

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 16th November, 1939.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Assent to Bills | 2015 |
| Bills: Escheat Ordinance Amendment, 1A. | 2015 |
| Reserves (No. 2), 3A. | 2015 |
| Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2A. | 2024 |
| Income Tax (Rates for Deduction), 3A. | 2020 |
| Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) (No. 2), 2A. | 2020 |
| Financial Emergency Tax, Council's requested amendments | 2030 |
| Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's requested amendment | 2030 |
| Loan, £2,137,000, 2A. | 2031 |
| Annual Estimates: Votes discussed | 2032 |

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 2, Dentists.

BILL—ESCHEAT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. Doney and read a first time.

BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [4.33]: I move—That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [4.34]: I intend to take this opportunity to reply to some of the statements made by the Minister for Lands and more particularly to his remark that I had a knowledge that the Government with which I was associated had written to His Majesty's representative in the State and asked to have a piece of land released. Before long the Minister will realise that communications will pass between his Premier and other Premiers and His Majesty's representatives of which some members of the Cabinet will be unaware. I was extremely surprised to hear a confidential document read to this House. Probably that was the first time it was ever

done. All communications between His Majesty's representative and that representative's advisers are always regarded as secret documents. I do not know that I have ever heard of such a thing being done and I suggest that it will be a long time before it is done again. The Premier of the day did not consult me about the matter referred to by the Minister. I am perfectly aware that we were looking around for a piece of land on which to construct a new Titles Office. The Titles Office has been in a congested condition for a considerable time. There has been a lack of accommodation for important documents, and the Government with which I was associated attempted to ascertain whether it was possible to secure a piece of land on which to erect a suitable building.

The Minister endeavoured to ridicule me by saying that I suggested we should shift the departments away from where they are. I did exclude two—the Titles Office and the Crown Law Department. The Titles Office should be in a central place and it should be closely associated with the Supreme Court buildings. A good deal of business is transacted between those two departments. I had it in my mind to say, if the Minister had given me an opportunity to do so, that portion of the Lands Department office could be used. There are many vaults under that building and the Lands Department could be shifted elsewhere and sufficient accommodation provided for the Titles Office in that building. It would be quite a proper thing to have the Treasury located there. There is no reason why it should not be in the same building because the public uses it a great deal. Many departments, however, are not used to any extent by the public and it would not cause great inconvenience if buildings to house those departments were erected in some other part of the city. The Minister also tried to ridicule me by referring to my remarks concerning King's Park grounds. I told him that he could do the same with that land as with the Government House Domain. I said that if he were looking for wonderful sites, he could not select a better one than King's Park overlooking Bellevue-terrace. He thereupon emphasised that I wanted to expropriate a piece of land from King's Park. I did not say that at all. He omitted entirely to mention that Observa-

tory Hill, which is a Class "A" reserve and, faces King's Park-road, would make a very suitable site for public buildings. The land is level and extends back a considerable distance. A much larger block of land can be obtained there than can be obtained from the Government House Domain, but the Minister made no mention of that piece of land. It did not suit him to say anything about that. I also mentioned Parliament House grounds about which he, of course, found it necessary to remain silent.

The Minister for Lands: I dealt fully with Parliament House grounds.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister did not deal with the land along Harvest-terrace between here and Malcolm-street. There is a large piece of land in that locality that could be used, and buildings erected there would not block out Parliament House at all. The Minister did not mention one word about Observatory Hill.

The Minister for Lands: You could not have been listening.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I listened very attentively. I hope the Minister is listening as attentively to me as I listened to him. It is not in keeping with the Minister's ordinary attitude to ridicule people. He does so occasionally but not with good grace. I have never referred to his shedding crocodile tears. He should realise I am here to express my opinion, whether my doing so causes the shedding of crocodile tears or anything else. I propose to continue expressing my opinion so long as I can keep within the Standing Orders in so doing. I presume if I did not observe the Standing Orders I would be called to order by the Speaker. I again protest against the use of this block of land that we are asked to excise from Government House Domain. I submitted an excellent case, one worthy of consideration by members. The Minister ridiculed me and he was not justified in doing so. But all the ridicule that the Minister for Lands or any other Minister cares to heap upon me will not prevent me from expressing my opinion.

The Minister for Lands: I suppose you read your speech carefully?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have a copy here, but I do not propose to quote from it.

The Minister for Lands: I would not, if I were you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If the Minister cares to read it he may. I admit there may

be some slight errors. Perhaps the Minister had an advance copy too. I can recall one correction I made. I substituted "Malcolm-street" for Melbourne-street." I did not use the words "Melbourne-street." These little errors are likely to occur now and then but I have no complaint to make about the report of what I said. I have it before me. If the Minister wishes to look at it before he makes a further statement, he is at liberty to do so. I strongly object to the excision of this land. The principle is wrong, unless at some time in the future it is proposed to take away from the people Stirling Square and hand it over to Government House. I would not be surprised if that were done. There will come a time when Government House will be such a magnificent building that it could well stand on a much larger area than will be reserved to it as a result of this excision. We must think of the future. Many other sites could be mentioned that would suit the purpose very well. I should like the Minister for Lands to look up a report made by the departmental committee in 1931 or 1932. I think it was made at the time when the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) was Premier of the State. I know he appointed the committee to ascertain which was the best portion of the city for Government buildings.

The Minister for Mines: Surely it was not in 1932, because the hon. member was not then Premier.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It might have been in 1934, just after the change of Government.

The Premier: I think it was in 1933.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes. I dare say the Premier knows something about it. I believe the recommendations were for a site somewhere in this direction. It would be worth the Minister's while to give consideration to the question of Government buildings being erected on the other side of the railway line—I do not mean in West Perth, but on some spare piece of land north of the railway. It is no greater sin to take an open piece of country on the north side of the line than to use a site on this side of the line. The Minister said the Government wished to be able to get a beautiful waterfront. There is no waterfront at Canberra, no great waterfront in Adelaide, and no great waterfront in Brisbane. I should be very surprised if it were possible to see the

Yarra from the Government buildings in Melbourne. That is not the point. What we have to do is to get the best site at a price the people of the State can afford to pay. I complain because the Minister has not told us what it is proposed to pay for the land to be purchased, on which Government buildings are to be erected. I refer to the ground occupied by the Christian Brothers' College. That information should be available to us. He has not told us the exact area of the land set out on the plan, comprising the excision from Government House Domain. All that information should be included in the Bill. Every other measure of the kind contains the acreage involved. If the measurements were supplied it would not be difficult for a draftsman or a surveyor to determine the area. We should be possessed of that knowledge. This idea of putting in a peg and saying, "We are going to have this" does not appeal to me. I object to a Bill being brought down in that form, and I propose to divide the House again on the third reading. I trust the Bill will never become law, and I will do my best to prevent it. The Minister is very quiet about using any land that interferes with a Class "A" reserve, but if he as a private citizen intends that to be done, I will exercise my rights.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [4.45]: I wish to refer to two points raised by the Minister. He dealt with a report he had received from the committee that was set up, and questioned my interpretation of it. Since the Minister made his speech, I have carefully read the report word for word. It contains no reference to any other proposition than the one set out in the report.

The Minister for Lands: That was admitted. I do not think you were in the Chamber when I explained that point.

MR. BOYLE: I wish to make my position clear. The Government gave the committee one choice only.

The Minister for Lands: That is not denied.

MR. BOYLE: The report deals only with the land to be excised. The Minister referred to the demolition of the Treasury buildings, and my inconsistency in advocating that and to my reference to the demolition of Christian Brothers' College. According to the plan, it is laid down by the committee that the college must be demolished.

The Premier: Some day!

MR. BOYLE: That may be done soon. If the intention is to have a block of three buildings, the College building nearest the Terrace must be demolished to make room for the complete plan. The Minister put forward the plan he wishes the House to adopt, and the House has passed the second reading of the Bill. There is a vast difference between the Treasury and the College buildings. The old structure in St. George's-terrace was built in the eighties, and does not compare in architecture with that of the Christian Brothers' College. The college is a comparatively modern building, and I am sure it cost between £30,000 and £40,000.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is a substantial structure.

MR. BOYLE: It is not suitable for conversion to the purpose indicated. It was built as a boarding-school in the first place.

The Premier: We are not going to rip that down next week. We shall get some use out of it first.

MR. BOYLE: We can take for granted that if the land is resumed and the plan is to be carried out, the building will certainly be demolished before many years have passed.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Government loves ripping things about.

MR. BOYLE: It is obvious that the college must be removed if a complete job is to be made of the undertaking. I think members will agree that the architect of the Treasury buildings must have been on a "jazz" when he designed them. There is no cohesion about the building, which is nothing but a rabbit-warren. I do not think it could be altered and made suitable for the purpose, notwithstanding the opinion expressed by the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson). I have no doubt it would be razed to the ground and a worthy structure erected in its place. That could be done piecemeal. It is intended by the Minister to resume a modern educational institution and make way for Government buildings. I agree that our public servants require decent accommodation. I suppose it is the worst housed service in the Commonwealth, and I would support the Minister in any reasonable scheme except that which involves the present vandalism. The acquisition of the college and land, as the

Minister outlined, will probably cost the State £50,000.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say that.

Mr. BOYLE: One would assume that that amount would have to be paid for the land. I know the value of such property.

The Minister for Lands: That is much different from saying I made that statement.

Mr. BOYLE: I think the Minister mentioned a scheme in which the interest payment would be on an expenditure involving about £50,000.

The Minister for Lands: I said that the amount now paid in rental for public offices would meet an expenditure of about £50,000, but that has no relationship to the issue you have raised.

Mr. BOYLE: When the Minister resumes that property, which will be necessary under the scheme—

The Minister for Lands: You are stretching it a long way in attempting to tie me to the statement you suggested.

Mr. BOYLE: I think the Minister will get a shock when he has the property valued even by the Land Redemption Board appointed under the Public Works Act. The Minister would not be unjust when it came to compensating people who have held that property for over 45 years. My point is that the Minister takes in his stride the expenditure of a vast amount of money in resuming property and putting out of action an important education establishment, whereas for two years I have been waiting for the erection of a little school at North Nangeenan. The Minister objected to the recommendations of the select committee appointed by this House to inquire into educational matters and voted against each one, including one with reference to country school accommodation. The building at North Nangeenan has been condemned officially, and parents have taken their children from the school because it is structurally unsafe. Even today we are waiting for a miserable sum of £195 to provide better facilities at that small country centre.

The Minister for Labour: Have you yet got that chalk for Hines Hill school?

Mr. BOYLE: That remark is not worthy of the Minister. I am battling for people in the rural areas, and the Minister represents a country constituency. He displays

little knowledge of the requirements of people outback.

The Minister for Labour: You made it an election issue.

Mr. BOYLE: I made it an election issue, did I?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think we will take any notice of what the Minister said.

Mr. BOYLE: If I made an election issue of it, my constituents concurred thoroughly in my action. The Minister must have a very scant knowledge of outback educational facilities when he can introduce such an unworthy remark into the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, suppose we get back to the Bill!

Mr. BOYLE: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The opposition to the Bill by members sitting on this side of the House is justified if only upon that ground. I do not object to the Minister wishing to become one of the immortals—I hope that will not be for many years to come—but I do not think he will achieve any fame among the immortals by attempting to take from the people of Western Australia one of the most magnificent waterside frontages in the Commonwealth. I oppose the third reading of the Bill.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [4.53]: I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has spoken on the third reading of the Bill. He mentioned that members had a right to express their views on this and every other subject before the House. I am also glad that the debate has developed in such a friendly atmosphere, because it is not a matter of life and death. We are aware that at a certain stage the issue was regarded as one of vital public policy. That is a ridiculous view to take. It is important that the Minister should delve into the facts and provide the House with a substantial programme regarding Government buildings, but I do not think we are justified in indulging in acrimony or regarding the issue as vital, simply because some members express views about other sites. The Leader of the Opposition said that a water frontage was not essential for public buildings. Admittedly that is so, but he went further and said that at Canberra there was no water frontage to the Federal public buildings. That hon. member has been long enough associated with the public life of

this country to remember the Griffin plan which was adopted by the Federal Parliament. That plan provided for a huge lake, something like our Swan River. That was indeed a compliment to us. The Federal people tried to provide artificially what nature gave to Perth—a magnificent water frontage. Personally I cannot see any objection to the proposed site, because it has the benefit of a water frontage. Rather do I regard that as an advantage.

Mr. Doney: That was not the ground for the objection.

Mr. NORTH: The point was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and I am replying to his remarks. Then when it comes to the financial side of the proposition we have been informed by the Government that the necessary money is available. I did not think there was any secrecy about that. I thought the money was available last year and that £100,000 had been set aside for the purpose. When proceeding to Parliament House from my electorate today, I thought there was another point that had not been mentioned, perhaps one almost of rivalry. I do not wish to raise a side issue, but when I saw in my mind's eye some magnificent public buildings erected on the proposed site, and then thought of the huge buildings already near the water frontage that have been erected by insurance companies, I wondered whether behind it was a sense of jealousy, or perhaps the better way to put it would be, a healthy rivalry, which prompted the Government to take the contemplated steps. Perhaps that arises from the fact that the Government has established its own insurance office and by virtue of that fact is now in a position, after a few years, to erect enormous public buildings, perhaps more palatial even than those erected by private institutions. However, that is just a side issue.

The Minister for Mines: We thought that was an absolute secret, too.

Mr. NORTH: Another point is that while I was very anxious during past years, as were others, that the site adjoining Parliament House should be availed of for public buildings, it was not my intention then to urge the construction of a huge block separate from Parliament House. My idea was to combine the two designs into one magnificent edifice. I contemplated Parliament

House being completed, with dome and all, with the Government buildings erected on the land at the back. I thought the building could be so constructed as to hide the fact that we were not possessed of sufficient funds to complete the Parliament House building as desired. Now, however, that we have plenty of money, I trust that in due course we shall see the erection of a truly magnificent edifice in which to house Parliament, though perhaps not quite in accordance with the plan displayed in the lobby. I trust that when the plans are drawn up they will not provide for the old-fashioned facade, but that some other design will be adopted more in keeping with latter-day architecture. Then again I do not see why it is essential for us, particularly on the Opposition side of the House, seeing that we have not much say in anything that is done because by the fortunes of political warfare we are the vanquished people, to reject the site that has been chosen by the experts. I consider the site will prove advantageous. We may think that better results might follow the adoption of some other site, but I do not think that we should take up an antagonistic attitude and hold back, decade after decade, the adoption of a necessary building programme, simply because we cannot get our own particular way.

