the great majority of builders, who are honest and careful, when I say that some of those prepared to pay almost any price would have their wants satisfied irrespective of the merits of their claims should there be no control. The Government can therefore see no alternative to accepting and shouldering an obligation which can be described as unpleasant.

The Bill shows that the Government recognises the necessity for doing its part now that hostilities have ceased. I have referred to the selfish attitude adopted by many of our own people. We hope to get the people to see in this measure a guide for their behaviour, both public and private, and hope they will ask themselves what effect their conduct is likely to have on the successful placing of our men returning from the war. Too many of our people are inclined to forget that duty and think only of themselves. The need to meet this shortage is desperate and the Bill is brought forward because we are certain that something must be done in the way of control. It is our duty to set the example and start a mission of goodwill that will arouse people to a sense of their responsibilities in the interests of the returned men, their wives and families. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (PROMOTIONS APPEAL BOARD).**

### *Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting a conference on the amendments insisted on by the Council, and notifying that at such conference the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

## **BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

**HON. H. S. W. PARKER** (Metropolitan-Suburban) [9.3] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill to deal with offences which are unfortunately becoming far too common. I refer to those cases in which negligent motor drivers cause the death of people. Possibly in the future we shall have more, when there are more cars on the road, and more reckless drivers. At present, if a person is killed through the negligence of a man who has driven a motor car at excessive speed or while drunk, the offender can only be charged with manslaughter; and juries are very reluctant to find people guilty of such a serious offence, which carries a penalty of up to 20 years' imprisonment with hard labour.

My experience, when I was in the Crown Law Department, was that no jury would convict a person of manslaughter in connection with a motorcar accident unless there was some very serious negligence, such as speeding or drunkenness or driving without lights. The idea of the Bill is that instead of charging a man with manslaughter, he may be charged with the offence of having under his control a vehicle and failing to use reasonable care and take reasonable precautions in the use and management of such vehicle, thereby causing the death of another. The maximum penalty provided is five years' imprisonment. This amendment does not prevent the Crown Law authorities, if they so desire, from charging the man with manslaughter. The Bill also provides that if a person is charged with manslaughter he may be found guilty by the jury of the lesser offence of failing to take reasonable care and precaution, thus causing death.

At present, a man cannot be charged with one offence and the jury find him guilty of

another, except in certain circumstances. If a man is charged with wilful murder, a jury may find him guilty of wilful murder, or if the circumstances warrant, of murder, or of manslaughter. But if a person is charged with murder, he can only be found guilty of murder or manslaughter; and if he is charged with manslaughter, he can only be found guilty of manslaughter and nothing else. The Bill provides that if he is charged with manslaughter, he may be found guilty of a lesser offence, resulting in a penalty of five years' imprisonment and he is found guilty of a crime, and not of a misdemeanour or a minor offence. The next portion of the Bill is to rectify an error that probably did not apply at the time the Code was drawn up. As amended in 1918, the Code provided that where any person apparently of the age of 18 years or upwards is convicted of any indictable offence not punishable by death, the court may order that person to be forthwith committed to a reformatory prison and detained during the Governor's pleasure. But if the person charged is under 18, the judge cannot award that penalty of imprisonment in a reformatory prison.

The Bill proposes to strike out the words "apparently of the age of 18 years or upwards," so that the court will be left with power to send any person of whatever age, charged in the Criminal Court, to a reformatory prison during the Governor's pleasure. Under the Code, the court has very great powers of punishment. The judge, if he so desires, may bind a person over, whatever the penalty laid down in the Code, except in the case of murder. He can fine him, or fine him and imprison him, or imprison him, or bind him over; but unless we pass this measure, he is not able to send a convicted person to a reformatory prison during the Governor's pleasure. I ask the House to give the Bill favourable consideration. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West) [9.10]: I desire to support the second reading. The fact that the Bill has already passed the Legislative Assembly on two occasions indicates that it has received the support of the Government. As a matter of fact, the Minister for Justice on both occa-

