

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Before you report the Bill to the House, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the Bill should again be recommitteed to alter the word "year" in the first line of Clause 2 and substitute "period." The clause begins "For the year ending the 30th day of June, 1934." In the latter part of the Bill we have made it read "For the period ending." It would be better to insert the word "period" at the beginning of Clause 2.

The Chief Secretary: I agree that the word "period" would be better.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Clause 3 covers the hon. member's point. It sets out that such tax shall be charged and paid in respect of salary or wages received on and after the 1st August, 1933.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It would be advisable to substitute "period" for "year" because we have altered the period. We are now about to part with the Bill and it would be better, before doing so, to make the amendment.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, Bill again recommitteed for the purpose of further considering Clause 2.

In Committee.

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

Clause 2—Imposition of financial emergency tax:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 the word "year" be struck out and "period" inserted in lieu.

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

The HONORARY MINISTER: The word "year" appears also in the third line of the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be consequentially amended.

Bill again reported with a further amendment.

House adjourned at 9.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 26th September, 1933.

	PAOB
Questions: Primary Producers' Bank, interest on mortgages	1057
Tramways, traffic and penny sections	1057
Assent to Bill	1058
Bill: Supply (No. 2), £1,201,000, all stages	1058
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, report	1058
Willuna Water Board Loan Guarantee, 2s., Com. report	1058
Fruit Cases Act Amendment, 2s.	1052
Police Act Amendment, recom.	1067
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment, Council's amendments, Com.	1084
Annual Estimates, Committee of Supply	1069

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

QUESTION—PRIMARY PRODUCERS' BANK.

Interest on Mortgages.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the liquidator of the Primary Producers' Bank is harassing the clients of the bank in this State by demanding the payment of 8 per cent. on their mortgages, a much greater rate of interest than that demanded by the trading banks? 2, If so, can action be taken against him to compel him to reduce the interest rate to that charged by the trading banks?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, I am not aware of it, but if the facts are as stated in the hon. member's question, the only action which could be taken would be under the Financial Emergency Act. This Act does not apply to mortgages given by banks, except that the Government may, by proclamation, declare any such mortgage shall be subject to the provisions of the Act. It is probable that under the interpretation of the Act each mortgage would have to be dealt with specifically.

QUESTION—TRAMWAYS, TRAFFIC AND PENNY SECTIONS.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What was the average number of passengers per trip carried on Bulwer-street-North Perth, Mt. Lawley-North Perth, Kensington-street and Claremont lines respectively for the year ended the 30th June, 1933? 2, Where are existing 1d. sections located on the tramway system? 3, When

was the policy of placing 1d. sections only at line terminals definitely commenced? 4, When was the 1d. section between Thomas-street and Rokeby-road inaugurated? 5, When was the section between Perth Town Hall and Milligan-street inaugurated? 6, For what reason does the last tram from Perth to South Perth leave considerably earlier on Saturday than on week nights?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: I have the reply to the hon. member's question. It is in the form of a return, which I will place on the Table of the House.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lient.-Governor received and read, notifying assent to the Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment Bill.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £1,201,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question put and passed.

Message.

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

Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Sleeman in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1934, a sum not exceeding £1,201,000.

The object of the motion is to secure the granting of Supply for another two months. That is the usual course. The Estimates are now before members, and anything that they may desire to say regarding Supply or other

matters affecting the financial position of the State, can be said on the Estimates. At the beginning of the session Supply was granted for two months, and that has now been exhausted. The granting of further Supply for two months will make provision for carrying on while the Estimates are being dealt with. I am willing to give members any information they may desire, but I do not think it is necessary at this stage, as members can deal with all the phases during the discussion on the Estimates.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Committee of Ways and Means.

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Sleeman in the Chair,

The PREMIER: I move—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1934, a sum not exceeding £900,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £300,000 from the General Loan Fund, and £1,000 from the Government Property Sales Fund.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Bill Introduced, etc.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, passed through all stages without debate, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WHOLE MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—WILUNA WATER BOARD LOAN GUARANTEE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 21st September.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [4.43]: The project dealt with in the Bill is one that will, I believe, receive the enthusiastic support of every section of the House. The position is that a prominent and fast-growing town, established on the far eastern fringe of civilisation, has found its progress endangered through having an inadequate

and, I understand, a contaminated water supply. A water board has been created, and the members of that body have come to the only conclusion possible in the circumstances. They set about borrowing £8,000 with the intention of sinking wells in an uncontaminated area and of distributing the water supply by reticulation to the 1,200 people who are living at Wiluna. The security seems ample enough, but apparently the lending authority, in this instance the Commonwealth Bank, do not regard the conditions at Wiluna as, I suppose, quite sound enough to warrant their lending the money unless the State Treasurer guarantees the repayments.

Mr. Marshall: That has become a habit with the Commonwealth Bank lately.

Mr. DONEY: I do not know the reason; I do not know that we need concern ourselves with the reason. The point is that the security offered is plainly ample. Merely for the State to guarantee the loan is not a very big thing to ask and not a very big thing for the State to give. I am sure that the Government will be only too pleased at the opportunity to demonstrate their willingness to help the gold mining industry, and equally to demonstrate their faith in Wiluna and show their appreciation of the big part played by Wiluna, in common with the gold mining industry generally, during the past three very critical years. Admittedly no one can tell what lies in the future. The stability of mining towns is notoriously shaky, but it seems to all of us that Wiluna has been so thoroughly tested as to place its bona fides in this respect beyond doubt. I should imagine that there could be in Australia no authority on gold mining who would be inclined to limit the life of Wiluna to the ten years over which the loan will be spread. At a rate of 1s. 9d., the loan should be a very easy matter for a town like Wiluna, and we must not overlook the fact that summer is imminent, which makes the particular work more urgent than it otherwise would be. There is no need to stress the urgency of the matter or the propriety of granting the State's guarantee. I hope the measure will have quick and easy progress through both Houses.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [4.47]: I do not intend to delay the House long in subscribing to the good case presented by the Minister for Works. The Bill need not agitate the mind of any member regarding the security offered to the Govern-

ment for the guarantee to be given to the Commonwealth Bank. The history of the loan should be worth reiterating because it is unique. Nowhere on the goldfields of Western Australia has it ever been considered advisable by local authorities to do for themselves that which it has been customary for the Government to do for them. The reason for Wiluna moving as a local authority to control the local water supply arose from the impossibility of the Government finding the necessary money, as it has been found for other goldfields, to install a reticulation system controlled by a Government department. When Wiluna experienced a revival we were, unfortunately, experiencing the depression and the Treasury was empty. It was therefore necessary for the local people, in order to supply the townsite with a reticulation system, to raise the money themselves. They created a water board and obtained the necessary legal sanction. They then decided to raise money to instal a system that would at least approach adequacy. The system now established at Wiluna was installed practically by local effort, and it was not contemplated by those in control at the time that Wiluna would grow with such rapidity. The need of a water supply for the townsite is acute. Shortage of funds and absence of Government assistance caused the residents great concern, and the only course for them to adopt was to establish a water board and attempt to raise the money. The figures quoted by the Minister for Works were accurate when they were compiled, but they have increased by hundreds within the last five or six weeks. Only yesterday telegrams were received urging the Surveyor General to have gazetted for sale an additional number of blocks within the townsite. That has been the experience for the last 18 months; town blocks could not be surveyed fast enough. Another remarkable fact is that sales have not been tampered with by land jobbers. Wiluna has been fortunate in that respect. In very few instances have lots either in the business area or in the residential area been purchased for profit-making purposes. The demand for blocks has been increased because, with experience of the operations of the mine, people have realised that it is not too healthy to live close to the mine. The company, in the early history of Wiluna's mining revival, built homes for their

employees, but they have ceased to do so. They have not erected buildings in or around the leases for a considerable time. Each day brings a little more doubt regarding the healthiness of living in close proximity to the mine. A number of people who were prepared to live on the leases have moved into the town and newcomers have refrained from going on to the leases. Consequently, the townsite has grown beyond recognition. There is scarcely a suitable block within three-quarters of a mile of the townsite that could be surveyed—so many have been surveyed and the surveyors have been puzzled to know where to look for additional blocks.

Mr. Latham: Are you referring to the new town or the old?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am speaking of what is called the business area—the townsite of Wiluna. I do not suppose anybody could get a block of land within three-quarters of a mile of the town that would be suitable for subdivision for residential purposes. The people are aware that it is not too healthy to live on the mine and that has led them to move into the town. The Surveyor General has been at his wit's end to make blocks available. In the last 12 months we have had four surveyors fossicking out land that could be surveyed. The absence of land jobbers has meant that every block has been taken up by a miner in order to establish a home, and he would be a consumer of water. Therefore, the 1,200 people proposed to be served by the scheme will rapidly increase. The security is apparent to anyone who understands Wiluna. For the information of members, let me explain that Wiluna is actually divided into three townsites. It is pity that is so, but the fact remains. One townsite is on the mine leases. Some thirty or like 200 camps were erected for single men, each camp accommodating two men, and 50 or 60 homes adjacent to them were built for married men. Those homes constitute quite a little townsite in themselves. On the eastern wing is what is known as the foreign element, and a fairly large townsite exists there. Proceeding towards Wiluna and Hill, where 200 to 300 homes have been erected. That would be about a mile from the mine or two miles from the town. The water board have in mind the possibility of reticulating Red Hill from the pro-

posed scheme, a distance of two miles. They do not propose to undertake that work immediately, because Red Hill is now served with a water scheme additional to the system belonging to the mining company.

Mr. Latham: That is a separate one entirely?

Mr. MARSHALL: Quite separate. I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to misunderstand me. In inaugurating the scheme, there will be a connection between this system and the present mine system. The water from the old well that served Wiluna for a number of years was found to be not quite suitable for human consumption. It is not bad water, but it is not good. However, the mortality amongst consumers has not been excessive. A man now 85 years of age has lived on it for 36 years and is still going strong. Another man who has just died at the age of 90 had also lived on the water for 36 years. Consequently the quality cannot have been very detrimental to the health of the community, though the analyst does not consider it quite fit for human consumption. A site has now been selected a mile and a half from the present supply for the mine. The idea is to lay down pipes from the mine supply to the wells that will be put down under this scheme in the case of a breakdown in the local supply. If the breakdown happened to be a big one, instead of the people in the town of Wiluna going without water, by opening up several valves and shutting others it would be possible to link up the supply with the mine system, and provide the necessary amount of water. It will also be possible to get electric current from the mine, which will be economical. The mine engineers have been in consultation with the engineers of the Public Works Department. It is to the credit of the Wiluna Water Board that they have abided strictly by the decisions of the engineers. They have not tried to violate any of the terms set out, and have looked upon the engineers as their guiding stars all through. It is proposed to put in a somewhat elaborate scheme for the present number of consumers, though at the moment it is not possible to supply more than a fraction of the numbers who are demanding water. The number of consumers is increasing rapidly. It is proposed to use the pipes associated with the present inadequate scheme to extend the water supply ultimately to Red Hill, two miles away. The

mining company does not feel itself obliged to transmit water not only under the main roads but also to Crown lands, but this has been done to oblige the 200 or 300 men who are employed by the company, and as a means of overcoming an immediate difficulty. There should be no doubt as to the security. There are 940 persons on the pay-sheet of the big mine at Wiluna. If that mine failed to sink another foot or do any further development work, the ore reserves would be sufficient to supply the treatment plant with material for the next four years. If the management did not drive another foot, nor sink another foot, they could proceed to stope out the ore that has already been developed for the mill, and could go on for four years at 40,000 tons a month, equal to approximately 4,000,000 tons of ore. The management, however, are not being inactive: they are still shaft-sinking and doing developmental work, and anyone with mining experience knows there is a great outlook for that one mine alone. There is also a group of leases to the north, adjacent to those now being developed by the big company. Some 40 or 50 men are working on those leases, and two diamond drills have been in operation for a considerable time. Although the public are not aware of it, the result of the boring has been encouraging enough for the company that has an option over the leases to open up the old shaft on the Moonlight. It is not likely the people concerned will throw their money away; they must have considerable confidence in that group of leases. That is only one series of leases, while another group is under option and prospecting and development work are going on there, too. Within 12 months or two years, Wiluna will be a rival to Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

Mr. Doney: Do you think the estimate of 2,500 consumers in two years is high enough?