MR. BERRY (Irwin-Moore) [4.59]: I am not much opposed to the Bill, except that I do not understand one point. During the last week or so I have been attempting to secure the erection of a school house at Bindi Bindi and also a school at Calingiri. I have been told that the war necessitated the curtailment of expenditure. Under the Bill now before members we propose to pull down a school and acquire land at a cost of £50,000 and proceed with a building scheme which, in my opinion, is not any more necessary than is the provision of accommodation in the country areas. Other than that I have no objection to the Bill. I do wish that equal consideration could be given to country requirements as is extended to city interests. I admit that the Department of Agriculture should be housed in a new building. If members could see some of the school buildings in the country, I think they would agree with me that better accommodation is required.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [5.0]: I am opposing the Bill not because the Minister castigated members on this side of the House so severely last night, but because to me it is entirely out of joint with the times we are passing through and with the state of the public purse.

Mr. Withers: It was the same 12 months ago.

Mr. DONEY: Yes. Perhaps we might have felt a little more enthusiastic over the big building programme foreshadowed by the Bill if the Empire were not at war.

Mr. Withers: Why did you not express that view last year?

Mr. DONEY: Of course that is not the only reason for my opposition. I would state other reasons if the Empire were not at war and if, in addition, the prices and prospects of our primary products were such as to ensure a reasonable income to the State and our population were expanding rapidly, thus affording a widening sphere of taxation, and giving us a bigger local market; and—perhaps this is the biggest reason of all—if we lived on our income instead of on loan money, as we do. It so happens that all these essentials are lacking today. That plainly means that the wrong moment has been chosen by the Government to launch this building programme.

The Minister for Lands: That is an argument in support of it.

Mr. DONEY: Apparently I do not construe the argument in the same way as does the Minister. The one favourable factor that I find in the proposal is the relative nearness of the proposed site to the centre of the city; but precisely the same can be said for the present buildings. I do not condemn those buildings, as did my colleague the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) and other members. In point of situation and convenience, it would be difficult indeed to excel that particular block of buildings. These buildings can be substantially enlarged—to what extent I do not know, but they can be enlarged. I agree that internally they are in need of much improvement. The Government appears to have the idea that public buildings ought to be surrounded by parks, gardens, parking areas and so forth. I do not agree with that view at all. I call the attention of the Minister in charge of the Bill to the fine block of buildings comprising the Gen-

eral Post Office and the Commonwealth Bank. Those buildings are as imposing and as beautiful as any in the State. From an architectural point of view, they are not to be excelled in the Commonwealth. Yet that result was achieved without the assistance of parks or gardens.

What is pushing us towards this scheme? It is the fact that the Department of Agriculture and the Lands Titles Office have insufficient accommodation. That is admitted, but it should not prompt us to lose our sense of proportion. Those are important departments, but not so important as to render it necessary to pursue so grandiose a scheme as the Minister has outlined. If the Government must satisfy its urge to build at once some structure or other, I suggest that it select the site—I hope the Minister is listening to me—now occupied by the Department of Agriculture and the old R.S.L. buildings. Upon that site could be erected a building of four or five storeys to house the departments I have mentioned. In addition, ample room would be available to house a number of other departments that at present are situated a considerable distance from the centre of the city. The Agricultural Department would require accommodation while building operations were proceeding; but it so happens that unfortunately there is in Perth today ample office accommodation available. In any case, just a small distance away in Barrack-street we have the roomy structure belonging to D. and W. Murray Ltd., which I have no doubt could be used for that purpose. Having erected the building which I suggest, extensions to house other departments could properly be deferred until the war is won and this State resumes its normal life. I question whether any country in the world at this juncture—other than Western Australia—involved in war or threatened by war, is facing a building programme of this magnitude. In an uncertain future, the one thing of which we are sure is that the first penny and the last penny are required for defence.

Mr. Withers: This is only a question of a reserve for future purposes.

Mr. DONEY: We know all about that. We do not know when the war will end. As a matter of fact, we have not been told whether the building will be commenced at

once or not; but we can take it for granted that within a reasonable period—say three or six months—some action will be taken if the Bill passes.

The Minister for Works: The departments will be pressing the Government to start the construction of the buildings.

Mr. DONEY: I have already agreed that the Government should proceed with the housing of the departments whose offices are inadequate. I fully agree that that work should be put in hand at once. Perhaps the Minister was not listening when I suggested a way out of that particular disability. The position is difficult to understand from other angles. I dare say it has been mentioned before during this session—although I do not especially recall it—that the Treasurer is at his wits' end for money. We know he has found it utterly impossible to relinquish even a penny of taxation; and today he is seeking for new bases whereupon to collect his major taxes. Yet we have the Minister for Lands, when introducing the Bill, telling the House that it will be comparatively easy to finance this project. I presume the Government will borrow the money.

Mr. J. Hegney: The Government will have the money given to it.

Mr. DONEY: I think most of us know the sources from which it is expected the money will be secured; unless, of course, the Government should desire to finance the project by slips of paper after the manner so frequently mentioned in this House by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) and the member for Claremont (Mr. North). If the Government can finance the project, however, then I—like the member for Irwin-Moore and the member for Avon—hope I shall not be told when I go to the Treasury and ask for £10 or £20 to repair some country school that the Treasury is very sorry indeed, but it happens not to have the money. To me it appears as if the Government is proceeding in this matter on the assumption that the expenditure of another little million won't do any harm. I join with the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Avon and the member for Irwin-Moore in suggesting to members that they will be well advised to vote against the third reading on the grounds I have stated, and possibly on other grounds.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [5.10]: I would like to explain why I voted against the second reading of this Bill, because the reasons advanced by other members do not happen to be the reasons that swayed my judgment. My only reason for voting against the second reading was that this is a proposal to erect a building, or a series of buildings, to last for all time—not 50 or 100 years, but for centuries. For instance, we know that buildings, if properly constructed, will last for over a century. Consider the old Barracks, which, probably for the use they are put to, are just as efficient to-day as when they were erected. If we are to spend a large sum of money upon the erection of buildings which will have to last for all time, I have to ask myself, has the right site been chosen, having regard to the future of the State? I suppose all of us entertain a vision of Perth one day being a great city, not perhaps in the next generation, but in the generations beyond. Should we then select this proposed site, which would then be on the very edge of the city? Perth cannot expand southwards over the river, because that forms an absolute boundary. Nor can it expand eastwards, because the river swings round and cuts off that possibility. Perth can only expand northwards beyond the railway and westwards. In the days of our grandchildren there will no doubt be an enormous population—

The Minister for Mines: In the days of our grandchildren?

Hon. N. KEENAN: In the days that possibly our grandchildren will see, there may be an enormous population north of the railway. It is possible to envisage the day when no railway will divide the town: the railway will probably be carried underground. So we must look at these considerations before determining upon a site on which to erect public buildings that are to last for all time. That being so, it appears to me that we should select a site which could reasonably be regarded 100 years hence—and certainly 200 years hence—as a central site. We must therefore pick a site away from the side of the river. For that reason, and that reason only, I voted against the second reading. Of course I shall not be in a position to vote on the third reading, for reasons that are obvious to the House.

The Premier: How does that argument apply to the House of Lords and the House of Commons in London?

Hon. N. KEENAN: Is not that an extraordinary question to ask? The House of Lords and the House of Commons were not built within the last 100 years.

The Premier: They are still in the centre of the city.

Hon. N. KEENAN: When they were erected, they were a long way to the westward of the then existing city. The boundary of the city was then Fleet-street, just outside the entrance to the Middle Temple.

The Premier: Along the edge of the river.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The buildings were a long way to the westward of the then existing centre of the city, but it was anticipated that London would extend in that direction. So it is that to-day the House of Commons is more or less in the centre of London.

The Premier: And right alongside the river.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I am talking not about rivers but of sites being central or not central. The Premier, by his interjection, has illustrated the very point I was making, and it might easily be that this large class of public building should be constructed a considerable distance over the railway line in anticipation of the city growing that way in future. That was done when the House of Commons was built, and to-day the House is practically in the centre of London. Let me remind members that there is scarcely any record of a city expanding except in a westerly direction. One of the most extraordinary experiences of the human race is that all the great cities of the world have expanded from east to west. That tendency will be accentuated in Perth by the fact that the river prevents any possible extension to the south or the east. I voted against the second reading of the Bill only because I do not believe the site chosen is the right one on which to erect buildings of this kind, and because I do not believe that we shall be doing our duty to the people who some day will live in this city by building a structure on a site that in time will prove to be on the mere edge of the city.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [5.17]: In supporting the measure I am guided by the fact that a definite investigation has been made. The question of a suitable site has been examined on numerous occasions. Other sites were considered, and now we have a report recommending the adoption of this site. The member for Nedlands

(Hon. N. Keenan) opposes the Bill on the ground that this is not a central site, but if it was a central site, having regard to the future expansion of the city, he would support its adoption. He suggested that the expansion will be in a northerly or westerly direction. In trying to visualise the future of Perth, I believe that the chosen site is very close to what will be the centre of the metropolis having regard to the expansion that can be expected. A large section of the population will be settled in an easterly and southerly direction from the city, in the Belmont, Victoria Park and South Perth districts. I foresee a time when we shall have not only a Causeway over the river linking the southern suburbs with Perth but also a bridge or a tunnel at Mill Point, thus providing the requisite means of communication for the people living on the south side of the river.

When we consider possible future development, we should remember that we have a competent Town Planning Commissioner who understands the development of cities all over the world—an officer who has worked under one of the most eminent town planners in the world—and that he was a member of the committee. The Chief Architect was also a member of the committee—a man of ability and capable of advising the Government regarding foundations and future prospects. In the effort to determine a central site, many divergent views are held by members. I do not think any member can claim to have expert knowledge that would enable him to say which is the best site. Ministers are only laymen, as are members, but they are being guided by experts, and they have confined themselves to the decision of experts.

The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. Doney) advanced the plea that the times are out of joint. [That argument was not adduced a year ago. On that occasion quite a different argument was used. While any old argument might suit the Opposition today, we should bear in mind that a different argument was used 12 months ago. The question of the necessity for establishing and equipping country schools has been raised and we have been asked, if the Government cannot afford to build schools in the country, why should it insist upon this measure? I have listened

to Country Party members pleading with past and present Governments for the provision of decent accommodation for the Department of Agriculture. If a Bill were passed, no doubt the Government would take the earliest opportunity to provide a suitable building for that important department. If this measure becomes law, and the Government decides to resume the Christian Brothers' College block, many years might elapse before the building is demolished. Buildings forming other parts of the scheme will be constructed as the financial resources of the State permit. To contemplate erecting at once all the buildings indicated in the plan would be impossible. The most urgently needed sections would be constructed first.

We have been told that this proposal should not be proceeded with because the country is at war. Yet the Prime Minister of Britain, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, and the Premier of the State have urged that business should be carried on as usual. We have a responsibility to ensure that employment is provided for our people, and a building policy will undoubtedly enable the Government to make work available for many artisans in the building trade. Whether there is a war or not, we have to find employment for our people. The matter of selecting a site for public buildings has been before Parliament so often that the time has arrived when we should make a decision, having regard to the probable future development of the city. If the question is deferred for 12 months or two years, will the occasion be any more suitable than is the present for making a decision? Members admit the need for planning in connection with the public building policy. The only point at issue is the site that shall be chosen. The Leader of the Opposition suggested the Observatory site as suitable. I am a layman, just as he is, and I suggest that the Observatory site would be most unsuitable. Not only is it not easy of access, but it is remote from the central part of the city. The hon. member said that in Eastern Australia the public buildings are located fairly close to each other. In Sydney the buildings are scattered, and are not in close proximity either to Parliament House or to the Treasury. In Melbourne the law courts and the Registrar's offices are at one end of

the city and the Department of Agriculture and other public buildings are at the other end of the city. In this State we are making a definite attempt to plan for the future by securing a site where we can erect, having regard to the future expansion of the city, a structure that will be an ornament to the city. In the course of 30, 40 or 50 years Western Australia might have a population of 2,000,000 people, and we must therefore plan for commensurate expansion of the city.

As I said, the Government has been guided by experts, due consideration having been given to the report of the committee. Ministers have listened to the pleas of Country Party members year after year for decent quarters for the Department of Agriculture. I could offer many proposals for the benefit of metropolitan constituencies, but we have to take a long view and not confuse a measure of this kind, which will have such important effects, perhaps for centuries to come, with lesser needs. In the days to come, this site will undoubtedly become a beauty spot. The Minister made an excellent reply to the arguments advanced against the Bill. I think the Leader of the Opposition was quite unwarranted in some of his remarks about the Minister, especially when he tried to disparage him as compared with his predecessor. I consider that the present Minister is doing a good job.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And so did his predecessor.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: He has ability and brains and is equally competent. On this Bill he put up a case that the hon. member could not fault. Though he tried to demolish the Minister's argument, he failed miserably. As I say, the Minister put up an unanswerable case. The Leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, has not adduced one argument comparable to the Minister's arguments. The Leader of the Opposition, I think, has been misled by outside influences. He opposes the Bill not on its merits or demerits but because he is Leader of the Opposition and must oppose a Government measure. I hope the Bill will pass.

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

| | | | | | |
|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 24 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 14 |
| — | | | | | |
| Majority for | .. | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| — | | | | | |

AYES.

Mr. Berry
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Fox
Mr. Hawke
Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Marshall
Mr. Millington
Mr. Needham
Mr. North

Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Panion
Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Triet
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wise
Mr. Withers
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Boyle
Mrs. Cardeli-Oliver
Mr. Latham
Mr. Mann
Mr. McLarty
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Sampson

Mr. Seward
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Warner
Mr. Watts
Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Holman
Mr. Leahy

NOES.
Mr. McDonald
Mr. Willmott

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [5.35]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [5.36]: I am of course aware of the fact that it is not usual to speak on the third reading of a Bill unless for some special reason. However, as I was not present, through my own fault, when the second reading debate took place, I desire the indulgence of hon. members for a few minutes. First of all I wish to deal with the case put forward by the Treasurer in introducing the Bill. The hon. gentleman said he introduced the measure in consequence of a mandate—some alleged mandate. I have never credited the Premier with being a humorous person; but if he persists in allegations of that kind, I shall certainly have to revise my opinion. Nothing could be more ridiculously humorous than that statement of his. Even the Press of Sydney, after the last general election in this State, ridiculed the idea that the present Government came in with any mandate, or came in at all except by reason of having several pocket boroughs. I do not for one moment object to the existence of these small boroughs, since they are forced on us by

the geography of Western Australia: but when one begins to get up and talk about a mandate given by half-a-dozen or so, I must protest against the absurdity. If the Premier had put forward the Bill, as he could have done, on the basis that it is common sense, that it is necessary for the general good, and therefore warranted, I would be inclined largely to agree with him. But when he comes here and says "this is my mandate," while having no more mandate in this instance than there is in relation to any of the ridiculous assertions made from time to time by others, I must of course object, and strongly object, to the Bill being advocated on that ground.

