

son but also an incorporated body may be brought under the provisions of the law. I ask the House to disallow the regulation, not to prevent the registration of an incorporated body, but to enable the Minister to amend the law to meet the case. I understand that the Minister has been in communication with certain lawyers on the matter and I hope to hear from him what the intentions of the Government are. There would be no point in disallowing the regulation and allowing the matter to rest there.

The Minister for Works: The Builders Registration Act was introduced as a private member's measure.

Mr. NORTH: Yes, but the question involved is a very important one. We have a statute which is preventing companies from building structures to a value of over £400. According to the Act only "persons" may build structures exceeding £400 in value. The reasons for disallowing the regulation might be largely extended, but I see no need to add anything further at this stage, beyond saying that we should not approve of a regulation that will not fully meet the case. Therefore I urge members to accept the motion.

(On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.)

House adjourned at 9.19 p.m

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 29th August, 1940.

	Page
Questions: Bags, State manufacture	503
Engineering trades and youth employment	503
Bulk handling, facilities in Albany zone	504
Bills: Growers' charge, 1s.	504
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2s.	504
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 2s.	505
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment (No. 1), 2s.	505
Reserves (Government Domain), 2s.	509

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

QUESTION—BAGS, STATE MANUFACTURE.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for the North-West: Is he able to give information concerning the difficulty of obtaining suitable bags for charcoal, grain and grain products, super and other commodities, referred to in a question submitted on Thursday, the 8th August, and the reply that inquiries would be made as to the establishment of jute weaving and bag making in the Fremantle Gaol?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied: No, inquiries are still proceeding.

QUESTION—ENGINEERING TRADES AND YOUTH EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Labour: In view of the heavy demand for men capable of carrying out engineering work, both for war purposes and the making of producer gas equipment, will he take steps to ensure that the position is brought before the Arbitration Court with the object of liberalising or removing the restrictions regarding the employment and instruction of lads at present unable to enter the engineering and allied trades?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR replied: I am not aware of the alleged heavy demand and would be obliged if the hon. member would supply me with details.

QUESTION—BULK HANDLING.*Facilities in Albany Zone.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Lands: What progress has been made toward the installation of bulk wheat facilities at sidings in the Albany zone?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: Co-operative Bulk Handling, Ltd. advise that installation has been commenced at six sidings, one of which has been finished, five being in various stages of completion. The work is proceeding satisfactorily and according to plan.

BILL—GROWERS CHARGE.

Introduced by Mr. Boyle and read a first time.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: The financial emergency tax has always been collected on the salaries or wages of taxpayers at the appropriate rate at the time when the salary or earnings were received. A man may earn £10 in one week, and he would be taxed upon that amount at the appropriate rate. Following that he might not for succeeding weeks earn anything at all, or earn only a little, but he still would have been taxed on the £10 he had earned before. In those circumstances a wage-earner who was engaged in irregular or intermittent employment, such as that of a lumper, well-sinker, shearer, and the like, might pay substantially more taxation than he would be liable for were he to pay the tax on the whole of his income for the year at the appropriate rate. The parent Act in Subsection (7) of Section 9 provides—

If it shall be made to appear to the Commissioner at or after the end of any financial year that any person has paid tax by means of deductions or otherwise, in respect of salary or wages earned during that year, a total sum exceeding the amount of tax which he would have been called upon to pay in respect of such salary or wages, if the same had been income, and financial emergency tax had been assessed thereon as provided by this Act, then

the Commissioner shall repay to such person the amount of the excess so paid by him as aforesaid.

When the financial emergency tax was first introduced, the tax for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1933, was imposed (a) in respect of salary and wages on the income paid between the 1st December, 1932, and the 30th June, 1933; and (b) in respect of income from other sources on seven-twelfths of the income of the year ended the 30th June, 1932. In each succeeding year the same principle has been applied, and the tax collected has been on the salary or wages for the current year and on other income for the previous year. When applications for credits under Section 9 (Subsection 7) of the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act in respect of wages or salary earned during the last financial year are dealt with, it is necessary to determine the amount of tax that would be paid if that salary or wages were income. But as the financial emergency tax ceased on the 30th June, the tax is not levied on income earned last year. Unless, therefore, Subsection (7) of Section 9 of the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act is amended, we shall not have the power to refund financial emergency tax collected last year on salary or wages paid at a rate higher than Parliament intended. The Bill contains the necessary amendment to clear up the position. It provides that for the purpose of calculating the refunds to be made to persons who have overpaid last year, the same rates shall apply as were levied last year. Not a large amount is involved, but it would be an injustice to some taxpayers if they had to pay at a higher rate than would be the case with others on the same total earnings. The Bill will remedy that position.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Will the Bill apply only to salaries and wages?

The PREMIER: Salaries and wages earned last year will be dealt with as heretofore and the appropriate rates charged. The Bill deals only with persons in intermittent employment such as shearers, lumpers, and others, who may earn £10 or £12 in one week and nothing at all for the ensuing three or four weeks. On £10 a man may have to pay at the rate of 9d. in the pound, whereas, if his income for the whole year is taken into consideration, the rate might be only 4d. in the pound. Provision

has always been made in the Act so that persons in intermittent employment who earn differing amounts of income from week to week, shall have their earnings lumped together and shall pay on the whole of their year's earnings at a rate that would be charged if the tax were levied on the income at the end of the year. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) will recall that he has frequently pressed me to introduce this tax very early in the financial year, so that for instance the lumpers, for whom he was particularly concerned, and some of whom have paid for the four or five busy months of the year taxation on weekly earnings of £7 or £8, whereas for the balance of the year they might have earned a couple of pounds or thirty shillings a week—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Their average weekly income would be much lower than £7 or £8.

The PREMIER: The tax on the lower earnings would be 4d. or 3d. in the pound, whereas for the rest of the year they had been paying 7d. or 8d. I do not know that more than a thousand pounds or so is involved; but men would consider themselves to be suffering severe injustice if they had to pay £2 or £3 more in taxation because of the intermittent nature of their employment than people earning higher yearly incomes. The Bill is quite simple.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not know about the clauses being simple.

The PREMIER: There is only one clause.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But it takes a bit of understanding.