Mr. MARSHALL: That would be the maximum number the plant would be able to serve, and it is estimated that this will be reached in the next year or two.

Mr. Doney: That indicates the scheme is not big enough.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is not denied. At the end of the period, the water board will have enough money with which to supply additional reservoirs and wells. At 1s. 9d. the board should show a huge profit. If we bear in mind the life of the town, we can

see that the board will be able to repay the loan from the Commonwealth Bank long within the stipulated period. As Wiluna is to-day, so will it be at least in four years, and the board will have sufficient capital to make additions to the plant as the demand arises. The money is required to make a start in order to supply the existing demand. The board know they will be able to cope with all future requirements. I do not think any member need be agitated over the Bill. I am positive the Government will not be called upon to put up a fraction of the money involved. If the board should want capital, they will be able to get it from the bank and will not require any from the Treasury. Wiluna has a bright future. The big company has spent a million and a half of their own money, and in addition to employing a large number of men, have two diamond drills continually in operation. When a main shaft is sunk, a good deal of overhead gear is required, and there is a continual drain on the resources of the management in order to supply the requisite machinery. A fairly big amount of money is coming in every month. The management consists of experienced men, who have known Wiluna for the last 30 years, and have watched it closely, knowing its possibilities. I see no reason to fear for the security that is offered. Governments have been generous in giving advice to people on these matters. When people have approached Governments for assistance, they have generally been told that if they will help themselves the Government will render assistance. Here is a case in which people, who know the position the present Government are in from the financial point of view, are quite prepared to help themselves, to create their own water board, and take on the responsibility of installing and managing the system. In the circumstances, the Government would be wise to afford the necessary assistance. The repayment of the loan is guaranteed. There can be no doubt about the success of Wiluna and of this reticulation system. At present everything is all right, but there have been one or two epidemics in the past, and doctors, rightly or wrongly, have put them down to an inadequate water supply. The temperature at Wiluna is very high for at least eight months in the year, and a good water supply system is urgently needed. The scheme has been laid down by engineers of the Public Works Department in conjunc-

tion with those attached to the big mine at Wiluna. Everything has been gone into most fully. The chairman of the Wiluna Road Board has interviewed the Government officials, and the instructions of those officers are being faithfully carried out. I merely rise to emphasise the figures which have been quoted by the Minister, and to point out that whilst they are fresh to-day, they will be stale in two years. It will not be long before twice as many people will require water in this district. I trust that the Bill will receive favourable consideration, so that the people of Wiluna may secure an adequate water supply for the coming summer.

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—FRUIT CASES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th September.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [5.17]: I offer no objection to the amendments desired by the Minister, as there is no reason why our Railway Department should be penalised in regard to the carriage of fruit in secondhand cases while motor transport may convey fruit in secondhand cases to practically any part of the State. True, there are regulations dealing with the carriage of fruit over certain areas; but I venture to say that those regulations are broken daily by motor transport. I agree that all secondhand cases should be subject to close inspection as regards their sanitary condition. Many cases come into the city carrying apples and other fruit, and these cases when empty are in perfectly good condition. It is a pity that they should not be used a second time.

Mr. Latham: What about the spread of pests?

Mr. THORN: Motor transport conveys the secondhand cases practically everywhere, whereas the Railway Department may not carry fruit of any description beyond a certain line near Yarloop. Motor transport, I emphasise, conveys fruit beyond that line daily. It is my opinion that most of the

pests existing in Western Australia thrive only in certain areas. Were it otherwise, there would be any amount of fruit fly south of Yarloop. Further south, in the colder areas, the fly does not thrive. Again, in the Swan district there is black spot in vines; but if an affected vine is replanted at Katanning, it cleans up speedily, because the disease will not live in that district. Although I do not suggest any extension of the carriage of fruit subject to those diseases, yet I often think an extension might be granted. However, I desire to be on the side of caution and to refrain from alarming growers further south, who claim to have clean orchards. The regulations in existence were quite in order while the railway system was the only means of transport, and full control could, therefore, be exercised over the carriage of fruit. To-day, however, that control has been lost. Then why penalise the railways in this respect?

Mr. Latham: Motor transport of fruit in secondhand cases surely is not permitted?

Mr. THORN: No, but we are aware that it takes place. Then why not permit the Railway Department to carry fruit in secondhand cases? In that way the department would obtain a large share of the traffic. The only carriage of fruit in secondhand cases now permitted is under the amending measure passed last year and having reference to transport of grapes. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [5.21]: Like the previous speaker, I feel that anything tending to cheapen the supply of fruit to outback districts is to be welcomed, provided undue risks are not incurred. It is for members representing fruit-growing districts to assure themselves that every safeguard in the way of fumigation and so forth is brought into operation to prevent the spread of pests. Our constant endeavour is to prevent the ravages of pests, whether of rabbits or of diseases peculiar to fruit. I listened attentively to the member for Murchison when speaking of hot weather conditions and the need for a good and plentiful water supply, the lack of which, he urged, had adversely affected the health of the people in his district. A good supply of fruit is equally important. In the hot months the arrival of consignments of fruit, especially in those vans which the Railway Department used to make available, was

eagerly awaited, as I can state from personal knowledge. I am rather surprised to learn that motor trucks are permitted to convey unfumigated fruit cases.

Mr. Thorn: There is no control.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The railway system seems to get hit to leg every time. Here is a pertinent case. If there is any spread of disease, it is brought about by motor transport. I welcome anything that will cheapen the supply of fruit to outback districts.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [5.23]: I would like guidance on one point. The Bill provides that second-hand fruit cases may be carried in accordance with regulations, and that those regulations may specify the method of transport. Regulations specifying method of transport mean regulations which carry a considerable amount of authority; and it appears to me, subject to what the Minister may say, that this may raise a question of principle. The regulations specifying the method of transport might possibly provide that no second-hand cases at all shall be carried by motor transport.

The Minister for Railways: That is to certain districts which are mentioned.

Mr. McDONALD: Specified districts. The regulations, as I understand the position, will provide that the method of transport may be determined by regulation. That provision, under this Bill, will be wide enough to enable regulations to be made excluding the carriage of second-hand cases by motor transport at all. That might raise a question of principle of some importance. While the railway system requires a certain amount of protection, if it is intended that the regulations shall be used possibly to prohibit the employment of motor transport to carry secondhand fruit cases, a question of principle may be involved which the House might like to consider. I should be glad of some guidance from the Minister on the point.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [5.26]: I presume this Bill refers to the amending measure carried last session. I feel certain that under no circumstances would the Minister allow secondhand cases to be sent into clean districts such as those in the South-West, where fruit fly is unknown and where growers have shown extra keenness in combating diseases. The growers in the South are not allowed to consign fruit of any description in secondhand cases. They have to pay from 9d. or 10d. up to 1s. per case, and

send those new cases to the metropolitan markets and elsewhere. All that has to be done then is to paint over the names of the growers and use the secondhand cases.

Mr. Withers: But those cases are clean.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes, because the fruit which they carry is clean. I do not see why fish should be made of one and flesh of another. Instead of having the existing regulation, we should insist on the carriage of all fruit in clean, new cases.

Mr. Thorn: That would be a great hardship. You admit that you send fruit in clean cases from clean areas?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes.

Mr. Thorn: Why should not those cases be used again?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It is hard to police these regulations. Road transport may carry a case of diseased tomatoes into the South-West, which has been kept clean by the efforts of the growers themselves and by strict regulations. The result might be the introduction of fruit fly or codlin moth. I do not think the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) will maintain that fruit fly will not live in that district.

Mr. Thorn: That is my opinion.

Mr. Withers: How about people taking fruit down in the train?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: It may be advisable to insist that all fruit should be packed in new cases. Certainly it would not be a hardship to insist that all fruit should be packed in clean cases. Nothing should be done to jeopardise the fruit industry. Tomatoes are sent to the South-West, and what is a greater carrier of fruit fly than tomatoes?

Mr. Thorn: Can tomatoes be sent by rail?

Mr. J. H. SMITH: Yes. Citrus fruit can be sent down to our area. Where is there a greater carrier of fruit fly than is citrus fruit? The risk is too great. I do not know whether the member for Toodyay has had the ear of the Minister, or what may be the Minister's idea in introducing this legislation. I should like the Minister to reconsider it and declare that all our fruit must be carried in new, clean cases. I am not at all keen on the Bill, and I propose to vote against it.

MR. WANSBROUGH (Albany) [5.31]: I will not go so far as to vote against the second reading, but I wish to record my protest, as I did when we had the earlier Bill dealing with second-hand cases which the

member for Toodyay was so anxious to have passed. I cannot understand why we should break down a good regulation. To-day the Commissioner of Railways is compelled, not only by regulation but by law, to see that all fruit carried by him is in new cases. Why should we pull down that standard? Why not raise the road traction to the same standard? By agreeing to the Bill, we shall be treading on dangerous ground. It is all very well for the Minister to ask for this provision to extend to a certain definite boundary line, but we know the motor trucks are now going beyond that line in the carrying of citrus fruit, tomatoes and rockmelons, which they pick up between here and Armadale and land all over the South-West without any inspection whatever. Yet the Commissioner of Railways is not permitted to accept fruit, except in new cases. We are allowing the motor trucks a free hand.

Mr. Thorn: Not a free hand; great difficulty is being experienced in policing them.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: There is only the one boundary on the Great Southern. What is the matter with having an inspection made of all fruit crossing that boundary?

Mr. Thorn: You couldn't well inspect every parcel that went over it.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: It would be necessary only to catch one or two, and the practice would soon stop. The weakness I see in the Bill is that under it we shall give the Commissioner of Railways power to carry fruit in second-hand cases, and those cases will come into traffic and get into clean areas. I see the same trouble in this Bill as I saw in the Bill of last year.

Mr. Thorn: How can they get into clean areas when the line is defined?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: The defined boundary line is at Narrogin, but the fruit is there taken out and a motor truck carries it off where it will.

Mr. Latham: They go to Narrogin, and pick up fruit for somewhere else and carry it on.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: Yes; the Commissioner of Railways is not allowed to do that, but the motor trucks are doing it every day. Albany requires 1,000 cases of oranges per fortnight. Some of the fruit is railed, but the Commissioner cannot take one case down there until it has been inspected.

Mr. Thorn: Do you say that oranges are going there without inspection?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: Yes, having been picked up at Armadale by motor trucks. The Commissioner of Railways cannot do that, but the Bill provides that he shall be allowed to do so. That is altogether wrong. Instead of breaking down a good regulation, we should be endeavouring to build it up.

MR. LATHAM (York) [5.35]: After all, the Minister has to take the advice of his expert officers. In 1919 it was found necessary to introduce the first of this legislation protecting the fruit growers, who desired to go out and establish the fruit industry. Last year, when we allowed that amending Bill to go through, I was very doubtful of the wisdom of so doing, but the member for Toodyay insisted that it ought to be done. It seemed a very harmless Bill, merely to permit the fruit growers of the Swan to send grapes into the mining areas for the making of wine.