Other grounds have been mentioned. They are these. A comparison was made in the course of the Premier's speech between his Government's present action and what was done by the Government in power in 1931 under the Financial Emergency Act, which was passed in that year. But the hon. gentleman forgets, and very conveniently forgets, that the action taken by the Government of 1931 was the same as the action taken by every other Government in Australia. In all the Australian States financial emergency Bills were brought down, and were passed. In the State of New South Wales, where Mr. Lang, who then was the arch-priest of the Labour movement—

The Minister for Mines: No, no! Never!

Hon. N. KEENAN: I suppose the Minister for Mines excepts the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson).

The Minister for Mines: He is the worst judge in the world.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Allowing that exception, I repeat that Mr. Lang was then the arch-priest of the Labour movement in Australia; and he brought down a flat rate of 1s. in the pound. Again I resent the action of the Treasurer, who had no need to refer to those matters, in dragging them in as if there was anything in connection with the Government of 1931 which was exceptional. Nor was that Government open to any particular blame.

The Premier: I thought I was very generous.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The reason for that generosity has not been defined. Undoubtedly the Financial Emergency Act did impose an undue burden on the taxpayer who was married and who had a family. It took no cognisance of the fact that he was mar-

ried or had a family; and I think both the Government party and our party agreed that the Act should be amended in that regard. Therefore I am not for one moment offering any opposition to an amendment which will bring about some redress in that regard. However, it is doubtful whether the present proposal will do that, or do it efficiently. We have been supplied with certain figures given for the purpose of guiding members to what the position would be if this Bill and some co-relative Bills became law; and I have found as the astonishing result of these figures that there is no difference whatever between a single man and a married man after the income of £300 is passed.

The Premier: That is the taxable income.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Yes, the taxable income under this Bill. The figures are stated in what is called the "Proposed Amalgamation," and with the exception of the first three incomes, every income above £350, so far as taxable income is concerned, remains the same for a married man and for a single man. That is not the only extraordinary result I find in these figures. Perhaps a more extraordinary result is this. The table goes on with families—one child, two children, and three children; and, strange to say, if you have the misfortune, or the good fortune, to have three children instead of two, then instead of getting some relief, you get something added on. Again these figures illustrate that. They are a comparison between page 5 and page 6. There a man with three children would, so far as taxable income is concerned, actually be in a worse position than a man with only two.

The Premier: The taxable income is what remains after the reductions have been made.

Hon. N. KEENAN: As I said a few moments ago, we were all agreed that the small taxpayer with a family was certainly under a great disadvantage by the existing law of the Financial Emergency Act: but we are proposing to give that man relief, and relief to a good many more. For instance, there are in this House some gentlemen who have incomes of £1,700 a year, and they are to get some relief under this Bill.

Ministerial members: No.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Yes. They will be entitled, as they have been in the past, to all the deductions allowed under the Income Tax Assessment Act; and those deductions

were not allowed under the Financial Emergency Tax Act. So they get that. Do we wish to give it to them?

The Premier: You are misrepresenting the position altogether.

Hon. N. KEENAN: It is no use saying that I am misrepresenting the position. These are the facts; and if the Bill becomes law, then there is no more assessment under the Financial Emergency Tax Act. It is merged in, and becomes part and parcel of, the Income Tax Assessment Act. Under the latter Act, anyone who looks at it will find numerous deductions which are allowed to all taxpayers. Among those deductions are premiums for life assurance and the cost of coming to one's business.

The Minister for Mines: That would not apply to anyone in this Chamber, for we all have passes.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The passes are not worth much. The point is that now we are giving to every taxpayer what the Financial Emergency Act deliberately took away from him—the right to make deductions which are allowed under the Income Tax Assessment Act. That is not the position put by us before the people at the general election. Our proposal was to relieve men who had incomes up to about £500 a year, relieve them of the unfair burden of the Financial Emergency Act. That no doubt was the understanding of most of the electors. There is also to be remembered, that the Financial Emergency Act is not the only one that does not allow deductions, and exactly the same remark applies to the Hospital Tax Act. Is it proposed under some of the Bills that have been brought down to take away the present system that applies to the hospital tax and to allow those that are assessed to make deductions? No. The Premier has no ground for bringing the matter forward in this general manner. Except for these considerations to which I have referred, I am in favour of the Bill; it is wise that we should attempt if possible—though it may be difficult to accomplish—but if it is possible, levy the tax at the source. We are sure then of getting a measure of taxation far greater than when the individual taxpayer is called upon to make a return and when the assessment is made on that return. A number of people do not make returns and so avoid assessment. There is this also to be admitted that as the burden will be spread over a great many payments it will

be more easily carried by the taxpayer, and so I am in favour of that proposal. I am also in favour of giving relief to the class who were unjustly burdened by the Financial Emergency Act; but I am not enthusiastic about spreading that relief ad infinitum. We must have regard for extraordinary circumstances which are likely to become far more marked in the future, and it may be well to remember that which has up to now been borne without complaint. I have in mind the man with a large income, not the small man, the man with an income of £1,500 or £2,000 a year. As it applies to those people the measure has gone too far, and maybe we shall some day regret it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton—in reply) [5.48]: While the hon. member was speaking I interjected that he was misrepresenting the position. The hon. member deliberately said that there were members in this House in receipt of incomes of £1,600 or £1,700 a year—perhaps he did not say it but he implied it—who would have their tax reduced. They will have no reduction at all, and it is nonsense for the hon. member to inflict that type of humour on the House. If he looks at the first sheet he will find that everybody in Western Australia, whether in this House or out of it, if in receipt of £1,500 or £1,600 a year, will not only not pay less taxation, but will pay between £20 and £30 a year more under the amalgamated proposal. I defy the hon. member to prove that is not so. When an hon. member makes a statement seriously, that because of the amalgamation of the taxes certain conditions will be brought into existence, or if he does not say it, implies that men with an income of £1,600 or £1,700 will pay less than they paid before, he is talking drivel, and should not be allowed to get away with it. It is no use the hon. member shaking his head; what I am stating is a fact. Neither do we expect the newspapers—opposition newspapers—to tell the people what Labour Governments have done, because it is their job to endeavour to discredit Labour even though it receives a majority of the votes of the people. The newspapers cannot take it lying down, and if it is possible for them to say anything nasty about the Labour Government they do so. Now the hon. member comes along and tries to delude the House into the belief that men with incomes

of £1,600 or £1,700 a year will pay less taxation than they did formerly, when he should know that they will pay between £20 and £30 more. I might take that statement in a personal sense, because I am one of those drawing a salary approaching the figure mentioned by the hon. member, and his implication is that I will pay less taxation. That is entirely and absolutely wrong.

Hon. N. Keenan: You will get your deductions.

The PREMIER: What concerns the taxpayers is whether they are paying the same figure or less or more. The hon. member talks about deductions. If he will glance at the tables he will soon convince himself that those with the incomes to which he referred, will, as I have already stated, pay £20 or £25 more. I am speaking correctly when I say that the hon. member has misrepresented the position, and because of that I cannot allow the statement to go unchallenged. When I moved the second reading of the Bill I said that there were two sets of people concerned. The single people without dependants will pay 50 per cent. more, that is to say, in their case the tax will be increased from 6d. to 9d. in the pound; the married man with dependants, three or four children, will pay less. The Bill has been deliberately designed to enable him to pay less. Those who are in receipt of £1,300 or £1,400, myself included, will have to pay considerably more under the Bill. That is what I want the hon. member clearly to understand. I felt that I could not allow statements such as that made by the hon. member or anyone with any sense of responsibility to go uncontradicted.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—INCOME TAX (RATES FOR DEDUCTION).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PLANT DISEASES (REGISTRATION FEES) (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [5.53] in moving the second reading said: I hope you will not

misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker, if I say that when I endeavoured to introduce a similar Bill last week I was rudely interrupted. In the few remarks I made with regard to this measure, I dealt with the establishment of this fund when the Plant Diseases Act was amended in 1934, and following the recommendations of the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee at that time, there have been many representations made to increase the registration fees. In 1937 a deputation waited upon the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee, and that deputation consisted of Mr. L. Thorn, M.L.A., Mr. A. F. Watts, M.L.A., Mr. F. J. Mayor, and Mr. A. C. R. Loaring. The committee was fully appreciative of the importance of the fruit industry in this State. The deputation made representations that the fees for commercial orchards be prescribed by the committee, and the desire was expressed that a special board should be set up. The fees suggested were 2s. 6d. per acre per annum as a minimum charge, and £5 per annum as a maximum charge, and those figures were to apply to orchards of 100 trees and vines numbering 400. That was the proposal put up by responsible people, and there is no doubt that their attitude towards the industry is to be strongly commended. No action was taken in 1937 and nothing was done until this year when a very active and representative gathering again met the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee and representations were made by the West Australian Fruitgrowers' Association. That association presented a strong request in favour of the adoption of the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the proposal for the levy of 2s. 6d. minimum and £5 maximum per annum. That recommendation had been adopted at the annual conference of the Fruitgrowers' Association. It was submitted to the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee, which body forwarded the recommendation to me, and in conversation with members of that committee they were very insistent that in view of the progress that had been made by way of controlling the pest, it would be foolish to retard the activities of the officers engaged on the work. It is more important to increase the vigilance in an endeavour further to effectively control the pest. The Fruit Fly Advisory Committee is still as representative as it was when the original proposal was made in 1934, the districts it

represents being Spearwood, Gosnells, Bickley, Kalamunda, Guildford, Karragullen and Harvey. It is interesting to note that four of the representatives are today residents of the district represented by the member for Swan. They are responsible people. They strongly urge that unless more money is collected, some of the inspectors will have to be put off early in the year. The fund, therefore, should be augmented to prevent that happening. Their recommendation is included in the Bill. The measure is not a Government Bill in the sense that it is recommended by the Government; rather is it a recommendation to the Government by those engaged in the industry that there should be imposed upon the industry a further levy to provide for an extension of the activities of the Government in the eradication of the fruit fly. Hon. members will probably be interested to know just how active inspectors have been in the control and eradication of this pest. From every district in which these officers have been engaged, have come satisfactory reports of the progress made. Hon. members representing some of those districts have actively co-operated with the department in this work: though in some districts there has been an attitude of passive resistance, or, rather, it may be a reluctance to give any credit to the department.

I have here several comments made by the officers concerned, which it would probably be wise for me to read to the House. One representative of the Fruit Fly Advisory Committee, referring to Donnybrook, which is right on the edge of the infested area, states that he found the back yard orchardists were the best to deal with and they were always anxious to carry out instructions. That is a point I desire to impress upon members representing fruit-growing districts: that the backyard orchardists, numbering about 40,000, have not only become used to paying the license fee of 1s., but are fully accepting their responsibility to the industry. Many people, rather than be worried with the incidence of the fly each year, have destroyed their trees, but others have taken another angle and scrupulously attended to the trees, baiting them for fly and obtaining excellent results. No criticism can be levelled at the city orchardists for not having accepted

their responsibilities. I called this week for reports concerning the reaction of the people in many suburban areas where fruit trees are grown in almost every back yard. I desired to ascertain the attitude adopted towards the inspectors. In the district of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn), there has been a merging between the commercial orchardists and the backyard orchardists, and very important results are claimed, not only in a reduction of the incidence of the fly, but in the growth of interest on the part of those concerned in the elimination of this pest. One officer reported this week—

I have to advise that when I first went to the Swan district a certain amount of opposition was met with in commercial orchards. However, once growers saw the good results obtained, which they were quick to do, no further opposition was met with. In fact, if any orchardist fails to carry out any instructions I am soon made aware of it by his neighbours.

Backyard orchardists were, at first, hard to deal with. Gradually, however, better results were obtained in most places. Some growers, however, seemed to treat instructions as a joke, and it was not until prosecutions were effected that some growers realised their responsibilities.

I further note that since the gazettal of Guildford and Midland Junction as fruit-fly infested areas, backyard orchardists very rarely need to be advised twice. Compulsory methods as now adopted in the Swan area appear to be far more effective than old methods.

Mr. Sampson: The increased tax suggests they were not effective.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is weird logic. The desire of the growers to increase the tax on themselves is surely an indication that they appreciate the remarkable results of the investment of their money in this direction in the past.

Mr. Thorn: They want it carried further.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: They want to levy themselves to a greater extent in order to eliminate the fly. The logic of the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) is weird. In the Upper Swan district the export of grapes has increased year by year and as a result of the work carried out in the control of fruit fly, we were able to guarantee last year to overseas countries that the fly was non-existent. Surely that indicates the progress made. Report-

ing early this year Inspector Rolinson said—

During the last week I have inspected all vineyards exporting early varieties of grapes. To the best of my knowledge there is no fruit fly in the vineyards. All early varieties have been sprayed according to regulations. In my opinion there is not at present a commercial orchard in the Swan area affected with fruit fly.

That is a remarkable state of affairs and it has been achieved in a few years by intense activity in a district that depends on its export grapes for its very existence. I desire the House to have that information because I would not be surprised if some members tried to suggest that we have achieved very meagre results. The export from that district in one year increased from 72,000 cases to 84,000 cases. We have had no complaints and no indications at all of infestation of the early grape berries from that district. We could not say that a year or two ago. From the report of the market inspector of this State concerning fruit that has come from the districts around the hills adjacent to Perth, we discovered that in the year extending from April 1937 to March 1938, 614 packages of fruit were condemned in the local markets because of fruit fly. Last year, however—the year immediately following—only 282 cases were condemned, in spite of an increase in production. Surely that result is worth achieving. My colleague, the Minister for Works, could tell of an orchard in another State belonging to a relative of his which is not infested with fruit fly, and he could speak of the pleasure it affords people to enter that orchard at night and pick and eat fruit without any fear of its being infested with fly. That is an important and desirable objective for us to endeavour to achieve in this State. We are heading towards that end, but more than a mere desire to appoint additional inspectors is necessary. We need the co-operation and sympathetic support of those engaged in the industry, so that there will be no need for a request for policemen to be looking after them the whole time. I hope that if the Bill becomes law, every district where the fruit fly is known to exist will be proclaimed an infested area. Such a proclamation has been made in three districts already and in those districts we shall be able to insist on baiting and other precautions being undertaken which will tend towards the elimination of this pest.

It is gratifying to know that a State which has suffered so severely in its local and export fruit trade because of the existence of fruit fly, has made such progress towards the eradication of the pest.

