

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

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

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on Thursday.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.1 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 6th October, 1925.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	1179
Question: Prison Regulations	1179
Bills: Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 1A...	1179
Western Australian Bank Act Amendment (Private), Select Committee's Report, 2A., Com.	1179
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, 2A.	1180
City of Perth, returned	1180
Labour Exchanges, Com.	1180
Primary Products Marketing, Com.	1195
Adjournment: Royal Show	1202

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read assenting to the Supply Bill (No. 2) £1,232,000.

QUESTION—PRISON REGULATION.

Mr. **MANN** asked the Premier: What is the necessity for the amended prison regulation laid on the Table of the House on the 29th September?

The **PREMIER** replied: The new regulation is necessary in order that the prison regulations may be sufficiently elastic to enable those controlling the prisons to deal with exceptional circumstances, such as the influx, at short notice, of a number of entrants which might more than double the usual number under detention. The prisons

do not carry stocks of clothing, cell equipment, etc., to enable the whole of the regulations to be strictly applied under such abnormal circumstances. Moreover, the seamen sentenced under the Merchant Shipping Act are obviously of a class distinct from the ordinary type of prison inmate. It is in accordance with recognised prison practice that, when there exists a number of inmates of a type similar to each other but different from the rest of the prisoners, there be applied to such inmates classification suitable to the circumstances. The new prison regulation enables this to be done.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Latham, and read a first time.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN BANK ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE).

Select Committee's Report.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.36]: I move—

That the report of the select committee be adopted.

Question put and passed.

Second Reading.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.37] in moving the second reading said: The Bill has been before a select committee, and the select committee's report is before members. The two main objects of the Bill are to facilitate the introduction of capital from overseas into the State as to the buying of the bank's shares abroad, and to facilitate the lending of the money when it has come here. For the former purpose it is proposed to establish branch registers in certain parts of the British Dominions. Later, the Bill provides that the bank may lend money to its clients in the same way as other banks do to-day in this State. The Western Australian Bank at present has a cumbersome method of handling loans, which handicaps it in comparison with other banks. The evidence given before the select committee shows that the same trouble was experienced by other banks, and was rectified in the manner proposed by the present Bill. Mr. F. M. Stone, the

bank's solicitor, in reply to Sir James Mitchell, stated—

The Western Australian Bank is the only bank in this State that is obliged to take its security in that manner. It is a cumbersome and old-fashioned way of taking a security. At one time banks could only take bonds, which were supposed to be worth more than any other form of security. It is to do away with that cumbersome form and to have one single document, thus saving expense and trouble to the customer, that the clause is included in the Bill. It is proposed under that clause to enable the bank to take a security over land in the ordinary way. Every bank at present established in Western Australia is able to do it. Only two banks that I can mention have had to do it as the Western Australian Bank has to do now. The Bank of Adelaide had its Act amended in 1904 by the inclusion of a clause similar to that contained in the Bill, while the Bank of New South Wales has also had its Act amended in the same way. This means that all the banks in this State, except the Western Australian Bank, can adopt this simple method of taking securities.

The Bill having already been fully dealt with before the select committee, I now merely move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [4.44] in moving the second reading said: The Bill provides for increased rating in the metropolitan area in view of the heavy expenditure involved in supplying Perth with water from the hills. The necessity for increased rating was anticipated by the previous Government when the hills scheme was first put in hand, but an undertaking was given that no increased rate would be imposed until such time as the hills water was made available to the citizens. That stage will be reached during the current financial year, and the Bill provides power for increased

rating, and will come into operation by proclamation. It is proposed that the increased rate should operate as from the 1st July of next year. Naturally, it was quite obvious that an increased rate would be necessary when the heavy expenditure involved in a supply from the hills was embarked upon. A comparison between the existing Act and the Bill is as follows:—The present Act provides a maximum rate of 1s. in the pound on the annual rateable value of land, whereas the Bill provides that the maximum may be as high as 2s. in the pound.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are more moderate than your colleague.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Under the Act the rate on the unimproved capital value of land is 2d. in the pound, whereas the Bill provides a maximum of 4d. That, in all the Acts I find, is worked on the percentage basis. In the present Act sewerage and storm water rates, taken together, represent 1s. 6d. in the pound. Under the Bill we propose to separate them, and we provide 1s. 6d. in the pound on the rateable value for sewerage, with 3d. in the pound on the capital unimproved value, if that system be adopted, while the storm water rate is to remain at 5d. in the pound as at present, with 5/6th of a penny in the pound on the capital unimproved value, if such system be adopted. All minimum rates are to remain as at present. A succession of deficits on the water supply revenue account has been built up in recent years. In 1918-19 the deficit was £1,692; in 1919-20, £6,691. The water rate for 1918-19 and 1919-20 was 10d. in the pound on annual values, but in 1920-21 the rate was increased to 1s. in the pound, the maximum rate leviable under the existing Act. The increase was to partly cover annual deficits due to increased interest charges on capital works, and higher operating costs. In 1920-21 when the rate was increased from 10d. to 1s., the deficit was £3,729; in 1921-22 it was £6,743; in 1922-23 it was £8,289; in 1923-24 £17,575; and in 1924-25 it was £28,200. It is estimated that for 1925-26 the deficit will be about £35,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Does that include the increased interest on the new works?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, the interest on the hills supply has been capitalised. The main reason for the increase in these deficits each year has been the additional interest charges on water supply works

of improvement that have been completed and charged to capital account. These do not include the hills scheme.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Do you propose to penalise the districts that will get no advantage from this? Will the rates be increased for Midland Junction?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Midland Junction will certainly derive benefit from these works, because Midland Junction in the past has had to be content with what water it could get from Mundaring.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But there is more than sufficient for all in Mundaring.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, that water comes from Mundaring as far as North Perth.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But Midland Junction and Guildford get their quotas and there is plenty to spare.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There has not been any to spare in any part of the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Lands: Fremantle gets its water from the gaol.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I doubt if it is possible to separate the account and charge different rates for each district, because shortly all will be served from the one source.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: This rate is for your old friend.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To meet the cost of the hills scheme, yes. I want to explain the reason why the deficits have increased in recent years. It has been mainly due to expenditure charged on capital account outside the hills schemes. The expenditure has been as follows:—In 1918-19 it was £23,432; in 1919-20, £39,030; 1920-21, £104,040; in 1921-22, £85,311; in 1922-23, £87,992; in 1923-24, £241,266; in 1924-25, £129,129. So there has been added to capital expenditure a total of £710,200, and of course interest on this expenditure is a charge against water supply revenue account. The capital expenditure on the hills water scheme is kept in a separate account, interest being capitalised while the work is under construction.

Hon. G. Taylor: Does not the increased demand for water help you to pay the cost?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, a bit. Also the increased valuations will be of assistance as well as the increased sales. However, in each annual report submitted to the House the department has pointed out that to meet annual de-

ficits and cover interest charges on extensive works of improvement and augmentation of supplies additional revenue would be required. Since 1919-20 those reports have indicated that interest charges and maintenance costs were increasing and that as the limit of rating powers had been reached and additional revenue for water sales would be negligible until augmented supplies were available, the authorisation of works to augment and improve the supply would inevitably necessitate an increase in rates to pay interest and maintenance costs of such works. Additional interest charges on completed works for each year since 1918-19 have been as follows: 1918-19 £2,097, 1919-20 £3,998, 1920-21 £3,452, 1921-22 £6,773, 1922-23 £4,979, 1923-24 £10,182, 1924-25 £10,916, or a total additional interest charge of £42,397. Since 1918-19 the department has had to pay from 6 per cent. to 6½ per cent. interest on all capital expenditure, whereas before the war the rate was about 4 per cent. The interest charges on the capital expenditure on the Melbourne water supply averages 4½ per cent., although on new works now being undertaken a heavier rate of interest will have to be paid. During the last year or two Melbourne's capital expenditure was at an interest rate of about 4½ per cent., so we are building under much more difficult conditions than were experienced in Melbourne. The expenditure on maintenance and management of our waterworks was £35,831 in 1918-19. Since that year it has increased up to £68,221 in 1924-25. The increase in operating and management expenses as between 1913-14 and 1924-25 has been £36,738, or 117 per cent. The main reasons for this are the expansion of the department's operations. Under the heading of "water consumption" the increase has been 89 per cent.; for water pumping 77 per cent.; number of services 42 per cent.; number of meters 37 per cent.; number of service reservoirs 75 per cent.; and mileage of mains laid 72 per cent.

Mr. Marshall: What are the solids' increase at North Perth?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have disappeared.