Mr. Withers: The surplus fruit.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, the surplus fruit. I remember it was said on that occasion that the Bill was only just a step to the breaking down of our inspection system. It seems to me a weak argument to say that because the railways at present cannot carry fruit in secondhand cases, the Commissioner desires to fall in with Cabinet's policy, and that consequently we should say to him, "You can do just as you like, because we cannot control the road traffic." We ought to be very careful about legislation of this class. The Minister has not convinced me that there was any greater danger when the Bill was introduced in 1919 than there is to-day. We know that passengers by train frequently carry fruit in bags. The same difficulty must have obtained in 1919. It is of no use passing such legislation and then, in a year or two, finding that there was no need for it. That only irritates people. Existing legislation may have prevented the spread of fruit pests in the South-West, and I am reluctant to give any authority to break down what the officials of that day told us was necessary. In 1919 we did what the members for Toodyay and for Middle Swan wanted. They are both keenly interested in this. On that occasion they seemed to have put up a very good case. Immediately we start weakening on this class of legislation, the whole of the inspection goes. I want to see people get their fruit as cheaply as possible, but I do not think they will get it any the cheaper in consequence of the Bill. I agree with the

member for Albany that we have no right to make the position more difficult for the railways. Certainly we are not going to assist the railways by passing the Bill, for the fruit will still go down by road, as it does to-day. What we ought to do is to catch one or two of the men who are breaking the regulation, and make the penalty sufficiently heavy to prevent them from doing it again. In this State we are remarkably free from fruit pests and diseases.

Mr. Wansbrough: What about the fruit fly?

Mr. LATHAM: I admit we have plenty of pests at present. I remember that at one time it was thought the fruit fly would not attack oranges. To-day, however, we know they are in oranges, the same as in other fruits.

Mr. Wansbrough: They are in all citrus fruit, and in tomatoes and in rockmelons.

Mr. LATHAM: If we relax our vigilance, other pests will come here. The Bill ought to be very closely looked into, for it represents a complete somersault by departmental officers, who first advocated the introduction of legislation to prevent the spread of fruit fly and other pests. While I do not want to oppose the Bill, I hope the Minister will give it very serious consideration. It makes the House look ridiculous to pass preventive legislation such as we have, and then proceed to break it down.

Mr. Thorn: You might as well say the legislation we passed in 1890 is necessary to-day. You will not admit that the changing times require changes in legislation.

Mr. LATHAM: In some respects, yes. But I cannot believe there have been any important changes in the development of our country calling for the change represented by the Bill.

The Minister for Railways: At one time we were not allowed to import apples from the Eastern States.

Mr. LATHAM: I remember that. And at that time we were told it was impossible to grow apples here. We ought to use caution in the making of these changes. It is of no use the member for Toodyay saying we are becoming old-fashioned because we are not reviewing all our ancient legislation. A lot of that old legislation was put on the statute-book for a definite purpose. The question is whether the same definite purpose exists to-day. The fruit industry is very important to this State, and the export of apples has done much to enable us to pay

our overseas debts. There is another aspect: it is not as if we were short of timber. What I should like to see would be lighter fruit cases. We cut our timber altogether too heavy. If we were to build lighter cases probably there would be no need for second-hand cases, because the new case would cost less than it does to-day. I do not propose to oppose the second reading, but I do hope the Minister will look further into this, and perhaps tell us something about the somersault on the part of his officers.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [5.44]: Unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I am distinctly opposed to the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition is lukewarm towards it.

Mr. Latham: I want to know something more about it.

Mr. LAMBERT: Nothing the Minister can say in explanation will influence me in the matter. It is very dangerous to allow second-hand fruit cases into our clean territory. Instead of introducing this legislation, which possibly will have no effect other than spreading disease, we should endeavour to pull up all the stone-fruit trees within 10 miles of the metropolitan area. That would be a wise course to pursue. It is scandalous the little regard that there is for the stone fruit industry which is the actual nursery of many bad diseases in the metropolitan area. If the Minister concentrated along those lines and made a reasonable attempt to eradicate some of the diseases associated with the stone-fruit industry, he would be doing a great deal more good than by introducing legislation of this type. We are trying to serve the interests of the grower in the State, but a firm and definite stand should be taken against what I would class as rubbishy legislation of this description. I remember in 1903 or 1904 when the late Mr. George Leake went to Kalgoorlie—the member for Nedlands will remember the occasion also—and told the people that he intended to remove the apple restrictions in existence at that time, restrictions which had been imposed to protect the then infant industry of apple growing.

The Minister for Justice: They were called the apple Ministry.

Mr. LAMBERT: And the Minister may remember that when the late Mr. Leake announced the removal of the restrictions, he was cheered to the echo. I agree that in

respect of anything that is likely to endanger a valuable industry a definite stand should be taken, but I am surprised that a responsible officer should put up a proposal such as this for consideration. If he submitted it to me, I would tell him to put on his hat and coat and walk out. I hope the Minister will give further consideration to the matter. It is a diabolical thing to even permit the slightest possibility of our fruit areas becoming contaminated, and if the department were to devote their attention to this side of the question, they would be doing the fruit-growing industry a great service. That service will not be rendered with the Bill we are discussing.

MR. PIESSE (Katanning) [5.47]: I agree that caution should be exercised in the passing of legislation of this kind. One can realise how the State has profited from the restrictions that were imposed in the early days, particularly regarding codlin moth. This might be said to be one of the few fruit-growing countries in the world that is free from codlin moth to-day. So we should be doubly careful in passing legislation of this kind, and while I do not feel disposed to vote against the Bill, I suggest that the Minister defer further discussion on it until after the Fruitgrowers' Annual Conference to be held at Donnybrook on the 19th October. It will be possible then to get the views of the fruitgrowers first hand. The association covers a wide area, practically the whole of the South-West, and no harm can result from delaying the consideration of the Bill for two or three weeks until we hear how it is regarded by the fruitgrowers themselves. I sent a copy of the Bill to the association, the head office of which is at Mt. Barker and I received a letter in reply stating that the executive council of the association had considered the amendments contained in the Bill and did not see anything to which to object. In the interests of the industry, however, and the State generally it might be advisable to defer the further consideration of the Bill until after the conference has been held.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [5.49]: Having listened to the debate, as far as it has gone, I confess I am in somewhat of a dilemma as to which way to vote. The Minister introduced the Bill for the simple purpose of enabling the railways to carry fruit

in second-hand cases in the same way as motor lorries are doing to-day. He explained at the same time that motor trucks are not permitted to carry fruit below the 33rd parallel of south latitude, the object of that being, I suppose, to prevent the spread of the disease. But if the regulations were observed, the department's objections would fall to the ground. What we want to do is to strengthen the legislation. The Minister further explained that the object of the Bill was also to assist in the eradication of disease but he did not elaborate that point. Under the Bill the Minister will enjoy the power to prescribe localities through which fruit can be taken either by rail or truck. But the most extraordinary thing is that if one takes the trouble to look at the principal Act it will be found that what is now proposed really means re-enacting section after section of the principal Act, without a single change and without even the punctuation being altered. We are spending time on legislation apparently to keep Parliament going; we are re-enacting what is already law. I have taken the trouble to compare the principal Act with this amending Bill and I find that exactly the same provision is contained in Section 8 paragraphs (a) (b) and (c) as is contained in the Bill. What is the use of the House wasting time in this way by re-enacting what is already law? It might be correct to suggest that the Bill will enable the railways to get some of the traffic that they do not receive to-day, and of which no one suggests they are rightfully deprived. It might also be that the Minister hopes that the power proposed to be given will enable him more effectively to control the trade; in which case the measure should be passed. It is difficult for those members who are not concerned in fruit-growing, in other words who do not represent fruit-growing districts, to discuss the question, but I intend to support the Minister in his effort to obtain more traffic for the railways, and also get legislation so framed that the power for the prevention of the spread of disease will be materially increased. Apparently that is challenged and as the Minister is not here, I think we might properly adjourn the debate.

On motion by Minister for Justice, debate adjourned.

BILL—POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.*Recommittal.*

Resumed from the 21st September; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair, the Minister for Employment in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 66 of principal Act:

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Employment had moved an amendment to insert after the word "by" in the first line of the clause the words "inserting after the words 'rogues and vagabonds' in the second line of the section the words 'with the exception of those mentioned in paragraphs 2a and 2b and by'."

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: The object of the amendment is to make provision by which the person who is convicted of an offence will not be classed as a rogue and vagabond. It was suggested that if we gave further attention to it, the amendment could be altered so as to be made less doubtful. There appear on the Notice Paper two amendments. One amendment will provide in proposed Subsection 2(b) that any person to be convicted of the offence outlined will have to be, to his knowledge, disentitled to the work, employment or benefit referred to. Only if he wilfully makes the statement knowing himself to be disentitled to assistance, will he be liable to the penalty. The second amendment will provide against persons convicted under the two new subsections being deemed rogues and vagabonds, but they will otherwise be liable to the penalties provided in Section 66 of the Act. In the circumstances, I do not desire to go on with the amendment before the Committee, and I ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of proposed Subsection 2 (b) after "shall" the words "to his knowledge" be inserted.

If the amendment be agreed to, the position then will be that any person continuing to receive or attempting to receive work or benefit, after he shall knowingly become disentitled to it, will be liable to the penalty.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: I move an amendment—

That a new subsection, to stand as Subsection 2 (c) be inserted as follows:—"Provided that any person convicted of an offence under Subsection 2 (a) or 2 (b) of this section shall not be deemed to be a rogue and vagabond, but otherwise shall be liable to the penalty prescribed by this section."

I do not think any further explanation is needed beyond what I have already stated.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister has made the position less objectionable, but I still maintain it is unreasonable and unfair to amend the Police Act in the direction set out in the Bill. I do not propose to continue arguing along the lines I have already stressed to members of the Committee. I consider this legislation should not find a place in a permanent statute. I said previously that I hoped it would not be necessary for this kind of legislation to be in existence for long, but I would point out that it could be made use of in connection with land settlement schemes that may be embarked upon for the settlement of the unemployed. It will be remembered that some years ago, the then Minister for Lands, Sir James Mitchell, inaugurated a land settlement scheme for the benefit of civil servants who had been retrenched, and another for water-side workers. Some of the best settlers were people who told us they had no money of their own, but subsequently we found that they had means and were prepared to use their own funds in the development of their holdings. One of those men was from Fremantle, and proved a very desirable, good class of settler. Should any Minister in the future desire to make use of this legislation, he may be able to lay a charge against a man in the position I have indicated, and may secure his imprisonment. I regard that as a shocking thing. I am sorry the Minister has not dealt with this matter in a separate Bill altogether. I tell the Minister plainly that I shall not support the third reading of the Bill. I will not be a party to making a man, who may misrepresent his position somewhat in order to secure work, a criminal and liable to action being taken against him under the Police Act.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am a little dubious about contributing further to the discussion on the amendment. Being a junior, or perhaps a bush lawyer, I may venture

along the narrow path of mistakes, and suggest that the principle involved is unchanged. I would refer the matter to my friend, the King's Counsel, for his opinion. While the Minister has seen fit to remove the objectionable reference to "rogue and vagabond," he still proposed to inflict punishment on a man who may make false representations in order to get work. That is what I object to. I will not be a party to passing legislation that will punish an individual for the terrible crime of getting work. The principle is wrong. Although someone else may be more entitled than he to assistance, I will not discourage the man from working, and much less will I agree to punish him. I will not say anything more regarding the amendment, but I will not allow it to be recorded that while I was a member of this Chamber, I was a party to enabling the passage of legislation that would punish any individual for the terrible crime of making false representations in order to get work.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: We do not propose to penalise any man for getting work, but we do desire to penalise the man who, by means of false representations, takes work that rightly belongs to a man more deserving than he.

