

homes for letting purposes. I will oppose the Bill.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [11.30]: I commend the Government for bringing down this Bill. I am surprised to hear Mr. Baxter's wholesale condemnation of the class of people it is thought the building of these homes will benefit. I do not know what justification he had for suggesting that they would not look after these homes, and would not pay the rent. The Premier says that a 4-roomed house can be built and let for 12s. 6d. a week. This is a means of providing a cheap house containing more accommodation than people would get from private owners. Members should give this small effort a chance to function. The Government is deserving of censure for not rising to the occasion in the matter of providing decent houses for a great many of its employees who are scattered throughout the State. I refer to the railway men who work in all weathers. The houses these men have to live in, with their families, are a disgrace to the Government, more especially to a Government that has been in office as long as this one has. When I say they are not houses at all, I am stating a fact. The Government should provide a type of home for these workers that could not be subject to criticism.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Have you seen the plans?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I am advocating that the Government should bring down a Bill to provide decent houses for railway workers. These men draw their wages from the State. Stationmasters and officers of the department have deductions made from their salaries for housing accommodation, so that the Government would not stand any risk of loss if it provided decent homes for other railway workers on the same basis. A lot of the discussion to-night has been wide of the mark. Many of the remarks made have been mere conjecture, and there has been no warrant for them. If this scheme is tried out in a small way and found satisfactory, it may be enlarged upon.

On motion by Hon. H. Tuckey, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 15th December, 1937.

	PAGE
Private members' business	2661
Questions: Fruit-fly control—1. Advisory Board's powers; 2. Imposition of a tax	2662
Nurses, scarcity	2662
Pickering Brook district, suitability for intensive culture	2662
Education, instruction on dietetics	2663
Dalkeith reserve, campers	2663
Private members' business	2663
Bills: Special Tax Assessment Acts Revision, 1R.	2661
Special Tax Acts Revision, 1R.	2661
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	2661
Housing Trust Act Amendment, 3R.	2664
Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act Amendment, 2R.	2664
Meat Industry (Treatment Works) Licensing, 2R.	2664
Mining Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., etc., passed	2668
Lake Avenue Resubdivision of Land, 2R., etc.	2669
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., etc.	2672
Terminal Grain Elevators, 2R., defeated	2678
Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act Amendment, 2R., etc.	2680
Meat Industry (Treatment Works) Licensing, 2R., etc.	2687
Public Buildings, 2R., Com.	2689
Housing Trust Act Amendment, returned	2703
Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2), returned	2703
Money Lenders Act Amendment, returned	2703
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	2703
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2R.	2703
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 1), 2R.	2703

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a letter from the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) requesting permission to move a motion for the adjournment of the House under Standing Order No. 47 to discuss a matter of urgency in regard to the question of the consideration of private members' business. I regret that I am unable to accept the matter referred to by the hon. member as a subject of urgency and suggest that he ask the Premier a question without notice, and in that way obtain all the necessary information he desires and would be likely to get by moving for the adjournment of the House.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Special Tax Assessment Acts Revision.
- 2, Special Tax Acts Revision.
- 3, Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2).

Introduced by the Premier.

QUESTIONS (2)—FRUIT FLY CONTROL.

Advisory Board's Power.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Does he intend to give executive powers to the Fruit Fly Advisory Board as requested by that body? 2, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No. 2, Parliament decided that the Act should be administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Imposition of a Tax.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it a fact that representatives of fruitgrowing organisations have assured him of approval to a tax based on area of orchard or quantity of fruit produced, and ranging up to £5 per commercial orchardist, subject to active measures being taken to control the fruit fly scourge? 2, In view of reports being received in respect to the alarming increase of the fly will he give favourable consideration to this proposition? 3, Have instructions been given that prosecutions are forthwith to be taken where the law relating to the suppression of the fly is disregarded—both in the metropolitan area and generally?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, A representative of the fruit-growers' organisation may have made the statement, but the department is aware how difficult it is to collect the present fee of 1s. even from commercial orchardists. 2, Fruit fly is not as rampant at present as is usual at this period of the year. 3, This matter is at present receiving consideration.

QUESTION—NURSES, SCARCITY.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Health: 1, What is the reason for the scarcity of qualified nurses in Western Australia? 2, Is it true that nurses are continually leaving the State for overseas, and, if so, why? 3, Why is it that opportunities for training are so strictly restricted? 4, Are no private hospitals in Western Australia qualified to train nurses? 5, Would he submit the whole question of the limitation of probationers, and consequent insufficiency of qualified nurses, to the examining board with a request that, with the object of securing a solution of the problem, serious consideration be given to it?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, The reduction of the hours of nurses in the larger hospitals brought about by the nurses' award meant the employment of about 50 more trained nurses and the employment of about 100 additional probationers. The effect of the employment of more probationers, however, will not be apparent until after February, 1939. 2, The State always has lost a certain number of trained nurses who, having a professional training behind them, are able to go to the Eastern States or overseas for further experience and for the purposes of travel. 3, Only the larger hospitals can be utilised as training schools. Western Australia has few such hospitals. 4, Only one private hospital can be recognised as a training school namely, St. John of God Hospital. 5, These questions and the answers will be submitted for the information of the Nurses' Registration Board. It must be remembered that the training of nurses involves theoretical instruction by doctors and matrons, as well as a great deal of practical instruction. It is essential that training standards be maintained in order to have reciprocity with the outside world, as well as to afford a proper standard for our own trained nurses.