Mr. Marshall: Have they? Don't you believe it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The increase in the wages bill has been from £12,844 in 1913-14 to £25,118 in 1924-25, the increase being due to expansion of opera-

tions and increased wages. Stores, oils, etc., also have increased. Coal has increased from 10s. to 17s. per ton, oils from 1s. 5½d. to 2s. 3d. per gallon, waste from 51s. 10d. to 107s. per cwt. The management expenses have increased by 70 per cent., due to increases in salaries and augmentation of the staff, but there is a consistent improvement in the percentage of management expenses to operating costs each year. In 1918-19 the management expenses amounted to £12,897, while for 1924-5 they were £16,131. In 1918-19 the working expenses were £38,439, and in 1924-25 they were £73,606. The percentage of management to working expenses in 1918-19 was 33.5 per cent., while in 1924-25 it was 21.91 per cent., a considerable improvement. The accrued earnings in 1918-19 were £143,672, while in 1924-25 the sum was £231,884. The percentage of management to earnings in 1918-19 was 8.9 per cent., whereas in 1924-25 it was 6.9 per cent. So there has been a marked improvement under both headings. In that respect the scheme stands fairly well as compared with schemes in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. The percentage of management expenses to working expenses in Western Australia in 1923-24 was 21.1 per cent., in Queensland 33.01 per cent., in Victoria 43.13 per cent., and in New South Wales 29 per cent. So that in that comparison we are a long way below any of the Eastern States. In the same year the percentage of management expenses to earnings was in Western Australia 6.9 per cent., in Queensland 8.86 per cent., in Victoria—a gravitation scheme—5.7 per cent., and in New South Wales 7.5 per cent. Victoria is the only State below us, and our figures are considerably better than those of the remaining States. The development and progress of the water supply largely depends on the growth of the city, and there has been a marked progress in Perth since the supply was taken over from the board. In 1896, when the supply was taken over from the board, there was an area of only four square miles served by the metropolitan water supply; to-day there is 100 square miles. At that time there were no bores operating, whereas to-day there are 13. There was only one service reservoir as against 18 to-day, and the capacity has increased from 784,000 gallons to 57,867,000 gallons. The number of pumping stations in 1896 was nil; to-day there are two steam, two electric, one electric and steam, and three boosters. The volume of water

pumped during the board's regime was nil; to-day it is 1,812,011,000 gallons. The annual consumption then was 168,354,000 gallons, whereas to-day it is 2,893,700,000 gallons. The daily average consumption was 461,244 gallons, compared with 7,928,000 gallons to-day. Those figures show the marked development that has taken place, and the prospects are that the demands on the water scheme will be much heavier in future. The previous Government realised that the position was becoming acute and secured Mr. Ritchie, the engineer in charge of the Melbourne scheme, to report. In 1922-23 the then Government decided to put in hand the hills scheme. The Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to know that as regards costs, the estimated figures to-day are the same as he used when he made his speech at North Perth outlining the position at that time. To-day the scheme is capitalised at £1,770,851 without the hills scheme, and the estimate for the hills scheme is £2,853,359. Thus the cost of the water supply will be more than doubled, but that will not mean doubling the cost of supplying water, though a considerable increase will result on account of interest charges. There are quite a number of works that were in hand at the time the Leader of the Opposition spoke at North Perth. These together with the amounts expended on them are—Melville reservoir, £43,850; Mt. Eliza No. 4 reservoir, £47,063; Osborne Park £43,579; Buckland Hill, £21,243; new filter bed at Osborne Park, £15,795; total, £171,530. These works have all been completed. Other works include:—Enlargement of mains, 24in. main Cottesloe to Fremantle £38,431; 24in. main Melville to Fremantle £28,777; 18in. main, Melville to Fremantle £26,573; 30in. main, Mt. Eliza to Claremont £59,034; a total of £152,815. All those items were included in the speech outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, and those works have been completed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And the reservoirs are all satisfactory?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. In addition, there has been an enlargement of other mains at a cost of £75,000. Since that amount has been added to the capital expenditure, there has been a deficit on account of there being no increase in the rate levied. The increased interest charges on revenue account in 1923-24 amounted to £9,344 and in 1924-25 to £20,456, a jump of £11,000. It is expected that when the programme of

work is completed, there will be an added interest charge of approximately £29,000 per annum. The works for the augmentation of supplies from the hills include the following:—Surveys, preliminary investigations and minor works, expenditure to the 30th June, 1925, £5,987; land resumption Churchman's Brook catchment area, estimated cost £15,000, expenditure £12,528; land resumption Wongong catchment area, estimated cost £28,000, expenditure £20,351; land resumption Canning River catchment area, estimated cost £35,000, expenditure £33,536; 16in. main, Churchman's Brook to Canning River, estimated cost £10,444, expenditure, £9,635; 30in. main, Canning River to Kelmescott, estimated cost £43,073, expenditure £39,866; 36in. main, Kelmescott to Mt. Eliza, estimated cost £255,678, expenditure £189,542; 30in. main, Wongong to Kelmescott, estimated cost £154,349, expenditure £22,884; 30in. main from junction with 16in. branch line Canning River, estimated cost £48,180, expenditure nil; Churchman's Brook dam, estimated cost £206,994, expenditure £61,959; Wongong Brook reservoir, estimated cost £429,238, expenditure £231—this money has been spent on sinking and trial shafts to test the country in order to find a suitable site for the weir; Canning reservoir, estimated cost £1,166,835, expenditure £312; 36in. main, Canning reservoir to Kelmescott, estimated cost £114,000, expenditure nil; 40in. main Kelmescott to Mt. Eliza, estimated cost £346,568, expenditure nil; total estimated cost of works, £2,853,359; amount expended to 30th June, 1925, £396,831. The capitalised interest on the expenditure to date amounts to £13,714, making a total expenditure, including capitalised interest, of £410,545. That is a very heavy expenditure to be faced, and with the present rating powers, it is absolutely impossible to meet the demands, and so this Bill is essential.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The charges proposed under this Bill will not suffice for the complete scheme?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is estimated that these charges will enable us to carry on the work until the Wongong scheme is completed, as was stated by the hon. member in his speech at North Perth. He estimated that a 2s. rate would be sufficient until the Wongong reservoir was completed, which would occupy a period of four to six years. If it is then decided, as is now proposed, to proceed with the Canning scheme, by the time that is completed we shall require

additional rating, unless there is an abnormal increase in values to provide a set off.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Increased population will save the situation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That will mean an additional demand, and the Wongong scheme will not be equal to supplying the demand. The work will have to be proceeded with. The pipe line from Churchman's Brook and the Wongong reservoir will be completed by December next, and also a pipe line to the Canning reservoir site, and pipe head dams will be provided at each of these sources of supply. Thus we shall be tapping these three streams before Christmas next. Instead of waiting until the reservoirs are completed, we have adopted the system of throwing out the pipe lines and building pipe head dams by means of which we shall tap each of the three streams. There has been criticism by sections of the Press to the effect that we shall not be in a position to tap these streams because the pipe lines will not be completed. It has been said that it would be useless to talk of bringing water from Churchman's Brook until the construction of the pipe line over the Causeway and the tunnelling under Mt. Eliza to reach the storage reservoirs there were completed. That will not be necessary, because the existing pipe line is not carrying its full volume of water. We shall be able to tap the pipe line at about Kelmescott and switch the Churchman's Brook water into the existing main and bring it to Perth. By the time we tap the Wongong and Canning, the work at the Causeway and at Mt. Eliza will have been completed, and the water will then come through the new main.

Hon. G. Taylor: What additional supply can you get through the present pipes?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We shall be able to bring from 750,000 to 1,000,000 gallons per day through the existing pipes. In 1923, when the late engineer put forward his proposals, it was estimated that the complete scheme would necessitate a rate of 3s. in the pound, and that a 2s. rate would be sufficient to carry us to the point when the Wongong scheme was completed. Those figures are still adhered to by the Department. It will take probably six years to complete the Canning scheme, and it will not be started for at least six years. The idea is to complete Churchman's Brook, then go to Wongong, and then to Canning. Churchman's Brook will be finished next year. Trial shafts have been put down to find a

suitable spot for the wall at Wongong. When Churchman's Brook is finished the men will be shifted to Wongong, and when that is finished they will go on to Canning. There may, however, be many alterations and changes between now and then, and it is rather too early to discuss that aspect of the question. At the present time there is an annual deficit of £28,200. To cover this the water rate should be 1s. 3¾d. in the pound without taking the expenditure on the hills scheme into consideration. The difference between 1s. 3¾d. and 2s. in the pound represents the annual expenditure on the hills scheme up to the year after the completion of the Wongong reservoir. The increased rate will carry with it an increased amount of water, and does not increase the rate per thousand gallons. As the higher rate is paid each householder will be entitled to an increased quantity of water.

Hon. G. Taylor: In the same proportion as we are getting it now?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, at that rate. Those who are paying any appreciable amount for excess water will be relieved to a considerable extent. No actual increase in the rate can be imposed except by the Minister, who prior to the commencement of each year will naturally review the position. This Bill does not actually impose the tax. It simply gives the Minister power to impose it. That is done by regulation. The regulation will subsequently have to be laid on the Table of the House, and will then be open for challenge as occurred on a previous occasion when the Leader of the Opposition was in charge of the Treasury bench.