The PREMIER: I have tried to make my explanation as clear as possible, and in view of the hon. member's knowledge of the principal Act we need have no fear but that the Bill will be passed. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—COAL MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This is a small Bill proposing two minor amendments in

the Coal Mines Regulation Act. The first two subsections of Section 67 of the principal Act, with which the Bill specifically deals, read as follows—

(1) The owner of every mine shall contribute to a fund for the necessary relief of miners who have been injured whilst working in coal mines in Western Australia, and for the relief of the families of miners who have been killed or of persons injured whilst so working, and for the purpose of such fund shall, in the months of January and July in every year, pay a sum equivalent to one half-penny per ton on the output of all coal sold from any mine during the preceding six months respectively, ending on the last day of the preceding month of December or June (as the case may be), into a trust account to be kept by a trust constituted pursuant to this section as hereinafter provided for.

(2) All employees (excepting boys) of every coal mine working in Western Australia shall each contribute to the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund one shilling per fortnight, and boys working in such mines shall each contribute sixpence per fortnight to the said fund, and boys in case of accident shall receive only half the benefits from the fund as compared with the adult employees, and the owner or manager of every such mine shall deduct fortnightly from the earnings of each of his employees such contributions, and pay the same to the trust to be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and shall be responsible to the said trust for compliance with the provisions of this section. The obligation to contribute to and the right to receive the benefits of the said fund shall extend to checkweighers appointed under Section thirteen and to persons appointed to inspect mines under Rule forty-nine in the Schedule to this Act, and the provisions of this sub-section shall apply to checkweighers and such persons accordingly. From moneys received from the owners and employees the said trust shall pay into the Aged and Infirm Coal Miners Superannuation Fund Trust, hereinafter specified, a sum equivalent to one-eighth of the moneys so collected.

Up to a few years ago the fund had accumulated considerable assets; but there has since been an alarming increase in the number of accidents, and the assets have dwindled to such an extent that on the present basis of contribution another six months will exhaust the fund. In 1936 the miners decided to increase their statutory payments by 50 per cent. The companies, however, have not been prepared to increase their contribution of one halfpenny per ton. Meanwhile the miners' additional contributions have been accumulating; and as they are actually illegal, they have been placed in a trust fund, which once totalled approximately £2,000. At the last audit

of the books, for the half year ended 31st December, 1939, it was found that the trust fund had been reduced to £196 18s. 6d. The miners have now requested that the Act be amended in order to legalise their increased payments. This means the amendment of Section 67 to provide payments of 1s. 6d. per fortnight for men and of 9d. for boys, and to legalise the payments already made. The coal mine owners will continue to pay the rate of one half-penny per ton.

Mr. Marshall: Why not compel the owners to pay more? Mine owners on the goldfields do so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not know that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Possibly increased output has increased the contributions of the coal mine owners.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The proposed amendment would place the fund on a much sounder financial basis. The rate of payment in cases of accident is 1s. 8d. per day. This is governed by regulation. In the event of the Bill becoming law, it is suggested that the rate should be increased to 2s. per day; but any higher payments of relief can be governed only by the funds in hand. I discussed this matter with a representative of the workers, and suggested to him that if there was an increase to 2s. there should also be a provision requiring the fund to be maintained at not less than £1,000. However, that can be done by regulation. The Bill is brought forward at the request of the contributors, and the Government therefore feels quite justified in introducing it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, debate adjourned.

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.50] in moving the second reading said: The Bill represents an attempt to amend the Inspection of Machinery Act and is along lines similar to the measure introduced last session. There is a difference in the present Bill in that it does not contain provisions regarding the

granting of certificates to engineers. That part of the Bill met with a rather disastrous fate in the Legislative Council last session, and in view of that fact and because the departmental view is that the provisions are not absolutely essential, those proposals do not find a place in the present Bill. Hon. members will recollect that the proposal involved a dispute between two industrial organisations regarding the issuing of certificates, and it was argued that the granting of such certificates to engineers would give them the right to drive engines without the necessary experience demanded of certificated engine drivers. As I say, the clauses relating to that matter have not been included in the present Bill which, as members will appreciate, provides for the inspection and regulation of boilers and other machinery.

In recent years remarkable strides have been made in electrical and other classes of machinery and not one word appears in the present Act affecting such developments. There have been changes in the use of machinery that were not foreseen when our principal legislation was enacted, and it has now become necessary to overhaul the Act generally in order to provide for various matters not now dealt with. We believe that, in view of the changed conditions, it is essential that proper control and adequate inspection of plant shall be provided for. Many of the installations are situated in places where they could easily become a menace to life. The present Act, for example, contains no provision for the control of refrigeration plants, apart from stipulating guards for belts, fly wheels and so on. As a matter of fact, there are a number of very big plants in various parts of the State that, as I have indicated, could easily become a menace to life and property should the refrigerant escape. I would remind members of an unfortunate accident which occurred at the Ayrshire Dairy a couple of years ago when two men were killed and another seriously injured as a result of an explosion. I do not suggest that if the plant had been inspected no accident would have occurred. On the other hand, had there been such an inspection there is the possibility that the accident might have been averted.

The Bill is essentially one that lends itself better to consideration in Committee. Although I do not intend to weary mem-

bers by going into technicalities, I shall outline briefly the effect of the main provisions and will deal with the various clauses seriatim. We propose to insert new definitions respecting "air receivers," "refrigerant," "refrigerating machinery," "ton of refrigeration" and "unit system." Many air receivers that are now exempt from inspection, constitute a source of danger and in Western Australia alone at least six of them have burst during recent years. In view of that number of explosions in such a comparatively brief period, members will agree that proper control and inspection of the plant becomes essential. The majority of the installations are located in places where they could easily become a menace to the life or safety of the public. The Bill provides authority to ensure that proper safety precautions shall be taken in future regarding this type of vessel. Another proposal embodied in the measure seeks to provide better control over refrigerating machinery, which is at present already dealt with in the Act, more especially where ammonia, carbon dioxide or other gases likely to cause injury are used in connection with the plant. The "unit system" refrigerators mentioned in the Bill—these include frigidaire and so on, which are used for domestic purposes—will not be subject to departmental regulations, and will not be brought within the scope of the Act at all. In those circumstances, should any member of this Chamber own a frigidaire he need not have visions of inspectors visiting his home and examining the installation. The Bill places certain restrictions on the employment of young persons in working or assisting to work boilers and machinery. One amendment provides that refrigerating machinery must not be left in the charge of any person under the age of 18 years if the gas used in the refrigerator would be likely to cause injury to persons should it escape from the plant. Various kinds of gases are used in refrigerators and some are highly dangerous.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Are those dangerous gases set out in a schedule attached to the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: They are set out in the Bills. The present Act provides that working plans must be submitted to the Chief Inspector of Machinery in cases

where it is desired to erect a lift. It does not matter where the lift is to be erected; the builder must set out all particulars of the proposed installation on a detailed plan. No provision exists in the Act for similar action should anyone desire to erect a comprehensive winder on a mine. The Bill proposes that a similar provision shall apply in respect of winding engines as that which concerns lifts. We consider that the control exercised in respect of lifts is equally necessary regarding winding engines. If in the future anyone proposes to erect a winder, he will not be allowed to operate it until a certificate is issued by the department to indicate that it has been properly erected. That provision is necessary because there are at least two instances where winders have been erected, but have had to be partially demolished and reconstructed in order to meet requirements. That emphasises the necessity for making provision in the Bill so that the requirements applying to lifts shall apply equally to winding engines. Plans will have to be submitted to the department for approval before winding engines can be erected.