QUESTION—PICKERING BROOK DISTRICT.

Suitability for Intensive Culture.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that in the large area of country north-east of Pickering Brook there are many rich portions of country suitable for intensive culture? 2, With the object of making this available for selection, would he look into the matter and advise what portions, if any, are available, or will be made available and when?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The bulk of the country north-east of Pickering Brook forms portion of the Coolgardie Water Supply catchment area, and is also a State forest: therefore it cannot be dealt with for settlement purposes. 2, The remaining Crown lands, which are not within the State forest or catchment area, consist principally of rough stony country. The department is not aware of any areas suitable for cultivation, but in the event of anyone making application for any of the land outside the State forest and catchment area, the matter would be referred to the

Forests Department to ascertain whether it could be released for settlement; as, although the land is outside the State forest, it is in an area within which the concurrence of the Forests Department is required before any of the land may be made available for selection.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, INSTRUCTION ON DIETETICS.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is he satisfied with the instruction given to State school pupils regarding nutrition? 2, When did instruction on dietetic matters commence? 3, Is any arrangement in force whereby private schools undertake similar instruction?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. Regular instruction is given in all standards. 2, Such instruction has been given since "Laws of Health" were compiled in 1908. 3, District Inspectors when visiting private schools ascertain whether instruction in hygiene is given regularly.

QUESTION—DALKEITH RESERVE, CAMPERS.

Hon. N. KEENAN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How many persons are at the present date camping on the Dalkeith Reserve? 2, What is the maximum number of persons who at any one time have been camping on the said reserve? 3, What is the longest tenure granted to persons camping on the said reserve? 4, What is the shortest tenure granted? 5, What was the total revenue collected from persons camping on the said reserve during the year ended 30th June, 1937? 6, What was the total expenditure incurred in respect to the said reserve in (a) capital expenditure and (b) maintenance costs during the year ended 30th June, 1937? 7, What is the maximum rental per week charged in respect to any building used by campers and what is the minimum? 8, What authority is responsible for the observance of sanitary conditions by campers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Approximately 30. 2, Number of persons unknown; fifty camps for short peak period. 3, One week. 4, One week. 5, £317 3s. 6, (a) £174 16s. 10d.; (b) £111 18s. 6d. 7, £1 under two weeks, or 17s. 6d. for longer periods; minimum 10s. per week. 8, State Gardens Board.

QUESTION—PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS.

Mr. BOYLE (without notice) asked the Premier: Will the Premier give the House an assurance that ample time for the discussion of private members' business now on the notice paper will be given before the House goes into recess?

The PREMIER replied: It all depends on what would be considered ample time, but I think that an assurance can be given to the hon. member that reasonable time will be given for the discussion of private members' business. Private members' business has been on the notice paper for some time and hon. members have had opportunity to incubate their ideas to some extent. If they have any remarks to make, and will be reasonably concise in dealing with matters that have to be brought before the House, it will be possible to give reasonable time to the discussion of those matters before the session ends. The Government is anxious to send to the Legislative Council the business that has to be dealt with by both Houses. All the items on the notice paper of the Legislative Council had some consideration yesterday. Some items were dealt with finally and the debate on others was adjourned. Unless we are prepared to prolong the session, the object is to send to the Legislative Council all those Bills that have to be concurred in by that Chamber as soon as possible. When that has been done, reasonable and even what the hon. member might consider ample time can be given to the discussion of private members' business on the notice paper.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do your remarks apply also to private members' Bills? It is no use a private member having his Bill discussed in this Chamber without having it referred to the Legislative Council.

The PREMIER: Yes; private members' Bills also will be given consideration. Hon. members who have motions on the notice paper will thus realise that if business which consists of Bills is given preference, it is because those Bills will necessarily have to be sent to the Legislative Council for discussion by that body. In the circumstances, Bills may be given some preference not because the Government or anyone else thinks they are more important than motions, but because of the fact that the Bills must receive further consideration by the Legislative Council.

BILL—HOUSING TRUST ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: This is a very short Bill, containing two main points. The one dealt with in the early part of the Bill gives the board authority to spend money from the administration fund for advertising butter under its jurisdiction. It is the desire of the board to stimulate as far as possible the consumption of butter, particularly now that a better standard has been reached, due to some extent to the activities of the board. The desire is to popularise the product and to insist that full publicity be given to it. When the original Bill was drafted no power was included authorising the board to spend money either for advertising or in the manner dealt with in the principal clause of the Bill. In connection with advertising, I might point out that per capita Western Australia has a very low consumption of butter per annum. The annual consumption for the Commonwealth is over 32 lbs. per head, whereas in Western Australia the annual consumption is 28.6 lbs. In New Zealand the figure reaches nearly 50 lbs. per head per annum. Therefore the board desires to expend some money in the advertising of that product. Members will observe that a proviso is inserted requiring the approval of the Minister for such spendings from the administration fund. The other clause is a very vital one to the industry. Great difficulties have been experienced by the manufacturers of butter to finance their concerns during the period of storage. Members are aware that suppliers of cream are paid regularly on or about the 10th of the month following the delivery of the cream, but under the provisions of the Dairy Products Marketing Stabilisation Act, the butter might remain in store for several months, and it has been possible to obtain bank advances on the stored butter up to only 80 per cent. of the value of the product. Often the larger concerns have been rendered financially embarrassed because of their inability to secure the requisite amount of