Mr. Marshall: If he is game enough to work, he should have it.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT: If the man has £10 a week coming in, it does not require a tremendous amount of gameness to take work from a man who has nothing coming into the house. We want to provide for the man who has nothing. If there are some men—fortunately there are very few of them—who, while in receipt of £10 or £12 a week, are prepared, by making false declarations, to take work from others who are in receipt of nothing, Parliament should legislate so as to prevent that sort of thing from continuing. We should see to it that people most in need of work secure what is available.

Mr. Marshall: I would agree with the Minister if Ministers generally and Parliament as a whole were consistent. It is their inconsistency that causes all the trouble. There are individuals walking about the streets to-day who put their hands into the Treasury and took £500 in hard cash, and have never been challenged.

THE CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: It has everything to do with the amendment, by way of comparison.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! I will rule the hon. member out of order if he persists in his attitude.

Mr. MARSHALL: The principle is wrong, and I am right in making the comparison. No one will stop me. I am entitled to do so. We should be consistent.

THE CHAIRMAN: So long as the hon. member refers to the matter by way of comparison, he is in order. Otherwise he is very much out of order.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the Minister for Employment were consistent, and desired cash in order that he might give employment to those in need of it, he should see to it that those who have taken the money from the Treasury refund it.

Mr. Moloney: Who are they?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not going to mention any names.

Mr. Moloney: Then you should not make the statement.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have made the statement, and I stand by it.

Mr. Moloney: Then mention the names.

Mr. MARSHALL: I shall not do so. The hon. member knows.

Mr. Needham: Then why level the charge?

Mr. MARSHALL: I referred to the case the other day.

Mr. Needham: Why do you make the charge if you will not mention names?

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not making a charge against any individual. I am indicating the inconsistency.

Mr. Needham: You have made a charge.

Mr. MARSHALL: I shall make the charge against the hon. member.

Mr. Needham: What is your charge against me?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Murchison will address the Chair.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Government indicate their desire to provide work for all, and to make the best use of the money in the Treasury. We know positively that money has gone from the Treasury, and no service has been rendered for it. In this instance, because an individual makes false representations in order to get work, he is to be singled out for punishment. Others who rendered no service whatever for the money they took from the Treasury are permitted to go scot free.

Mr. Moloney: They should be punished.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. TONKIN: I have not yet been able to understand why the Minister seeks additional power in order to punish men who endeavour to get work in the circumstances that have been alluded to. Power already exists to punish men who make false statements when they apply for sustenance, and one requisite for obtaining work is that a man shall be in receipt of sustenance.

The Minister for Health: Not necessarily.

Mr. TONKIN: Almost always; the difference is so small that we can afford to neglect it. I think sufficient power already exists to enable the Minister to do what he desires, and I cannot support the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Bill reported with further amendments.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1933-34.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 19th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £1,442:

MR. LATHAM (York) [7.30]: At the outset I should like to congratulate the Treasurer on the innovation of having his speech printed, so that members could follow more closely the views expressed by the Government. It gave us an opportunity to follow his speech, and probably we gained a far more intelligent aspect of the situation than we should have done by reading it in "Hansard." It is very much drier to read it in "Hansard" than to follow it as delivered. The present Budget differs very little from those which have preceded it, and it would be difficult to find much difference between this one and that of last year. Consequently, it would be difficult for me to find any fault with it. In any event, it is not my duty simply to oppose anything submitted by the Government, and on this occasion I certainly would not be justified in doing so. To members the Budget is most important, because it is a statement of the revenue anticipated for the year and the

expenditure from that revenue. Members ought closely to follow the Estimates as that would enable them to appreciate the amount of revenue taken by taxation and other means from the people and to understand how it is to be expended. Very frequently in this Chamber there is confusion between the Loan Estimates and the Revenue Estimates. The Loan Estimates, however, are introduced at a later stage and members are then informed of the expenditure proposed from loan funds. I regret to say that over most of the Estimates this Chamber has really little control. We might pride ourselves that we have control, but in reality we have not. We know that the Government are committed to expenditure from the Revenue Estimates, and we find frequently that the Government have set out a programme of works in connection with the Loan Estimates. Often they have spent a considerable amount of the money before we have had an opportunity to express ourselves on the expenditure.

Mr. Marshall: That has always been so.

Mr. LATHAM: It has been so for a long time; I admit it is nothing new. I have already pointed out that there is very little new about these Estimates. I do not think the people of the State will derive much satisfaction from this year's Estimates, because the deficit budgeted for is almost identical with the deficit budgeted for last year. Though the people, I suppose, will, from time to time, change the Government, I believe they do so in the hope of securing a change for the better. Nothing is of greater importance than the control of the finances of the people. I am personally disappointed that the estimated deficit is so large. I was hopeful that the Treasurer would have been able to show an improvement in the financial position of the State. I had believed that he could reduce the deficit by at least a quarter of a million pounds. It is expecting the impossible to look for a balanced Budget at present, but unbalanced Budgets illustrate the financial confusion in which we find ourselves, and reflect the intention of Treasurers to gamble on the future. Every time a deficit is created, unfortunately, we do not create a corresponding asset, and so, by heaping up deficits, we are creating a liability on which we have to find interest charges from year to year. Since the granting of Responsible Government, deficits have frequently occurred, and it is for that

reason, I say, Treasurers gamble on the future, anticipating that at some future time they will be able to clean up the deficit. Unfortunately, however, we get deeper into the mire as the years go by. I do not say that the previous Government should not accept their share of the blame regarding deficits. In 1930-31 the deficit amounted to £1,420,529; in 1931-32 it increased to £1,557,896, but last year it was reduced to £864,081, which represented a reduction of £593,815 on that of the previous year. That shows that the previous Government had some control of the finances and realised that we could not go on incurring deficits. The instructions from the Loan Council were that we were to balance the Budget this year. It seems an impossibility to expect this State to balance its Budget. The Treasurer could set out exactly how the deficit was reduced last year. It was made possible by the introduction of certain legislation, by the reduction of interest on conversion loans and other things, and while I know that the present Treasurer will not have an opportunity to reduce his deficit to the same extent, we must not lose sight of the fact that he is budgeting for an estimated increase of revenue of £115,000. In other words, he anticipates getting that sum more than we got last year. I maintain that with that increase of revenue and the saving he will make on exchange, provided it remains at 25 per cent., and the smaller amount of exchange he will have to provide for overseas interest, consequent on the conversion loans in London, plus the amount of saving he should effect on unemployment relief—a considerable saving could, and should be made under that heading during the current year—he should be able to reduce the deficit by £250,000. With additional loan funds available, more work can be provided, and granted that the Government carry out the intention expressed by the Premier—to finance work that will absorb the unemployed—he will be called upon to find so much less money from Consolidated Revenue for unemployment grants and sustenance. I realise that the Treasurer and members of this Chamber have very little control over the Budget—very little indeed. Year after year Parliament passes Acts authorising appropriations from revenue. If we turn to the Budget, we find on pages 13-16 that we have delegated control of the finances to certain other authorities to the tune of

£3,870,780. I admit that a considerable amount of it is interest and sinking fund, but over that amount of expenditure we have no control whatever. The money has to be found unless Parliament agrees to alter the Acts concerned. Then come the salaries and wages of civil servants—more expenditure over which we have no control. The Public Service Commissioner has power under regulations to fix the salaries of civil servants, and if the salaries fixed are considered to be unsatisfactory by the persons to whom they are paid, they can appear before the Appeal Board and the board may either allow the salary to stand or increase it. Other persons may go to the Arbitration Court. Consequently, in the Appeal Board and in the Arbitration Court we have vested power greater than we possess. Hence we have very little control over the financial position and it is of no use our priding ourselves that we have control.

Mr. Hegney: Do you advocate that Parliament should fix wages?

Mr. LATHAM: No, not for a moment. I should not like to leave the fixing of wages in the hands of some members. The Treasurer would certainly have a headache in trying to meet the desires of some members. Another item is that representing the losses on trading concerns and public utilities. By losses I mean those amounts by which trading concerns and public utilities fall short of meeting working expenses and interest charges. Unfortunately we have some of them. Then, again, we have works that are not interest-earning. I know that some of the money for such works is provided out of loan funds, but that is a very wrong principle. Any public work such as that being carried out by the Minister—the Causeway reclamation work—

The Minister for Works: And railway construction.

Mr. LATHAM: No, the railways are a public utility. If the Minister can show me any analogy between the construction of a railway and the Causeway reclamation work, I will admit I am wrong. He must acknowledge that there is no analogy between the two.

The Minister for Works: There is no payment to interest sinking fund.

Mr. LATHAM: They do not pay all of it.

The Minister for Works: Or any of it.

Mr. LATHAM: I say they do. The Minister knows that the railways paid some interest last year.

The Minister for Works: What about the new lines?

Mr. LATHAM: Even if they do not pay for the first year or two, they assist in opening up the country, and enable us to increase industry. Thus they confer a benefit in another way.

The Minister for Works: The Causeway work is to open up the river.

Mr. LATHAM: It is closing the river. The Minister is making a beautiful spot at the Causeway for the people of Perth. I have no objection to the work being done, but it should be paid out of revenue. It is not going to earn interest on the expenditure. I do not desire to speak at length on that point, but I would say that I consider the City Council should provide the funds for beautifying the city. For the Government to provide the money does not relieve our position. For the moment such schemes provide a little work for men, but really they do not assist us. They are only aggravating the position, in that we are spending public funds on works that are not interest-earnings. The capital expenditure ought to be found out of Consolidated Revenue and not out of loan funds.

The Minister for Mines: Not much in the way of public works would have been done in this State if they had all been constructed out of revenue.

Mr. LATHAM: Perhaps I have not made the point clear. What I maintain is that those public works not capable of earning interest should be constructed out of Consolidated Revenue. The general run of public works have to be constructed out of loan funds, and it would be foolish to suggest otherwise. The largest amount of loan expenditure is incurred on railways, and I would not for a moment suggest that they should be built out of revenue. Undertakings such as the Causeway reclamation works should be carried out from revenue. One reason why we await the receipt of the Budget is that we may ascertain if any additional taxation is required. I am pleased to note that on this occasion there will be no additional taxation. That will be of considerable relief to the community. When I say "no additional taxation" I mean, no more than appertained last year. The people have reached the

stage when they cannot pay additional taxation. I wish to refer to the position of the workers. There is no better barometer than the Savings Bank business. If members will turn to Return 23 of the Treasurer's financial statement, they will see under the heading of "Savings Bank deposit and withdrawals" that a tremendous amount of money was withdrawn from the savings bank of Western Australia in excess of the deposits. That will probably explain to some members and outsiders why it was necessary to hand over to the Commonwealth the State Savings Banks. In 1928-29 the savings bank deposits amounted to £12,142,575, and the withdrawals were only £11,590,206. At that time the State Savings Bank was in existence, as well as the Commonwealth institution. For the year 1931-32 (the latest figures available are only for nine months so I will not quote them) the deposits had fallen to £7,864,997, and the withdrawals amounted to £8,734,317. This shows the financial position of the salary and wage earners in Western Australia.

Mr. Wansbrough: The figures are practically on a par with those for the previous year.