I desire to impress on the House that the Government is not in any way tied to the provisions of the Bill. The measure does not affect the backyard orchardist at all. It does not concern the person who is not a commercial orchardist. No increased levy will be made upon an individual unless he has an acre or more of fruit trees. If those members who know the industry submit that £5 is too high a maximum, I reply that the Bill is in their hands. Obviously, however, it is essential that we should have another £1,000 or £2,000 in the fund not only to enable the continuation of the work of the inspectors already appointed, but also to provide for the appointment of additional inspectors in other districts. For the guidance of hon. members who desire to know the effect of the fees, I have had figures prepared. Those figures indicate what amount of money is likely to be returned. The number of orchards and the varying acreages are set out in the table. I find that there are only 53 orchards in the State that have an excess of 40 acres. A big proportion of orchards have from three to ten acres. Even if the maximum of £5 is considered too high, I suggest to hon. members that they do not interfere with the minimum for commercial orchardists; otherwise there will be an insufficient sum raised to bring about the desired result. In view of the fact that the preponderance of orchards have under 15 acres and in view of various circumstances such as marketing, etc., if members so desire, the maximum fee of £5 might be reduced. I repeat that the Bill is in the hands of members. It is the outcome of representations made by those who know their industry. Some logical argument, some convincing appeal would be needed to induce us to accept an amendment, but I assure the House that provided a good case is made out, the Government will be pleased to fall into line with the requirements of hon. members.

At the moment the greatest delinquents in regard to orchard registration are not the backyard orchardists, who have accepted their responsibilities in the main and have done something—and a very important something—in the interests of this industry. If

it had not been for the levy imposed on those in the metropolitan area, this fund could not have been established, the five inspectors who have been operating could not have done so, and the results achieved in the control of this pest could not have been secured.

Mr. Thorn: I ridicule the imposing of 1s. fee on commercial orchards. I suggest it be 5s. at least.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: In the fund at the moment is a sum that will not carry the present staff beyond the early part of next year. It may be possible to keep the existing staff going until February. Because of an active campaign in certain districts and the possibility of this week launching over 100 prosecutions, in various districts, we hope that those lagging behind in the payment of their fees will be stimulated to make payment. Some people have evaded their responsibility to their neighbours. Some have had neglected orchards infested with fruit fly and those orchards have not been registered. Wherever we have had an opportunity to eradicate trees in such orchards, advantage has been taken of that opportunity on the recommendations of the inspectors. The collections per annum exceed £2,000. We expect this year that we shall receive £2,100.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Before tea I stated that the receipts coming into the fund now amounted to about £2,000 per annum, and that it was desired to augment it to an extent sufficient to provide for the appointment of four or five inspectors. On the scale of acreages compared with the different number of orchards of varying acreages, it would seem that the fees imposed, if the Bill becomes law, would perhaps represent more than sufficient to provide for that number. It would also seem that a reduced amount would be ample. If members are prepared closely to scrutinise the number of orchards between varying acreages, they may desire a reduction in the maximum sought in the Bill. We do not want to interfere with the minimum acreage figure—it will be understood that that figure will bring in most of the money—but we could probably reduce the maximum figure by 50 per cent., and that may provide sufficient funds for the putting on of four in-

spectors. The matter will be one for the Committee to decide. I submit the Bill as a recommendation from year to year of the departmental fruit fly advisers.

Mr. Sampson: Will the whole of the tax be used for the control of fruit fly?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. Whilst much could be said concerning the activities of the inspectors, the good work that has been done, and the need for an endeavour to eradicate the pests, I think it is unnecessary for me to dilate upon these questions. I have all the relevant information, and shall be glad to make it available to members who wish to see it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Hill, debate adjourned.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

Council's Requested Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. The Schedule, second part, column (1), (b):—Substitute:—

"Fivepence" for "Sixpence."

"Sixpence" for "Sevenpence."

"Sevenpence" for "Eightpence."

"Eightpence" for "Ninepence."

"Ninepence" for "Tenpence."

"Tenpence" for "Elevenpence."

"Elevenpence" for "Twelvepence."

The PREMIER: I do not propose to delay the Committee in discussing this request from another place. It is one to which the Government cannot possibly agree. The difference represented in revenue would amount to about £50,000, and everyone will admit it is not possible to forego that sum at this stage. The Budget has been brought down, and we must make every possible endeavour to balance it. To consider remodelling our proposals by giving away £50,000 is something that is impossible of attainment. Another place has not amended the Bill, but has sent it back to us with the request that we should make certain amendments, in accordance with constitutional practice. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I thought the Premier would accept the amendment. He will have to get used to doing with less money, and this requested amendment would probably be an excellent means of breaking him in.

The Minister for Mines: It is too big a lump.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It would probably reduce the amount only by one-sixth or one-seventh.

The Premier: A lot depends on how many people are in the different groups.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If ever another place did a sensible thing it did so on this occasion. I am sorry the Premier has not accepted the requested amendment, but I do not propose to test the feeling of the Committee on the subject.

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

No. 2. The Schedule, third part, column (1), (b):—Substitute:—

"Fivepence" for "Sixpence."

"Sixpence" for "Sevenpence."

"Sevenpence" for "Eightpence."

"Eightpence" for "Ninepence."

"Ninepence" for "Tenpence."

"Tenpence" for "Elevenpence."

"Elevenpence" for "Twelvepence."

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not made.

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

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Council's Requested Amendment.

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment requested by the Legislative Council is as follows:—

The Schedule—second part:—Delete the word "ten" in the third line of clause (3), on page 3, and substitute the word "twenty."

The PREMIER: What I have said in connection with the Bill we have just dealt with applies equally to the Bill now

before us. If the request were complied with, revenue would suffer a loss of £20,000. That is too great an amount lightly to cast aside in these times. Another place has given no reasons for its request, and we would not be justified in acceding to it. I move—

That the amendment be not made.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am not opposing the motion, but hope the Premier will make available some money for the assistance of the wheatgrowers. Some time ago when certain Bills were before us we pointed out that with the money he had available he ought to be able to render assistance to wheat producers. An arrangement was entered into between Western Australia and the Commonwealth Government when it was agreed that the latter Government should find £2,000,000 for the assistance of wheatgrowers. I think the Premier agreed to find about £200,000. I hope this Bill will be the means of giving the Premier the money necessary to find this much-needed assistance. Although the harvest has been heavy in parts of the State, assistance will be required in many instances. Evidently the money needed will not be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. I know of course, that when the Premier entered into the arrangement, he did so in good faith.

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

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—LOAN, £2,137,000.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willecock—Geraldton) [7.45] in moving the second reading said: The Bill is necessary to provide authority to raise money for expenditure on works and services as detailed in the Loan Estimates now before the House, and to provide further authority to make advances to the revenue fund to meet the accumulated deficit. The total amount asked for is £2,137,000, of which £1,987,000 is for works and £150,000 for deficit purposes. The unfunded deficit as at the 30th June last amounted to £5,836,486, and the estimated deficit of £31,288 for the current financial year will bring it to £5,861,774 by the end of June, 1940. In previous Loan Acts, provision was made for temporary advances

from the general loan fund to the revenue fund up to a total of £5,723,000, and authority is now sought to raise a further £150,000, so that the anticipated deficit will be provided for and a small margin made available for eventualities.

The estimated Loan expenditure for the year is £2,210,863, including £122,581 charged to Loan Suspense last year, and, taking into consideration the unexpired balances of previous authorities, the amount in this Bill will provide for the whole of that expenditure, and, in addition, will permit of the works being carried on where necessary until the 31st December, 1940. The reason for providing funds sufficient for six months' expenditure after the close of the financial year, is to prevent the authorities for works in progress becoming exhausted before it is possible to obtain further approvals. As members are aware, legislation of this nature is introduced almost at the end of a session, and so it will become necessary to make further provision about this time next year. Our requirements for the year have been submitted to the Loan Council for consideration, in conjunction with those of the other States, and although the Commonwealth itself will require very large amounts for defence, it is confidently expected that sufficient funds to enable us to carry out our programme will be made available.

At the recent Loan Council meeting, approval was given to the flotation of a private loan of £10,000,000 from the Commonwealth Bank and the trading banks. Applications for subscriptions to the loan will not be sought from the public, and no underwriting charges or other expenses will be incurred. The rate of interest is $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the loan will be repayable in three equal instalments over three, four and five years. That means to say that one-third will be paid at the end of three years, one-third in four years, and the remainder in five years' time. It is a short-term loan extending over the five-year period, and on that account the interest rate is lower than the current charge. Our share of the loan is £860,000, and this, together with loan money already provided this year, should meet our needs until well into the latter half of the financial year.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Have you that additional loan money in hand?

The PREMIER: I referred to our share of the £10,000,000 loan.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you said something about other money.

The PREMIER: We have already had some money this year.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is that in hand?

The PREMIER: It is nearly all spent. That was the money from the last loan.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is the expenditure from the 30th June?

The PREMIER: Yes. As I have said, our share of the loan will be £860,000, and that, together with the loan money already received this year, should carry us on till April or May, and by that time a public loan will be floated to finance the balance of the loan programmes and provide a carry-over into 1940-41. In addition to the big conversion operation in December, 1938, two loans were floated by the Commonwealth during the last financial year, one in February and one in May. The February loan was for £8,500,000, this State's share being £924,760. The issue was at par, with interest at 3·7·8 per cent., and a currency of 17 years, the Government having the option of redemption after 15 years. Our share of the flotation expenses was £8,205, leaving the net proceeds at £916,555. The May flotation was for £4,750,000 at 3·7·8 per cent., the issue price being £99 and the loan maturing in 1955, the Government again having the option of redemption two years earlier. From this loan we received in cash £376,864, discount and expenses amounting to £7,136, making our total liability £384,000. In addition to these public loans, the Commonwealth Bank made available in June, 1939, the sum of £3,000,000, of which this State received £283,000 in cash, there being no flotation expenses. Interest is at the rate of 3½ per cent., and the loan is repayable in 1943. The Commonwealth Bank again made available the money at a somewhat lower rate of interest than that applying to Commonwealth bonds. In addition to the amounts I have mentioned, we raised the sum of £292,855 locally, £228,000 being our proportion of the increases in depositor's balances in the Commonwealth Savings Bank, and available to the State under the provisions of the Savings Bank Transfer Act, together with £64,855 by means of counter sales.

The total public debt of the State on the 30th June last was £95,472,600, of which

amount £45,998,197 was held overseas, and £49,474,403 in Australia. Our balance in the sinking fund amounts to £359,656, making a net public debt of £95,112,944, an increase of £1,708,214 compared with the total for the previous year.

With regard to the Bill itself, Clause 6 provides authority for the re-appropriation of certain moneys, as set out in the Second Schedule, that are not now required for the original purposes. These moneys will be applied to the various items enumerated in the Third Schedule. That is all the information I have to place before members. The Bill is the usual type introduced at this period of the year. Members will have an opportunity to discuss on the Loan Estimates all the items of expenditure proposed and the Bill now presented to them provides authority for raising the necessary funds in accordance with the arrangement made with the Loan Council. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1939-40.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 7th November; Mr. Marshall in the Chair.

Vote—Labour, £1,410.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon the Minister to introduce his Estimates, I wish to remind the Committee that no Vote is provided for the State Government Insurance Office, and, should any members wish to discuss matters relating to that department, they must do so during the general debate and before we proceed to deal with the Divisions.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [7.55]: Among the many activities of the Department of Labour, the following are very important:—

1. Advising Government and semi-government departments on all questions of an industrial character.

Considerable work is involved in that particular activity. The department is called upon daily to give rulings in connection with provisions contained in various awards and agreements under which the different Government departments operate.

2. Investigating claims submitted by unions and negotiating with the parties concerned for a reasonable settlement of all such claims.

3. Fixing margins of skill for all new classes of work as carried out by Government and semi-government departments.

4. Inspecting jobs on which disputes have occurred, and taking all steps considered reasonable and necessary for the settlement of any actual, or threatened, dispute.

5. Preparing and filing answers to claims made by unions in the Court of Arbitration, as they affect Government departments.

6. Attending to all work associated with the application of basic wage adjustments as they affect the Government.

7. Carrying out investigations and preparing reports in connection with documents received from the International Labour Office at Geneva.

During the last financial year, officers of the Department of Labour were consulted in connection with a number of industrial claims. The following were finalised and registered at the Court of Arbitration:—

1. Clerks employed in the State Shipping Service.

2. Cost clerks and timekeepers, amendment of their existing agreement.

3. Clerks employed at the Fremantle Hospital.

4. Country hospital employees.

5. Steam road-roller drivers employed by the Main Roads Department.

Helpful advice was given in the following cases:—

1. Bulk handling at Bunbury.

2. Abattoir employees, Perth.

3. State Battery employees.

The Secretary for Labour is also the Government's advocate in the Court of Arbitration. That work involves the preparation of briefs and the taking of cases before the court. It also necessitates the representing of Government departments before boards of reference appointed under awards or industrial agreements, and also before certain appeal boards that operate in connection with Government departments.

The following is a brief summary of the work carried out by the Court of Arbitration during the year which ended the 30th June last:—

Three hundred and seventy-seven plaints were filed in the Industrial Court, 304 of which were dealt with; 25 industrial agreements were registered; 10 awards of the court were made by members of the Arbitration Court; 18 awards were made by industrial boards operating under the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act; five ex-

isting awards were amended; 84 decisions were given by boards of reference.

There were 1,748 apprentices registered as at the 30th September last, including 271 registered with the Commissioner of Railways. There were four stoppages of work during the last financial year covering the following industries:—

1. The slaughtering section of the meat industry at Kalgoorlie.

2. The printing office of the "Kalgoorlie Miner."

3. The Ajax gold mining shaft dispute at Norseman.

4. Netting and wire manufacturing industry at Leederville.

All the stoppages of work in question were settled by negotiation between the organisations representing the employers on the one hand and the workers on the other.

In connection with the Factories and Shops Department, the number of factories registered during 1938 was 2,871, that being the highest number ever registered in this State in any one year. The number of persons employed in factories during the year was 28,965. Those figures include registrations under the Timber Industry Regulation Act, 1937. Leaving out of consideration the factories registered under the Timber Industry Regulation Act and the number of persons employed therein, the factories registered in 1938 totalled 2,066, with 23,133 employees. Judged on a comparative basis with any previous year, those figures also created all-time high records. Shops and warehouses to the number of 9,323, providing employment for 35,096 persons, were registered with the department in 1938. Those figures are the highest ever recorded in this State. During 1938 the following activities were carried out by the officers of the department:—

7,496 inspections of factories,
13,910 inspections of shops and warehouses,
3,248 inspections under the Bread Act.

This information I am sure will be of considerable interest to the Leader of the Opposition.

438 inspections under the Industrial Arbitration Act.

These inspections resulted in the recovery, without recourse to prosecution, of underpaid wages amounting to £286 for 85 workers.

300 accidents were investigated,

- 477 defects or omissions in factories and shops were dealt with and corrected,
- 142 inspections were made under the Employment Brokers Act,
- 62 reports were made under the Shearers' Accommodation Act.

Registration fees payable in respect of factories and shops in this State are considerably lower than those in the other States of Australia. The total fees paid last year amounted to £2,943. Of that amount, £128 was obtained as a result of licenses issued under the provisions of the Bread Act. Of such licenses 264 at 10s. each have been issued this year.

The main item of increase in this year's expenditure, compared with last year's, covers the administration of the Wheat Products (Prices Fixation) Act. That Act operated for only half of the last financial year, as it did not come into force until January last.