money to meet requirements for paying the suppliers of cream. This Bill has been drafted to permit of the bridging of that gap by enabling advances to be made against stored butter to the manufacturers from the stabilisation fund, a fund to which all manufacturers of butter contribute. Although there have been large sums of money in the fund, and often sufficient to relieve the tension in the industry, the Act prohibits the board from utilising the funds in that way. The board may invest its funds; some are invested on fixed deposit, but the board cannot advance money from the stabilisation fund for this purpose. Since the industry contributed the money, we think it reasonable that the money be released to ease the position. Members will notice that the board is not being given wide powers; in fact its powers are circumscribed. If the market price of butter in Australia drops below the value of the product at the time the butter is placed in store, for example, if it were stored at 110s., and the market price fell to 100s., the board would have authority to utilise the stabilisation fund to make good the difference to the manufacturer. A subsequent part of the clause gives power to waive storage charges which amount to a severe tax on those who have the butter in store. The Bill simply aims at giving the board the full utilisation of the funds at its command in the interests of the community.

Mr. Marshall: I should like you to explain the proviso to Clause 3. You have not told us explicitly what it means.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not permitted to do that at this stage. I can explain it in Committee.

Mr. Marshall: You could explain the principle.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. D. Ferguson, debate adjourned.

BILL—MEAT INDUSTRY (TREATMENT WORKS) LICENSING.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [4.52] in moving the second reading said: This Bill as the title indicates, is to provide for the

licensing of works for the treatment of carcasses of sheep and cattle for export. Members are aware that the Commonwealth has supreme control in connection with licensing for export, but there is no control in the State for the licensing of plants that treat for export. Provided that abattoirs or treatment plants come up to the required specifications of the Commonwealth as places suitable for killing, they may obtain licenses to export. Under this Bill we desire to give every possible support to the important lamb-raising industry particularly. Members who realise how very important the industry is will support every effort to maintain it at its present standard, and assist in extending it to the limits of the productive capacity of the State. The lamb-raising industry has been fostered by the Government to a very large extent. It has also been fostered by private enterprise. Figures showing the increased production in this State during recent years are very interesting, and indicate that in the near future it is possible for Western Australia to reach very ambitious figures in the production of fat lambs suitable for export. The exports during the past four years have been—

		carcases.
1934-35	131,454
1935-36	168,201
1936-37	143,949
1937-38 (estimated)		230,000

In this State there are many districts adjacent to and perhaps radiating from important ports that could produce very large numbers of lambs suitable for export. Right around our coast from Geraldton to Esperance opportunities exist to extend this industry, and I hope some day to see treatment works established at those centres. I think we can anticipate, with the fullest development of this industry, reaching in a few years a figure of 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 carcasses. When we remember that our lambs have competed with the lambs from all other recognised lamb-producing countries in the southern hemisphere and have topped the market, we must realise that we are producing a lamb acceptable on the other side of the world, and it is being produced at a very remunerative price to the growers here.

Mr. Stubbs: They are getting over £1 per head.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so. There have been consignments up to 1,400 lambs which, on being sold in London, have netted the producer over 21s.

per head on the farm. Whilst we cannot anticipate that those prices will be maintained—we cannot hope that the figure of 8¾d. per lb. that has been received in London for the Swandown type of lamb this year will be maintained—we can expect that a very remunerative price will be realised for the lambs produced in this State, provided we maintain the standard that has been set. We have very many districts in this State capable of producing lambs two or three weeks earlier than any other State of the Commonwealth. That is a very important factor in supplying the English demand for lambs producible in Australia. Every week of early maturity affects the price appreciably, to the benefit of the primary producer particularly in this State, and of course to the benefit of the whole State, because of the new money being received from that source. Therefore any move to maintain the splendid reception given to our lambs, as well as the profits to our producers, should receive our earnest attention. Anything should be resisted that would increase the costs and thereby reduce the returns to the producers.

Mr. Stubbs: Has not Albany such facilities now?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes, Albany has very fine facilities, to which I intend to refer at a later stage. I believe that under license the erection of treatment plants should be encouraged wherever a district is found suitable and able to support such works. But there are many reasons, which I hope to indicate, why those works should be operating under license. It can be reasonably supposed that when any district reaches the stage of development to warrant the erection of a treatment plant, licenses will be encouraged for that particular district. It is reasonable also to assume that no treatment plant would be erected unless it was economically sound to provide it in the particular district. That is a necessary safeguard, and a safeguard provided for in the Bill—that licenses must be applied for, and approved only after taking all these matters into consideration. It can be imagined that some interests which are world-wide—foreign interests—would not object to embarking on the industry in an uneconomic way if there were a possibility of eventually monopolising that industry. That is something which must be guarded against. In the interests of the whole of the Australian States, and of the money the