sions supported it and pointed out that it had been introduced on the representation of the Justices' Association. Justices of the Peace in the metropolitan area have done a great deal of coronial work, and their experience in coroners' courts has led them to believe the amendment is very desirable. There have been many serious accidents, and drivers have been acquitted on charges of manslaughter arising out of those accidents. Only recently there have been two instances. There was one case known as the Gosnell case in connection with which, on the 3rd October, 1945, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. There was another case a few days ago, known as the Victoria Park accident, in which a similar verdict was returned. There were others a little while ago. The reason for acquittal has been that there is no other penalty to be awarded than the extreme penalty of 20 years' imprisonment.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan**: You could not say that with any certainty.

**Hon. H. TUCKEY**: The maximum is 20 years.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan**: But you cannot say with any certainty the reasons for acquittal.

**Hon. H. TUCKEY**: The judge would have the right to inflict the maximum penalty of life imprisonment on a charge of manslaughter. Time and again juries have refused to convict because of that position, and there appears to be far too big a gap between offences under the Traffic Act and offences under the Criminal Code. If the Bill is agreed to, it will mean there will be an intermediate penalty which will, in many cases, meet the situation. The maximum penalty provided is five years' imprisonment with hard labour. That is very different from imprisonment for 20 years with hard labour. I hope the House will agree to the Bill.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [9.13]: I would like Mr. Parker to explain one point. The Bill refers to "any person who has in his charge or under his control any vehicle." Does that apply to any vehicle however propelled?

**Hon. H. S. W. Parker**: Yes, any vehicle.

**Hon. J. CORNELL**: A horse-drawn vehicle?

**Hon. H. S. W. Parker**: Yes.

Hon. J. CORNELL: So long as that is the case, I support the Bill. If it only applied to automobiles, it would be different.

On motion by Hon. E. M. Heenan, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.14 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 28th November, 1945.*

	PAGE
Question: Housing, as to board homes at Kalgoorlie and Boulder	2266
Bills: Adoption of Children Act Amendment, 1A.	2266
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1B.	2266
Public Works Act Amendment, 3A.	2266
Public Service Appeal Board Act Amendment, 3A.	2266
Marketing of Eggs, 2A.	2267
War Service Land Settlement Agreement, Com.	2271
Local Authorities (Reserve Funds) Act Amendment, 1A.	2274
Justices Act Amendment, 1A.	2274
War Service Land Settlement Agreement (Land Act Application) 2A., Com., report	2274
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, Council's Message	2274
Industrial Development (Resumption of Land), Com.	2275
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2A., Com.	2280
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2A., Com.	2282
Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board), Council's Message, Assembly's request for Conference	2282
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed	2283

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

### QUESTION—HOUSING.

*As to Board Homes at Kalgoorlie and Boulder.*

Mr. STYANTS asked the Premier:

1, How many dwelling houses have been erected by the Workers' Homes Board in Kalgoorlie and Boulder respectively during the past 12 months?

2, To how many has approval been given for their erection?

3, Is it a fact that the Eastern Goldfields have not received a fair quota of houses, on a population basis, compared with other portions of the State during that time?

4, If so, will he see that the position is rectified?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) and (2) In common with many other places it has been difficult to promote acti-

vities in workers' homes building beyond the approval stage during the past 12 months. Ten approvals have now been given.

(3) and (4) Allocations are made on a basis of need and the need is established in Boulder and Kalgoorlie.

### BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Adoption of Children Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Social Services.

2, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Labour.

### BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT.

*Third Reading.*

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.35]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [4.35]: I would like to ask the Minister what is the nature and extent of the consideration which he mentioned last night was to be extended to those who have filled temporary positions in the Public Service.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville—in reply) [4.36]: The consideration that will be extended to those who are temporarily employed in the Public Service will be in accordance with the regulations. We cannot do more about the matter.

Hon. N. Keenan: Will the Minister allow the temporary officers the same privileges for leave as permanent officers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: They will get pro rata leave, provided they are retired.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.