Hon. G. Taylor: It will operate from the time when it is presented.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. The passing of the Bill does not mean that the rate is to be increased then. I say frankly and candidly the Government intend that it shall operate from the 1st July of next year.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Bill makes provision for that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. The Bill does not fix any date, but I am stating what the intention of the Government is.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You cannot have water without paying for it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Everything else has gone up, but the price of

water has remained the same. I find that amongst the 24 local authorities, within the metropolitan area served by this water supply, values have gone up considerably, and rates have also substantially increased.

Hon. G. Taylor: The municipal rates have gone up.

The Minister for Lands: The Fremantle rate has gone up considerably.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. It used to be 6d., but after the amalgamation the same charge as for Perth was imposed although practically the same water, that drawn from the prison, was used. From the year ended 30th June, 1914, to June 30th, 1924, the following increases in rates have been made by the local authorities who come within the area supplied from the metropolitan water supply scheme. Claremont municipality has increased its rate by 7½d., Cottesloe by 1s. 0½d., Fremantle by 6d., East Fremantle by 2½d., North Fremantle by 6d., Guildford by 3½d., Perth by 6d., Midland Junction by 7d., and Subiaco by 10¾d. I now come to road boards. Bassendean has increased its rate by 4½d., Bayswater by 7¼d., Belmont by 2d., Claremont from 5d. to 6¼d., Cottesloe Beach by 2.65d., Melville from 2d. to 5d., Peppermint Grove by 1¾d., Perth from 3¼d. to 9¼d., Swan from 1½d. to 2½d., Armadale-Kelmscott by 1.6d., Fremantle by 3¾d., Gosnells by 2½d., and Greenmount by 1½d. Notwithstanding these increases the water rate has remained the same.

Hon. G. Taylor: The municipal rates in Perth have gone up considerably during the last few years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is rather unfair to compare the prices charged in Perth with cities in the Eastern States. The schemes there have been carried out with cheap money. In the case of Melbourne the supply is handy to the city, but in Perth we have had to go a long way to tap the source of supply. It is not reasonable to ask that the Perth scheme should be compared with the city supplies in the Eastern States. The bases of supply are not similar. Unless the Bill is consented to, giving the Government power to increase the water rate, other devices will have to be resorted to. One of these may be to increase the charges for water allowed against the rates and for excess water, which would be most unfair. The other would be to allow the deficit to pile up and the cost to

be borne by the people as a whole, not merely those in the metropolitan area.

Hon. G. Taylor: The metropolitan area ought to bear its own costs.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The second alternative would also be unfair. The proper thing to do is to have the scheme financed by the people who are benefitting from it. The arrangements are well in hand for giving the metropolitan area a good and clean water supply, and this will have to be paid for. In the case of sewerage there is also substantial need for increasing the rating power. Since 1911-12 there has been a succession of deficits. In 1911-12 the deficit was £261; in 1912-13 it was £17,042; in 1913-14 it was £13,523; in 1914-15 it was £7,870; in 1915-16 it was £10,419; in 1916-17 it was £8,901. Up to this particular year the rate had been 10d. and was then increased to 1s., but this did not wipe out the deficit, which continued. In 1917-18 the deficit was £7,711; in 1918-19 it was £8,751; in 1919-20 it was £5,535; when the rate was again increased from 1s. to 1s. 1d. In 1920-21 the deficit was £9,227; in 1921-22 it was £3,448, and in 1922-23 it was £1,543, making up a total accrued deficit of £94,231 to the 30th June, 1923. In 1923-24 there was a surplus of £3,255, and in 1924-25 there was a surplus of £6,702. It is anticipated, owing to building developments and increased valuations in sewered areas, that surpluses will accrue each year on the existing sewerage system. The trouble is in connection with the sewerage at Subiaco, which will show a substantial loss. The figures indicate that on that scheme there will be an annual deficit of £14,175.

Mr. North: Will that be shared by the whole area?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The proposal is to treat Subiaco as part of the whole. It would be most unfair to map out different districts. Part of Subiaco is difficult to sewer. Because in that portion of the metropolitan area, the cost of providing the sewerage is heavy, the area might object to bearing the whole of the expense; but, in the event of an epidemic breaking out it might easily affect the whole of the metropolitan area. I do not think we can talk about separating the district. It must be treated as one scheme.

Hon. G. Taylor: Does the Minister propose to carry on the scheme towards Hawthorn and Leederville, along Oxford-street?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are making arrangements for certain extensions this year.

Hon. G. Taylor: I mean Oxford-street going north from Newcastle-street?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Within the last few weeks there has been a notice in the *Gazette* showing that it is proposed to extend the sewerage system. The preliminaries have already been carried out. I cannot say whether the district mentioned by the hon. member will be affected. With the anticipated deficit on the Subiaco portions of the scheme, and the accrued deficit to which I have referred, it means that something must be done to meet the situation. The estimated expenditure on Subiaco is as follows:— It is estimated that it will cost £270,000 to complete the scheme. The expenditure to the 30th June last was £56,000. We are, therefore, in for heavy expenditure there.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is that £270,000 for the whole municipality?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. The interest on the sewerage and storm water sections has all been capitalised, and the total amount so capitalised up to June last was £12,315. We had to stop the storm water drainage in Subiaco. It was commenced when we took office. We are going on with the completion of the main outlet to the sea and from the filter bed out to the ocean, the channel has been made to take both sewerage and storm water. The drainage of Shenton Park and Jolimont has been stopped on account of the enormous cost of the work. As a matter of fact, we could buy Jolimont cheaper than we could drain the area?

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. Taylor: I should think so, to.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That work has been stopped altogether. If Subiaco were left to pay the charges for the storm water drainage I refer to, it would mean that the residents of that district would have to pay a rate of 6s. in the pound. That rate would be altogether unreasonable. It was because the cost was so high that we decided to stop those operations.

Hon. G. Taylor: Was much money spent on the work?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, practically the only expenditure was on the outfall from the septic tank half way, between there and the ocean. Instead of making two jobs regarding the storm water and the sewerage, we have made one job of it

so as to complete the whole thing. But the tapping of Jolimont and Shenton Park has not been touched. In the future when that work is undertaken, the outfall will not be duplicated because the one expenditure will have served the two. It meant making the tunnel a little larger and we incurred the slightly additional expenditure with an eye to the future.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No unnecessary expenditure has been incurred?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, there was no expenditure on work that will not be useful in the future.

Mr. North: Are the tanks big enough to treat the Perth sewage in due course?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, that is a different scheme altogether.

Mr. North: It was suggested that the whole of it should be transferred from Perth.

The Premier: That would require a big pumping scheme.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member is referring to another scheme which was to do away with the Burswood filter beds and to pump the sewage to the North Beach, not through the Subiaco outfall. Since 1913-14 the number of houses connected to sewers has increased by 152 per cent. and the mileage of main sewers laid has increased by 51 per cent. The increase in the wages bill has been from £4,436 in 1913-14 to £10,594 in 1924-25. This means an increase of practically 138 per cent. This increase has been due to the much bigger staff employed to-day in view of the extensions and, of course, the increase in wages has also accounted for it to some extent. Since the sewerage scheme was inaugurated in 1912, the length of sewers laid has increased from 53.25 miles in 1912 to 136.85 miles to-day. The number of houses sewered in 1912 was 1,227 and to-day they number 15,678. The population served in 1912 was 5,030, while to-day the population served totals 75,000. The quantity of sewage treated in Perth in 1912 was 133,646,000 gallons and in 1925 the quantity treated has risen to 618,831,000 gallons, while in Fremantle the quantity treated in 1912, namely, 19,100,000 gallons, has increased until to-day 179,772,000 gallons are treated. The present Act provides for a maximum storm water and sewerage rate of 1s. 6d. in the pound with a minimum rate of 10s. We are allowing the minimum to remain as it is and are asking for an increase in the sewerage rate to 1s. 6d. in the pound, the

storm water business to be treated separately altogether. The actual sewerage rate at present levied is 1s. 1d. in the pound, which leaves 5d. in the pound as a storm water rate. It is proposed to leave that storm water rate as at present. It will be seen that the main reason for asking for increasing powers regarding sewerage is on account of the deficit incurred over past year and the annual deficit of £14,000 that the Subiaco scheme will represent. Under this scheme it is proposed to wipe out the deficit over the period of five years, by levying the rate of 1s. 6d. in the pound. I have covered the main points in the Bill. The storm water rate will continue as at present, but I am hopeful that we may be able to review the position in a year, and in all probability we may be able to make some reduction under that heading. It must be remembered that heavy outlays are still necessary. The local authorities are pressing for work in connection with the Claisebrook drain. That will involve a heavy outlay without any additional income. We have made substantial progress with the hills water scheme. We have appointed an engineer from South Australia as resident engineer in charge and everything seems to be going on well. I have no doubt that by the end of this year we shall be bringing to the city water from three of the streams, taking practically the whole of it. Until the reservoirs are completed, however, it cannot be said that the city will be assured of full supplies, and some slight restrictions may be necessary. I do not anticipate that they will be at all serious, if they are necessary at all, from now onwards. With anything like decent luck, however, we shall be able to get through without any restrictions of any kind. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell debate adjourned.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH.