Government have invested and of private money invested by the producers of the State, a close check should be kept on applications for and issue of licenses for this particular industry. I have indicated that the State has no say in connection with the final approval of carcass meat for export. That is controlled by the Commonwealth Veterinary Branch, and the officers of that branch operating at our meatworks either approve or reject for export carcasses submitted to them for that purpose. In dealing particularly with the two main provisions of the Bill, first the licensing of the treatment plants for sheep and cattle for export, and secondly the protection of the producers' interests in that works must treat sheep or cattle on account of the owner if so desired, I should like those two points to be reviewed in some detail. They form the essence of the whole Bill. The proposal to license treatment plants is not entirely new; it has been put forward on several occasions before the Agricultural Council of Australia, and has been considered and also recommended by the Australian Meat Board. I have recently had an opportunity of giving considerable investigation to the position obtaining in New Zealand, and that country's legislation dealing with the slaughtering of stock. All hon. members are aware of the name of New Zealand in the meat markets of the world as regards the products of that country, whether lamb or mutton. New Zealand is famous for the quality of its products, and has won a name in highly important import countries of those commodities. New Zealand is famous, too, for its control of those works. New Zealand citizens attribute a great deal of their success in the markets of the world to the control the Dominion exercises over the licensing and the erection of treatment plants for export, and even over additions to such plants. As this State of the Commonwealth was the last to enter the field in the lamb industry in particular, we should jealously guard the name we have achieved so quickly for the quality of our product. We have a name on the London market vying with that of New Zealand. In short, Western Australia has made history in a few years as regards lamb production. That is extremely gratifying, not only to those engaged in the industry but also to the Government which desires to foster in every possible way the continuance and expansion of that industry to the very limit. In referring

to New Zealand legislation I desire to point out that as far back as 1918 the Dominion Government brought in a measure to the effect that it was unlawful for any person or firm to carry on business as meat exporter unless authorised under license by the Government. In 1918 the penalties were fixed at £2,000 with an additional £400 for each day during which operations were carried on without a license—a terrific penalty of £2,000 as the first impost, and £400 per day of unlicensed operation. That fact indicates how extremely jealous the New Zealand people were of the very important industry which is not so very old in that country. In 1934 the New Zealanders found that they had met with great success in their rigid control, and in the fine article they had been able to produce under that control. By 1934 the New Zealand Government had added to their powers of 1918. They considerably increased those powers by providing that no extension of or addition to existing works should be made unless the Government was satisfied that the extensions were necessary to meet the requirements of the industry. The underlying object of the New Zealand legislation and all the actions of the Dominion in this connection was to build up an efficient control, and to provide control of outside bodies. That was one of their worries, and one of the things they have provided for adequately. From the measure of control they sought and obtained, they have had great results. In Western Australia our principal treatment works operating for export are situated at Fremantle; and it is in the best interests of the producer and of the taxpayer, in the Government's opinion, that this legislation should be passed. As regards the operations of the Western Australian Meat Export Co., I may say that that company started about 20 years ago with a capital subscribed by local producers of £74,000. There is £74,000 of private capital from producers of Western Australia in that company. As time went on, due to expansion of rural interests in this State and due to the demand for sheep in outlying areas, the company found itself in difficulties with regard to carrying on. Although the works were initially erected to handle 250,000 grown sheep per annum, they have in recent years been called upon to handle that number in a few weeks. It has been found necessary for the Government to assist the company from time to time. For many years

the Government has given strong support to the company, in such a measure that the company now owes the Government over £162,000. So that there is more public money in the works than private money. It is highly important that the interests of both should be protected. The Government has no desire to hamper the company in its operations. It has no desire to do other than foster anything that will tend to increase the production, and the return from that production, of the desirable commodity handled. So far there has been no return whatever to the private investors, and it is highly unlikely that such a return will be possible for many years to come. However, as the Government has been generous in its review of the position of the works and its attitude towards the company, we have no desire other than that the company shall be successful ultimately. In regard to Albany, the question of which port was raised by the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs), the Government desires there also to give an opportunity for the establishment of treatment works to serve the district. A year or two ago a plant belonging to the Government, which was lying idle, was handed over to a Western Australian company at a very low figure, provided the company spent considerable sums on it. The company has spent in the vicinity of £25,000 on the works, and thus has given a strong stimulus to the district in the production of fat lambs. The company has difficult times to pass through. It has a big sum invested proportionately to the number of lambs it can treat; but at the same time the expectation is that the company will ultimately weather the storm and be able to get out at some profit. We hope also that other outlying districts and other important ports will have similar facilities as time goes on. The Government desires to protect the best interests of the State, and in the operating under license consideration will be given to whether any district is properly served by existing facilities, whether the site upon which it is proposed to erect the works is a suitable site, whether the firm or person applying for a license is a firm or person fit and proper to carry on such works, and whether the construction recommended and impending is suitable for carrying on the industry. There are many considerations to be taken into account as to whether it is in the best interests of the State as a

whole that a license shall be granted. It must be remembered also that fat lambs are a highly perishable commodity—one of the most perishable commodities we have before slaughter. The Government is therefore desirous of extending every possible facility to expedite the arrival of fat lambs at the meatworks. The Government is increasing sales facilities and improving the marketing conditions in regard to sale-yards, so that early despatch may be possible of the lambs from the farm to the works.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Facilities ought to be increased rather than concentrating sales at Midland Junction.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government is giving consideration to that important aspect. As hon. members are aware, a stale lamb, a lamb that has been held for two or three days or a week, is difficult to skin for one thing, and loses its bloom, and often turns out a very indifferent carcase. Therefore it is important that every facility should be made available to give greater opportunities for the marketing of lambs in prime condition, and for treating them whilst in that condition.