Mr. Patrick: Was not the trouble caused by the ropes?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am not a technical man, but I know that a lot of trouble has been caused in the past and, therefore, the amendment is regarded as necessary. We also propose by means of another provision in the Bill, to ensure that full particulars shall be submitted to the Chief Inspector of Machinery by persons who desire to erect refrigerating plants so that proper safeguards may be insisted upon for the protection of both employees and the public. As members are aware, some of the gases used in those plants can cause serious, and possibly fatal, injuries by contact or inhalation, should they escape from the plant. Such refrigerating plants have been installed in many of the big buildings and I have been informed of one instance where only a wall divides a big refrigerating plant from a factory where a large number of girls are working. Should there be an explosion or an escape of gas, the lives of those girls would be in danger. We consider that where such dangerous gases are used and where such plants are installed, more control should be exercised over them

so as to obviate, as much as possible, the menace to the safety of people who may live or work in the vicinity.

With regard to the determination of fees for inspections, which is dealt with in Section 37 of the principal Act, the Bill contains an amendment setting out a new basis for computing horse power. This amendment is necessary owing to the introduction of oil, gas and pulverised fuel firing where there is no grate area. The amendment also anticipates the introduction of electrically-heated boilers in the near future. In both the 1904 Act and the 1921 Act the words "any winding engine" were not inserted. This omission did not matter while all winding engines were driven either by steam or compressed air. Of late years, however, electric winding engines have been installed on many mines and the necessity for regulations providing for the training and certification of the drivers of electric winding engines has become urgent. The Solicitor-General has ruled that such regulations cannot be made until the words "any winding engine" have been inserted in Section 53. At present a driver must train on steam engines to procure a winding engine driver's certificate, and as the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) is well aware, there are many centres like Wiluna where there are no steam engines on which the men can practice. The words "any refrigerating machinery" and a new paragraph have also been added in order to ensure that the person in charge of any refrigerating plant of over five tons capacity shall have the necessary safe-working knowledge. An enginedriver with a first, second or third-class certificate must operate such a plant.

A great deal of discussion took place last session with regard to the board of examiners. Many members were under a misapprehension at the time. It is now sought to increase the number of examiners from three to four. This is because the Chief Inspector of Machinery, Mr. Wilson, is also State Mining Engineer, and the Bill provides that he, in his capacity of Chief Inspector of Machinery, shall be chairman of the board of examiners. Occasions may arise when he will be unable to sit on the board, as he has frequently to travel to Wiluna and Leonora and other outlying places. Therefore provision is made for

the Deputy Chief Inspector to take Mr. Wilson's place as chairman, but only on such occasions as he cannot act in that capacity.

Section 55 of the principal Act provides for the issue of certificates of service to internal combustion enginedrivers, boiler attendants and electric crane drivers. We propose to safeguard the rights of holders of service certificates granted under the principal Act. Such certificates were granted to certain men at the commencement of the Act. We also propose to authorise the board of examiners to issue first and second-class refrigerating machinery drivers' certificates of service to enginedrivers who have been in charge of refrigerating machinery of certain sizes for the periods mentioned. Men who have worked on that class of machinery and have given good service will obtain their certificates without further examination.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But only for that class of machinery.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes. The amendments proposed to Subsections (1), (2), (3) and (7) will not in any way alter the privileges granted by the existing Act to holders of the certificates in question. The proviso it is proposed to delete from Subsections (2) and (3) is also contained in Section 68; consequently there is no need for it here. The two new subsections set out the privileges of the proposed first and second-class refrigerating machinery driver's certificate. Both the 1904 Act and the 1921 Act permitted the board to grant a first-class steam enginedriver's certificate to the holder of either a first or second-class Board of Trade certificate as engineer of a steamship. It is now proposed to give the board power to grant an internal combustion enginedriver's certificate to the holder of a Board of Trade certificate as engineer of a motor-driven ship. Therefore drivers who now hold a Board of Trade certificate for a motor ship will be able to secure a certificate to drive internal combustion engines on land.

The next amendment, which relates to Section 68 of the Act, enables the Chief Inspector to require any steam engine and its boilers to be placed under the charge of separate persons if it is impracticable and therefore dangerous for one person to be in charge of both. Since Section 68 was

enacted, large internal combustion engine power houses have been built in various parts of the State. The department desires this section to cover any likely combination of steam engines, internal combustion engines and refrigerating machinery. During the last few years, particularly on the goldfields, quite a number of engines have been placed in different parts of the mines. They may be a considerable distance from each other. So far we have not had any trouble over them; but it is just possible that they might be placed in charge of a driver unable to look after them all. Therefore power is to be given to the Chief Inspector to order that two men shall be placed in charge, if the engines are so far apart as in his opinion to require the attention of two drivers.

The Act provides that any person who removes any boiler or machinery as prescribed from place to place for a period longer than one month shall furnish particulars of the removal to an inspector. The present section, however, applies only to portable and semi-portable boilers. It is desired that any owner of such boiler or machinery shall give ample notice of his intention to remove it if it is set in brick-work, so that any part hidden by the brick-work may be examined before the boiler is again built in.

Authority is sought to enable the Governor to make regulations concerning various matters not dealt with by the existing Act. These include refrigeration, winding engines, hoists and cranes; the medical examination of crane drivers, the qualifications to be held by applicants for appointment as inspectors, and so on. New regulations will be made if the Bill becomes law.

I have given members a general outline of the Bill. As I said, it is almost identical with the Bill I introduced last session, and I think I have overcome the objections which were then advanced. It is essential that the Government should have complete control over refrigerating machinery, particularly as the plants are getting bigger and bigger. I think members will agree that the department should have the right to inspect machinery erected in thickly populated centres. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Patrick, debate adjourned.

BILL—RESERVES (GOVERNMENT DOMAIN).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 27th August.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.8]:
As one of the signatories—

Mr. Marshall: And a partisan to the Bill.