Returned from the Council with an amendment.

BILL—LABOUR EXCHANGES.

In Committee.

Resumed from 1st October; Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported consideration was being given to Clause 9 relating to private unemployment brokers.

Mr. DAVY: Although I am in favour of the first proposal embodied in the Bill which sought to establish labour exchanges and to provide the necessary machinery to enable them to be carried on, I can see no good reason why people who have been engaged in the business of employment brokers should be prohibited from continuing as such. Any abuse of the existing system could easily be overcome by amending the existing Employment Brokers Act. Attacks upon private employment brokers were made in France as far back as 1870, when the arguments used against them were the same as they are to-day. The Minister said it was immoral that a person applying for work should have to pay for his job. Without discussing the morality of the position, that difficulty can be overcome by an amendment to the Employment Brokers Act providing that any fee payable shall be paid by the employer only. At present the Act provides that the fees shall be paid equally by both employer and employee. The Minister stated that employers were not found paying those fees. There may be instances where the employers have not done so, but I can produce numerous instances to prove that they have paid. Any employer with common sense would recognise that it was worth paying £1 or £2 to get a suitable employee. That would wipe out the whole objection raised against private employment brokers. Even should the State establish labour exchanges, if private brokers are able to provide something that the State exchanges cannot, surely they should be permitted to continue in the interests of the community. The proposed abolition of private employment brokers is unnecessary and to do something that is unnecessary, at the same time depriving some people from continuing to earn their living, and restricting the liberties of private individuals, does not seem to be justified.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I would not object to the Minister improving the system of the Government Labour Bureau. If people do not wish to find employment through a private broker's agency, they will not go to those brokers. I do not know how much work private brokers get and I do not know why people patronise them seeing that the work is done gratis at the State bureau. Under the clause no one will be able to

secure a job if there is to be a reward for services rendered. Surely the Minister does not want to go so far. This will mean that pastoralists will not be able to employ their agents in the city to secure the services of shearers for them. I do not understand why the Government want a monopoly when they themselves do the work for nothing and the other people make a charge. I move an amendment—

That the following subclause be added:—
“Nothing in this section shall apply to any person who procures employment or provides labour for others or arranges contracts of service and does not make any charge to, or receive payment or reward from, the employee.”

The object is that people who can be better served by agents than by the State bureau and who are willing to pay for the service, shall have the right to do so. I have in mind shearing contracts which it will not be possible, under the Bill, to negotiate except at great inconvenience to the owners. We do not want that, and unless we can insert the subclause I have submitted, the Pastoralists' Association will not be able to do what has been done in the past.

Mr. STUBBS: This clause is the crux of the Bill. If any member purchased a business how would he like to find legislation of this kind being introduced to wipe him completely out of existence?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the clause and not speak generally to the Bill.

Mr. STUBBS: I am in favour of the amendment and I am against the whole clause.

Mr. ANGELO: I support the amendment; at the same time I ask the Minister whether paragraph (b) does not meet the position. It reads—

No person shall hereafter—for or with a view to reward—procure or seek to procure employment or provide labour for another or arrange or attempt to arrange any contract or service.

Does that not cover the position set out by the Leader of the Opposition? If it does not, I shall do all I can to have the amendment carried. The clause has an extremely wide application; shearing contractors would have to engage their men and others through the State Labour Bureau. Many shearers are now engaged in various parts of the country and it would be almost impossible to keep track of these men and engage them at the short notice that would be given to the

bureau. We all know that the pastoralists' bureau is a domestic institution created by the pastoralists to enable them to engage their shearers and shed hands to the best advantage. Therefore any dislocation of the present conditions would react not only on the pastoral industry but on the pastoralists themselves and also on the employees. The chief concern of the Minister seems to be that the employees are asked to pay a fee for engagement. The employee does not pay anything at all; he is engaged free for a fee. The bureau is maintained by the pastoralists.

The Minister for Railways: And is used to victimise unionists.

Mr. ANGELO: The Minister is not right in that statement. There may have been a very small percentage of non-union men engaged there, but it would be very small. The institution has been in existence for some years and has given absolute satisfaction, not only to the employers but to the employees. The Minister has already made an exemption in the case of seamen, and could well make one in the case of shearers, who represent a far larger number than the seamen engaged here.

Mr. THOMSON: I have no objection to giving the Government statutory authority to find employment for people throughout the State, but I strongly object to the elimination of employment brokers, for which the Minister has put up no case. As regards the abuses he mentioned, I shall be quite in accord with any effort to prevent them. I agree also that a man looking for work should not have to pay a fee in order to secure it. Let the State function in this respect, but let the private employment brokers continue. In the case of unions, I understand, members are taken in rotation.

The CHAIRMAN: That aspect has nothing to do with the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON: I fail to see how the amendment can take effect. The member for Northam quoted the Pastoralists' Association. Similarly I might quote a farmer writing to the Primary Producers' Association a request that they should engage a farm worker for him. If the association did so, they would be liable to a fine of £50 for attempting to arrange a contract. If over-charges have been made, the Government have been lax, since the fees of employment agencies have to be submitted for approval.

The Minister for Works: There is no limit under the Act.

Mr. THOMSON: Then why does the Act provide that the scale must be submitted to the Government and displayed in the office?

The Minister for Works: An employment broker can display any scale of fees he likes.

Mr. Davy: The Minister has no control.

Mr. THOMSON: The Minister can get control by amending the Act so that he will be able to prescribe the fees to be charged. The Act could also be so amended as to provide that no fee shall be paid by an employee, and that only the employer shall pay a fee. This clause is drastic to the point of absurdity.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I understand that the amendment is under discussion and not the clause. The fears of the member for Katanning are groundless. If the amendment were carried, it would be the easiest thing in the world to defeat the whole intention of the Act. If the clause were amended as proposed, it could not possibly be administered. Under the clause as it now stands, there is nothing to prevent anyone from engaging workers for someone else so long as he is not in the business of an employment broker and is not engaging workers for fee or reward. If someone wrote to me from the country saying, "Please engage a man for me," I would not charge him a fee for doing it.

Mr. Sampson: If the business were carried on without fee or reward, there would be no objection.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In that case the employment agency would not come under this Bill. That is a weakness with which I am still unable to cope. There is nothing to stop pastoralists from employing men from shed to shed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think there is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause as it stands will not affect the arranging of engagements for those men. The arranging would be done by the secretary of the Pastoralists' Association, or perhaps by the secretary of the Westralian Farmers Ltd., and these secretaries would have as much right to do it as anyone else.

Hon. G. Taylor: It might be argued that it is part of the duty for which the secretary is paid.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That would be stretching the thing. Under the Bill people would not be able to run labour bureaux for fees. The labour bureau run by

the Pastoralists' Association is part of the organisation. Through the Pastoralists' Association pastoralists can engage men as they like and arrange sheds ahead. The Pastoralists' Association would not be in the business for gain or reward, and therefore the clause would not interfere in any way with what the pastoralists want to do.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amendment is quite unnecessary. Everything required is provided for in the clause. So long as he is not carrying on a business of this nature or engaging people for reward, any man can oblige another. As for the shearers, I understand that a contractor employs a number of men, takes quite a string of contracts and, with his team, goes around the stations. The clause will not interfere with that arrangement, nor will it interfere with agents acting for their bona fide clients in country districts or legitimately engaging men for others, so long as it is not done for a reward.

Mr. Teesdale: There must be no payment of any sort?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. Still there is nothing to stop agents of pastoralists from securing men for the pastoral districts, any more than there is to prevent a union secretary from engaging a man and sending him out to some employer who requires his services. The secretary of the A.W.U. sends out hundreds of men in that way.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Under the Bill he will be penalised for doing it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. He is not in business at all. The Crown Law have assured me on this point.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the Minister walks along the street he will see here and there a sign, "I communicate with Hobart." That is the same thing. Those agents do it for fee or reward. If the Bill pass, it will be an offence to act as an employment broker; so, notwithstanding what the Minister has said, it will be an offence for an agent to secure a man for, say, a farmer up country. I know union secretaries who send a good many men to the country in the course of their ordinary duties performed for their salaries. Under the Bill all such salaried officials and agents will be prevented from engaging men for others.

The Minister for Works: It would not be done for a direct payment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, but it would be done for an indirect payment. If we are to have such a Bill, it should be a reasonable measure. It does not matter how a man gets his work, so long as he gets it. We ought to open every avenue for securing employment. I cannot understand why the Minister should resist the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand that in bringing down the Bill the Minister has been influenced by the Geneva Conference.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us keep to the amendment. We are not discussing the whole Bill.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	19

Majority against .. 1

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
Sir James Mitchell	(Teller.)
Mr. North	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munro
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Pantin
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hughes	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Millington
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYES	NO
Mr. Denton	Mr. Corboy

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I wish to refer to the chart illustrating the action taken by the various countries on the decisions of the Geneva conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot refer to the Geneva conference.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand that the Minister, in framing this measure, was influenced by that chart. Unemployment is mentioned, and the only countries that have approved—

The CHAIRMAN: That was a matter for general discussion. The hon. member must discuss the clause.