The State Insurance Office was legalised as from the beginning of this year. The volume of business transacted by the office has increased considerably since that time, with the result that additional staff has been appointed. A more comprehensive system of statistics has been initiated with a view to keeping a closer watch on the experience of the State office in connection with policies and claims. Efforts have been successfully made to obtain closer co-operation between doctors and the officers of the State Insurance Office. Goldmining towns and other towns in the country are visited periodically by the medical officer of the State Insurance Office and by other officers as opportunity permits. Some attention has been given to the important question of preventing accidents wherever possible. Far too little attention, it is considered, has been paid to this matter in the past. The cost of workers' compensation to industry in this State could probably be much reduced without any of the benefits being affected if employers, insurance officers and other persons concerned gave more study and attention to making factories, workshops and other places safer for the workers employed therein.

In this regard, I was interested to find that the Chambers of Manufactures in Victoria and New South Wales conduct insurance business in connection with their ordinary activities. The insurance departments of those chambers provide insurance

under the Workers' Compensation Acts of those States. As the result of the operations of those Chambers in the field of accident insurance, they have been able to give the manufacturers of those States much cheaper insurance against accidents in industry than was previously offering. The executive officers of the Chamber of Manufacturers in Sydney found that after they had been conducting this insurance business for some time, a number of factories and workshops were registering a far greater percentage of accidents, including serious accidents, than were other factories and workshops of a similar class. The Chamber then decided to appoint safety engineers, who would be attached to the insurance department in Sydney. Those engineers are employed full time. They are specially trained men and visit all the factories in turn, paying special attention to the factories and workshops which showed a high percentage of accidents, including a number of serious accidents. As a result of the activities of these engineers, the percentage of accidents, including serious accidents, in the factories and workshops, of Sydney particularly, has been considerably reduced. I think the time is long overdue when something of that nature should be attempted in Western Australia. The number of accidents occurring here appear to be far too high. Outside the operations of officers employed by some Government departments, not a great deal of attention appears to be paid to the matter of establishing the safest possible conditions in our factories and workshops. The question seems to me to concern not only the Government, but all employers, especially big employers. It is one that should concern private insurance companies, as well as the State Insurance Office. I am hopeful that in the reasonably near future a conference may be arranged between all those interested in this matter with a view to ascertaining whether something cannot be done in this State along the lines I have suggested. There is ample room for improvement in the safety conditions now existing in our factories, workshops and other places of employment. If the number of accidents in industry can be reduced, and the number of serious accidents also reduced, the cost of workers' compensation insurance to industry will be decreased, while the workers will not lose any of the benefits conferred on them by the existing legislation.

The accommodation now available for State Insurance Office purposes is far too small. Investigations have been made with a view to providing larger and more suitable accommodation.

I come now to a consideration of the activities of the Department of Industrial Development. As hon. members are aware, the activities of that department have increased greatly during recent months. In past years, the department was not regarded as one of major importance. It had to receive whatever time Ministers could devote to it, and the Ministers concerned had most of their time occupied by departments that were then considered to be more important. The result was that in past years the efforts of the department were more or less spasmodic. Every now and then a special effort was made, and some special activity was carried on. When the particular effort or activity ceased, a period of comparative quiet followed, during which not very much was attempted and of course not very much achieved. As a result of an extension of Government policy, the department is now regarded as one of the most important departments of the State. Generally speaking, the task of expanding our secondary industries is believed to be one that should be concentrated upon until the necessary measure of success has been obtained. Progress will not be made in a spectacular manner. The suggestion has been made that the Government's policy in this respect has not during the present year led to any substantial expansion of our secondary industries. True, no substantial expansion of those industries has taken place; but anyone aware of the difficulties and of the magnitude of the task could not reasonably have expected that there would have been any great expansion in so short a period. Progress can be achieved slowly, quietly and continuously.

The Government has enlisted the active support and co-operation of a number of individuals and organisations in the carrying out of this policy of industrial expansion. A Council for the Development of Industries was established recently. The members of the council are devoting themselves earnestly to the various proposals that have been put forward from time to time. There are a special Production Committee and a special Sales and Propaganda Committee associated with the work of the council and of the Department of Industrial Development.

Leading representatives of manufacturers, retail traders, industrial workers, women's organisations and others are officially associated with the council or with one or other of the committees set up under the council. It was my pleasure this week to have an opportunity to address a number of retail traders at their invitation. They told me they were keen to co-operate with the Government and assured me they were anxious to do everything possible to increase the sale of locally-made goods in this State. They admitted that their interests as retail traders were as much bound up in the development of secondary industries as were the interests of manufacturers or of any other section of the community. When we find the retail traders so interested and aroused to the importance of industrial expansion, it augurs well for the future of secondary industries in Western Australia. There is also a committee of four expert Government officers. This committee consisting of the Government Analyst, the Economist attached to the Treasury Department, the Mechanical Engineer of the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department, and the Conservator of Forests has already done good work and will, I am sure, continue to assist the Government with technical advice on proposals for the expansion of existing industries and more particularly for the establishment of new industries. The members of this committee investigate mainly questions and problems of a technical nature.

The Government recently created a new position in the Department of Industrial Development known as that of Industries and Works Promotion Engineer. Mr. N. Fernie, M.E., A.M.I.E., was appointed to the position and has carried out very valuable work in a short period of time. When the Government appointed Mr. Fernie, there was a fair amount of criticism in the city. Members might recollect that the Government advertised all over Australia to obtain the services of a man to investigate secondary industries in this State and advise the Government continually of the condition of our industries and the best steps to be taken to expand them. We received applications from all over the Commonwealth. We gave the closest consideration to each application. We finally concluded that we had in our service men quite as capable as any outside who applied for the position. Mr.

Fernie was not an applicant. The question of appointing him was discussed with him and was also discussed with all those who were interested and with those who we considered were able to offer helpful advice. After weighing the position carefully, the Government decided that Mr. Fernie was the best man available. At the last annual meeting of the Chamber of Manufactures the Leader of the Opposition paid a high compliment to Mr. Fernie, which I greatly appreciated. He said it was the best appointment the Government had made. I think he intended to convey that all the appointments made by the Government were good, but that this one was the best of all. The criticism that was levelled against the appointment came from a few manufacturers, a few commercial men and some of the disappointed applicants. Most of the criticism pivoted on the point that Mr. Fernie was a Government employee, had been in the service of the Government for many years, would be bound by departmental ideas, would be a stickler for what are commonly called red-tape methods and would lack the necessary initiative, courage and discretion to do the things required if the secondary industries of this State were to be expanded. All the criticism that was levelled at the time has since died away. The opinion is unanimous that the appointment was a good one and that Mr. Fernie, in the short period he has occupied the position, has done excellent work that is already showing practical results.

Mr. Boyle: It is the best appointment you ever made.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am glad the hon. member endorses the opinion of every supporter of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Williams-Narrogin. It is pleasing to report that the Retail Traders' Association and the Chamber of Commerce, as well as a number of other organisations, have officially associated themselves with the endeavours now being made to expand local factories and workshops. We believe that those associated with the Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Traders' Associations have it within their power greatly to assist in the work of increasing the sale of locally-manufactured goods. Let me point out that the Commercial Travellers' Association is officially associated with the department in its work. We might reasonably have ex-

pected that the Chamber of Commerce would not take sides in a matter of this kind, particularly as many members of the Chamber are importers who deal exclusively in goods brought here from the Eastern States or from countries abroad. The Commercial Travellers' Association is composed of men, some of whom handle only local products, but most of whom handle mainly goods that are imported from other States and other countries. When we find organisations of that kind linking up with the department and enthusiastic to help in every possible way, it indicates beyond a shadow of doubt that a great deal of united effort is now being put forward to increase the sale of local goods and to increase the number of factories and workshops operating in the State. The new form of organisation set up, and the activities now being carried out by the department and the different sections, have already resulted in much closer co-operation being established between the Department of Industrial Development and the Chamber of Manufactures. That closer co-operation also exists between the department and individual manufacturers.

A considerable number of inspections of local factories and workshops has been carried out in recent months. The secretary of the department, Mr. A. H. Macartney, and Mr. Fernie have made most of the inspections and have created much goodwill and confidence amongst the manufacturers. Valuable advice has already been given to many manufacturers regarding the carrying out of their operations and in connection with proposals for the expansion of their factories and workshops. At the end of each month Mr. Fernie prepares a report covering his activities. The reports are extremely interesting and indicate not only the possibilities, but also the opportunities in the State for the expansion of existing industries and the development of new ones. I am hopeful that the monthly reports prepared by Mr. Fernie will be made available to members in order that they might obtain a clear understanding and a full knowledge of what the department is attempting and is doing, and thus gain a fuller appreciation of the possibilities existing for the further development of our secondary industries.

Mr. Doney: Can you deal with achievements, or is it too early?

The **MINISTER FOR LABOUR**: I propose to refer to some of the results that have been obtained. The Premier, as well as other Ministers, is particularly anxious to see the present policy of industrial expansion succeed. He has agreed to make available an amount of £15,000 from this year's loan funds for financially assisting proposals put forward from time to time for industrial expansion. Some members might think the amount is not very great, but that sum will cover only the period till the 30th June next—the end of the financial year. It is not the policy or the intention of the Government to distribute financial assistance without first making careful investigation and giving all possible consideration to each application.

It would of course be an easy matter for the Government to distribute £100,000 every year in connection with factories and workshops already established and in connection with proposals for the establishment of new industrial enterprises in Western Australia. During the last three months we could without any difficulty at all have distributed anywhere up to £100,000. The Government's idea regarding the making of financial assistance available to secondary industries here is that such assistance will be made available only after the most thorough investigation, and only after the officers of the Department of Industrial Development and the officers of the Treasury have completely satisfied themselves of the justification for making the particular advance. We feel, and I am sure every member of this Committee feels, that the best and the quickest way to achieve success is to hasten slowly. We have no desire to set up new industries which do not offer a real hope of permanency. We have no desire substantially and quickly to expand any existing factory or warehouse unless such expansion is based upon the most solid ground possible. The amount made available will be used carefully in the best possible direction, and should materially help to encourage manufacturers in expanding their present activities.

The annual conference of the Federated Chambers of Manufactures was held in Perth during November of last year. An exhibition of locally manufactured goods was staged in the Barrack-street warehouse of Messrs. Goode, Durrant & Murray, Ltd., during the period that conference was being held. The four floors and basement of the

warehouse were fully occupied by exhibits, and the attendance exceeded 70,000. Hon. members will understand that 70,000 different individuals did not attend. Some persons attended more than once. The total attendance during the period the exhibition was open numbered 70,000. Delegates from the Eastern States to the conference in question were considerably impressed with the exhibition. During the last few months exhibitions have also been held at Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Northam and Geraldton. Local Products Week efforts were staged at Northam and at Geraldton with excellent results. The department again co-operated with the Empire Shopping and Local Products Council in the organisation of Empire Shopping Week, during which 20,000 posters and 100,000 leaflets were distributed throughout the State. As an instance of the value of the department's work it is pointed out that a buyer from Malaya was recently put in touch with local manufacturers, several export orders being thus secured. It is also gratifying to be able to report that substantial repeat orders have since been received.

Some little time ago the department circularised manufacturers for the purpose of obtaining information regarding the type of articles produced by each manufacturer and the brands under which they are sold. Almost 400 replies have been received from the 580 manufacturers who were circularised. Other valuable information was also supplied by many of the manufacturers, and additional replies are still being received. When the returns are regarded as being complete, the department will possess a comprehensive index of secondary industries operating in the State. It is proposed to issue in book form an authoritative list of goods manufactured here, together with the brands under which they are sold, in an endeavour further to educate the public regarding the extent and value of articles manufactured in Western Australia. The Federal Department of Commerce now has an office in Perth. It has taken over the secretaryship of the Advisory Committee on Eastern Trade, which work was previously carried out by the Secretary of the Department of Industrial Development, Mr. Macartney. Contact is still being maintained with that committee, as Mr. Macartney is now a member of it.

Successful action was recently taken by the department to bring under the notice of

the Federal authorities the suitability of fibrous plaster for certain defence works at Darwin, in connection with which an article not manufactured in Western Australia was specified in the contract. As a result of this action, a substantial order for fibrous plaster was placed with local manufacturers, and fibrous plaster was used instead of the eastern product which it was intended in the first instance to adopt. Following representations made by the department to a local authority concerning difficulty that was being experienced as to the extension of its battery manufacturing activities by a company manufacturing batteries in Perth, the difficulty was overcome. It is believed that the company in question is likely to make a further extension of its activities in the near future. Again, the interests of local manufacturers have been conserved by the retention in the State of scrap lead that was previously being exported to other States, and in some cases to other countries. If action had not been taken to prevent its continued export, local industrial activity would have been quite seriously hampered.

Now as regards dumping. A widespread opinion has developed in Western Australia suggesting that there is little or no hope of industrial expansion here so long as big manufacturing concerns in the other States are in a position to send their goods here and sell them at any price whatever. I am of opinion that the fear of dumping has been the strongest factor operating against the expansion of secondary industries in this State. In fact, the fear of dumping has been a far greater militating factor against our secondary industries than any actual dumping that has occurred. Dumping has to a large extent been a bogey, which has been exploited for a dozen and one reasons. It has been exaggerated to such an extent as to create a great deal of fear in the minds not only of Western Australian manufacturers but also of people with money to invest here. During recent months the officers of the department have invited local manufacturers to make available instances of dumping to the Department of Manufactures here. The officers of that department have carried out inquiries in every conceivable direction for the purpose of obtaining information, and if possible, proof of dumping activities operated against this State by

manufacturers in other States. I am convinced that if we can destroy, or to a large extent destroy, the fear of dumping we shall have taken a great step forward in our policy of industrial expansion. We took the opportunity to make personal contact with the Minister for Customs, Mr. Lawson, when he was in Western Australia a few weeks ago. We discussed this particular matter with Mr. Lawson, and the general question of expanding Western Australian secondary industries was also referred to. The Minister for Customs was more than interested. He was quite friendly, and assured us that if we could at any time provide him with proof of dumping he would take effectual steps to bring such activities to an end. It might be wondered what steps he could take, with the Commonwealth Constitution as it is. Every secondary industry operating in Australia operates under tariff protection. It is my opinion that a word from the Minister for Customs to an Eastern States manufacturer would have sufficient moral influence to bring about a cessation of dumping activities on the part of the manufacturer concerned.