Mr. McDONALD: — and as a partisan of the report, I propose to support the Bill. The Bill is for the appropriation of part of a Government reserve for the purpose of Government buildings. When the special committee was appointed at the end of last session, the international situation did not perhaps look quite so dark; but since then further difficulties have arisen and the only misgiving in my mind is whether money should be appropriated to new buildings at a time like this, when there is great call, for war purposes, on funds not only in the hands of Governments but of private citizens. On that point I would like to have an expression of opinion from the Treasurer as to what would be the view of the Commonwealth and the State Treasurers about the expenditure at the present time of a large amount of money on buildings of this character. Setting aside the matter of finance and dealing with what is before the House, namely, the question of the determining on a site for future Government buildings, I have, as the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) said, signed the report in favour of the appropriation proposed in the Bill. When the committee met it was actuated by several considerations which I think would be agreed to by all members of both Houses. I will enumerate them.

The first consideration was that new public buildings are urgently required. I do not think that any hon. member, after listening to what has been said on this subject, will dispute that a new building is urgently required for the Agricultural Department.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And for the Titles Office.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes.

Mr. Needham: It is long overdue.

Mr. McDONALD: The second consideration was that if any new buildings are to be constructed they should be erected according to a long-range plan, having regard to further Governmental accommodation

and to all the factors involved in Governmental accommodation including the embellishment of Perth as the capital city of our State. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned certain evidence given by Mr. Hall, the Assistant Under-Secretary for Works. Mr. Hall referred to two possible classes of Governmental buildings. One was the utilitarian type and the other the type constructed to be a feature of the aspect and architecture of the capital city. The committee considered that if the time had arrived for Government buildings to be erected, the State would be justified in putting up not merely utilitarian structures such as might be built for factory purposes at the minimum cost and without any attributes in the way of gardens; but that such buildings should if possible include features which would add to the attraction of the capital city.

The third consideration was that every available opinion, and particularly expert opinion, should be sought. Before the committee commenced its consideration of the matter it sought the views of interested bodies, and particularly of people who might be considered able to tender expert or semi-expert advice. Such organisations as the Chamber of Commerce and the Institute of Architects were written to and invited to consider the matter and to place their opinions before the committee, and the committee was fortunate in having the views of some of those organisations.

The fourth consideration was that if possible a definite decision should be arrived at. The reason for that view is that similar matters have been debated in this State time after time until opportunities of settling them have passed by. The committee was told, for instance, that the matter of a Town Hall site had been discussed in Perth for 40 years and had not been settled yet, and sites in the city that might have been regarded as suitable for a Town Hall in bygone days have now been utilised for other purposes. The consequence is that if the city is to have a new Town Hall a site must be chosen from the residue. Had the matter been decided years ago a far wider choice of desirable sites would have been possible. Mr. Hall told us that in 1928 a special committee was established by the Government to consider suitable sites for public buildings, and it catalogued a num-

ber of sites, but that in the short period of 12 years all of them had been utilised and were therefore no longer available; that is, with the exception of Parliament House grounds and the Observatory block. Consequently the members of the committee felt that it was time they took their courage in their hands and made up their minds as to what was the best thing to do. That is what was done, and the committee reached a unanimous decision in favour of the site mentioned in the Bill.

If hon. members will consider the names of those who appeared before the committee they will find that a certain number can be considered as having been expert witnesses. There was Mr. Clare, the Principal Architect who is, of course, an expert and a high authority. Without any hesitation he recommended the Government Domain site. Mr. D. L. Davidson, the Town Planning Commissioner, was also a witness whose opinion must carry very great weight. He recommended the Government Domain site as having a claim beyond that of any other, adding the qualification that he thought the Christian Brothers' College site should also be obtained. Mr. Summerhayes, who has been President of the Institute of Architects and is a practising architect of high standing in this city, as well as being an expert, recommended the Government Domain site, and considered that all the Government Domain should be reserved for future treatment, as of course it will be. The Domain will always be Governmental land existing for the people's purposes. Mr. Fyfe, the Surveyor-General, also an expert, recommended the same site. Cr. Boas favoured the site which had been recommended by the Town Planning Commission that sat some 10 or 12 years ago, a site bounded by the railway, Newcastle-street, Beaufort-street and William-street. It was acknowledged, however, that the site he thought ideal for a Governmental or civic centre could be regarded as being no longer available. It contains the James-street school building, the Government Museum, the Public Library and the Military Barracks, and at the time the committee sat authorisation had been given for and work was about to be commenced on further Commonwealth buildings on the military site at a cost of tens of thousands of pounds. That site could not therefore be looked upon as being

available. Mr. Herbert Parry, also an expert, and President of the Institute of Architects, gave evidence. He was not prepared when he appeared before the committee to give any very considered opinion. To use his own words, he said he would give "an unconsidered conversational opinion" to the committee. He was invited to refer the matter to his institute and obtain the views of the organisation which would naturally carry great weight. The only evidence I will mention in detail contains the views of the Council of the Institute of Architects.

Mr. Styants: Which held a special meeting to consider the matter.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes. This is what the secretary stated in writing to the committee—

My council is of the opinion that the proposed site of the Government Domain, including the Christian Brothers' College, is the site amongst those mentioned which best meets the requirements, taking into consideration all aspects of the proposal not only for the present but all future needs and possibly the future town planning development of the city.

Mr. Hall, on whose opinion the Leader of the Opposition justly placed a great deal of reliance, stated that for a utilitarian building, he thought the Treasury Gardens site would be convenient. I think that proposal would excite a good deal of hostility on the part of the people. It is the nearest public garden to the city and is availed of by large numbers of people who go there to rest during the lunch hour. If they were deprived of its use, I feel sure there would be considerable opposition. Mr. Hall merely said that for a purely utilitarian building, that site was most convenient. He also said that if we were going to have buildings which would be something more than buildings, which would be an ornament to the city and which would envisage future requirements and development, the Government Domain site was the best.

I have referred to all those witnesses who come in the category of experts and who expressed an opinion to the committee. The consensus of their views is in favour of the site mentioned in the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the matter of boring for the foundations of the building and the possibility of seepage. That obviously caused the committee a great deal of thought. Inquiries were made of the Principal Government Architect and others on

the point. Mr. Summerhayes, who had just finished building a block of flats known as Lawson Flats on Mount's Bay-road—a building of eight or nine storeys—on what might be called an identically similar site, assured us that there need be no fear of any difficulty regarding the foundations of the building.

Mr. Patrick: You do not agree with the witness who said that we could put the building in the middle of the river?