Mr. SAMPSON: The clause is largely based on the decision of the conference.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in referring to the conference.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand that only three countries has approved of the suggestion made to cope with unemployment—France, Hungary and the Irish Free State.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must discuss the clause and not what is done in other countries.

Mr. SAMPSON: I wish to obtain further information. I consider it has not been established that employment measures have been introduced in other countries as a result of the conference decision.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. TEESDALE: I was pleased to hear the clear and straightforward statement by the Minister that this clause will not interfere with financial institutions or with the Pastoralists' Association in securing shearers or station employees. The clause contains the words "with a view to reward." If an institution secures half a dozen shearers, no charge is made, not even for the stamp on the letter of advice.

Mr. THOMSON: Clause 7 provides a penalty of £20 for fraud or artifice, but under this clause a penalty of £50 is provided, and ignorance or inadvertence is not stated as a ground of defence.

The CHAIRMAN: We have already considered a later portion of the clause and the hon. member cannot now go back to the penalty paragraph.

Mr. THOMSON: Then I shall vote against the clause.

Mr. ANGELO: Presumably the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition was considered to be too general. The Minister has told us that the Pastoralists' Association or other institution will be exempted so long as no charge is made. Ministers, however, come and go, and there should be no objection to having the exemption stated in the Bill. I move an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause (2):—"or apply to the engagement or employment of or procuring the employment of shearers or other persons employed in the pastoral industry if no charge is made to or payment or reward acquired from the employee."

Mr. Thomson: Make it read, "pastoral or agricultural industries."

Mr. ANGELO: Very well.

Mr. Panton: Would it not be better to provide that the present Minister for Works shall not be removed from office?

Mr. ANGELO: Certainly not. The pastoralists' bureau has done good work by assisting the industry to operate smoothly, and no remuneration has been asked from employees.

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

Ayes 20

Noes 22

Majority against .. 2

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. James Mitchell
Mr. Barnard	Mr. North
Mr. Brown	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Davy	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Maley	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Mann	Mr. Richardson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Heron	Mr. Troy
Miss Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Millington
	(Teller.)

PAIR

AYE	NO
Mr. Denton	Mr. Corboy

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister is acting very unwisely. He is indulging in a piece of ruthlessness that will blot out a few people who are doing no harm. I shall vote against the clause.

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

Ayes 22

Noes 20

Majority for .. 2

AYES.	
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Cbesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heron	Mr. A. Wan-brough
Miss Holman	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Withers
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Kennedy	(Teller.)
Mr. Lamond	

NOES.	
Mr. Angelo	Mr. North
Mr. Barnard	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Davy	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Maley	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)
Sir James Mitchell	

PAIR	
AYE	No
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Denton

Clause thus passed.

Clause 10—Proportional parts of license fees to be returned to employment brokers.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister proposes to wipe out these unfortunate women who run this type of business.

The Minister for Works: Cut it out!

Mr. DAVY: I will not cut it out. He proposes to return them part of their license fees.

The Minister for Lands: Keep your temper.

Mr. DAVY: I never lose it. This is a ruthless piece of conduct. I propose to move an amendment that will give these people some compensation, just as it is given to holders of wine licenses or publicans' general licenses in a similar case. I can see no difference between the license of a person who follows the business of an employment broker, and that of a person who is selling alcoholic liquor. Each has a license from year to year, and each has a right to a renewal subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions. If anything the preference is in favour of the person who is an employment broker. The offences for which the renewal of a license may be refused in her case are carefully defined in the Act. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (1) the following words be added:—"and shall pay compensation to every holder of such license, such compensation

to be calculated on the basis of a two years' purchase of the average net profits derived by such holder from his business as an employment broker. In the event of any dispute arising as to the amount of compensation which is to be paid, the same shall be decided by arbitration under the Arbitration Act, 1895."

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the amendment out of order, as it imposes a burden upon the people.

Mr. Sampson: But a Message has already come down.

The CHAIRMAN: A private member cannot move an amendment imposing a burden upon the people.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister says he intended to provide for at least one year's notice in this case.

The Minister for Works: I do not propose to put that into the Bill, but will give that undertaking.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is usual to have these things printed in the Bill. I do not know that the Minister will have power to postpone the closure of these places for 12 months if this Bill is passed.

The Minister for Works: I do not propose to proclaim the Act for 12 months.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister should amend this clause in order to give effect to his undertaking. He should also extend the notice to two years. Why should we spend time in discussing the Bill if it is not to be proclaimed for 12 months?

The Minister for Lands: That is time compensation.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am afraid we shall not achieve much good for anyone.

Mr. DAVY: I invite the Minister to move my amendment. It would be the proper thing for him to do. He cannot produce a precedent for depriving people by law of their means of livelihood without giving proper compensation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When I gave the undertaking that these people would receive 12 months' notice I thought that was accepted by members opposite as a fair thing. Employment brokers have not any vested right in that business.

Mr. Davy: They have. If the bench refuse a license except on approved grounds, they are going outside their authority.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is any amount of scope under the Act for the bench to refuse licenses. This has been

done repeatedly in the interests of the public. Had the decisions been faulty they would have been challenged long ago. It is ridiculous to compare an employment broker with the business of a licensed victualler. These brokers have only an office, a table and a chair, and possibly a bench outside, and still they are to be given 12 months' notice.

Mr. Mann: Sometimes they purchase a business.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have no right to do so, because no goodwill goes with it.

Mr. Davy: Why not?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no guarantee that the bench will agree to the transfer of the license.

Mr. Davy: With all due respect, there is.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: With all due respect to the hon. member, there is not.

Mr. Davy: I challenge you to get an opinion from the Crown Law Department on the point.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have done it and that is what counts, irrespective of what opinions there may be.

Mr. Davy: If it has been done, the bench has been wrong, for there is no power to do it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The decisions of the court would have been challenged if they had been wrong. It has been done ever since the court has been dealing with brokers' licenses.

Mr. Davy: Members can read the Act and see for themselves that there is no power at all, as you suggest.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no comparison between the position of a licensed victualler and an employment broker. The former has to incur great expenditure in connection with his premises, while the latter requires only a table and a couple of chairs. I do not wish to inflict any hardship upon those concerned, and in agreeing to give the employment brokers 12 months' notice, the Government are going as far as they could be expected to go. The proviso to Section 8 of the Employment Brokers Act, 1909, shows that a licensee shall be entitled to the renewal of his license "provided such license has not been allowed to expire or has not become void or liable to be forfeited from any cause whatever."

Mr. Thomson: What about Section 9?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Have you wiped out any employment brokers?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. Mann: "Any cause whatever" means any legal cause prescribed in the Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I will not be taught my business by the member for Perth.

Mr. Mann: I have been in touch with courts for many years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: And I have sat on the bench for over a decade and if the decisions of the court have been wrong, they would have been challenged by lawyers before now.

Mr. Mann: I can remember only one broker's license being refused.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know of more than one. However, I cannot accept the amendment. The Government have gone as far as they should be expected to go in giving 12 months' notice.

Mr. DAVY: The Minister has not gone as far as he should reasonably be expected to go. There is no difference between the license of a licensed victualler and that of an employment broker when it comes to a question of renewal so as to permit business to be carried on. It is true that the employment broker does not require much plant in order to conduct his business, as is necessary with the licensed victualler, but that does not affect the point that a goodwill is established in connection with the broker's business. Whatever the experience of the Minister may have been on the bench, Sections 8 and 9 of the Employment Brokers Act, 1909, represent the clearest possible Parliamentary drafting. Those sections mean that an employment broker is entitled to have his license renewed unless certain things can be proved against him, and those things are set out clearly in Section 9 as being "fraud, imposition, extortion, the conduct of the business for immoral purposes, or non-observance of the Act."

The Minister for Works: There are other causes.

Mr. DAVY: There are not. The Minister cannot point to any others. I cannot understand the attitude of the Minister. If it is deemed necessary to prohibit certain businesses in the interests of the public, it is only just that the public should pay adequate compensation to those who are deprived of the opportunity to carry on business.

Mr. THOMSON: I realised that the amendment of the member for West Perth would be ruled out of order as it is not within the province of a private member to propose the

imposition of a tax upon the people. I regret that the Minister could not accept the amendment and embody it in the Bill. What is the compensation that the Government propose to pay to the employment brokers whose businesses are to be stopped? It is the "part of the licensing fee proportional to the unexpired term of the license." Those fees are set out in the parent Act as £1 on application for a license, and £5 on the issuing or annual renewal of a license! That shows what a gross injustice is to be done to a small section of the community. There are only 13 registry offices in the city and we know that the people in the country have full confidence in some of those with whom they have been accustomed to do business. Yet that is all the compensation they are to get!

Mr. Richardson: It will break the Government. There will be a big deficit next year.