Mr. LATHAM: During a period of depression these figures serve as a good barometer of the financial position of the people, particularly of those who are the small income earners. Unfortunately there are all too few taxpayers in this State at present. There is no accumulation of wealth here such as is found in the Eastern States, and we have therefore no accumulated moneys to draw against. Some people think we should get additional taxation out of the gold-mining industry. In my opinion we should leave it alone. If there is one thing that is helping us to-day it is the gold-mining industry. Without the increased activities associated with it, we would have found it exceedingly difficult to absorb many of our unemployed. For some time to come the industry should be the means of providing permanent employment for numbers of men. Any encouragement we can give to that industry we should give. I am not speaking of the harm that might accrue to Western Australia, but I am referring to oversea investors. They have no knowledge of what a tax on the gold-mining industry would mean, but at the first mention of the word taxation they fight shy of investing their money. There should be no

talk of taxing an industry that is one of the bright spots in our present history. The primary industries are still being very hard pressed, and there is very little hope of their making a profit in the immediate future. There has been an improvement recently in the price of wool, but that will have to remain firm for a long time before the small growers can get out of their difficulties. They have had a bad spin for several years. Most of them began operations when sheep were at a high price, and they bought on a rising market. Unfortunately for them they were landed with stock costing them a great deal of money. Later on there was a falling off in the price of wool and the falling off in the demand for stock, with the result they got into difficulties. Although at the moment some slight relief is afforded to the woolgrowers, I doubt if the additional price of wool will carry them on from year to year, let alone enable them to work off any arrears. The wheat industry which means so much to Western Australia is still in a bad way, and the prospects are unfavourable. I wish to point out the position of the wheat farmer, who was induced by the Prime Minister to produce more wheat in order that it might be exported and our national solvency maintained. I want to show what the producer has done from a national standpoint, and the result of his effort to maintain our national solvency. In 1929-30, before the request was made, Western Australia produced 39,081,183 bushels of wheat, the export price of which was 5s. The whole of this was not exported, but the total value of that produced at 5s. a bushel was £9,770,295. Immediately after the request was made to increase production, the yield for 1930-31 was 53,504,149 bushels, but the price having dropped by half to 2s. 5¾d. the export value of the commodity represented £6,632,285. In 1931-32, the last completed figures we have, the yield was 41,360,698 bushels, and the export value at 3s. 0¼d. per bushel, amounted to £6,247,188. Although the yield in 1931-32 was 2,000,000 bushels more than in 1929-30, the value of the wheat was one-third less than it was in 1929-30. I wish to show the importance of this industry to Western Australia. I admit that in 1931-32 a bonus of 4½d. a bushel was paid, and this provided something over £700,000 for the producers. Unless something is done, I am very doubtful whether it will be pos-

sible to maintain this industry, which is of so much importance to us. I am pleased that an application is being made to the Prime Minister to see whether it is possible to assist the wheat producer in Australia again this year. I believe we can obtain sufficient money for the industry if a price can be fixed for wheat for home consumption on an Australian basis. If the price were fixed at 5s. there would be sufficient money to give a substantial increase in price to the Australian producers. It would be of little use for Western Australia alone to take such steps. Last year we found that on a price of 5s. a bushel we would only get in £240,000, which works out at a little less than 1d. per bushel. In the capital cities of Melbourne and Sydney with their large populations, it would be possible to obtain a sufficiently substantial amount to give some assistance to Australian producers. We must not be satisfied with that but must do everything possible to reduce the cost to the producer. I know the banks have done a considerable amount in reducing the interest account, but I believe they will have to do more. We may not be justified in asking for reduced interest on new accounts, but we are justified in asking for reduced interest on old accounts. The producers are only building up a greater liability and adding a burden to an already overloaded industry. I hope in the case of those accounts that are worth anything the banks will not stop at reducing interest to 5½ per cent. If the charge was only 3 per cent., I doubt if the industry could be very much assisted in that respect, but we ought to give some heart to those who are engaged in carrying it on. We must do something to remove the disparity between the cost of production and the market price of the commodity itself.

Mr. Griffiths: One bank charged 7½ per cent. interest.

Mr. LATHAM: That institution is midway between a bank and a business concern; it is in the hands of liquidators. Some people think Western Australia can produce the cheapest wheat in the world. That is not so; Argentine can produce it cheaper than we can.

Mr. Marshall: The same quality wheat?

Mr. LATHAM: No. Their land is dearer than ours, because most of it is taken up in big areas and is then leased to the growers. The fertility of the soil enables the producers to grow wheat without fertilisers. They also

have the benefit of cheaper machinery than we can buy. I understand that Australia sends machinery to Argentine where it is sold at a lower figure than that at which it can be purchased in Australia. They also have a cheaper marine freight. The distance from the nearest Argentine port to London is about half that between London and Australia. They also have cheaper labour conditions. There is a tremendous Latin and Mexican population in that part of the world. They have cheaper labour conditions for everything not only for farming. All these things tend to bring down the cost of production. Another important thing is that the people there pay no income tax. The country has been developed by private individuals and Governments have not played the part they have played here. The railways are owned by private companies, and nearly all the development work has been carried out by individuals. At one time they had inflation there. Members who think we can help ourselves in Australia by that means ought to read the early history of the Argentine and discover what happened there. Although I agree that we produce superior wheat, the average yield in the Argentine is higher than it is in Australia. In 1927-28 the average yield in Australia was 9.62 bushels, and in the Argentine it was 11.76. The last year for which I have the figures shows that the average yield in Australia was 10.99 and in the Argentine 11.76. It is no use saying we have an industry that can compete with the world in cost of production, because in the Argentine people can produce wheat more cheaply than we can. That country has a large agricultural area. Most of it fronting the Pacific and Atlantic coasts is in an assured rainfall, but like Australia it has also its dry spots. We must not take consolation in the thought that when the market opens up again for wheat we can beat the Argentine, because that country will be well in the running. The position of the wool-grower is very little better than it was, as we see when we look at the figures. In 1929-30 we had 9,556,823 sheep and the clip was worth £2,779,113. In 1930-31 the number of sheep was 9,882,761, and the clip was worth £2,386,538. In 1931-32 we had 10,096,614 sheep, and the clip was worth £2,345,570. In 1932-33 we had 10,417,031 sheep, whose yield of wool was worth £2,548,892. Although we have in-

creased the number of our sheep by one million over that of 1929, yet the value of the clip is £200,000 less than it was for that year. For the current year, of course, the price has gone up considerably—I believe, sufficiently to meet current expenses and, in the North, to provide some little surplus of revenue. In 1927-28 wool was a good price, and the return from the wool clip for that year was £4,962,916—more than double the value of the clip for 1930-31 and 1931-32, and nearly double the value of last year's clip. The grazier had a good year, but his receipts made the industry so attractive that numerous people bought in; and those people have suffered reduced prices for their wool ever since.

The Premier: That was the peak year.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes. People bought into stations and went in for sheep along the Great Southern railway. It was not the value of wool, but the high price of sheep. To-day many purchasers of sheep at high prices are entangled in a labyrinth of debt from which they will find it very difficult indeed to extricate themselves. Coming to even up those two industries, there is the gold output. For the year 1929-30 it was £1,602,142, for 1931-32 it was £2,998,136, and for last year £4,403,642. That is one of the bright spots, and helps us to even up the losses made in our other industries. If the three industries were prosperous to-day, Western Australia would be in a happy position. They seem to go hand in hand. One factor causing a little concern is the increase in our imports. Over the previous two years they exceeded our exports, excluding gold, by over £2,500,000. Including gold, however, the balance is in favour of our exports by over £3,000,000. Our exports, including gold, are worth £35 per head of the population, as the Premier stressed in the course of his Budget Speech. A great proportion of our imports comes from the Eastern States, something over £7,000,000 worth, as mentioned by the Premier. The remainder consists of imports from overseas. There are still some people who believe that we can obtain credit without creating the corresponding assets. If those people would consider where real wealth comes from to provide interest and sinking fund and to produce all the money in circulation, they would realise how stupid that idea is. Any energetic and impartial survey can lead to

no other conclusion than to discredit those claims. I regard the means indicated as simply a road leading straight to destruction. We must look to our primary producers for our income. Unless they can produce at a profit, our position is hopeless. Now I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to that paragraph of the Premier's Budget Speech dealing with our relations with the Commonwealth Government. I endorse every word of that paragraph. It is bound to make the States envious to see the huge surpluses of the Commonwealth Government. What the Commonwealth Government do with those surpluses is to relieve certain people of taxation and say to the States, "If you want a little more money, there is your avenue." But in Western Australia there are not the same avenues of taxation as exist in the Eastern States. If the Commonwealth Government have a large surplus, they should do what the Constitution intended—distribute it amongst the States. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth has left the States with all the governmental functions meaning expenditure. For a number of years the Premier has advocated avoiding the overlapping of State and Federal functions, but we do not seem to get very far in the matter. A great deal of money could be saved to Australia by that means. Our State officials are just as competent to do Commonwealth work as they are to do State work. Indeed, for a long period they did the Commonwealth work. Duplication of services means increased expenditure. I feel that Australia should look after her defences; I recognise that up to now she has been dependent entirely on the knowledge that Great Britain would stand to her.

Mr. Marshall: I thought the last war was to end war?

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know anything about that. I am afraid that the League of Nations—

Mr. Marshall: League of notions!

Mr. LATHAM:—has not served the purposes it was intended to serve.

Mr. Doney: Anyhow, what outlook is there for our industries if our defences are not good?

Mr. LATHAM: We can reverse the order. The best defence I know of for a country is peopling a country; giving people an opportunity to live in it.

Mr. Doney: That is not my point.

Mr. Marshall: Would you say that the people of Western Australia are living today?

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member may have his own opinion. Certainly people are living here under far better conditions than are certain white races in other parts of the world.

Mr. Marshall: That is not the argument.

Mr. LATHAM: If Commonwealth surplus revenue is to be used for defence, thus sacrificing our industries, I am deeply concerned about it. What annoys me is that there is no mention in Commonwealth quarters of the disabilities of industries so important to outside States like Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania. Those are the States which are suffering most. I am annoyed when I read that the Commonwealth can find money for defence but not for industries. The State Government cannot keep industries going if the price of wheat is to remain as low as it is at present. The Treasurer cannot get additional funds. He cannot go on borrowing when he knows the industries are not paying. I do not know what the present inquiry will produce. It has not started off too favourably. I do not care to express an opinion about it at the moment. I trust, however, that the result will be a better realisation of Western Australia's difficulties than some Eastern States have at present. The Commonwealth Prime Minister came over to see Western Australia. But did he come over to see our disabilities? Of course he did not. What we particularly desire is that representatives of the Commonwealth should come over here and for themselves see our difficulties. If they went into our wheat industry and saw what it really means to Western Australia, they would have a better appreciation of the position of this State. The cost of production is greater than the price of the product.

Mr. Marshall: Do you mean to say the Prime Minister's last visit was not a revelation to him?

Mr. LATHAM: It is no use expecting Governments to do everything for industry. Those living on industry must help too. They must make sacrifices. Tariffs which enrich a few at the expense of the rest of the community will have to go if primary industries are to flourish. Bonuses which injure production must be re-cast. I do not think any

of us can talk too frequently about what the position is in Western Australia, and what the policies of protection and borrowing are leading to. At the present time we have organisations making unreasonable demands on Treasurers, coming along with axes to grind. At election time it seems impossible to stand up against them. The position of Commonwealth Treasurer must be extremely difficult, continually besieged by organisations such as chambers of manufactures, chambers of mines, pastoralists' associations, trade unions—

The Premier: And wheatgrowers' unions.

Mr. LATHAM: —all coming along with axes to grind. They do not realise that even if the Treasurer acceded to all their requests, the money would have to be found by someone.

The Premier: The axe to grind is very often the interests of the State, mind you!

Mr. LATHAM: Sometimes it is not.

The Premier: It is not always, but sometimes it is.

Mr. LATHAM: I sometimes think it would not be a bad idea to give these organisations representation in this Chamber, just to let them see the difficulties and how impossible are some of their propositions.

The Premier: Or representation in the Government.

Mr. LATHAM: These people come along with requests, expecting someone else to carry them out. It is much easier to make requests than to do things. Such organisations, I fear, take some standing up against. I sometimes wonder what the result will be if they go on exerting their influence. I believe that the influence of some organisations is exercised in favour of high tariffs.