Mr. McDONALD: I believe even that could be done under modern building conditions. When I joined the committee, I did not do so with a predisposition in favour of Government Domain site. Only a few weeks before I had opposed the Government's Bill, not because I thought the site was necessarily a bad one, but because I considered we had not sufficient information as to the best site. For many years I have had an inclination towards a scheme for electrifying the railway, putting the metropolitan lines underground and releasing for public and civic use the area of railway land lying between West Perth and East Perth. That proposal has been put up by experts in the past. I have advocated in this House that that proposal should be adopted, and if it was, that site might be a suitable one for governmental offices and a civic centre. However, the Commissioner of Railways was called to give evidence and he told the committee that that scheme was entirely impracticable as the cost of electrification would not be within the bounds of possibility until the city was very much larger than it is to-day. Consequently that idea had to be abandoned.

Other members did not arrive at the committee with any predisposed views in favour of the Government Domain site. I do not think that Mr. Baxter has ever shown, or could be accused of showing, any violent prejudice in favour of Government proposals, but the fact is that after we had examined all the various alternatives, after we had inspected the various sites and after we had debated every aspect of the matter in our deliberations, we were driven to the conclusion that on the overwhelming weight of the evidence the Government Domain site was the best one we could recommend. Before I reached that conclusion, I personally analysed all the views of all the witnesses, and I was driven inescapably to the judgment that this was the

best site we could select. I am still of that opinion. At the close of our inquiries, I felt that we had obtained a vast amount of valuable evidence and had considered the matter from every possible angle. If better times come and the finance is available and we can complete the plan for a governmental centre on that site, then in view of the situation of the City of Perth and of its aspect along the water front, we shall have a series of buildings that will help to give Perth one of the finest aspects of any city in Australia. Therefore I propose to give the Bill my full support.

MR. STYANTS (Kalgoorlie) [5.30]: As one of those who was appointed by this House on the committee to determine the question of a site for Government buildings, I would like to give my views. I listened with great interest and with some amusement to the opposition raised by the Leader of the Opposition the other evening when the Bill was before the House. There was one agreeable feature about the hon. member's opposition and it was that a fine mixture of levity was associated with it. He raised two objections at the outset. The first was that the House had no authority to appoint a committee of this kind. I am not going to voice an opinion as to whether the hon. member's assumption is correct or not. The other objection was that the committee had committed a breach by swearing the witnesses. I do not know whether that is right or wrong.

Mr. Marshall: Definitely the Leader of the Opposition was wrong.

Mr. STYANTS: The swearing of witnesses certainly did not detract from the value of the evidence given by the particular people who were called before the committee. I think that disposes of the hon. member's second objection. The duty imposed by the House upon the committee was that it had to consider alternative sites for the erection of buildings to accommodate the public service. The first essential was that the committee had to establish the necessity for such buildings and in its opinion the most suitable man to supply that information was the Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Simpson. That officer demonstrated the necessity for the erection of new buildings for the service. He

told the committee that the public offices to-day were located in 28 different parts of the city. I think that all members of Parliament who from time to time are obliged to call at certain Government departments have realised that a chaotic state of affairs exists in this respect, and particularly in the Titles Office and Lands Department, where the employees are working under conditions from which the maximum effort of efficiency cannot be expected. The premises in which the officers in question are housed are more like rabbit warrens than decent offices. Mr. Simpson also pointed out to us that we were paying in rent no less a sum than £3,868 per annum. That amount in itself would provide interest on a capital expenditure of £100,000. Thus it appeared to the members of the committee that the necessity for erecting new Government buildings for the purpose of housing the service was definitely established by Mr. Simpson.

The second matter we had to deal with was the space required effectively to house the service, and we thought that the best man available to give us information on that question was Mr. Clare, the Principal Architect. Mr. Clare gave us valuable information in connection with that aspect. He was definitely of the opinion that to use Parliament House grounds on which to erect a large building of from six to nine storeys would have the effect of dwarfing the Parliament building. To enable the House to get the opinions of the various witnesses examined by the committee I shall set out as fairly as I can, both for and against the recommendations of the committee, the opinions of the various witnesses who gave evidence. I shall quote the appropriate questions and the answers given by the witnesses. In connection with Mr. Clare's opinion as to whether the erection of a tall building alongside Parliament House would dwarf the Parliament building, I shall read question 135 asked by Mr. Holmes and the answer given by Mr. Clare—

Did you inspect any site over the Beaufort-street bridge—I mean Government property?—No. I have here plans dealing with a number of schemes for the development of the Parliament House site. Parliament House is a two-storey building. It has been designed so that its main facade will face the city. If buildings are erected to provide accommodation for the

Public Service they will have to be high buildings, much higher in the main than Parliament House. The final result will be instead of Parliament House being the most important building set in beautiful surroundings, it will be surrounded and dwarfed by big buildings. I have tried various ways to minimise the dwarfing of Parliament House. This plan, marked "M," provides for the completion of Parliament House to enable it to be seen from the Terrace, but seven-storey buildings would have to be erected on the two flanks of Parliament House, and there would be another lot of four-storey buildings here (indicated). That plan would carry us on for about 80 years, and Parliament House would be surrounded by these great buildings and would be robbed of all dignity. This is a wonderful site, one of the best in Australia. It is axial on the Terrace and is elevated, and Parliament House could be completed and made into a beautiful building in a delightful setting.

On the same subject the Chairman asked a question about parking facilities and Mr. Clare's reply was—

There is not much space available for that purpose. As an architect I am certain that the erection of public buildings here would ruin Parliament House. Plans "G" and "F" provide alternative suggestions, but the erection of buildings that will ultimately dwarf Parliament House, cannot be avoided. That is the main objection to this site.

Then Mr. Clare went on to say that another objection was that in the course of time this place would not be in the centre of the city. Mr. Clare's opinion was that any building erected on Parliament House site would definitely dwarf Parliament House. We wanted to know what sites were available and for that purpose we called Mr. Hall, the officer in charge of Government land resumption. We thought he would be able to tell us what sites were available, because it was useless for the committee to give consideration to sites that were not available. In the opinion of the committee the question very quickly resolved itself into a choice between Government Domain and Parliament House grounds. Those two were practically the only sites although we certainly did inspect others, including that on which the Treasury buildings stand. There were so many objections to the Treasury buildings site that we quickly decided it was not worthy of consideration. The block was too small without resuming the Town Hall. The area of the site was 1 acre, 2 roods, 23 perches and with the resumption of the land on which

stands the Town Hall, there would have been available 1 acre, 3 roods, 25 perches. Regarding the resumption of the Town Hall, Mr. Hall would not give an estimate as to what expenditure would be involved because he said if it was desired to resume it from the Perth City Council, that body would want not only the intrinsic value, but also the potential value of the land. In addition, he added that no Government had ever taken a local body to court to find out the value of any particular land it was desired to resume. In the opinion of the experts, it was doubtful whether the present foundations would be strong enough on which to erect a building ten storeys in height. There was no room for garden plots, and the proposal to build a Government centre there was condemned by practically all the witnesses. A transport problem of great magnitude would have been created had a big suite of Government buildings been erected in the central portion of the city. Not only would that have meant drawing something like 2,000 civil servants to one centre, but would have affected all the people of Perth who wished to do business in those buildings. Persons coming from the country would also have been driven to that one centre, but no parking space would have been available for their cars.