Mr. THOMSON: These people are entitled to adequate compensation.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have been greatly amused by the previous speaker's heroics in respect of what was done by this side of the House. He declared "We are here to protect the minority." Let us throw our memories back a little while to the time when there was a discussion in this Chamber regarding the wheat buyers of Australia who had given their services for the purpose of forming a wheat pool. Were they not given an undertaking, after the cessation of the pool, that their businesses would continue as before? Then, do we not know what happened? Now the hon. member makes an appeal on behalf of half a dozen licensed brokers. Did the hon. member advocate protection for the minority after the termination of the wheat pool, the minority that were thrown out of business by the vote of members now sitting opposite? I have no doubt that at the present time some of the brokers will be affected.

Mr. Latham: All will be effected.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Some of them ought to be put out. Let me tell members opposite that the majority must be protected at all times with the minority. We know from past experience that some of the people who have been conducting the agencies have not dealt fairly with their clients. I have known instances of young lads having been sent to the country only to find that there was no job for them, and then having to tramp back to Perth.

Mr. Latham: That may have been an accident.

Mr. Thomson: That has happened also at the State Bureau.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If it did it must have been because wrong information had been supplied to the department.

Mr. Thomson: I would be sorry to think that any employment broker would deliberately do that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It has been done. We should ask whether this legislation is or is not good for the community. It is our place to consider whether half a dozen should be compensated; what we have to consider is whether the proposed legislation is good for the community.

Mr. Thomson: Have you not entered into an undertaking to do justice to all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Of course, but not to protect any person who is carrying on a business that is proving detrimental to the majority. The hon. member's attitude to-night is due to his change of seat in this Chamber.

Mr. LATHAM: It seems to me that the Minister is taking upon himself the purchase on behalf of the State of the various Labour bureaus. At least those people have the right to compensation for loss of business. A person may three months ago have paid a considerable sum of money to go into one of those concerns, and yet within a short period, he receives notice to quit. He has no goodwill to sell. I have no doubt that as many mistakes have occurred in the State Bureau as have been attributed to the private bureaus.

The Minister for Works: If they were not mistakes they were deliberate acts.

Mr. LATHAM: I know of people who have applied to the State Bureau and waited a month without getting an employee. Then on informing the bureau that the man was no longer required, they were told that someone had been sent. I sympathise with the Minister to a certain extent, because I believe the introduction of the Bill is the result of an instruction from the conference held in Beaufort-street.

The Premier: You have often acted under instructions from your conference.

Mr. LATHAM: At any rate I have never brought in a Bill.

The Premier: No, because you have never been in a position to do so; all the same you have had instructions from your conference.

Mr. LATHAM: My sympathy goes out to the Minister for Works in having to present

this kind of legislation. Perhaps the Minister does not believe it it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are getting away from the clause.

The Premier: I know your conference carried many resolutions and instructed you to give effect to them, and sometimes you have been pretty hard pushed in respect of your conscience.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister might now be fair to the bureau keepers whose business he is taking away.

The Premier: He can give them what you gave the wheat buyers.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister should give these people compensation. They should receive at least £600 each.

The Premier: £600!

Hon. S. W. Munsie: They must have wonderfully good businesses if you think they are entitled to £600.

Mr. Davy: According to the Minister some of them are making £3,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion is entirely out of order. There is nothing in the clause relating to compensation.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	19

Majority for 2

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Heron
Miss Holman
Mr. Hughes
Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lamond

Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Munste
Mr. Pantou
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Maley
Mr. Mann

Sir James Mitchell
Mr. North
Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Teedale
Mr. Thomson
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Richardson
(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYE.
Mr. Corboy

NO.
Mr. Denton

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11—Returns by employers:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope the Minister will agree to the deletion of this clause. I hardly know what its object can be. We know that agriculture has a slack season, and that work on the Fremantle wharves fluctuates. The Minister knows those things without having returns and record furnished by the employers. I do not know why an employer should be obliged to send in that kind of information. People ought not to be troubled unnecessarily, and the proposed return would not serve any purpose. Under the clause, a man employing a boy of 16 might be required to send in a return.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause was inserted in order to empower the Minister to collect information and extract from it particulars which might get over the annual difficulty of a vast army of unemployed in the city and men still coming in from the country while workers are wanted there. Frequently there is an actual shortage of workers in the country while appeals are being made to the Government for charitable relief to the unemployed in the city. The desire underlying this clause is to arrive at a scientific basis for drafting unemployed from centre to centre so as to meet periods of depression in particular classes of work. From the list of employees during the various months of the year, the Government would recognise the fluctuations, and thus would be enabled to organise forces for overcoming the unfortunate annual position where the country cannot get workers and the city is over-supplied with them. I am not particularly keen on the clause, however.

Mr. Latham: It would not have the effect you desire.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the statistics are really found to be necessary after the State labour exchanges have gone into proper working order, the information could be obtained through the Statistical Department under other Acts. For instance, every factory owner has now to send in these figures. There is no extra work under this clause so far as factory owners are concerned. I may say that the clause has been toned down from its original form, which was of rather an inquisitorial nature. However, it is inhuman that we should allow an annual recurrence of an unemployed difficulty extending over two or three months. Still, as I say, the information if required can be obtained through other sources.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 12—Regulations:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Is it not customary to provide that these regulations shall be laid before Parliament?

The Minister for Lands: That is provided for in the Interpretation Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 2—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—PRIMARY PRODUCTS MARKET- ING.

In Committee.

Resumed from 29th September; Mr. Pantoun in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 7 dealing with the exclusive rights of the board was under consideration when progress was reported.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Sub-clause 2 sets out that no person shall sell or deliver any of the "product" to or buy or receive any of the "commodity" from any person other than the board. Why the use of the word "commodity," instead of "product."

The Minister for Agriculture: They mean one and the same thing.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They need not by any means.

The Premier: Anyhow, it saves repetition and provides variation.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The sub-clause provides a penalty for this awful offence amounting to £500.

The Premier: There is no reference to imprisonment.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the offence justifies the imposition of a fine up to £500, the penalty should carry with it, as the Premier suggests, a term of imprisonment. It is a ridiculous penalty. I move an amendment—

That the word "hundred" be struck out.

The Premier: The I.A.B. will pay the fine.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Where would a small farmer get his fine, if he were convicted of selling a case of fruit to someone other than the board?

Mr. E. B. Johnston: It would be a case of I.A.B., or gaol!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would simply mean that the Government would have to pay the fine and the money would be transferred from one pocket to the other and the farmer would have to pay the interest.

The Minister for Lands: That would mean that the interest would be left on the books.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have not the slightest intention of agreeing to the amendment, because it would merely invite persons to break the law. In a pool, such as the wheat pool, dealing with millions of pounds, it would pay anyone to break the law and operate to the disadvantage of the pool, if £5 were the penalty provided in the Bill. In any case, £500 is merely the maximum fine and the court could impose any fine they considered necessary to meet the circumstances of a case.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause (4):—"The board shall exempt from the operation of this section sales of fresh and dried fruits and vegetables by the grower direct to the consumer."

This will remove any possible doubt as to the right of growers to sell either at their orchards, on the roadside, or at the kerbstone market, provided the sale is direct to the consumer, which is largely the reason for the Bill.

The Premier: This should meet with the approval of both of those who favour the Bill and those who are against it.

Miss HOLMAN: I will support the amendment for it will be a good thing for the small growers to sell direct to the consumer, particularly in the vicinity of sawmills, where there are a good many growers ready to deal direct with the consumers. Down in the Manjimup district an orchardist made arrangements with the mill people to sell them apples at 6s. a case. He kept to his contract although he found he could have got 15s. a case in Perth. The selling of those apples led to quite a brisk little trade in fresh vegetables as well, to the advantage both of the producer and the consumers. There is also the advantage of selling direct in the open markets and selling in the orchards, where fruit such as peaches and apricots can be picked fresh off the tree and the buyer can have it packed and transported. I will support the amendment.

Mr. ANGELO: I am in favour of the amendment. This class of business has developed considerably, to the joint advantage of consumer and producer. It means that the producer gets a good price for his commodity, while the consumer secures fresh fruit and vegetables at what, in his view, is a very reasonable price.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment is quite unnecessary, since subclause (4) provides that the board may, with the approval of the Minister, exempt any small growers.

Mr. Angelo: But there the board has the say.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment is inconsistent with the Bill. Either we have control by the board or we have not control. We cannot have it both ways. Whilst the member for Swan asks for control, he moves an amendment for decontrol.

The Premier: That is where he catches both those with the Bill and those opposed to it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Subclause (4) provides all that is required to meet the hon. member's wishes. The amendment would make it mandatory on the board to exempt all growers who were prepared to sell direct to the consumers. They could organise their sales to the consumers and so undercut the board.

The Premier: There would be no pool at all.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, and the control would be of no service to anybody. The amendment, if carried, will not secure the benefits the hon. member desires to confer upon the growers.