Lambert: Their influence there has been running for many years.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course, the people requiring favours desire all the backing they can possibly get, and the result is they frequently find themselves in trouble, and approach the Government to help them out. It is hard for public men to stand up against that kind of thing. Some do, but usually when they do they are shown another road. There is no doubt that if this continual pressure goes on, they will have some form of government quite distinct from what they have at present; for frequently the best men are sacrificed because they will not give in to the pressure.

The Minister for Employment: The best way to maintain our parliamentary institutions is to give them sufficient voting power.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, we have heard of that. I can put up an argument against it, but at present I do not propose to do so. If the individuals who come along with demands on the Government were to invest their own money in those things in which they ask the Government to invest, we would get a good deal further than we are getting at present. An individual can get better value for his money than can a Government, and he is not likely to invest it in an unprofitable concern.

The Minister for Railways: The individual, when investing his own money, does not want to get all those "indirect benefits" which constitute a stock argument when he is requesting the Government to invest.

Mr. LATHAM: The Argentine is a very wealthy country. It has its troubles, I know, and I do not want the same form of government here, but it is a wealthy country, and most of its expenditure is carried on by individuals.

Mr. Lambert: The Bank of Argentina has done more to develop Argentina than has any other factor.

Mr. LATHAM: I notice that the cost of railway construction there is higher than it is here, while their railway freights are a good deal lower than ours. We all know that Australia is quite capable of getting out of its difficulties if it be given a chance; and this State particularly can get out of its difficulties, for we have a great deal of untouched wealth, and it is only a question of markets. Our mineral assets alone would get us out of our troubles if we had not to compete with other countries which are dumping their stuff on the markets of the world, and with the cry for higher pay and shorter hours, and our go-slow policy, and protection, and bonuses, and uncontrolled expenditure. None of those things will help to develop this country.

The Premier: I thought you were asking for help for the wheat-growers a little while ago.

Mr. LATHAM: I was asking for the development of the industry. Of course, I do not suggest that a bonus would do the industry any harm. But we have got to the stage when we have so many bonuses that people are beginning to realise the weakness of the system. Once a bonus is granted,

it is very difficult to remove it. Still, it is quite essential that our wheatgrowing industry should be developed. It was the industry to which the Prime Minister rushed when he wanted credit on the London market. He did not go to the wool growers because he knew it would take them too long to build up their flocks; and so he went to the wheatgrowing industry, which was able to respond in quick time. What the Prime Minister wanted was to establish credits in London.

The Minister for Employment: But we want to employ our own people in our own country.

Mr. LATHAM: We have not been too successful in that, because the man with falling prices for his commodities has had to pay higher prices for what he requires.

The Minister for Works: We had not the money to pay for what we wanted in London, and so we had to stop the imports.

Mr. LATHAM: I have faith in the suggestion put up by the Minister for Lands the other night when he said, "Let us get back to every man doing his best to work out his own salvation." That is a very sound policy. At the same time, I remind members on the Government side that it is going to be difficult to get people to engage in our industries while the present trouble remains, if we are to have been working alongside of them for 44 hours per week and getting the basic wage.

The Minister for Employment: They should be working 40 hours a week or less.

Mr. LATHAM: All right, but let us all have it; let the dairyman and the wheat-grower have it also. All you are going to do is to swell the ranks of the unemployed. You have a man running a road and working 44 hours per week. On the other hand, a man milking cows has to milk twice a day for seven days a week.

The Minister for Railways: But he hopes to build up a competence for himself.

Mr. LATHAM: He hopes in despair. He sees the actual money earned by the other man and he notes the shorter hours the other man works, and he asks, "What have I at the end of the year?"

The Minister for Employment: He sees the asset he himself is building up.

Mr. LATHAM: That asset is a liability at the present time, and he knows it.

The Minister for Employment: The day has gone by when people will advocate longer hours of work.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not mind shorter hours, but let us all have them. Under your proposal you are going to have a few individuals working short hours, while those engaged in the industries have to work longer hours with no return. In those circumstances, your industries must collapse.

The Minister for Employment: The greatly increased producing power of machines makes it definite that working hours must be reduced.

Mr. LATHAM: I can remember years ago when the machinery we used was very primitive as compared with the machinery of to-day. In those days I was on a farm. Even with the improved machinery of to-day we have still to work long hours and do not get any more out of it.

The Minister for Employment: Perhaps you do not work hard enough.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not care about the opinions the hon. member may have of me. It is of no use our imagining that we can create an artificial prosperity by borrowing money. We cannot do it. And when the time comes that we cannot borrow any more, how can we undo the harm we shall have done? Luckily, in Australia we have been able to print some notes, Treasury bills. Unfortunately, we are paying interest on them. That is one grudge I have against the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Government; they print notes at a cost of about 1d. each and they charge us about 4 per cent. on some of them.

The Premier: It was 6 per cent., then 4 per cent., and it is now 2 per cent.

Mr. LATHAM: But during the war we got money advanced to Western Australia, and we had to pay 6 per cent. on it for a long time; it is now down to 4 per cent.

Mr. Lambert: We had money from the British Government to the extent of about 90 millions.

Mr. LATHAM: The British Government have not treated us too badly.

The Minister for Justice: Better than any other Government in the world.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes. For the last two or three years I think they have let us off the payment of interest.

Mr. Lambert: We are paying them 4.75 per cent. for it—the highest that any country is paying.

Mr. LATHAM: We cannot hope to develop Australia under some of our existing conditions and tendencies. It is not only those who preach the basic wage and sustenance, but those who cry, "Do not pay your debts." All those make it very much more difficult for those trying to assist others engaged in industry. We have to stand up against these things, in the interests of the workers, of the primary producer and of the State generally, because we are not going to get very far until we return to living within our incomes. I wish to say a word or two about this building revival campaign. I appreciate the high aim of those engaged in the campaign. Their idea is to try to revive the building trade, but it seems to me useless to start building in the city when our industries are languishing, as they are. It is all topsy-turvy. If they could show us how to pay interest on the capital invested in those buildings, it would assist us materially. They are building houses costing from £600 to 800. On this occasion, the land is being donated for the purpose, but normally an £800-house with the land will run into £1,000, while a house at £600 and land will mean £800. But the people's earnings have so fallen that the people cannot afford to pay rent on that high capitalisation. I am hopeful that those carrying on the campaign will show us how to build a serviceable house at £400 or £500, a house suitable for the wage-earner and the salary-earner. What is the good of building elaborate houses? As a rule, a man who can occupy such a house can find sufficient money to carry out his own work. We want to encourage the building of houses cheap enough for ordinary people to live in without running into debt.

Mr. Lambert: The trouble is the tendency to create brick areas.

Mr. LATHAM: We tried in this House to alter that, but it is most difficult. That is the result of giving powers to outside bodies to do things that we in this House should reserve the right to do.

The Minister for Justice: That is the result of plural voting.

Mr. LATHAM: In any event, it is the householder who has the vote. A man may own £50,000 worth of property and not have a vote, because the householders have the votes. It is the silly idea the local authorities get that they ought to have brick areas declared. In many parts of the world there

are none but wooden buildings, and very nice buildings they are, too. More than half the houses in Wellington, New Zealand, are built of wood. What I should like Mr. Boas and those associated with him to do is to show us how to erect a good class of house for about £400 or £500.

Mr. Lambert: That would scarcely appeal to the architect.

Mr. LATHAM: I think Mr. Boas is sufficiently public-spirited to do that.

Mr. Lambert: I am not speaking of him individually.

Mr. LATHAM: I have referred to him because he is prominent in this building campaign. But he is not going to get people to occupy houses at such a high valuation.

Mr. Lambert: And the houses ought to be built in the country districts, where they are required.

Mr. LATHAM: I should like to see them erected along our railways and in our country towns.

The Minister for Employment: We may extend the activities of the Economic Council to those districts for that purpose.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister knows my opinion of the Economic Council, but I am not going to discourage that body.

The Minister for Employment: They are producing results.

Mr. LATHAM: I have not seen any of them.

The Minister for Employment: None so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. LATHAM: I desire to make a protest against the system in operation of giving men sufficient work to enable them to earn wages and then stand them down. The men were better off under the system adopted by the previous Government.

The Minister for Employment: Unfortunately, the men did not see eye to eye with you on that point.

Mr. LATHAM: They did. The men could go out and work full time and come back and enjoy their wages with their families. I know of instances where they had other jobs in between. We should encourage men to earn their living. The payment of sustenance takes away from men their self-respect. Years ago in this House we used to speak disparagingly of those people who were drawing the dole in England. Now we are branding our own people in the same way.

The Minister for Employment: We are not; we are taking them away from sustenance in thousands.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope you are.

The Minister for Employment: I have just said we are doing so.

Mr. LATHAM: I am very pleased to know that. I have been unable to find out the number of men employed to-day because the system of keeping count of them is not the same as that which was in force under the previous Government.

The Minister for Employment: We are giving them more work now.

Mr. LATHAM: That should not alter the system of keeping count of the numbers employed. The old system of keeping count gave entire satisfaction.

The Minister for Employment: And you kept men down for their lifetime.

Mr. LATHAM: They are worse off to-day.

The Minister for Employment: Tell that to the men.

Mr. LATHAM: They know it and they are protesting. If you give a man the opportunity to work for his living, even if he has to stand off for a while, he feels he has some self-respect left. The most important thing this House has to consider is finance, involving our obligations to overseas creditors. It is really becoming more difficult. By that I mean that it is not possible for us to dissociate the growing and intense nationalistic trade tendencies from finance. It is admitted by all, I think, that the policy of free borrowing, which we adopted in pre-depression years, was carried to a point at which the obligation so created became a menace to future stability. There have been—not in this State I am thankful to say—suggestions that Australia should repudiate those obligations. I hope the Parliament of Western Australia will never give the slightest consideration to any suggestion that this State should not meet every contract entered into on behalf of the people on the credit of the people.

The Minister for Employment: Are you reading an extract from some journal?

Mr. LATHAM: I am not. I have seen the hon. member read his speeches in this House. I assure him that I am not reading an extract from anything. I cannot close my eyes to a possible future position which may bring about results entirely be-

yond our control. We are familiar—so familiar that our knowledge almost breeds contempt—with the fact that interest and sinking fund payments now take a tremendous slice of the amount we raise annually from our people, and although there has recently been some relief through the conversion operations carried out by Mr. Bruce, we cannot view with equanimity any action which must add to that annual obligation.

The Minister for Justice: You do not object to our trying to get better conditions?

Mr. LATHAM: No, I say that we should continue to meet our obligations.

The Minister for Justice: We are trying to get our interest reduced.