Mr. Needham: You are leaning on a very broken reed there.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I was not over-optimistic that the Minister for Customs would be able to achieve the results which he suggested to us he could and would achieve whenever we provided him with proof of dumping activities; but I am glad to admit in this Chamber tonight that he can do what he said he could do. I am also glad to state—which is more important still—that he did do what he said he would do. We did discover an instance of dumping, and a most glaring instance, subsequently to the visit of the Minister for Customs to Western Australia. A local firm which was manufacturing electric conduit piping experienced repeated undercutting of prices by Eastern States firms which were dumping their products into Western Australia. They were selling conduits in Melbourne at 9s. 3d. per 100 ft., and were selling the same conduit to traders in Perth at 7s. per 100 ft. The question was taken up with the Commonwealth Government by the department, and action has since been taken to protect the interests of the local firm. As a result the

local firm has overcome most of its difficulties and has extended its range of manufacture. It is now exporting its own product to the Eastern States, at 2s. 3d. per hundred feet less than they were selling it for in the State where it was being manufactured.

Mr. Warner: Plus freight?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Plus nothing. They were selling it in Perth to distributors at 7s. per hundred feet, and in Melbourne at 9s. 3d. per hundred feet. The hon. member may be suggesting that not only should the price be the same as in Melbourne, but that it should be additional on account of the freight and other charges that have to be met by the manufacturers when they send an article to this State.

Mr. Doney interjected

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I have never known the member for Williams-Narrogin to be so impatient as he is this evening. I assure the hon. member that I have given a great deal of time and attention to the preparation of this statement, and I assure him that all the information he wants will be given to him in good time. The question was taken up by the department with the Commonwealth Government through the Minister for Customs, and action has since been taken to protect the interests of the local company. As a result, the local company is now overcoming most of its difficulties by reason of its being able to compete on a fair basis in the local market with the Eastern States manufacturers. It has not only been assisted to carry on the activities it was engaged in, but it has been placed in the position of being able to instal additional machines for the purpose of manufacturing other sizes, with the result that it is now in a position to supply the whole of the requirements of the local market, which it is doing. Further, and more important still, it is exporting conduit piping to the Eastern States and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, it is selling the piping in the Eastern States at a fair price. So I desire to pay a tribute to the Minister for Customs and the other Ministers of the Federal Government for the interest they have shown and for the measure of help they have given in that direction. No doubt every member of the House could give in-

stances of where the Federal Government has not assisted as much as it could and should have done. I might give many instances myself of where the Federal Government might have done more, especially in connection with defence contracts that have been let in recent times; but wherever we find that local manufacturers have not received the consideration we believe they should have received, we make immediate direct representations to the Federal authorities and those representations are carefully considered. In several instances the right thing, from our point of view, has been done.

Mr. Hughes: Section 92 of the Federal Constitution has been dethroned.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I would not say that Section 92 has been dethroned; I would say that to some extent a track has been built around it. Members of the Government are to have brought under their notice any instances of actual dumping. We are satisfied that if any such instances are brought under our notice, action can be taken that will have the result of effectively improving the position. There is the difficulty, of course, of having to decide where strong competition ends and dumping begins. I doubt whether there is any member in this House or any person outside of it who could draw a clear line in regard to any article and say that fair and strong competition ends there and dumping commences here.

Mr. Hughes: Is it not always dumping where an article is sold at less than the price it brings in its home market?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I consider that is dumping, and we have suggested to the Commonwealth Grants Commission that it should investigate the question on that basis.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Then we are dumping our butter in England and selling it at less than the price consumers here pay.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are highly disorderly.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: We may dump certain goods in other parts of the world just as other countries dump goods into our country, and they do dump their goods into our country. But the comparison is not in my opinion logical. All the States of Australia are operating under the one policy so far as secondary

industries are concerned and we should resist that with all the power at our command. The tariff policy in Australia, as we all know, has benefited mainly New South Wales and Victoria and has acted to the detriment of Western Australia, South Australia and perhaps to some extent Queensland and Tasmania. I think that the Federal Government particularly is not only entitled to take whatever action is possible to even up the benefits and to wipe away the disparities, but I think it is its bounden duty to do whatever lies in its power in that direction. I am convinced that the members of the Federal Grants Commission will make whatever representations it is within their power to make with the object in view of seeing that the smaller States do receive a better share of the benefits which undoubtedly flow from the operation of the tariff policy in connection with the secondary industries of Australia. Anyone would be foolish indeed if he did not realise and admit that there are many difficulties existing in Western Australia regarding secondary industries. There are natural difficulties. I propose briefly to deal with the major difficulties that face us. The small population of this State compared with the populations of New South Wales and Victoria is a very great difficulty. A further difficulty from our point of view is that New South Wales and Victoria became the home of Australian secondary industries many years ago. The third difficulty is that the secondary industries of New South Wales and Victoria are supported by a considerable amount of capital, and they are tremendously powerful.

Mr. Sampson: And they have big local markets.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I think I made that point clear when I was dealing with the first difficulty. Another difficulty is that the secondary industries of those States have been developed on the basis of supplying their local markets plus the markets that could be won in the other States. There is also the difficulty of local secondary industries in meeting competition of goods sent to this State by the powerfully established secondary industries of New South Wales and Victoria. The amount of money available in Western Australia for investment is comparatively small. That applies not only to the amount of money available for investment in secondary industries, it applies to

the amount of money available for investment in anything.

Mr. Lambert: De Bernales got a little of it.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I very much doubt whether all of the money or half of it obtained by the person in question was local money.

Mr. Hughes: It was all English money.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It is true that the amount of money available in this State for investment in any industry is small and certainly comparatively small when we take into consideration States such as New South Wales and Victoria. There is the additional difficulty that persons in this State with money to invest hesitate to place it in secondary industries either established or proposed to be established. I have already dealt with that point. I believe that most persons with money to invest in Western Australia have been scared out of investing it in secondary industries because of the fear of dumping that has been developed in the minds of nearly every person in the State.

I turn now to a brief consideration of the advantages existing in this State for the expansion of our secondary industries and for the establishment of new industrial activities. The present volume of imports of manufactured and semi-manufactured goods from Eastern Australia is valued at £13,000,000 per annum. An additional amount of £6,000,000 is spent each year on similar goods imported from overseas. The existence of a large local market is thus demonstrated. I think that is one of our greatest advantages and it is one that is being exploited to the fullest possible extent for the purpose of bringing about an extension of existing factories and workshops and also trying to interest people in the question of establishing in this State industries which at present do not operate here.

The total value of the output of local factories and workshops in 1938-39 was almost £20,000,000, the value added in the course of production being £8,562,000, and the wages paid to 23,000 employees amounting to £4,740,000. It will be seen that the total value of local output of manufactured goods is practically the same as the total value of similar goods imported into the State from the Eastern States and other countries of the world. It becomes obvious therefore that the amount of money we spend each year on importing semi-

manufactured and totally manufactured goods provides us with a great opportunity to extend local manufacturing activities and establish new activities of an industrial character.

Among the goods imported are to be found many articles—food-stuffs, clothing, footwear, and other everyday necessities. I have had two statements prepared. One deals with the increase of imports from Eastern Australia in the year 1937-38 compared with the year 1929-30. The other deals with the decrease of imports in 1937-38 compared with 1929-30. Those years were chosen for the purpose of comparison because the price level of last year is fairly close to the price level of 1929-30. The main items which show an increase of imports are dried milk, confectionery, tinned fruit, bottled beer, bulk beer, tobacco in manufactured form, cigarettes, silk stockings, wireless receivers, mining machinery and motor bodies. The main items in connection with which there has been a decrease of imports are butter, cheese, bacon and hams, tinned meat, condensed milk, jams, boots and shoes and biscuits.

Hon. N. Keenan: Have you any clothing figures?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I will quote some figures relating to clothing at a later stage, and if the hon. member desires any information in addition to that, I shall be pleased to make it available to him at any time. Obviously much additional activity in the manufacture of many of the items mentioned could and should be carried out in this State. The fact that plenty of cheap land is available in and close to the Perth City area, is an important advantage, especially as all the land can easily be served by existing railways, roads, water and power supplies and other essential facilities. A growing consciousness among the people of the State regarding the necessity of supporting necessary local industries is probably the greatest advantage of all. The determination of the Government to assist financially and otherwise in promoting industrial expansion in the State is also a considerable advantage.

I have here a table that indicates the percentage of local production to total local consumption in connection with a number of manufactured articles, all of which can

be regarded as necessities. The figures are as follows:—

| | Per cent. |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Cheese | 31 |
| Tobacco | 10 |
| Confectionery | 39 |
| Pickles and sauces | 32 |
| Jams and jellies | 20 |
| Boots and shoes | 30 |
| Hats and caps | 27 |
| Paints and varnishes | 7 |
| Textiles and textile goods | 7 |

Although some of those figures are disappointing inasmuch as they show that we import more than 50 per cent. of our total local consumption, some of the figures will be informative as indicating that factories and workshops are operating in this State and manufacturing quite a substantial proportion of our total local requirements. There has been an idea abroad that manufacturing in Western Australia is unprofitable. A widespread belief has existed amongst the people of our State that our factories and workshops are of no significance, that they are twopenny half-penny affairs and more or less out-of-date, that what they do produce is either too dear in price or quite hopeless in quality. I wish it were possible for every man and woman in Western Australia to have an opportunity of carefully inspecting every industrial establishment within the metropolitan area. I am sure that would be the best form of education they could possibly have regarding the value and the strength of our secondary industries and the great need that exists for their expansion. The transport and other costs that have to be met by manufacturers in the Eastern States in sending manufactured and semi-manufactured goods to Western Australia is an advantage to us that has been increased as a result of the war. Practically every cost associated with the sending of goods from the Eastern States to Western Australia has been increased, that is, where the goods are sent by sea. Interstate shipping freights have been increased, I think, some 15 per cent. I admit I would not become very frantic if they were increased 35 per cent. or 50 per cent.

Mr. Lambert: Railway freights operate against us.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Railway freights are another matter and they have not been increased in recent months.

Mr. Lambert: Ten per cent.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Between Kalgoorlie and Perth they have been increased in connection with certain items.

Mr. Seward: Very important items, too.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am not concerned about the increases in railway freights between Melbourne and Kalgoorlie and Adelaide and Kalgoorlie. If the railway freights between Adelaide and Kalgoorlie increased 25 per cent., I am afraid I could not join in any protest about it.

Mr. Seward: There would be some justification for our increases then.

[Mr. Withers took the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The Chief Inspector of Factories recently compiled a list of new factories established and registered under the Factories and Shops Act since the 1st January last. The number of new factories and shops so registered is 73. On the surface that might almost justify our throwing our hats in the air and saying we have achieved marvellous progress during the year, but if any hon. member is inclined to become over-enthusiastic, I would ask him to wait until I complete the statement I have to make about this matter. The number of persons employed in those factories is 223, made up of 197 males and 26 females. It will be seen that the average number of employees per new factory is not very high.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They all have a small beginning, you know.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: They do. A very important fact was elicited as a result of our investigation of the persons employed. We found that a far greater number of males were employed in the factories than females. In these days when the male is being displaced from so many occupations it is satisfying to learn that in the field of secondary industries the number of males employed is far greater than the number of females. That appears to me to be an important point and should move us to greater effort in the task of extending our secondary industries. Many of the new factories established and registered this year are comparatively unimportant. The whole of them show an average in employment of only three persons per factory. The greatest number employed in any of the new factories is 20, and they are employed in the skin drying industry being carried on at South Fremantle by Westralian Farmers

Ltd. Nevertheless, several of the factories established this year offer good prospects of advancement. With reasonable care and attention some of them might easily expand to quite substantial proportions in the not distant future.

I have already made brief reference to defence contracts. Several defence contracts have been received by factories and workshops in this State, and the obtaining of those contracts has been of considerable assistance to the factories and workshops concerned. Industrial enterprise that has benefited most from defence contracts is that operated at Albany, namely, the woollen mills. Just prior to his death, the late Dr. Simpson, who for many years was Government Analyst, prepared maps showing the distribution of gold, copper, lead, tin, tantalum, niobium, iron, arsenic and coal in this State. The maps were prepared this year, and are therefore up to date. They have been printed, and copies have been forwarded to the Department of the Prime Minister at Canberra. We believe the deposits of the minerals mentioned are such as to offer a solid basis for the development of much additional industrial activity. More than likely war conditions will give us greater opportunities to exploit those particular deposits than were available to us previously.

When the war commenced, many people expressed the opinion that the Government's policy of seeking to expand industrial activity would have to be set aside. They had an idea that war conditions would cripple any attempt made to promote industrial expansion in this State. The members of the Government held an entirely opposite view, believing that the advent of war conditions would assist efforts for the promotion of our secondary industries rather than hinder them. Certainly war conditions have already made it very difficult and very costly to bring semi-manufactured and manufactured goods here from other countries of the world. That fact in itself gives our secondary industries considerable opportunity to make progress where progress might otherwise have been impossible. There is the further fact that many of the factories and workshops in the Eastern States are operating almost completely for the purpose of supplying the requirements of the Defence Department. The factories in question will not be able to supply the needs of the civil population

in the Eastern States with the lines they produce. If they are, by special effort, able to meet those requirements, it is reasonably certain that they will not have the same surplus of production as they had previously to send to Western Australia. So I think we shall not only find it more difficult to obtain semi-manufactured and manufactured goods from overseas during the period of the war, but shall have more difficulty in obtaining such goods from Eastern States. That will not apply to every line of secondary production, but it will apply to a considerable number of lines. Thus there seems to be a further and considerable opportunity for the factories and workshops of this State to progress.

The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) asked the position regarding clothing. Speaking from memory, the people of Western Australia last year sent £1,350,000 to the Eastern States for the purchase of wearing apparel. Other textile productions and other articles of clothing were purchased both interstate and overseas, and the value of our total imports of wearing apparel, including boots and shoes, hats and caps, would, I believe, reach nearly £2,000,000 a year. In that field we believe there is some opportunity for progress in this State. Members must bear in mind, however, that competition in the clothing trade is particularly fierce. Competition in the clothing trade in Sydney and in Melbourne, by one manufacturer against another, is fierce. Competition between manufacturers in the clothing trade in Perth is fairly fierce. Seemingly this is a trade in which fierce competition always exists. Some of the information given to us in Melbourne a few months ago, if true, was such as to indicate that all sorts of undesirable practices operate in the trade in Victoria and, to a lesser extent, in the trade in New South Wales.

The Minister for Lands reminds me that we export articles of locally-made clothing to the Eastern States. The export of manufactured clothing to the Eastern States is fairly considerable, and the quality of the locally-made articles is quite equal to that of goods manufactured in the Eastern States, and the prices are competitive. I asked a local manufacturer of clothing to see me the other day, because I had had an experience in a shop that I thought warranted my having a discussion with him. I went to a shop

and asked to see some locally-made shirts. Several brands were produced, some of which I knew were locally made. One brand put up in a cellophane wrapping was quite a nice-looking production, and the price and everything else appeared to be right.