Mr. Seward: But you will not confine treatment works to the ports exclusively, will you?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. Wherever it is found necessary to erect treatment works, facilities will be provided.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It means that you will have to provide cold storage on the railways.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It has to be remembered that this is an Australia-wide industry, and that other Australian States have had some experiences prior to obtaining control in the manner proposed by the Bill. All the States of Australia have agreed that in the best interests of the meat export industry of the Commonwealth all treatment works for export shall be licensed. South Australia a few weeks ago passed an Act to give authority for licensing all treatment works, in spite of the fact that most of the treatment works now operating in the State are co-operative or else controlled by the State. A serious view was taken in South Australia of the possibility of control by companies which would militate against the best interests of the farmer and against the

best interests of this important export industry. The second point under the Bill is that of making it an obligation on the owner or manager of the treatment works to treat an owner's sheep on his account. That is a most important point. We have had experiences in other Australian States where it has been the desire to establish what I may call monopolistic control, the works being owned and controlled by foreign interests, that they treated lambs solely on their own account within a given district, and that they refused to treat unless the beast was right for slaughter. This means, of course, a detrimental reaction on those who desire to treat on their own account lambs of a very fine class, and to place the commodity on their own behalf in the markets of the world. That is a position which has obtained in an Australian State with very big interests in the production, where it has been found that owners of particularly good lines of cattle are hampered in their desire to export their own commodity on their own behalf. So we can imagine a great retrogression in the industry where indiscriminate operations by unworthy owners of works are acting detrimentally against a perishable export article if handled improperly and if handled not in the best interests of the producer. Those who have a knowledge of the requirements of the meat trade in this and other countries will readily realise the necessity for maintaining the very high quality for which we have already attained a reputation in the markets of the world.

Mr. Lambert: Who has asked for legislation of this description?

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the hon. member had been in his seat earlier, he would have heard me explain that it was desired, on behalf of all the Governments of Australia, to institute a system of licensing treatment plants associated with the export trade, seeing that no control over them is vested in the State at the moment. Since the future of this industry is of great concern not only to Western Australia but to the whole of the Commonwealth, I hope members will support the Government and realise it is in the best interests of all concerned to do what is essential for the industry. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. D. Ferguson, debate adjourned to a later stage of the sitting.

BILL—MINING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [5.17] in moving the second reading said: As members will observe, the Bill is small and was the privilege Bill introduced in another place. It comprises one clause and provides power to enable the Government Geologist or any person authorised by him to enter upon private property for geological survey purposes. We were of the opinion that that right was contained in the Act, but some time ago the Government Geologist was refused the right to enter upon private property. When the Crown Law authorities were consulted, it was found that no such right was vested in the Government Geologist or his representative. It is necessary, particularly in a State like Western Australia where there are scores of instances of minerals of various descriptions being located on private properties, that the Government Geologist shall have the right desired. If a prospector wished to do so, he could secure a permit to prospect, and if he located any mineral he could make application in the ordinary way for a lease and then could work the property. From the departmental point of view, if the Government Geologist wished to inspect that property, with a view to taking samples or to ascertaining what the mineral there really was, he could be denied the right of access. The Bill is necessary and I have indicated what it contains. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. PATRICK (Greenough) [5.18]: The Bill is quite reasonable. I always thought the Government Geologist had the right that it seeks to provide. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—LAKE AVENUE RESUBDIVISION OF LAND.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. PATRICK (Greenough) [5.21]: Since the Minister placed the Bill before members last night, I have had an opportunity not only to inspect the plans, but, which is of more importance, to inspect the subdivision on the spot. It would appear that the original subdivision was made some years ago and it was what might be regarded as a very bad subdivision. The land slopes down towards a reserve and if the houses had been built on the blocks as originally laid out, they would have faced the backyards of another row of houses in Nicholson-road. At the same time their backyards would have faced a reserve or park that later on will no doubt become a beauty spot. The effect of the proposed re-subdivision will be to turn the blocks in the opposite direction so that they will face the park instead of the backyards of the Nicholson-road properties, while a new road will be made—certainly it will not be a wide road—to serve the houses with frontages to the park.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Will the effect be to turn the houses round as well?

Mr. PATRICK: Fortunately houses were not built on the subdivision as originally laid out, and I do not think anyone would have been foolish enough to have contemplated building there. It can be said that the proposed re-subdivision is already an accomplished fact, because there are now many fine houses so constructed there that they face the park. I presume it is really a matter of putting the position in order for the purposes of the Titles Office, and presumably that is the reason for the legislation. The Bill is quite reasonable. The effect of it will be not only to improve the blocks from the owners' point of view, but from that of the municipality and will rectify a position that was actually absurd. I would like to know whether the Government incurred any cost in connection with this matter.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. PATRICK: I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.25]: I agree with many of the statements made by the Minister for Lands when he moved the second reading of the Bill, but I cannot

accept a principle that sets aside an important feature of the Municipal Corporations Act, which declares that roads shall be a full chain wide. The Minister apparently considers that the existing position regarding Avenue Lake is of greater importance than the convenience and needs of the people who live in the area to which the Bill relates.

Hon. N. Keenan: Are you speaking for those people?

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) knows that when a person is elected to Parliament he is not sent there to represent his own backyard only. He is to act—

Mr. Withers: As a statesman!