Mr. LAMBERT: This is a remarkable effort on the part of the member for Swan to face north, south, east and west.

The Premier: Well, you see, he is in a difficult position.

Mr. LAMBERT: He says the grower should be allowed to supply the consumer at the kerbstone markets. There is no evidence that if he takes his produce to the kerbstone market, it will be sold to the consumer. It may be sold to the retailer. I see no value in the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: When the producer sells direct to the consumer we secure what is desired by the Bill, namely the bringing together of producer and consumer.

The Minister for Lands: The Bill doesn't do that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Give us an illustration of dried fruit going from the grower to the consumer.

Mr. SAMPSON: In small quantities, it reaches the consumer direct in the open kerbstone market. My sole desire is that the growers shall be able to secure a living return from the industry. It should be mandatory on the board to exempt sales made direct by the grower to the consumer. There is in the Bill power to establish pools, but there is also power for the board to regulate the sale of products in other ways. We should make the measure of the utmost service to those for whom it has been brought down.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Let me point out to the hon. member the danger in his amendment. We have soldier settlers in the Swan district. Unfortunately some of their holdings have had to be forfeited. In consequence, last year the department had to sell the fruit from those orchards. The fruit, including grapes, was sold at a reasonable price, and the grapes were taken to market in Perth and sold at ridiculously low prices, ruining the season for other growers. I may say the man who sold those grapes in the market was able to dispose of them cheaply because he failed to pay the department for them. The amendment simply invites persons to sell produce at a reduced rate. That could happen under the proposed amendment. The member for Swan wants a compulsory pool, and now he suggests that growers who wish to retail their own produce should not be bound by a pool. What would be the use of a pool under such conditions?

Mr. Sampson: Where were those grapes sold?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To the shops and in the kerbstone markets.

Mr. Sampson: They were not sold direct to the consumer.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The clause provides that it may be done if the board approve.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, but the board will have an opportunity to judge what effect that would be likely to have upon the market at the time. If the amendment is inserted, each individual will be able to act upon his own without consulting the board, and thus nullify the value of a pool.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Swan evidently does not realise the seriousness of his amendment.

The Premier: It will destroy the whole Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. A large number of fruitgrowers did organise and decided upon a voluntary pool, but they were unable to achieve anything because a few growers started selling, as they contended, direct to consumers. That undermined the whole organisation.

The Premier: And prevented the voluntary pool from functioning.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so. A small minority absolutely defeated the aims of the majority.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I hope the amendment will not be pressed. There appears to be some confusion in the mind of the member for Swan. Control is the vital principle of the Bill, and it is impossible to have control and decontrol. It must be one or the other. If growers were given the right to sell outside, the whole purpose of the Bill would be undermined.

Mr. THOMSON: What will be the position of growers who, after many years of labour and at great expense, have built up a close connection between orchard and consumer? They will have to ask the board for permission to continue their existing business. The board might object, and while the result would be very nice from the point of view of growers who did not have such business, it would be very hard upon the men who had built up a connection. The amendment would be reasonable from the standpoint of such people.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But you, of course, are opposed to the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That Subclause (7) be struck out.

I do so because I cannot understand why the Minister proposes to exempt contracts or arrangements for sales of an interstate character. There are reasons why we should have an understanding with the other States. Maybe the subclause has been inserted for constitutional reasons. We have worked with the other States in regard to the pooling of products and this, like the amendment just defeated, will be an invitation for producers to trade outside the contracts made by the pool, and thus undermine the pool. Will the Minister explain the reason for the subclause?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: To interfere with trade between State and State would be a violation of the Federal Constitution. The subclause is inserted because of the experience gained in Queensland. There the middlemen got together and appealed against control by the committee of direction, and the decision of the court made the control valueless. Following that experience, we considered it necessary to show growers the risk they ran in making such contracts. If the provision be retained, growers will know just how far they can go.

Amendment put and negatived.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The member for Guildford the other night secured an amendment of the definition by inserting "Fresh fruitgrower means a person by whom fresh fruit is grown or produced for market from an area of not less than two acres." As the Bill does not make any reference to fresh fruit, the amendment will be inoperative. On recommitment I propose to have that amendment deleted, but in order to meet the point raised by the hon. member I move an amendment as follows:—

That a new subclause be added as follows:—"This section shall not apply to fresh fruit grown by any person who does not use for the purpose of fruit growing an area of more than two acres."

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It would be necessary to insert the words "for marketing."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is already provided for in the amendment of the member for Swan.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Unless the words are repeated, the subclause will not be as complete as the definition.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister would be well advised to accept the suggestion. A man may specialise in apricots or some other fruits, and would be a competitor against other orchardists.

The Minister for Agriculture: I cannot for the present see that the words are necessary.

Mr. THOMSON: From the apple-growing point of view the area is too small. Most of the orchardists in the Mt. Barker district have as much as 50 acres under trees. Men with only two acres would have as much say in the sale of their products as the man with 25 acres.

The Minister for Agriculture: Why not?

Mr. THOMSON: Why should they? These people are being compelled to come under the Act against their own free will.

The Premier: Do you distinguish for voting purposes between different areas that are under wheat?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Premier should not ask embarrassing questions.

Mr. THOMSON: The question is not embarrassing. It is absurd to suggest that a man with two acres of wheat should have as much say as a man with 250 acres.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing voting power under this clause.

Mr. THOMSON: A man with two acres of orchard is to be entitled to the same voting power as a man with 50 acres.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the clause.

Mr. THOMSON: I have received a telegram from Mt. Barker as follows:—

Growers of Mount Barker and Cranbrook districts, signatures obtained from 111 growers representing 2,500 acres of standing orchards oppose the Bill.

They maintain that two acres is too small an area. I move an amendment on the amendment—

That the following words be added:—"Except for apple and pear orchards which shall be five acres."

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The amendment of the Minister means that a grower with less than two acres need not deliver his fruit to the board, but everyone who grows fruit will have a vote for the election of members to the board. This amendment is only an exemption when it comes to the delivery of fruit.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: We would be inclined to accept the Minister's amendment if he would agree to add the words contained in the amendment of the member for Katanning.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot accept the amendment on the amendment. I am not keen on the two acres. If we exempted all acreages under five, it would lead to the swamping of the market.

Mr. Sampson: The position would be hopeless then.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment of the member for Katanning would not remedy the position of the growers in his district, because they would still come under the operations of the measure.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: These people would all have a vote in the election of members of the board and for the pool, but would not have to come into the pool if they held under two acres of orchard.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. They would not be registered, and the Bill would not apply to them.

Amendment on the amendment put and negatived.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister's amendment really means that all fruit-growers would determine by a vote that a pool should be established, and the men with two acres would vote. Then the men with two acres would vote for the election of the board, and after that they would escape putting their fruit into the pool.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The men with two acres would not be included in the register.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But we have included them.

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

Clauses 8, 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Board to accept product tendered when of prescribed quality and to pay growers out of proceeds of sale in proportion to quantities delivered; board's decision as to standard, etc., to be final:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (3), line 14, "year" be struck out, and "period" inserted in lieu.

The Opposition Leader rightly pointed out on the second reading that certain products must be sold on a far shorter period than one year in order that the producers may receive the actual result of the market price. Early grapes on some soils and by certain methods of cultivation are placed on the market possibly 14 days before the general crop, and thus bring an extra price. On the yearly basis the growers of those early grapes would lose that extra price, and there is no reason why they should do so. Wheat might be on a yearly basis, but some other products might be on a shorter basis, even a daily basis. The period should be determined by the board.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause (3): "This subsection shall not apply to fresh or dried fruits."

Subclause 3 places the responsibility on the board to pay to every grower the value of the product which has been received, stored,

or stacked ready for delivery to the board, and which thereafter through no fault of the grower has been damaged or destroyed. The provision is all right for certain products, but in the case of fresh or dried fruit it would be an impossible provision because the board could not go to every grower and inspect what he puts up. Suppose, for instance, fresh grapes were put in a petrol case and got damp; the contents would be damaged, but the board would be responsible because the grapes had been put up for market and had been under the control of the board. Therefore the provision is dangerous in the case of fresh and dried fruits.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot accept the amendment, and I hope it will not be pressed. If the board received the product under the control provided by the measure, then the board should accept the full responsibility. Otherwise the board could fail in their duty to the growers, and that ought not to be permitted. Once wheat is delivered at the siding, the responsibility of the grower ceases.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But the wheat is inspected there.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is one of the most satisfactory features of the pool. Here the board must take a similar responsibility.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Do you think it possible for the board to protect themselves against what would constitute fraud?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Every possible security is given to the board by the Bill. What position is the grower in after the commodity has passed out of his hands and he has complied with all the conditions? In such a case the interests of the grower, under the amendment, would not be sufficiently secured.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 11—Issue of certificates, etc.:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Why are the certificates to be non-transferable? I fail to see why they should not be transferable, especially if wheat is to come under the measure.