Mr. Cross: Was it made in Germany?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: No, it was made very close to the hon. member's district, and I think some of his constituents work in the factory, so he had better hesitate before making nasty remarks about those shirts. I questioned the shop assistant three times as to whether the shirts were in fact locally-made, and he assured me that they were, and gave me the name and address of the manufacturer. When the manufacturer came to see me, I asked him why he did not mark or brand his shirts to indicate that they were made in this State. He replied, "If I did that, my local sales would probably decline 50 per cent. It would be very dangerous on my part to allow the people of Western Australia to know that those shirts are made here. So long as people do not know, they buy them, praise them, recommend them to their friends, and are satisfied in every way."

Mr. Watts: How will you overcome that?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The only way to do so is by every means possible to educate the people of Western Australia to develop some faith in their own State and the possibility of industrial production locally. I had the pleasure last night of opening a factory erected by Claude Neon, Ltd., on Stirling Highway, Claremont. That company manufactures Neon lights that are used for advertising purposes.

Mr. Seward: Were you working overtime?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: No, but I was doing a different class of work. I should really have been here. The factory is a fine modern structure, both inside and outside. It has been erected upon a large block, and there is still plenty of land available for future extension. The company intends to make further extensions in the not distant future. Another important proposal it has in mind is the establishment of a porcelain plant in this State. That is a new development in connection with Neon sign advertising. The company recently established a similar plant at its works in Sydney, at a cost of

£60,000. It will not establish so big a plant here, but the porcelaining undertaking will be a further step forward in industrial expansion in Western Australia.

I mentioned a little while ago that we exported to the Eastern States certain articles of clothing manufactured in Western Australia. We export to those States confectionery, cigarettes, tobacco, cigarette papers, cigars, boots and shoes, condensed milk, and a number of other manufactured articles.

Mr. Patrick: The imports of preserved milk have increased.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: If one asks in a confectionery shop in the Eastern States for a box of chocolates, one is invariably given those manufactured by Plaistowes.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I like that advertisement. I wish that was true. I went to one shop in Sydney and was given Nestle's chocolates.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I do not say that this applies to every shop in the Eastern States; some of them are owned by Nestle's, and others by MacRobertson's.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Government railway refreshment rooms would be a good place in which to stock these chocolates.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The confectionery manufactured by Plaistowes and sent to the Eastern States finds a good market, and is highly praised. In our own State people are continually buying imported confectionery.

Mr. Patrick: In many shops in Perth one cannot buy the local article.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: If we are going to take up the attitude that we cannot buy local articles in our shops, we might as well cease every attempt to develop our secondary industries. If they are determined about it the people of this State can get the local article in any shop in Western Australia.

Mr. Boyle: They could force the position.

Mr. Warner: People have only to ask for the local article, to get it.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: In Northam several housewives determined that they would get such local articles as they required in the shops of the town. They may have wanted sauces, jams, chocolates,

or anything else. Almost without exception their orders were filled by the imported goods, despite the fact that they had stipulated that they wanted locally made articles. The housewives promptly sent a message to the storekeeper in question, telling him to send his van to remove the goods he had consigned to them. The storekeepers generally were told that if they could not supply locally manufactured goods, those goods would be obtained from the city. The result is that today one can go into any shop in Northam and procure locally made goods, and in many instances it is not necessary to stipulate the local article because that is the first thing offered. If a shopper wants the Eastern States product he must ask for it. It is no use saying it is impossible to get the locally manufactured product in our shops.

Mr. Patrick: I did not say that, but that many shops in Perth did not stock them.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I admit that. It is the fault of the consuming public that shops do not stock the local article.

Mr. Patrick: I agree.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It is high time that every man and woman in this State, who desires to see progress made here, who wants to see more opportunities for employment offered to our young people, taught the shopkeepers or storekeepers concerned a lesson. The consumers could close up any shop if the shopkeeper refused to stock locally made goods. It is within the hands of every man and woman, the buyers of the goods, to determine that all the shops in the State shall not only stock locally made articles but do everything possible to increase their sales to customers. A great deal more could be said regarding secondary industries, but I do not propose to say anything further concerning them at this stage. I shall be pleased to give whatever information is in my possession to assist members during the detailed discussion of the Estimates.

I come now to a brief consideration of the Child Welfare Department. That deals with infant life protection, the legal adoption of children, the investigation of complaints of ill-treatment of children, the supervision of children placed in orphanages and industrial schools, the supervision

of children boarded out with foster parents and foster mothers, and also those released on probation by the Children's Courts. It grants assistance to women upon whom children are dependent, to unmarried mothers, and provides legal aid to such women to assist them to obtain affiliation orders whenever possible. Outdoor relief to those in distress through sickness is provided. The department supervises the street trading of children, and has offences committed by children up to the age of 18 dealt with through the Children's Courts. It has probationary and preventive work carried out in connection with children, and deals with the establishment of children's courts in the country and the appointment of members thereto. It exercises control over children performing in public. At the 30th June last 594 wards of the department were cared for in various institutions. The departmental subsidy was being paid to institutions for each of these children. The number of children at service and in training was 324, and the number of those with relatives and others without subsidy was 464. The children with mothers receiving allowances, but not being wards of the department, numbered 2,572. The number of children under six years of age placed out with licensed foster mothers and licensed institutions and paid for by relatives was 134. There were 351 children on probation from Children's Courts and industrial schools. In addition to the institutions that have been operating for a number of years, a new Presbyterian Home for Children is now being operated at Byford. That home was officially opened a few weeks ago. Only a small number of children is being cared for in that home at present, but the number will increase as time goes on. Assistance was rendered by the department to 1,157 families, 394 incapacitated husbands and 2,572 children, or a total of 4,123 persons as at 30th June last. The position at that date, as compared with the position at 30th June, 1938, disclosed an increase of 10 cases, with a decrease of 45 persons in the number receiving assistance. The number of women upon whom children were dependent, in receipt of assistance on the 30th June of this year was 1,050. The main groups concerned were—widows 354, women with incapacitated husbands 394, and deserted wives 179. Assistance was being given to 2,580 children who were not

wards of the department. At the end of the last financial year the number of children licensed to carry on street trading was 283. Of those licensed, 210 were between 12 and 14 years of age, the remainder, 73, being between 14 and 16 years of age.

The number of children at the Fairbridge Farm School during the financial year 1939-1940 averaged 125 per month. That institution is subsidised on the following basis: the British Government provides 5s., the Commonwealth Government 3s. 6d., and the State Government also 3s. 6d. per child per week.

Mr. McLarty: The number at the Fairbridge Farm School is decreasing.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Yes, on account of the war. The subsidies are paid for the children until they reach 14 years of age. It is anticipated that expenditure of the Child Welfare Department will be £130,400 during the current financial year, as against an actual expenditure of £126,309 during the last financial year. The main item of increase in expenditure covers the increased rates of assistance granted by the Government to widows and others with small families as from November of last year. The next to last thing I want to do is to offer my heartfelt thanks to the Premier and Treasurer for the fact that it is not my responsibility this year to introduce and deal with the Estimates of the Department of Employment. My last duty is the one I now perform, of moving the first item.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [9.40]: After listening to the long but highly interesting address of the Minister, I should have liked a little more time to consider all that he has said; but in the absence of that facility I shall do my best to make a few observations directly and indirectly concerning his department, with a view to placing my views on certain subjects before members of the Committee. The Minister's principal occupation, it appears, is to encourage secondary industries in Western Australia. With that desire we are, doubtless, all in complete accord. He has set out this evening his opinion of the advantages and disadvantages, respectively, which he in his capacity as Minister for Industrial Development has to encounter in his job. One thing I think he did not mention, and that was the absolute necessity for the turning out of high-quality products of all kinds by our local

manufacturers. I do not suggest that there are not high-quality products being turned out at the present time; but there have come under my notice, and doubtless there have come under the notice of other members of this Committee, products turned out by local manufacturers which in no way were comparable with those that have come from other places. If in any degree at all that state of affairs exists, then there is little doubt that the Minister's task will be made harder.

The Minister for Labour: It has been greatly facilitated in recent years.

Mr. WATTS: I admit that too; but the Minister's task will be made still harder, for it is a strange thing that the low reputation of even one solitary article will travel further and be more known to the public than the good reputation of numerous articles. Nor is there any justification for any low quality in the products of manufacturers in this State, so far as I see. We have all our raw materials of local production as good in quality as can be found in any other part of the world. I am not inclined to believe that our workmen are not of calibre equal to the calibre of workmen elsewhere; and so it seems to me that all that is required is a desire on the part of the manufacturer fairly to compete with the products of other manufacturers, and the equipment necessary for him to do so. It is admitted that there may be times when a manufacturer is in difficulty financially regarding the necessary equipment; and I have no doubt that it is partly for this reason—that financial assistance may be given in cases where it is deserved—that the Minister has made preparation for a certain amount to be applied in helping those who are endeavouring to start or promote secondary industries here. The hon. gentleman made some reference to action that could be and was being taken by the Federal Minister for Customs for the prevention of dumping where it could be proved to have taken place in cases such as that quoted by the Minister. The Minister assured us that he would give us the complete story: but up to the present, so far as I can remember, he has not told us what the Federal Minister for Customs did. If it has not been wrapped up, as a great many Federal matters have been during recent months, in the veil of secrecy, perhaps the Minister will be kind enough—should he, as I hope he will, reply to this discussion—to inform the Committee

of the nature of the action taken by the Minister for Customs.

The Minister for Labour: I presume he carpeted the Eastern States manufacturer concerned.

Mr. WATTS: If that was all the action that could be taken—and I was at a loss to understand what legislative or administrative action other than that was practicable—I do not feel well assured as to the absence of fear of dumping in regard to our secondary industries in the future.

The Minister for Labour: What does the farmer do when the bank carpets him?

Mr. WATTS: His position by no means compares with that of the manufacturer before the Minister for Customs, because it is most unlikely that the latter will take off the duty, which would affect, in all probability, a large number of others as well, in order to deal with a minor case such as the Minister mentioned. I still feel, as I did when the Minister made his statement, that there will be considerable difficulty to be overcome by him, in his efforts to promote secondary industries, for the prevention of dumping. If any means can be found to overcome that practice, it is definitely desirable that such means shall be used, and I join with the Minister in expressing appreciation of the efforts by the Federal Minister for Customs, and express the hope that his efforts will be continued and will prove as effectual as apparently they were in the present instance.

With reference to the operations regarding workers' compensation insurance and of the State Government Insurance Office, the Minister remarked upon the large number of accidents that occur in Western Australia as compared with the other States. Members may remember that previously some discussion took place in this Chamber regarding the adverse comments of the Federal Grants Commission on that particular question. The members of the Commission claimed, quite rightly, it would appear, that the cost of workers' compensation to industry in Western Australia was at least one of the deterrents to the establishment of secondary industries in this State. It is admitted that we have been inclined to blame other causes for the high cost of workers' compensation insurance. We have been inclined to blame, for instance, the benefits, particularly medical, as compared with those available in the other States, because in some instances they are higher in Western Australia. Possibly

too, we have been inclined to arrive at the conclusion that the insurance companies themselves were partly responsible. I still think that those companies cannot absolve themselves from participation in some of the blame on both those counts. But we are now struck by the fact that there is a greatly increased number of accidents in Western Australia. An article that appeared in this morning's "West Australian" was simply astonishing. Therein reference was made to industrial accidents, and it showed that there were in Western Australia 58 accidents per thousand during the year under review, while in New South Wales there were 39, and in the remainder of the States the highest recorded was 11 per thousand. Thus, with the exception of Western Australia and New South Wales, all the States experienced under 12 accidents per thousand. In turning to coalmining accidents, a similar state of affairs, although to a lesser degree, is found to exist.

I join with the Minister in expressing the hope that some action will be taken in regard to improving conditions in factories that already exist and that provision will be made accordingly in factories that may be established in the future. I refer to improved conditions in the direction of minimising accidents as far as possible. The Minister mentioned the appointment, by the intervention of the Chamber of Manufacturers in the Eastern States, of what would be called "safety inspectors." I was struck by a series of photographs in an illustrated paper showing the action taken in certain parts of the Commonwealth for the prevention of accidents by the installation of safety gear of different kinds, with which hon. members are perhaps, well acquainted, at least by way of description. I suggest that, without endeavouring to inflict upon manufacturers any great additional cost, much could be done towards minimising accidents that take place in factories and other industries in regard to which the figures I have mentioned are indeed startling. I believe there would be some expense to which employers would be put, but I think they would be ultimately recouped by the saving that would be effected in regard to workers' compensation insurance, and, moreover, by means of the improved running conditions of their factories and trading conditions generally.

Some two or three weeks ago I was struck by observations that were made by the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat) concerning the basic wage. Generally speaking, he adopted a line in regard to his discussion of the problem, which was rather different from that submitted in this House and on the hustings by members sitting on the Government side of the House. He said that, though he was perhaps on difficult ground, or words to that effect, he felt he ought to express his views on the subject, and I commend him for expressing those views—if my commendation is worth anything. While he did not for one moment depart from fundamentals in which he believes, at the same time he indicated very clearly that he thought some improvement could be effected. The hon. member said that 20 years ago or thereabouts he was better off on £3 or £4 a week than he is today. No one will contradict that statement. What is wrong with the basic wage system at the present time? I interjected during the course of the speech of the member for Mt. Magnet that the trouble was, as far as I could see, that the worker was always six weeks behind the clock. I believe as far as the worker is concerned that is the position. The cost of living rises. Weeks afterwards, the basic wage rises proportionately on calculations made in the Arbitration Court. During the intervening period no benefit has accrued to the worker owing to the increased cost of living and the basic wage not then having risen correspondingly. Thus an effect is produced upon the manufacturers and other persons who have to pay. They, of course, pass it on, and the cost of living again rises, and so on ad infinitum. In the end, the worker is no better off. Then again, any sum of money is worth only what it will buy. If £1 yesterday bought what £2 will purchase by tomorrow, then a man will be no better off with £2 tomorrow than he was with £1 yesterday. If we bear that in mind when giving consideration to such questions as that under review, I think we will get a little nearer to a true understanding of the position than most of us possess today. We find that the cost of living rises, and the basic wage rises later on to catch up with the cost of living, but it does not quite do so. It does not quite compete with the increased cost of living, but the in-

creased basic wage is always a little way behind.

Mr. Styants: Why do not you support price-fixing legislation?

Mr. WATTS: Have I ever objected to that?

Mr. Styants: Members on the opposite side of the House have always objected to price-regulation.

Mr. WATTS: A Bill was passed last month with the assent of every member of this House.

Mr. Styants: As a wartime measure.

Mr. WATTS: It received the approval of every member of this House, and I have objected to that legislation on no occasion. I do not think the hon member can combat my statement. Price-fixing, as I view it, is not altogether a cure, because it is no use fixing a price for an article below what is a profitable price, one that will pay expenses and provide a reasonable margin of profit.

Mr. Styants: What is reasonable?