Mr. SAMPSON: I am sorry to correct the member for Nedlands. The width of the road that was the subject of special commendation by the Minister when he introduced the Bill, is at one end 21 feet wide and at the other 26 feet. I shall be surprised if the member for Nedlands will favour that, particularly as, in addition, on this very narrow strip of land there are electric light or power poles, so that the width of the road is all too narrow for modern traffic requirements. I was observing that the Minister presumably regarded the importance of preserving a strip of land along the Class "A" reserve as of far greater importance than the public convenience, so that the road could be constructed of a width to comply with the requirements of the Municipal Corporations Act which, as I have pointed out, requires that roads shall be of a width of not less than 66 feet, unless a special Bill is introduced to provide for a reduced width. We have heard a lot about the importance of houses being erected on a quarter-acre or even on an acre of land, but in this instance, in this age of quickly moving vehicles, we are asked to agree to a reduced width for a road of 21 feet. It was suggested that it would be a one-way traffic street. Imagine a street of that description in the wilds of Nedlands! Surely the member for Nedlands does not stand for that. To do so would be to anticipate the time when Nedlands will be so congested that such a course would be justified. Under the proposed conditions how will it be possible for the Subiaco Municipal Council to do what is so important, namely, to beautify this particular area? How will it be possible for the local governing author-

ity to build a road so that it will be utilitarian and enable traffic to pass safely over it?

Mr. Marshall: They could make a rose arch there.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is no real reason why a road of a decent width should not be provided. This is a reactionary movement, and I am surprised at the Minister for Lands condoning such an action in the Subiaco municipality.

Mr. Hegney: Are you speaking for Subiaco?

Mr. SAMPSON: I would remind the hon. member, as I did the member for Nedlands—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. Needham: The member for Swan is speaking as a statesman.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister would have acted more wisely if a strip of land necessary to give this road reasonable width had been decided upon and the consequent Bill brought down. This reserve is an "A" class reserve. Since the Minister for Lands is now in his seat, I will repeat that I was surprised that he should have lent his influence to secure approval for the passing of a road only 21 feet at one end and 26 feet at the other end. I am looking at this from the standpoint of modern road utility. I will even vote for this if necessary, but I think the treatment that the Subiaco Municipal Council is receiving is not justified. The Minister should have met their reasonable wishes and given them a one-chain road. I know that the position is a difficult one, but it is within the power of the Minister to amend it. Once more the Nedlands electorate appears to be in trouble.

Mr. Patrick: I think the original subdivision was only half a chain.

Mr. SAMPSON: Certainly the previous position was not satisfactory, but the Minister had opportunity to put this matter in order. Had he done that it would have been possible for a system of landscape or water-scape gardening to be entered into, and a very beautiful place could have been created from what is at present a swamp. It would be a beautiful site, particularly if the Minister would do what is right. The street will be under the control of the municipality and I say that even now there is ample time for the necessary amendment to be put through, and that consequently we will not pass a

road only 21 feet wide at one end and already obstructed with electric light poles. It is not right, and I ask my friends of the cross benches to support me in this. Often have I heard them support the importance of reasonably sized blocks for building purposes, but if we have a road limited to 21 feet at one end and encroached upon by electric light poles, it is a sad commentary upon this year of so-called progress. It is not a year of progress when the Minister refuses to give the municipality of Subiaco the consideration they asked for in respect of Lake Avenue.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.34]: I wish to point out that the Bill does not deal with roads at all, but is for a resubdivision of land. It should also be remembered that at any time it will be within the rights of this House, through the Minister for Lands, to increase the width of that road, because there is a Class A reserve on the south side. The Bill deals solely with a resubdivision of private land. Houses are already built there, so it is impossible for the people concerned to make available any of their land. The only thing to do is to pass the Bill and rely on the commonsense of the Government to widen the road if and when that becomes necessary.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [5.35]: Of course it is possible for Lake Shenton to be converted into a beautiful spot. Where I have a sharp difference of opinion with the Minister for Lands is that when legislation of this description is introduced, he should present to the House a plan indicating exactly what is intended. For it is not possible for the ordinary member, unless familiar with the expressed words in the schedule of the Bill, fully to understand what is intended.

Mr. Sampson: I personally viewed the scene on the spot.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think that would get me any nearer my desires, even if you stayed there for 20 years and viewed the place from 50 different spots.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: This is not an over-urgent matter, for Lake Shenton has been commented on for a considerable number of years and its possibility as a beauty spot for the people of Subiaco has been before the public for many years. Considering that

we are nearing the end of the session, this is one matter we could well go into on another occasion. I believe that a considerable portion of freehold land surrounding Shenton Park could be resumed.

MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the resubdivision, so I am not allowing any discussion on that point.

MR. LAMBERT: I do not wish to delay the Bill, but I fear that if the Government is going to persist with this I will have to vote against the second reading. I repeat that when the Minister for Lands is bringing down legislation with which the ordinary member is not permitted to be familiar, the legislation should be accompanied by a plan. I remember that when certain alienations of "A" class reserves have been proposed, they have been accompanied by plans, although I recall one at Peppermint Grove in which an area was alienated from an "A" class reserve for the purposes of constructing tennis courts, and members had no exact knowledge of it whatever. So I say that in common fairness the Minister should illustrate by a plan a subdivision such as this, or, alternatively, members should not be called upon to cast a vote upon it. I could recall three or four such subdivisions if I desired to waste the time of the House.

MR. SAMPSON: Your speeches are never wasteful!