Mr. Doney: Did you listen to what other witnesses had to say apart from officers of the Public Service?

Mr. STYANTS: Yes. I intend to quote from the evidence of several witnesses.

Mr. Patrick: We gave everyone an opportunity to give evidence.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, and advertised on two or three occasions for witnesses. Every opportunity was given to persons outside the service to appear before the committee.

Mr. Doney: I presume there was a preponderance of witnesses from the service.

Mr. STYANTS: The hon. member will be able to form his own opinion on that point after I have finished. It was proposed that the site at present occupied by the railway accounts buildings in Bridge-street should be resumed. The committee inspected the site. The resumption of that area would cost a great deal. It would include the Shaftesbury Hotel, and the Luxor Arcade and shops, and in addition, the Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Ellis) stated in evidence that he would be loth to

agree to a resumption of that land as he considered it was required for railway purposes. The Francis-street site that was spoken of by the Town Planning Commissioner as a civic centre was not available, as pointed out by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald), because certain parts of it were owned by the Commonwealth military authorities. Another site that was tentatively proposed was the Esplanade. I think it was the opinion of practically every member of the committee that no buildings should be erected there, whether for civic or Government purposes. We were of opinion that that area should be saved for all time for the recreation of the people, and as an open air space for them. It was also the general opinion that whilst the Observatory provided a magnificent site, it was unsuitable owing to its isolation from the business centres of the city. Stirling Square, or what is generally known as the Supreme Court gardens, was also considered. With the exception of one member of the committee we agreed that it should remain as it is.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You refer to the Government Gardens.

Mr. STYANTS: Yes. Only one member of the committee put forward a proposal for that site and strongly advocated it. Most of us realised that we would have brought a hornet's nest around our heads and would have been extremely sorry for ourselves if we had suggested the use of any portion of those gardens.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The gardens would have been there ready for the building.

Mr. STYANTS: If the hon. member is in favour of the erection of Government offices there, he is entitled to his opinion but I would not be a party to such a scheme. Those gardens are particularly favoured by the people of Perth, and as a breathing space for the city should remain untouched.

Mr. Fyfe, the Surveyor-General, was the next witness. His opinion concerning the Parliament House site is given in answer to Question 350 put to him by Mr. Holmes—

Here are the plans prepared by Mr. Clare for buildings on Parliament House site. We were told that this site would be suitable—I hope I am interpreting the evidence correctly—except for the fact that Government buildings erected in this vicinity would dwarf Parliament House?—In considering this site we

must weigh all the factors I have already referred to. Firstly we must consider its position in regard to the city itself, where the main bulk of the business of the Government departments will be carried on; that is to say, the business in which the people themselves are interested. If there is an easterly extension of the city permitted by a different arrangement from that which exists at present, the alternative site would be much more central than this. Until quite recently, Barrack street was considered of higher value than William street. That was the main north-south street, but at certain points the streets are of substantially equal value at the moment. Sharp's corner was the most valuable in the city. The Government Domain is a comparatively short distance from Barrack street, whereas Parliament House is a considerable distance from William street. The bulk of the people that have to transact business at the Titles Office and at the other Government offices have their offices between Barrack street and William street in St. George's terrace. It is much more convenient for them to move in that easterly direction than for them to come up as far west as this. If the city continues to extend westerly, it might make this site more central, but in considering that you have to bear in mind there is quite a steep rise here, and another factor that I mentioned has to be taken into account, that is the narrow distance between Wellington street and King's Park road. On the eastern side of the city, on the other hand, we have an increasing width between the river and the railway as we go easterly. Therefore, it seems to me that ultimately the Government Domain site will be the more central position. As regards the spoiling of Parliament House by the erection of buildings on this site, I would stress the necessity for the establishment of a Parliament House worthy of this city of Perth, one that will compare with Parliamentary buildings in other cities of the world. My opinion is that it would be a tragedy to do anything to prevent such a development from taking place.

The same witness, in answer to a question asked by me (Q. 373), again referred to Government Domain site. My question was—

From the point of view of suitability, the sites resolve themselves into two in number, the Government House Domain and Parliament House grounds. No other sites are available. If that is so, which of the two areas would be your choice?

The answer was—

I should say the Government Domain site. The Parliament House site is at the western end of the ultimate development of the city whereas the Domain site is more likely to become central in fifty years or so. If Parliament House grounds were occupied with Government buildings, the people of the State would be deprived of a complete Parliament House as was originally intended, a fine building overlooking the city and facing St. George's terrace.

Mr. Parry, the Vice-President of the Institute of Architects, also gave evidence. In my view he definitely favoured the erection of buildings on the Parliament House grounds. His opinion is found in answer to Question 396.

By the Chairman: It includes the Barracks and the adjoining buildings?—That would be a very good site, with many points to recommend it, one of which is that people are in the habit of going there at present and would not experience any confusion in adapting themselves to the new location of centralised public buildings. I do not know exactly what is meant by the Esplanade site.

Mr. Parry gives his opinion of the Parliament House grounds site in his replies to the following questions—

400. By Hon. W. J. Mann: Do you think the placing of this block, buildings of sufficient dimensions to house the whole of the civil servants would lead to the dwarfing of Parliament House?—I think the new buildings could be designed so as to improve the general pile rather than otherwise. I do not see why that should not be.

401. Such buildings would have to be of considerable height?—I would not like to say what restrictions would have to be imposed in order to do that.

402. Do you agree that from an architectural point of view it is desirable that Parliament House should dominate the city?—This is a wonderful position for a Parliament House that would prove an inspiration to the people. The original design contemplated a dome and various other features to give Parliament House a very imposing appearance.