Mr. WATTS: That is a matter for consideration. In some industries the profit may be great, in others less, depending upon the amount of work done by the individual to earn it. But behind all this, one section of the community cannot pass on increased costs. I am not one of those who believe our duty is to bring all people down to the lowest level; rather should we make every effort to bring those on the lower levels up to the higher ones. We should try to discover what is keeping people on the lower levels down and assist them to surmount their difficulties. Those who find the greatest difficulty in passing on increased costs—in fact, they cannot do it at all—are they who find themselves compelled to sell the greater part of their products in a totally unprotected market. I refer to farmers and other primary producers, who are obliged largely to take whatever they can get, because the home consumption that can be dealt with by price-fixing regulation is extremely limited. It is impossible for the primary producer, at prices and under conditions well known to members of this Committee, to pay high wages or high prices for their necessities and still carry on their operations. If the cost of living were half the amount it is today, it would be a perfectly fair proposition to lower the basic wage by 45 per cent.: the worker would still be five per cent. better off than he is now. That would make it possible for the primary producers to carry

on without having to struggle with the difficulties now continually facing them. Not for one moment do I think my suggestions can be carried into effect overnight; but every effort should be made by all of us in our respective spheres to assist the Government in one way or another. Everything possible should be done to prevent cost of living from rising; wherever possible it should be reduced, so that there may be a levelling down, as it were, of costs and prices in the industries I mentioned. Unless and until that is done, primary producers cannot possibly pay the reasonable wages and offer the good conditions which I and every other member of the Committee would like them to pay and to offer, but which they cannot offer so long as they must meet mounting costs while receiving too low prices for their products. Unless we put the brake on the continual rise in the cost of living, primary producers will be unable to carry on.

Without desiring to keep the Committee too long, I would refer to an appointment mentioned by the Minister—the appointment of Mr. Fernie, some months ago, to the position of Engineer in Charge of Industrial Development. I have known Mr. Fernie for some years, but only by reputation. His reputation is one that should stand him in good stead in the position he now fills. By way of interjection when the Minister was speaking, I said that Mr. Fernie's was the only good appointment that the Government had made; but there may have been others. This, however, is the only good one that has been brought to my notice recently. I congratulate the Minister upon appointing a man at once zealous and competent to perform the duties required of him. I hope that his investigations into secondary industries and their possible expansion will prove of great assistance to the Minister. It would be much better for our primary industries if we had a larger home consumption market, for undoubtedly such a market would mean an increase in the number of persons employed in secondary industries. Consequently we can look forward, to some extent, to an increase in our secondary industries because of a desire for an increased market for at least some of our primary products at payable prices. I hope the Minister will be good enough to make available to members from time to time the reports furnished to him

by Mr. Fernie, so that we may have an opportunity to consider them. I agree with the Minister that no occasion exists for curtailing the activities of his department. I also agree with him that, notwithstanding present conditions and the fact that the nation is at war, there may be a greater demand in this State for Western Australian products. The demand may be greater because of the fact that we are at war, for reasons mentioned by the Minister.

I was surprised to hear the Minister remark that a manufacturer in this State was obliged to hide the fact that his goods were of local manufacture in order that he might sell them here. If locally manufactured goods are of the desired quality—and I assume from the Minister's observations that these goods were—then in my opinion every right-minded citizen would want to buy them because of the very fact that they were made locally. I see no justification for any Western Australian refusing to purchase locally-manufactured goods, provided they are of the right quality and are sold at a reasonable price. If the Minister intends to undertake a campaign—as he suggested he might, and I certainly agree with his suggestion—to educate the Western Australian people to buy locally made goods that are of comparable value and price with goods made elsewhere, I am sure that members on this side of the Chamber will be only too happy to assist him in any humble way we can.

In conclusion, I desire to say a few words about the Child Welfare Department. I have had some experience of the officers of that department during the past few years. Whatever may have been said concerning them by other members to the contrary, I have definitely found these officers to be both courteous, and anxious to assist within the limits of their responsibilities. Every case I have placed before them has been dealt with in a reasonable and proper manner. As I say, they have done everything they could to assist, within the limits of their responsibilities. I trust that the activities of that department will always be carried on by officers of the same calibre.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [10.4]: I move—That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. BOYLE: I am sorry the Minister would not accept my motion. The hour is late and I was really anxious to assist him; apparently he is not willing to reciprocate. The Minister referred to the appointment of Mr. Fernie as Engineer in charge of the Industries Development Department. The member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) mentioned that he did not know Mr. Fernie other than by repute. I have known Mr. Fernie from the time he was a cadet in the Works Department. He is a local product and a brilliant engineer. He is one of the two engineers in Western Australia who can affix to their names letters indicating that they are Masters of Engineering. Mr. Fernie has collaborated with me on many occasions in my district. One hundred miles of the main pipe-line run through that area, and many hundreds of agricultural pipe lines. During Mr. Fernie's occupancy of the office of Water Supply Engineer at Northam, I came into close contact with him and learned to appreciate his sterling qualities both as a man and as an engineer. One instance will suffice to illustrate his capabilities. The Minister for Works had an estimate of £14,000 for an extension of the water supply to Yorkrakine. Mr. Fernie undertook the job and completed it for under £7,000—less than 50 per cent. of the cost estimated.

The Minister said there was £15,000 behind his department. That is a most inadequate sum. I regret that the State's finances will not allow of more being granted to the department. A hundred thousand pounds would be little enough to put behind the department for the establishment of secondary industries in this State. The Minister mentioned that dumping is not the hogey it used to be.

The Minister for Labour: I did not say that.

Mr. BOYLE: I think the Minister intimated that dumping is losing its intensity. Shall we put it that way?

The Minister for Labour: No. I did not say that either.

Mr. BOYLE: Well, I will put it my own way. Dumping is a menace to secondary industries in Western Australia.

The Minister for Labour: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOYLE: I will give an instance. I happened to be in Melbourne when an orphanage picnic was being held. Five hun-

dred children go to that picnic down Port Phillip Bay each year, and they are provided for by a central committee in Melbourne. I met a member of the committee who told me he had searched Melbourne for empty cases in which to put the provisions for the picnic. At several factories he was told that there were no empty cases in Melbourne, but that there were plenty in Perth. That is typical of the Eastern States outlook. Western Australia is the dumping ground for them, and they undersell our products here. I will give another instance of what happened to a certain firm in Albany, where Rayner's jam factory was being developed. Rayner's were the pioneers in Western Australia of the manufacture of jams and preserves. They became well-established. I think they were assisted by the Government, and there was an overdraft of £5,000 guaranteed by the Government. That, of course, was justified; but the position resolved itself into a struggle between Rayners and Eastern States jam interests. I happened to be in Albany and saw a telegram from a firm in Tasmania. I think I have identified the firm by saying it was in Tasmania. The telegram was to the effect that owing to the good fruit season in Tasmania—and this was midway through a 12 months spread delivery of 5,000 cases, about 2,500 cases having been delivered—the firm had decided to reduce its contract price to the firm in question by 3s. per case, obviously undersell Rayner's.

The Minister for Labour: When was that?

Mr. BOYLE: A few years ago. I mention it to show that this menace has not been done away with. The head of the firm told me it was a business institution and they would cut Rayners out.

The Minister for Labour: Rayners are still going strong.

Mr. BOYLE: I hope that they will be a lot stronger. I mentioned these incidents to show what infant secondary industries in this State have to face. The Minister stated the total value of the output of local factories and workshops in 1937-38 was £20,000,000, and said that 23,000 employees were engaged full time to provide that output. It is only a matter of deduction for us to realise that if we had half of the balance of our adverse trade with the East of

£12,000,000, there would be little unemployment difficulty in this State.

Mr. STYANTS: We would have to import labour instead of goods.

Mr. BOYLE: There would be no need to import labour; men would come running to such an excellent field of opportunity. Efficient secondary industries would be a tremendous help to our great primary industries. Australian manufactured goods represent something like £430,000,000 a year. Figures I saw recently indicate that about £239,000,000 of that sum represents products of our primary industries. That is to say, that amount represents the value of raw materials, and the balance is made up of labour costs and profit to manufacturers. If we could spend in Western Australia half the amount that is spent in the East today, we could certainly find an outlet for about £1,000,000 or £1,500,000 worth of our primary products. That would give the Treasurer an opportunity to obtain more revenue, and would be a good thing for the State altogether. I am disgusted with the lack of loyalty shown by Western Australians in the main. They overlook the fact that today our products are of a high standard and compare very well with the products of the Eastern States. I am sure the Minister is on a good wicket from now on, because the war must assist industry in this State. I was pleased to notice that the hon. gentleman when attending a recent function said it was a good opportunity to boost Western Australian products while the Eastern States were taking every advantage of the war money available. Very little of that money will come to the West. I do not suppose we shall get 10 per cent. of it.

The Premier: We will not get 5 per cent.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not think we will.

The Premier: We will not. I have seen the figures.

Mr. BOYLE: It is a pretty rotten state of affairs.

The Premier: We have only 7 per cent. of the population.

Mr. BOYLE: But it is an important percentage. Another golden opportunity Western Australia has is in the production of gas producers. We have had from the Press recently a good deal of propaganda on this subject. Without any overstatement whatever, the position has been put

very well indeed. The possibilities in that direction are enormous. I am particularly interested in it, because in my district at the present time there is one firm—at Kellerberrin—employing 24 men on full wages in the manufacture of gas producers.

The Minister for Labour: That firm will be putting on more men.

Mr. BOYLE: Yes, it is an industry that will be decentralised in the rural areas. The burning of charcoal is a big factor and that industry can be carried on only in the country districts. It is quite on the cards that before long there will be 900 to 1,000 men employed in the manufacturing of charcoal in Western Australia for gas producers.

The Minister for Labour: Particularly if petrol is rationed.

Mr. BOYLE: Yes. Recently I read a booklet by a high officer of the Defence Department issued in August last stating that if international difficulties degenerated into a war, petrol would probably be not only rationed in Australia but reserved for military use. I have been told that there will probably be another 2d. rise in the price of petrol within the next two weeks, and so petrol in the metropolitan area will possibly reach 2s. 6d. a gallon.

Mr. Cross: During the last war it rose to 3s.

Mr. BOYLE: But I have figures to show the difference between the number of motor vehicles owned by people during the last war and the number now owned. The difference is too great to place on a percentage basis. There are in operation in Western Australia today 5,000 tractors, 300 of which are fitted with gas producers. There are 36,000 motor cars, practically none of which is fitted with a gas producer. There are 22,000 motor trucks, very few of which are fitted with gas producers. There are 300 motor buses, none fitted with a gas producer. The total is 63,300 motor vehicles which offer a potential field for fitting with gas producers and for the consumption of charcoal. At £90 for each gas producer, this would involve a capital expenditure of £5,500,000. One does not need a vivid imagination to visualise the employment that would be created in fitting only half the total number of vehicles with gas producers. If the authorities have to prohibit the use of petrol, conceivably all those vehicles will be fitted or they will have to go out of commission.

When we realise that producer gas costs only one-sixth of the price of petrol at 1s. 7d. a gallon, we can understand that perhaps the war will have done a certain amount of good in that direction, if in no other.

Mr. North: And we could not exhaust the supply of charcoal.

Mr. BOYLE: That is quite true. The firm referred to has obtained from the Forests Department the cutting rights for charcoal over 20,000 acres of land north of Kellerberrin. We have timber in useless country, the timber at present being equally useless as the country, that could be converted into fuel, instead of our sending so much money abroad. I am sure that every member is behind the Government and the Minister in the endeavours being made to expand local industry. The Minister said that money is not available in Western Australia for industries of this kind. Let me recall that the Neon Light Co. was floated only about three years ago. With all due respect to modern methods, it does not add one cubit to our stature to have a red or green light informing us of the presence of a drapery store or a hotel; it is only our craving for something different. Yet that company had no trouble in securing £75,000 of working capital. I am quite satisfied that if industry in Western Australia needs capital and the industry is soundly based, it will not lack for money. The gas producer is a work of national character. I know that it has passed the experimental stage. The member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Berry) will remember that in the Wheatgrowers' Union of Western Australia, we pioneered this industry and spent over £200 when money was scarce in order to combat the rising tide of farmers' costs in tractive power. At least we succeeded in making a commencement. Others today, notably the University of Western Australia—and I pay a tribute to Professor Bowden, who has fought hard and well for the last seven or eight years to make as perfect as possible the gas producer—are carrying on the good work. The firm at Kellerberrin has evolved two patents, one of which is a water cooler for the gas instead of an oil cooler. This device has proved phenomenally successful.

I assure the Minister that he will get all the help I can possibly give him. If the Government succeeds in putting secondary industry on to a sound footing—and it now

has the chance of a lifetime of reducing to reasonable proportions the flow of money from Western Australia to the Eastern States—it will have done the equivalent of making two blades of grass grow where none grew before. This is not a party question or a political question; it is a question involving our survival. We realise that our great primary industry, wheat, has been very sick indeed. I have come fresh from a select committee which elicited that millions of bushels of wheat of the 1938-39 crop had passed from the farmers to the merchants at an average price of 1s. 1-1/3d. a bushel. Those farmers have been squeezed out at a loss of about 1s. a bushel as compared with the market price that ruled in the early days of the war, and the loss has been colossal. There are other primary industries that would find a great outlet for their produce by way of raw material for secondary industries if only we could succeed in the object of not carrying all our eggs in one basket but of undertaking more diversified production. Our economic system is certainly ill-balanced. The primary industries have made the State, and in referring to primary industries I include gold mining. The Premier always insists upon gold production being included in primary industries.

The Premier: I think you must have been reading my policy speech.

Mr. BOYLE: I am quoting a little from my own policy speech, which I think was infinitely better than the Premier's. However, there is one policy upon which I shall always agree with the Premier and the Minister for Labour and that is the need for making this State more independent of the Eastern States than it is at present. That question admits of no successful contradiction and I again assure the Minister of all the support I can possibly give him.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 21st November, 1939.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Bills: Potato Growers Licensing, 1R. | 2052 |
| Bread Act Amendment, 1R. | 2052 |
| Dairy Industry Act Amendment, 3R. | 2052 |
| Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, report | 2052 |
| Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2R. | 2052 |
| Income Tax (Rates for Deduction), 2R. | 2056 |
| Traffic Act Amendment (No. 1), further recom. | 2057 |
| State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, Com. | 2002 |
| Firearms and Guns Act Amendment, Com. report | 2003 |
| Reserves (No. 2), 2R. | 2065 |

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

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Potato Growers Licensing.
Introduced by Hon. H. V. Piesse.
- 2, Bread Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Honorary Minister.

BILL—DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.42] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this measure is to insert new machinery provisions in the Income Tax Assessment Act to authorise the collection of income tax by instalments. As indicated in Parliament last year and by the Premier in his policy speech, the Government's intention is to abolish the financial emergency tax and collect the money required at the source under the provisions of a scientifically designed Income Tax Assessment Act. For obvious reasons, the Government cannot forgo the revenue at present collected in the form of financial emergency tax, but nevertheless, it