MR. LAMBERT: I repeat that when we are dealing with subdivisions we should have a plan clearly setting out the subdivision. Only a day or two ago we had a plan here showing the proposed new boundaries of electorates; if we can spend money on that sort of thing, we could equally well spend money on providing a plan of this subdivision. I will vote against the second reading.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [5.42]: I had no intention of speaking to this Bill until the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) spoke. I do not think it is the intention of the Government to make any excision from this Class "A" reserve. Some members do not seem to be very conversant with this subdivision, but several took the trouble to go out there this morning. Every member here, of course, could have gone out and viewed the land. Those that did so could not possibly vote against the Bill. The land cannot be resumed, because there is no land to be resumed. There is a Class "A" reserve, and the houses built there have not any clear titles.

Any member knowing anything at all about the question would vote for the Bill, because it is impossible for anything else to be done in order to improve the unsatisfactory position. A mistake has been made and the Minister wishes to rectify it. The only way to do that is to vote for the Bill.

MR. TONKIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.43]: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), in the course of his argument, made reference to the fact that a portion of a Class "A" reserve in my electorate was alienated for the purpose of the construction of tennis courts. But on that occasion the Minister for Lands went down purposely and had a look at the reserve, portion of which it was desired to alienate at the desire of the local authority and of the member for the district. I want to say that since the establishment of those courts no complaints whatever have been made.

MR. SPEAKER: Has that anything to do with the Bill?

MR. TONKIN: Well you, Sir, allowed the hon. member to say those things.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member was ruled out of order, and you are out of order in going over it again.

MR. TONKIN: I must bow to your ruling, Sir, but you permitted the hon. member to make certain statements, and I think I ought to be permitted to say that his remarks were entirely unwarranted.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Of course, we understand that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

MR. SLEEMAN in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Dedication of Lake Avenue; alteration of plan:

MR. SAMPSON: Is it proposed at a later stage to provide a reasonable right of way in Lake Avenue?

MR. CROSS: Do you want a bridge over the lake?

MR. SAMPSON: The right of way is 21ft. wide at one end and 26ft. wide at the other. The Minister should advise the Committee whether at a later stage steps will be taken to provide a road of a reasonable width.

The Minister for Lands: The matter will be considered when the necessity arises.

Mr. SAMPSON: From the width I have given must be deducted the space occupied by the electric power posts. Some criticism is justified. It would be most improper to have a right of way or road of this width in a part which may become one of the beauty spots of the metropolitan area. There is no possibility of building a retaining wall of sufficient width to be of any utility.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 19, Schedule, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

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

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [5.52] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is necessary to bring the Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act into conformity with the taxing Bill which has already been agreed to by this Chamber. The assessment Act provides that the exemption shall be £3 15s. for salaries and wages, and £195 for incomes. The taxing Bill provides that the tax shall commence at £3 17s. for salary and wages, and £200 for incomes. As the exemption is altered from the 1st January next, the Bill also makes the necessary adjustment for applying the alteration during the year of income. In the circumstances there is no need for me to say more, except that the Bill conforms to what the House has already done. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Point of Order.

Hon. C. G. Latham: On a point of order, is not this Bill similar to a Bill that was introduced a little while ago, and a decision arrived at upon it by both Houses? Has not this matter already been dealt with by both Houses, although the Governor's assent has not yet been given to the measure?

Mr. Speaker: Of what is the hon. member speaking?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Of the Financial Emergency Tax Bill. I understand that the Financial Emergency Tax Bill passed a little while ago was that which was the subject of a conference between the two Houses. This Bill seems to me to be overriding that other Bill. I do not know whether it is proposed to amend a Bill that has not yet been assented to. It seems to me this measure is one to amend a Bill that has not yet received the Governor's assent. I would like a ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this Bill is in order.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know to what Bill the hon. member is referring.

The Premier: This Bill does not amend the Bill that has not yet been assented to. It proposes to amend the 1932-36 assessment Act. It is true this House did endeavour to get through a similar Bill, but it was somewhat different in principle in that the words "basic wage" were used in that instance. There is a difference in principle. The principle in regard to the amendment which has been passed by this Chamber was in the use of the words "basic wage." We have now introduced a different principle by using the figures "£3 17s."

Hon. C. G. Latham: Can a Bill be amended when it has not yet been assented to?

The Premier: This amends the Act passed in 1932-36. We tried to amend that Act by putting in the words "basic wage," but Parliament did not adopt the principle. We are now seeking for a different principle by putting in the figures instead of the words "basic wage."

Hon. C. G. Latham: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to give a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: It is a simple matter to do so, if the hon. member desires.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should like to hear your ruling, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have been asked to rule whether or not this Bill is in order. The Bill is one to amend the Act that provides for the tax commencing at £3 15s. per week. That is the Act it is now sought to amend. The Bill that has not been assented to was that which used the words "basic wage." The Bill containing those words was not agreed to, and there was trouble between the two Houses on the question of

this difference in principle. I rule that this Bill is in order.

Debate Resumed.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [5.55]: This Bill contains a provision which was introduced into the financial emergency taxing Bill. This was passed the other day. It seems to me that this measure overrides the decision of both Houses given a few days ago. It was then decided definitely that the Act was to remain as it was.

The Premier: No.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: This Bill provides for what I asked the Premier to do when he first introduced the assessment Bill. When the first decision was arrived at, a compromise was effected concerning the use of the words "basic wage" as it related to the decision of another place, namely that we should take a sum of 2s. above the basic wage. I think that principle has since been followed more or less. The Government will not take good advice. If it had brought down this Bill providing for a sum of 2s. above the basic wage and £200 for income there would have been no trouble at all. This is the first occasion on which I have seen the Bill, but I understand now what it is desired to do. I thought when the Bill was introduced to fix the tax, that something else was wanted.