Mr. LATHAM: By co-operation we should do so. If we continue to borrow—and to some extent we must borrow—we must also be ready to meet the interest bill which such borrowing involves. Borrowing has this advantage—if advantage it can be called—that it carries its own penalty. We are now learning that to our cost. There is a limit to the extent we can borrow. So long as our primary industries were flourishing and we were able to meet our contractual obligations, we were not very seriously perturbed, but I would like to remind the House that the position in respect to inter-Empire and international trade has undergone a swift and material change; and what is more, that there is very grave evidence of further change which must be taken into account when we approach the question of finance. There is to-day in Australia, and throughout the Empire and in foreign countries, a growing demand for self-sufficiency, a policy of national self-containment. Nations are aiming to become independent of other nations. We know what has happened in respect to wheat; and the same thing is happening in respect to other food commodities. As we know, the logical result of that policy is trade restriction. For us it may become a major problem. It is already engaging our most serious attention. We look to the British market for the disposal of our commodities, but we cannot expect the British consumer to take everything we like to send him. Nor can the British Government ignore the claims of its own primary producers. British agriculture is receiving special attention to-day, and the British producer is demanding protection

from his competitors both within and without the Empire. You can see that if this policy develops it must not only seriously affect our own producers, whose market must be restricted, but that it must also affect our position with the bondholders, because we must meet our obligations abroad with goods produced in Australia. We have no right to ask the British Government to say that the people of Great Britain shall eat Australian butter and Australian beef or any other specific commodity, if the British agriculturist is able to produce all the requirements of the British market, particularly when we ourselves are pursuing an intense policy of national self-containment. Moreover, the position of Great Britain is different from our own. She is isolated from her Dominions. She is within a few hours of a Continent seething with unrest. In a crisis she might find herself unable to keep the trade routes open as she did in 1914-18, and it is quite easy to appreciate her anxiety to promote the interests of her own producers as well as to safeguard the interests of the whole of the people by a policy of productive insurance should she again be faced with a sudden emergency. Whilst, therefore, we should use every endeavour to promote trade on a reciprocal basis, we have no right to insist on advantageous preference for our own people. It might be said that unless Great Britain makes it possible for us to meet our obligations and pay our interest bill each year by accepting goods in payment thereof, and if she refuses to reduce those interest payments by lowering the rate of interest, that we will default; but I submit that we are not entitled to do that, and that we must approach the whole question on a basis of true co-operation, and not close our doors to each other irrespective of the future welfare of the Empire as a whole. I must confess to very grave fears in respect to the development of international trade restriction. I believe it constitutes one of the greatest evils of to-day. It is the genesis of war; and in actual results it is probably even more cruel than war. Because Western Australia is so vitally concerned in marketing her major commodities, I think the Government ought to make the most earnest representations to the Federal Government that in any negotiations which take place as between the Australian Government and

the British Government, in respect to trade agreements, or as between the British Government and the Governments of other countries, the opinion of this Government should be ascertained in consultation with the Governments of the respective States and their representatives in London. We can only continue to exist so long as we find satisfactory markets for our surplus primary products. Admittedly, the part which the State can play is comparatively small. From a financial point of view we are, even now, practically in the hands of the Loan Council. This Parliament can have very little say in framing financial policy; but that does not excuse us from making whatever contribution is possible, nor from insisting that those in control of the Government of this country shall exercise the greatest possible care within the scope of its domestic spendings. It is because of the position as it appears to me, and as I have endeavoured to present it to this House that I view with alarm the proposed increase in this year's spending of borrowed money. In years gone by the Treasurer has spoken warningly of the tendency to increase the loan commitments, and I am sure he will agree that a continuance of that policy can only lead to disaster. It would be foolish to the point of criminality for us to believe that because there has been a dramatic upward movement in wool prices, that we have said good-bye to our difficulties. I do not desire to appear pessimistic, but I do feel that we have got to look far beyond the immediate present. There is no need for me to remind hon. members what would have happened this year had our seasonal fears of a few weeks ago been realised, and that is a position we have got to consider as something more than a possibility in the not distant future. We have enjoyed a succession of wonderful seasons, for which we should be tremendously thankful; but we cannot ignore the possibility of seasonal failure. Our Governments must therefore budget conservatively. We should endeavour to consolidate what we have won, and not launch out upon new expenditure until we can face the future with a greater degree of confidence. Governments have got to learn to live within their means. After all, it was departure from that inexorable principle of stability that has been so largely responsible for plunging the nations into the depression. If a family has a certain income, it

must live within that income. If its expenditure exceeds its income, and it resorts to borrowing, or begging, or stealing, to make ends meet, it can only do so until it is found out. It is the same with Australia and with Western Australia. We cannot indefinitely live above our income, and we cannot mortgage our future to the point of bankrupting our honour.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [8.43]: I should like to offer a few remarks before the items are reached. The first point is in regard to the necessity for us to reduce our deficit. Unfortunately, we are in a position very different from that of the Commonwealth Government, who are able not only to balance their Budget but to secure a big surplus. Our position is just the reverse. No country can live without new money, that is, if it is desired to make profits. The Federal Government should be producing new money from somewhere. But they are taxing the people and taking from them more than is actually needed and that action is forcing the States to have unbalanced Budgets. Correctly speaking, the position should be reversed. That has led to the present demand either for Constitution reform, or, alternatively, for secession. This is a most important point, and should be stated clearly in the House. Whatever may be said about the necessity for individuals balancing their budgets or, for that matter, of the necessity as applied to the State, it is not the concern of the nation. If the nation as a whole attempted to balance the national Budget, without providing new money, it would lead to ruin. Some nations prefer to balance their Budgets with regard to revenue and expenditure but such nations are creating new money in addition, or, perhaps, are producing gold. Our policy as a State and as a nation is to make profits, and profits, as expressed in terms of money, cannot be secured except by means of the provision of new money. Otherwise, we would have the same funds circulating around the community and for profits to be shown in respect of every activity or concern, would be an impossible position. The figures are against such a situation. Therefore, when the Federal Government tax the people beyond the needs of that Government and collect millions of pounds more than are required, and at the same time force the States to carry on with unbalanced Budgets, an

impossible position is created that should be remedied.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: But that is what they are doing.

Mr. NORTH: Many of us believe in secession. Should our move in that direction fail, then there must follow very great Constitutional reforms. We have the absurd spectacle of the national Government receiving money from the people in the form of taxation, instead of that Government creating new money. If anyone were to give half an hour's consideration to the effect of every individual or industry attempting to make profits, which is our theory of civilisation, he would see that at the end of 12 months there must be new money created somewhere. Either a loan must be raised, gold must be produced, or taxation must be levied. That must be done so as to show the profits that are recorded. If that were not the position, it would mean that for every person or industry making a profit, a consequential loss must be disclosed elsewhere. That is the explanation of the big movement that has taken place recently and is referred to as "the new economics" which endeavours to indicate that the world is bound to crash in its present situation. As Dickens once pointed out, the individual who spent 19s. when his income was £1, was in a good position, but if he spent the other 1s., he had to face ruin. If we apply that to any sovereign State, from which should emanate currency we reach a point of complete difference, and therefore I would venture to protest against the existing method of budgeting under which this State is being forced to incur a deficit at a time when the Federal Government are over-taxing the same people. Turning now to our indebtedness overseas, the position regarding loan moneys is fairly reflected in the railway situation. Our railways are doing useful work and earning quite a reasonable return in revenue, when we consider the cost of the undertaking. But by reason of the fact that the money invested in the railways has been borrowed, and there are bondholders in other parts of the world, who may be regarded as in the position of preference shareholders, our railways have to show a loss. I believe I am right in saying that if the money invested in our railways represented capital owned by shareholders—that is to say if the railways were run as a private concern—we would be showing a good return on the money in-

vested. I think the return would be about 3 per cent. That reflects on the general question regarding the difficulty of making both ends meet when we have not a more workable provision regarding finance. Other matters I desire to refer to on the general discussion relate to local questions. I urge the Government to extend the sewerage system to the Claremont electorate. That is necessary work, and will provide employment, besides furnishing a return from the people to meet the cost involved. Another question of importance to Cottesloe relates to the sale of a Class A reserve. In various parts around the city, there are Class A reserves that are idle and useless. At Cottesloe the local authorities have been urging the Government to permit them to sell a Class A reserve in their district with a view to carrying out certain important projects. So far, that permission has been refused, and I urge the Government to reconsider the matter. In these days when money is so hard to procure, and we, as a State, have not the sovereign power enabling us to create our own money, a few thousand pounds that could be raised by the sale of idle Class A land would be of assistance to the people, and would permit the local authorities at Cottesloe to perform useful work at no cost to the Government, and with no taxation involved. The unemployed would be assisted correspondingly.

Mr. Marshall: But you must keep an eye on the future.

Mr. NORTH: As to that, I think that when the early surveyors plotted out some of the land here, they must have had their eyes shut. The Class A reserve that I have in mind is a bare hill covered with boulders and stones, quite useless for anything except for cutting up into small building blocks. When we think of Class A reserves, we have in mind areas set apart for recreation, and so forth. That cannot apply to the reserve in the Cottesloe area. I think the Leader of the Opposition, when Minister for Lands, was favourably inclined towards the Cottesloe proposal, and would have agreed to the sale of the land. I do not know whether the present Government are of that opinion, but I urge them to consider it in a favourable light. It would help the district and would help the Minister for Employment in the solution of his present difficulties. Another point I want to refer to relates to the railways in my electorate. For a long time

it has been urged that something should be done to improve the approaches to the railways. There are two or three places where there are very high steps. Cases of heart failure have been reported, and have been traced back to the effect of the high steps at some of the railway stations.

Mr. Marshall: In these days of jazz and so forth, I should have thought people could have taken anything in their stride.

Mr. NORTH: That is all very well for the younger generation, but we reach a stage in due course when that does not apply, and heart failures then occur. In these days of quicker transport, there is a possibility of the Government, in due course, doing away with the heavy steam trains and substituting a quicker coach service. In that event it might be possible to remove some of the bridges that have caused so much trouble in the past. In many parts of the world there are no railway platforms at all. Footpaths are provided alongside the rails and at different parts there are the stations. People are able to walk freely across the rails as they can across a street in the city. In fact, at times the Fremantle-road is far more dangerous to cross than any of the railway lines. It is known that trains pass at certain times, and at all other times people could pass across the rails without any danger at all. On the Fremantle-road, the traffic is passing all the time, and it is far more dangerous to cross the road in those circumstances. An alternative would be to remove the bridges and construct sub-ways at some of the stations, but that would be very costly in these days. That brings me to my final point, which relates to unemployment. I am glad to acknowledge the great strides that have been made by the present Government in gradually absorbing the people who have been out of work. The depression has lasted for three years or more, and, as a State, we would be foolish if we were to refrain from adopting a policy of making ample provision for people who are displaced in various avenues. We should recognise that they were entitled either to some employment or to the equivalent of it in purchasing power. If that claim had been advanced some years ago, it would have been laughed at and been regarded as impossible. It is no longer impossible; the facts are obvious. Even the Leader of the Opposition, in his position as a great critic, has

expressed in this House during the present session, his desire that every person should have all his needs met for ordinary home life, whether he was at work or not. There is everything in Western Australia needed for that purpose, except tea and sugar. We have all the food, clothing and all the requirements for reasonable shelter readily available. At present an effort has been launched to revive the building trade. As the Leader of the Opposition said, we have a surplus of everything required in Western Australia for the needs of the average person, except tea and coffee. If we cannot sell sufficient wool, butter, fruit and other produce to purchase the small amount of tea, coffee and sugar that are required, my figures are most erroneous. If that point of view were adopted by the authorities and each party in Parliament—the view that each person is entitled, for himself and his family, to the right either to do some work or to have the equivalent purchasing power—ample provision could be made so that the requirements of food, clothing and shelter would be met for the community generally. That brings me to the relevant point raised by the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) with regard to the rent question. He made a striking point when he expressed the view that unless it was decided by Parliament that where there was unemployment, the landlords were to carry the cost of meeting the rent, then the community, or industry, should shoulder the burden. That entirely dovetails in with the point I am making. We grow ample wheat, wool and other commodities to comply with the needs of 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 people, except for tea and coffee. We grow enough wheat to feed more than 3,000,000 mouths, and enough wool to clothe many millions more. I commend the Minister for Employment for his action in taking men off sustenance and for the work he is carrying out in the interests of the unemployed. The time has gone by when any person denied the right to work, should be refused food, clothing and shelter. To-day he is partially getting food, and that is perhaps all we can say he is getting. I do not think any provision is made by which a man who receives sustenance may buy a suit of clothes, unless he reports to the authorities that he has earned the few pounds that enable him to do so. If people who are drawing rations

are able to earn a few shillings to enable them to pay their rent, they are forced to report the fact to the authorities, to show how they have reached that position. The thing can be done—the provision of food, clothing and shelter—but only by pressure exerted by all sections of the community on the Federal Government, who nominally control all the credit available for this purpose. Pressure should be brought to bear in order that the Federal Government and the Loan Council will be able to visualise the loan requirements, so that the whole of the community will be provided with work or provision will be made enabling them to preserve reasonable health and strength until jobs are available.