403. Then there would be a danger if other buildings were erected around it?—I think not. I believe other buildings could be erected around Parliament House without interfering with its appearance. The corners of the block towards Hay street and Malcolm street would permit of a large amount of accommodation being provided without erecting buildings six storeys high.

I do not wish to camouflage the position, but to give the House opinions both for and against the proposal. In my judgment, Mr. Parry definitely favoured the using of Parliament House grounds for these buildings.

A matter which is definitely linked with this question is that of transport. We called Mr. Millen, the chairman of the Transport Board, who went into the matter extensively, giving the committee a wealth of information showing that much more passenger traffic would be convenience by the Government Domain site than by the Parliament House site. Another witness was Mr. Boas, architect, City Councillor,

and chairman of the Town Planning Board which selected the site now occupied by the Military Barracks. I quote portion of his evidence—

533. By Mr. Styants: Assuming your opinion is correct and that the city will expand eastward or northward, or perhaps in each direction, that would be a serious objection to a governmental centre on Parliament House grounds, because the centre would be right on the western fringe of the city?—Yes.

534. By Mr. Patrick: At the same time, I think you said when you commenced your evidence that the site which you previously recommended and which you said was No. 1 site was Parliament House grounds?—No. 1 site I would say definitely is the commission's recommendation; No. 2, in my judgment, would be the Esplanade; No. 3 would be Parliament House site.

535. Do you think it would be possible to group the Government buildings on Parliament House site without dwarfing Parliament House?—I am sure of it. It is only a question of architectural treatment.

I quote also other replies given by Mr. Boas—

545. By Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you think it would be wise to erect public buildings on Parliament House site, and so dwarf Parliament House?—The Houses of Parliament in other countries cannot be dwarfed. It is a question of design. They are magnificent structures.

546. What would our Parliament House look like if it was finished and had a ten-storey building in front of it?—This building was designed 40 years ago. If you called for a design for Parliament House today you would probably get an entirely different design.

547. By the Chairman: But it would be desirable to complete Parliament House as designed?—Yes, I suppose so.

547a. If the building is finished as designed it will be possible to treat the grounds in such a way that Parliament House would not be dwarfed?—I am sure that could be done.

548. By Mr. Styants: I understood you to say that a serious objection to establishing a governmental centre on this site would be its being on the western fringe of the city all the time?—Yes.

549. Before you came here you had not had the suggestion put up to you which was submitted to us by a witness and outlined to you by me, that is, for the shifting of Government House to the Observatory site. Assuming that Government House could be shifted and the 30 acres on which it stands could be made available for a governmental and civic site, would you then think that this ground should rank as the third site in preference? That is to say, would you favour the erection of a governmental centre only on the Parliament

House site, or a governmental and civic centre on the Government Domain?—I would say that would be the second preference.

550.—Which?—The Government Domain.

So that eventually Mr. Boas arrived at the opinion that if the Drill Hall site was not available, then the Government Domain site would be the most suitable. The next witness was Mr. Ellis, Commissioner of Railways, who was definitely opposed to moving the city section of the railways from the present position. He said that his travels in other countries had shown him that large sums of money were being spent there in endeavours to bring the railways to the central portion of the capital city, for the convenience of passenger traffic, and that it would be a mistake to remove the Perth railway station from its present position. Mr. Ellis also gave evidence concerning passenger traffic.

The most conclusive evidence, however, in favour of the Government Domain site is, I consider, that contained in a letter from Mr. E. G. Sier, secretary of the Royal Institute of Architects of Western Australia, dated the 11th January, 1940. Part of Mr. Sier's letter has already been quoted, but I think it well to have the whole communication recorded in "Hansard"—

Re Proposed Government Offices.

In response to the request of the Hon. F. J. S. Wise, Chairman of the joint Parliamentary Committee inquiring into the suitability of sites for the proposed Government buildings, a special meeting of the Council of my Institute was called today to consider the respective sites set out in your letter of the 8th inst.

My Council had the advantage of the Principal Architect's attendance, together with plans setting out the proposals in respect to each of the sites concerned, and after a full review I am instructed to convey to you their decision.

My Council is of opinion that the proposed site of the Government Domain, including Christian Brothers' College, is the site amongst those mentioned which best meets the requirements, taking into consideration all aspects of the proposal, not only of the present but future needs and the possible future town planning development of the city.

My Council feels that the proposed Governmental group shall be in a setting which will provide not only for a garden treatment, but of sufficient size to allow of the disposition of the various buildings so as to be free from congestion, give ample light and air, and provide adequate approaches and parking space for all future traffic requirements, as far as it is possible and wise to visualise.

In arriving at this decision my Council is influenced to a large extent by the condition that the proposed buildings about to be erected are to form the nucleus of what is to be an ultimate complete governmental group of offices and open spaces between Victoria-avenue and Barrack street, and occupied by Government House, the Supreme Court, and Treasury buildings, and which will form a town planning group when completed on the river front, unrivalled in any other city of the world.

My Council is convinced that such a scheme should include the condition that the whole of the river frontage, from the Causeway to the Narrows, shall be reserved for all time against any intrusion of commercial structures, either governmental or private.

They are of opinion that whilst there is no direct relationship between a civic centre and a governmental group, they should be related insofar that the civic centre should be placed also facing the river frontage, and thus form part of this town planning scheme.

Should the Committee so desire, one of my council would be pleased to attend and elaborate the main points in regard to the various sites, which influenced them in arriving at the above decision.

My Council trusts that these views may assist the Parliamentary Committee in arriving at a decision which, whilst meeting the immediate needs of governmental requirements, will provide for the ultimate town planning development of the city in all its aspects, and for the next 50 to 100 years ahead.

Mr. Harold Boas had previously given evidence as a city councillor and an architect, and had expressed his personal views on the matter. We invited a representative of the Institute of Architects to appear before the committee and Mr. Boas was appointed to represent that body. To quote part of his evidence on his second appearance before the committee is quite worth while. In answer to a question (710) put to him by the Chairman, Mr. Boas said—

As regards the Parliament House site, that was considered admirable in itself from the standpoint of situation, but the group scheme would dwarf Parliament House—

Mr. Boas had previously asked us to take particular notice of the fact that he was then giving us the opinion of the Institute of Architects and emphasised that the opinion he was then expressing was not his personal opinion, either privately or professionally, and that in giving evidence on that second occasion he was presenting the views of the Royal Institute of Architects. His answer continued—

The sloping ground and surrounding streets might limit the effective use of that site for

traffic and parking, even if Parliament House were removed to another site. All the time we were thinking in terms of a group of Government buildings, not merely of the two that are particularly concerned at the outset. When the group of buildings ultimately eventuates, traffic, parking and other facilities and the surroundings for the group will require to be of a special nature. I think Mr. Clare indicated to you that at the present time some 2,500 employees are involved in the scheme. That number is likely to increase as the years go by, and there will possibly be an increase in public business. In those circumstances it was felt by the council of the institute that in respect of Parliament House site, the sloping ground and the sloping streets surrounding the area did not help to make it a good site for a group of Government buildings.