The Minister for Agriculture: The clause says they shall not be transferable except with the approval of the board.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What have the board to do with it?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We do not want gambling in the certificates. When the com-

pulsory wheat pool was first started, the certificates in this State were made non-transferable, but in the Eastern States certificates were transferable.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It has nothing to do with the board if the owner of a certificate cares to give it away. He certainly should have the right to sell. I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. In the early stages of wheat pooling the transfer of scrip was prohibited. It may not have been wholly due to that provision that we got through without difficulty whereas in other States where scrip was transferable all kinds of people got hold of it and in consequence some of the biggest scandals in the history of Australia occurred. We want the producer to control his products and to organise his marketing. We don't want commercial parasites coming into it at all. If the scrip is transferable we are bound to get all sorts of people coming in and interfering to the prejudice of the producer's interests.

Mr. THOMSON: I am amazed at the hon. member's argument. The Bill will compel men to put their products into a pool.

The Premier: No, they will compel themselves.

Mr. THOMSON: What about the minority who are opposed to the pool? They will be compelled to put their products into it, and will be compelled to take promissory notes, which are the certificates. Suppose such a producer, being hard up against it, takes his certificate to his merchant and asks him to accept it as payment. Under this it will not be allowed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Clause 13 covers it.

Mr. THOMSON: No, that is financing the board. We are dealing with certificates. It is wrong to compel a man to put his products into a pool and then refuse to allow him to negotiate his certificates. I hope the Minister will accept the amendment.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are a beautiful primary producers' representative! A commercial bug.

Mr. THOMSON: That is offensive. I ask that the hon. member withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must withdraw.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I withdraw.

Mr. THOMSON: The certificate is nothing more nor less than a promissory note, so I hope the Committee will support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I object to these continued references to compulsion. It is compulsion by choice of the growers themselves. No outside agency can exercise any influence whatever. The member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) would feel resentful if I said the trustees of the voluntary wheat pool were people drawn from outside the ranks of the growers. This proposed board will be elected by the growers themselves, and so will not act prejudicially to the interests of the growers. The object of the provision is to prevent undue speculation. The certificate may be transferred with the approval of the board, and since the board are the growers acting by direction of the growers, the growers can instruct themselves to transfer the certificates if they so desire.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What the producer first gets out of the pool is his certificate, and it should be for him to say whether he shall hold it or sell it. What has it to do with the board? The member for Guildford (Hon. W. D. Johnson) wants to stop speculation; but surely a man can do what he likes with his own! I am not quite certain that all the people who bought wheat scrip in the other States made money out of it. I hope the amendment will be carried.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The grower does not keep his certificate in his pocket until his product is sold. Clause 12 provides that the board may arrange to make advances to him on his products.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clauses 12 and 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Contracts of sale of products:

Mr. J. H. SMITH: I should like the Minister to explain whether it will be compulsory for the contract of sale to go through the board or whether it will be permitted for contracts to be made between agents and the growers. If the board takes control and exports against the agents, the position of the agents will be a pretty bad one.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the measure was applied to the apple industry the growers, before the season started, would have to take action by vote and

so there would be plenty of time for growers to refrain from making contracts.

Mr. J. H. Smith: A grower often sells his fruit three months ahead.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the growers decided to take advantage of the measure, they would know six months beforehand, because they would have to make the whole of their business arrangements months ahead. If a contract had been entered into 12 months previously and it was declared void under this provision, the money paid in respect of the transaction would be repaid by the board. That is all that can be done.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A contract made out of the State could not be rendered void. An English buyer would have an action against a local seller who did not supply. I do not see how contracts can be voided with safety. Contracts made in good faith should be kept and people should not have their contracts cancelled unnecessarily.

Mr. Griffiths: If contracts were cancelled, who would pay the damages?

Mr. Thomson: The growers themselves.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The growers take all the risks. Fruit sold to the Eastern States must go there, but it could be reshipped to England.

The Minister for Agriculture: We shall do what we can.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If a contract were rendered void, the man who sold to London could be compelled by the buyer to pay.

The Minister for Agriculture: You know that contracts are not made 12 months ahead.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Contracts are often made years ahead.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Not by producers, but by commercial gamblers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister knows all about it, so we can leave it at that. To cancel contracts solemnly made is a serious thing, and I shall be surprised if the Committee agree to it.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	15
				—
Majority for	6
				—

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Chesson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Heron
Mr. Hughes
Mr. W. D. Johnson
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Lamond

Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Munsie
Mr. Panton
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington
(Teller.)

NORHS.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Latham
Mr. Lindsay
Mr. Maley
Mr. Mann
Sir James Mitchell

Mr. North
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Thomson
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Richardson
(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.
Mr. Corboy

NO.
Mr. Denton

Clause thus passed.

Clause 15—Commissioner of Railways and other carriers to refuse to carry controlled products:

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is a most extraordinary clause. It is not necessary to impose any other conditions than those already contained in the Bill. It is not right to give the board power to request the Commissioner to refuse to carry goods that are the subject of the Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 16 to 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Interpretation of Sections 17, 18, 19 and 20:

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "sent to" be struck out, and "received by" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (2) the following words be added:—within 28 days of the date of the Order in Council declaring the controlled product."

The object of this amendment is to have some date when the notices of these encumbrances shall be put in. The board should know where it is before it starts.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The period of 28 days may not be long enough in some cases. I will go into the matter.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 22—Protection of Crown and its officers and boards against actions:

Mr. THOMSON: This is a most extraordinary provision.

Hon. G. Taylor: There must be some good reason for it.

Mr. THOMSON: The board can make the most horrible mistakes, which will lead to the total loss of products; they can be grossly negligent, and commit all kinds of faults, and yet be free from all responsibility or legal obligation.

The Premier: There may be some explanation that will satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. THOMSON: One can only take the clause as it is printed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The clause provides merely what it means. There is no reason why any person should have a claim against the Minister or the Crown by reason of this measure, since the Minister or the Crown will not be responsible for the administration or the control of the product. The board will be the growers themselves acting as a board and handling their own product. The position of a member of the board will not be worth £1,000 a year. The members will be doing the work for very little, as the wheat scheme trustees do their work. It would not be right if the members of the board, because of any act of theirs which resulted in loss, were held responsible, seeing that the growers are not compelled to enter into the pool, but willingly enter into it by their own votes. If the members of the board were not protected, men would not be found to take the positions.

Mr. Thomson: Will you agree to the deletion of paragraph (c)?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I will not agree to anything being struck out, because I am advised by the Crown Law Department that in the interests of the growers themselves the members of the board, while serving the interests of the community, should not be placed in a position which might be disastrous to their private affairs. If the member for Katanning did represent the growers—which of course he does not—and had a knowledge of the growers—which of course he has not—he would not endeavour to wipe out a protecting clause of this kind.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister relieves the Crown of responsibility for anything they may do, whether under the authority of this measure or not. I agree that the members of the board cannot take unlimited responsibility for a comparatively limited remuneration; but they can be expected to take the responsibility of doing their duty as members of the board. If they are careless about their duty, or wilfully negligent of it, they should not be relieved of responsibility. The growers will be entirely in the hands of the members of the board. I protest against the clause, and I am surprised that the Minister stands by it.

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) be struck out.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [10.58]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Thursday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th October, 1925.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	1202
Question: Gold Bonus	1202
Bills: Municipality of Fremantle, 1R.	1202
Forests Act Amendment, Report	1202
Entertainments Tax Assessment, 2R.	1202
Western Australian Bank Act Amendment, 1R.	1209
City of Perth, Assembly's Message	1210
Entertainments Tax, 2R.	1210
Narrogin Soldiers' Memorial Institute, 2R., Com. Report	1210
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 2R., Com. Report	1210
Water Boards Act Amendment, 2R.	1211
Jury Act Amendment, Com.	1212

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Supply Bill (No. 2) £1,232,000.

QUESTION—GOLD BONUS.

Hon. H. SEDDON (for Hon. E. H. Harris) asked the Chief Secretary: Having regard to the official statement made by the Acting Minister for Mines (Hon. J. W. Hickey) on the 30th April last, in which he stated that, "The Government have given consideration to the granting of a bonus on the gold produced in the State, but, owing to financial stringency are unable to carry it into effect," will the Government now demonstrate their sincerity by devoting the amount of £450,000—promised by the Prime Minister to assist Western Australia to overcome its disabilities—to the relief of the gold-mining industry in the form of a bonus, as endorsed by both Houses of the State Parliament during the present session?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: As the Prime Minister has never offered, nor have the State Government accepted, the sum of £450,000, it is premature to consider the disposal of that which, up to the present, is merely a pre-election announcement.

BILL—MUNICIPALITY OF FREMANTLE.

Introduced by the Hon. G. Potter and read a first time.

BILL—FORESTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ASSESSMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: The Commonwealth Government propose to abandon the entertainment tax on all admission charges up to 2s. 5½d. This Bill seeks to re-impose the tax in order to augment the amount now donated by the State Government in the form of subsidy to the various hospitals throughout Western Australia. Governments in late years have experienced great difficulty to find money to