The Minister for Employment: To pay what they require in order to live, they must have restored to them their purchasing power.

Mr. NORTH: There is a sinister side that should receive attention in the near future and that is the possibility of pestilence appearing. Some of the leading health authorities have come to the conclusion that we are likely to experience some form of pestilence due to the undermining of the constitution of so many of the unemployed. For a certain period it is possible for individuals to make a brave show. It is known that a person can live for seven to 18 days on water. It does some people a lot of good.

Mr. Marshall: Provided you mix a drop of whiskey with it.

Mr. NORTH: Few are inclined to try it. However, when people carry on for three years with what is less than is needed to provide for the human frame, the constitution becomes undermined. Articles are being published by health authorities warning us of the possibility of terrible pestilence that may sweep the country as it did after the Great War. People in Germany particularly, owing to under-nourishment during the blockade, were stricken down with influenza, strong as well as weak being affected. More people were killed by influenza in one quarter of England than were killed in any similar period in the war. Consequently the Minister for Employment should be strengthened in his efforts to get men back to some form of what is called reproductive employment. That term is merely an excuse to give men the means to buy food, some clothing and pay some rent. Actually there is so much invention about

us that what to-day is termed reproductive employment in a few years becomes an obsolete asset, as we see in our trams and eventually shall see in the railways. Still, for the time being, it is convenient to term it reproductive employment because it enables the workers to get in addition to their food, a few clothes and some shelter. I urge that consideration for the health of the community must now be taken into account. This question is being discussed by churches and other sections apart from political forces, namely, that every person in Australia should have sufficient of the necessities to keep him in health. We do not allow our best stock to deteriorate. That is too important; it must be kept up to the mark.

Mr. Latham: The death rate in this State is declining.

Mr. NORTH: That has been so for some time. The Leader of the Opposition made an excellent, cautious speech urging us to keep the belt tight and have regard for the future of the country, but this country has never been so wealthy as it is to-day in those things that make human life possible. I ask him to name one thing that we are short of except money. I will add to money that we are short of tea and coffee. Other things like oil and motor cars and forms of electrical machinery do not come into consideration. I am trying to point out that the basic needs are here—food, clothing and shelter. I congratulate the Minister for Employment on the work he is doing. A move, however, should emanate from the Loan Council. If they would take into consultation the chief health officers, whose duty it would be to cope with any crisis consequent upon the privations suffered by the unemployed, I think they would see the advisableness of increasing the national figures of accountancy to permit of a large sweep of work and the purchasing power that work brings. If that were done, we need have no fear for the future. I am convinced from published figures that other countries are far more involved in the so-called economic outlook than we are. It is interesting to compare the aims of the local unemployment council, which is seeking to increase employment by encouraging local production and the patronage of home-made goods, with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who presented an equally pressing problem for our consideration, namely the danger of economic nationalism and

the need for general world trade. The two policies are utterly conflicting and we have to decide which should come first, whether the food, clothing and shelter of the individuals forming the nations are not more important as a basis of economic policy than the extraordinary ambition to export goods to the other side of the world. While we are anxiously striving to get an extra load of wheat or wool away to London or elsewhere, we are able to enter a Perth shop and buy German safety razors at a penny apiece, while those same razors in Germany might cost 4d. or 5d. each. It is a policy that forces the exportation of goods to other countries while the masses in the home country are suffering privation. Hence it is necessary for those who advocate the world trade policy to consider its conflict with the policy we are asked to adopt, namely that everything possible should be made locally to meet our own requirements. At the moment dairymen in the South-West are being urged to produce enough butter to supply the needs of the State over the whole year—it is not quite possible to meet the local requirements yet—and yet that very policy will put men out of work in the Eastern States. The most striking commentary on the world policy is supplied by Japan. There we have exemplified the policy which aims at sending goods away and not bothering about the home masses who apparently may as well starve. Until Japan suddenly started to export goods, at low cost to all parts of the world, we were being urged in the Press and generally to stimulate our exports and revive world trade, but when Japan came on the scene and sought to revive world trade by exporting her goods and undercutting the British market, then a new cry was raised, namely that this was not trade but that it was a menace. What was previously advocated as a desirable policy for Britain and this country became a menace when adopted by Japan. Japan kept her masses working 50 hours a week for paltry rates of pay and that, plus a big credit inflation, enabled that country to flood this and other markets with cheap goods. Thus we have exposed to us the folly of the cry for world trade. I am convinced that the general adoption by every country of the policy of the local economic council—the policy of building up the condition of the masses and leaving the export of the

surplus as a secondary matter—would soon cause all our troubles to pass.

Progress reported.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 14 amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Sleeman in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 1.—At the end of the clause add the following words:—"and shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation."

The PREMIER: This amendment proposes that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation and involves consequential amendments. I do not propose to debate the question. As regards income-tax payers the measure would operate from the 1st July and wage and salary earners would pay as from the 1st August. I think members have made up their minds, and even if I discussed the question at length, it would not be likely to influence anyone. I may say that the Financial Emergency Act of 1931 came into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. The Act provided that it should operate as from the 10th July of that year. It was not assented to until the 18th August, and was proclaimed on the 19th August, but it had effect as from the 10th July. After all, another place did pass that Act with retrospective application. Whilst much objection may be taken to legislation of this kind, it is not new, even to another place. Although the retrospective aspect of this Bill may be a little longer than that which I have quoted, the principle is the same. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 2.—Delete this clause:

The PREMIER: This is consequential upon the amendment I have just dealt with. The clause provides for the operation of the Bill as from the 1st July, as it affects incomes. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. N. KEENAN: When the Bill was before us, I expressed the view that it was not for members to challenge the statement of the Treasurer as to the amount of money required for Budgetary purposes, and that therefore we should not lightly reject any proposal of his to fix the date from which taxation should be collected. Two forms of taxation are provided for in this measure, one being on income, and the other on wages and salaries collected at the source. Whilst it would be quite legitimate to call upon income payers to pay for the whole financial year, it is equally legitimate to allow a wider latitude in the case of taxation on wages and salaries, collected at the source. I do not think, however, it is wise to refuse to support the Treasurer in the raising of the money necessary for budgetary purposes.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 3. Clause 3.—Delete paragraph (a):

The PREMIER: This amendment alters the exemption for single people. The effect of it is to revert to what appears in last year's Act, namely £1 is. per week. The Bill provided for £2 a week. I cannot accept the amendment. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 4: Delete paragraph (b):

The PREMIER: This is consequential upon the amendment we have just dealt with. The paragraph alters the exemptions in the case of the incomes of single people, and brings them into line with the salaries and wages. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 5: On motion by the Premier, the Council's amendment, "Paragraph (i), in line 4, delete the word 'forty' and substitute the words 'twenty-one'," not agreed to.

No. 6: Paragraph (ii). In line 5, delete the words "ten shillings":

The PREMIER: This amendment deals with married people. The Bill provided that the tax should not be levied on anyone in receipt of wages and salaries of less than

£3 10s. a week. Another place has reduced the amount to £3 a week. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 7: Paragraph (iii). In lines 7 and 8, delete the words "one hundred and four" and substitute the words "fifty-two":

The PREMIER: This follows the other amendment in regard to married people, and substitutes £156 for £182. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 9: Clause 4—Delete paragraph (b):

The PREMIER: This amendment is consequential upon the alteration of £1 1s. per week and £3 10s. per week respectively. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 10: On motion by the Premier, the Council's amendment (Consequential on No. 8)—In paragraph (c) lines 26 and 27, delete the words "eighty-two" and substitute the words "fifty-six" not agreed to.

No. 11: Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (d), as follows:—(d) by adding a subsection, as follows:—(7.) 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.

The PREMIER: I have no objection to this amendment on principle, but am assured by the Commissioner of Taxation and the Crown Law authorities that it is unnecessary and is already contained in the principal Act. Whilst I might let it stand. I do not think we ought to put anything into an Act that is not necessary. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 12: Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (e), as follows:—(e) by adding a subsection, as follows:—(8.) Persons paying salary or wages to any other person shall be responsible only for the payment of financial emergency tax calculated at such rate per pound as would be applicable if the salary or wages so paid were the only salary or wages received by such other person.

The PREMIER: This is another principle with which I agree, but the Commissioner of Taxation says it is already provided for in the principal Act, and is therefore unnecessary. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. N. Keenan: Can you refer me to the section of the principal Act which embodies this?

The PREMIER: I am not sure of the number of the section. However, both the Commissioner of Taxation and the Crown Law Department advise me that the power already exists in the principal Act.

Mr. LATHAM: This amendment is somewhat different from the others. Apparently it refers to deduction on a graduated scale. There has been some argument as to what the rate of deduction should be—4d., 5d., 6d., or 7d.—and this amendment seems to deal with that aspect.

The PREMIER: Another place considered that if an employer was paying a salary of £3 per week, the employee might be drawing another £1 per week from another source altogether, of which the employer had no notice, and that in those circumstances the employer would be responsible for collecting tax on £4 per week. The amendment seeks to absolve the employer from responsibility except as regards the salary or wages he himself pays. Again here the Commissioner of Taxation and the Crown Law Department state that the matter is already provided for in the principal Act.

Mr. Patrick: In those circumstances the rate of tax might be altered.

The PREMIER: Yes, but that would come up for consideration in connection with the man's income tax assessment at the end of the year.

Mr. McDONALD: Another aspect is that the trouble arises from that provision of the principal Act which gives the terms salary and wages an artificial meaning, including commissions and directors' fees. A man might receive a commission of £5 on one day, and £2 on the following day, and £3 the next day; so that the employer would not know how much tax to take back from the commission. Perhaps the Premier might talk the matter over with the Commissioner of Taxation and the Crown Law Department, and ascertain whether some member of another place was not anxious to safeguard that point. In my opinion the proper way is to cut out the artificial definitions and provide that all commissions and directors' fees, which the Bill makes salaries and wages, shall be income and shown in the ordinary return of income.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 13: Clause 5.—Delete this clause.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

This is consequential.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 14: New Clause.—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 6, as follows:—"This Act shall remain in force until the 31st day of October, 1934, and no longer."

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot accept the new clause. I rule that it is out of order.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A Committee consisting of the Premier, the Minister for Railways and Mr. McDonald drew up reasons for not agreeing to the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 9.58 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 27th September, 1933.

	Page
Bills: Financial Emergency Tax, Standing Orders suspension	1086
Supply (No. 2) £1,201,000, 1r.	1086
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1086
Goldfields Allotments Revestment, 2r., Com. report	1086
Metropolitan Whole Milk Act Amendment, 1r.	1090
Wiluna Water Board Loan Guarantee, 1r.	1090
Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, 2r.	1090
Southern Cross Southwards Railway, 2r.	1094

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

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, so much of the Standing Orders were suspended as to permit of the Financial Emergency Tax Bill passing the report stage at one sitting.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2) £1,201,000.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the amendments made by the Council in the Bill, for the reasons set forth in a schedule annexed.

BILL—GOLDFIELDS ALLOTMENTS REVESTMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.41] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of the Bill is to enable certain freehold townsite lots in various parts of the goldfields such as Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Southern Cross, Brown Hill, Coolgardie and Trafalgar, to be re-vested in the Crown. The owners of these lots are in many cases unable to pay rates