Next I shall deal briefly with the point raised regarding the foundations and possible water trouble. As the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) pointed out, evidence was tendered on that question by Messrs. Clare, Summerhayes and Parry, three of the leading architects of Western Australia. Mr. Clare's opinion is set forth in his answers to Questions 72, 73, 84, 85 and 86 of the printed evidence, which read as follows:—

72. With regard to Government House Domain, have soundings been taken as regards seepage, etc?—We have bored over the whole area, and we know the various strata down to sand and where the water level is. The seepage can be dealt with and I do not anticipate any difficulty either with foundations or seepage.

73. There is a continual seeping between the brewery and the Esplanade Hotel?—Yes. We would need to deal with the seepage. Seepage occurs right along the Terrace. We are now putting up a new Technical School building, and have the same problem of seepage to deal with. Seepage occurs at Shell House, and has been successfully dealt with.

84. The seepage, I think, is common to most of the water front, right around?—Yes. You get seepage right along the Terrace.

85. There is no shadow of doubt about your being able to deal with the seepage in a big weighty building?—No, none whatever. Take Shell House; you have the same conditions on that site.

86. But Shell House would be slightly higher?—Yes, but they have the water there. At the Technical School we have the water again within 18 inches of the surface.

Thus Mr. Clare's opinion, as the result of the boring, was that the foundation would be suitable and no difficulty would be experienced regarding seepage. The opinion of Mr. Summerhayes on the same question will be found in his answer to Question 303, in

which he was asked if he would like to see the Principal Architect's sketch plans for dealing with the Government Domain site, as follows:—

Yes. I assume that the idealistic layout of Government buildings is to concentrate the whole of them in a development scheme at one centre. I believe the whole of that block will be required for the purpose at some future date. If it is assumed that the block can be made available for such development, I consider that the site is possibly the best that can be used for Government buildings. It has a river frontage across the Esplanade and buildings could be designed with an attractive appearance from the river. The site would be convenient to the municipal offices of the city; it would be convenient to the business community and the public; it would be convenient; also, bearing in mind the future development of the city, which I think must be eastward. That development should be considered as part of a complete scheme for the whole of the block, and not merely one end of it. Perhaps the Supreme Court buildings might be reconstructed and Government House might be rebuilt on another site. In any development scheme I should like to see provision made for the continuation of Bazaar terrace to these buildings. Bazaar terrace has been widened from William street to Barrack street, but at the eastern end it merely looks into the trees in the gardens with the corner of the Supreme Court building just showing, but it has no focal point at the end of the drive. The policy of good planning is to have some focal point of interest at the end of the main thoroughfare. The Australian Broadcasting Commission's studios are only of a temporary nature and need not be considered. The Government House site is too valuable and important to Perth as a site for the Governor's residence. A much more appropriate place for that would possibly be on the Observatory site, or somewhere up there. That is not a development of the moment, but could be visualised for the future. If that alteration could be made, and the development of the whole of the domain could be considered as one entity for the housing of Government offices, etc., I think that would be an ideal site.

Here is where he referred to the question of foundations:—

If the foundations at the eastern end of Government House domain are the same as were found in connection with the C.M.L. building, there would be no difficulty in erecting Government offices to the maximum height allowed on that site. In the case of the C.M.L. building we had a high floor loading of 100 lbs. per square foot. The building was designed in accordance with that loading against a normal loading of about 40 lbs. per square foot. That necessitated a raft foundation for the building. With a floor loading of 40 lbs. per square foot, and Government offices going to the maximum height, there would be no difficulty in putting down foundations without

a raft, seeing that the soil consists of a mixture of clay with shale in between. That is quite a sound building structure to work on.

I shall also quote Mr. Parry's opinion in regard to the foundations—

425. Would there be any difficulty about erecting buildings there?—Not the slightest. I was working in Mr. Cavanagh's office when the Christian Brothers' College was built, and I know there was no difficulty about the erection of that building.

I have now quoted the opinions of three of the State's leading architects.

The Minister for Lands: I wonder why the Leader of the Opposition did not read them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not want to take up too much time of the House.

Mr. STYANTS: There are two or three other phases I desire to deal with, but I understand the Leader of the House wishes an adjournment. I therefore ask leave to continue my speech at the next sitting.

Leave granted.

House adjourned at 6.11 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 3rd September, 1940.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining, copper, lead, etc., at Northampton	518
Bills: Police Act Amendment, 1R.	518
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	526
Profiteering Prevention Act Amendment, 2R.	527
Return: Government motor Vehicles, cost of fuel....	518

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

QUESTION—MINING.

Copper, Lead, etc., at Northampton.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, In view of the shortage of copper supplies in Australia, as reported in the "West Australian," of the 28th August, will the Government send the Government Geologist to the Northampton mineral

areas to report on the possibilities of obtaining copper from old or new copper mines in that district? 2, In view of the fact that the Broken Hill Pty. Co., Ltd., has contracted to sell to the British Government for the period of the war and three months thereafter 13,870 tons of lead per calendar month f.o.b. Port Pirie, at £18 16s. 7d. (Australian) per ton, will the Government endeavour to do something to assist in reviving the lead-mining industry in the Northampton district? 3, As it is stated that in addition to lead and copper in the Northampton district, zinc and other minerals exist, which, owing to the present world situation might be profitably mined and disposed of, will the Government arrange for the Government Geologist to make a thorough examination of this mineral district with a view of obtaining a full report on any mineral deposits contained therein?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The Government has recently been in touch with the Commonwealth authorities to ascertain which minerals are required at the present time to assist the national effort. It intends to utilise its geological officers to investigate deposits of any necessary minerals accordingly. Northampton district will be included in such investigation. 2, Advice received by this Government has been to the effect that the present Empire lead supply, both ore and metal, is in excess of demand. 3, Naturally when visiting Northampton, the geological staff will give attention to all mineral deposits.

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

RETURN—GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES.

Cost of Fuel.

Debate resumed from the 28th August, on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (East):—

That a return be laid on the Table of the House showing the cost of fuel used by Government motor vehicles for the years 1933-34 and 1939-40 respectively.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.37]: The hon. member who introduced the motion stated that had