The Premier: True.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Now that the Premier has brought down this Bill, I hope the House will not pass it. We should not give this exemption after the decision which has been arrived at by both Houses.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—TERMINAL GRAIN
ELEVATORS.**

Second Reading—Defeated.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet—in reply) [6.3]: I propose to reply to some of the criticism

of members who have spoken during the second reading debate.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are going to thank us for the treatment the Bill has received!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Some members of the Opposition have taken exception to the Bill, and its provisions. The Leader of the Opposition told the House that in Victoria a single authority handled the wheat from the farmer to the grain elevator. That is quite correct, and in that State it is an authority under the Victorian Grain Elevators Act and similar to the provision in the Bill now before us. The Royal Commission which reported to the Government made a recommendation regarding bulk handling in Western Australia, and stated that had it not been for the fact that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. was already operating in the country, it would have recommended carrying out the work on Victorian lines.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Don't bother about replying; we will take it as read.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Royal Commission would never have recommended as it did but for the fact that bulk handling was already in operation. The Leader of the Opposition also stated that the Minister was not satisfied with one board but made provision for two. One board, however, is only advisory, and the existence of two boards would provide against friction. The proposal is that there shall be a board of five members, two representing producers of grain, one the merchants interested in shipping, one the millers, and the fifth representing the bulk handling company. What is wrong with that? Is there anything wrong in asking advice from those interested in the business in any matter that might arise? The hon. member also made another statement, which I hope will not be taken seriously. He complained about the number of boards already established. He stated that when the new Government came in after the elections it would cancel all the boards appointed by the Government now in power, and would cancel all contracts entered into, without granting any compensation. To provide against that proper provision will be made and no one will be victimised.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You cannot do it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I can, and will do it. When the board in New South Wales was abolished by an anti-Labour Gov-

ernment the members of it received compensation. The members of the board must get compensation according to their office, and that must be kept in mind.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What is the good of Parliament if the Minister overrides it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No Government can break a contract; that is the position. It might put an end to the occupation of the office, but it is not possible to break a contract.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will not save them: Parliament is the greatest authority after all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: With respect to every board that is appointed and every appointment that is made, we will have to see that there is no victimisation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will not be able to protect them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member exaggerated quite a lot about the appointments made by this Government, and I tell him that we have never victimised anyone. At the same time, a great majority of the appointments were made by the previous Government. Will the Leader of the Opposition tell me which boards he proposes to abolish? The Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank cannot be described as a new board. Those gentlemen took the place of a former board. Then there is the Dairy Products Marketing Board. Is it intended to abolish that? The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) would say no to that very definitely. Next there is the Dried Fruits Board. Is it intended to abolish that? There is the Milk Board. Would the hon. member abolish that? All those boards have been supported by the present Government. Further, there is the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Board. Would the hon. member abolish that? I cannot see him abolishing any of those boards. That is the sum total of the boards authorised by the present Government.

Mr. Seward: There is the Licensing Board and the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Fremantle Harbour Trust has been established for years. I am afraid it is to the boards established by the present Government that the hon. member opposite offers objections. He also told this House that the cost of the proposed board to the wheat-growers would be terrific. That is an exaggeration. There is no warrant for such a statement. It is not the intention of the

Government to appoint a full-time board. It would only be a temporary board, and so if the cost of the board operating the elevators at Fremantle, Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany were to be terrific, what about the board associated with Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., a board which operates all the facilities in the country. Is the cost of that board terrific? The Leader of the Opposition must have some ground for making that statement; he must be speaking from experience. The board proposed to be appointed under the Bill will be a temporary board. Are we to understand from the hon. member that the cost of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.'s board is terrific? That board is not constituted of three members: its personnel consists of eight gentlemen, directors of Westralian Farmers Ltd., and others. They are Mr. Harper, Mr. Monger, Mr. Marwick, Dr. Boyd, Mr. Bath, Mr. Teasdale, Mr. Driver and Mr. Johnson. The cost of that board may be terrific, but that also would be an exaggeration.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They do not get a couple of thousand a year.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is not intended that any member of the proposed terminal elevators board shall receive £2,000 a year. It is to be only a temporary board: it is not necessary that such a board should be permanently appointed. Another statement that the Leader of the Opposition made was that the Bill proposed to hand over control of the wheatgrowers' wheat to an outside authority. It would be no more an outside authority than that under the Government scheme in New South Wales, or under the Victorian system. It is wrong for the hon. member to say that the wheatgrowers' wheat is to be put under the control of an outside authority. When it goes to the terminal it frequently belongs to someone else. It has passed to the buyer, and that party therefore is entitled to consideration. Another objection of the hon. member is that it is proposed to give the board power to recondition wheat and that that reconditioning is not necessary. Everyone knows that wheat taken to Fremantle is sometimes weevil-infested, and that that will happen more and more as time goes on, because the system in the country is not an adequate system. It is a makeshift system, and the longer the bins are established in the country the greater the possibilities of our weevil-infested wheat going to the ports. Most of the ports are charged with the responsibility

of receiving wheat, and some authority must be responsible also for our good name as exporters.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know that it is easier to keep weevils out of wheat under this system than under any other system in the world.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Is that so? The hon. member should know that when weevil gets into the wheat it stays there. The Harbour Trust should not be entitled to take wheat sent to Fremantle in bulk without a check being kept upon it. No one should ask an authority controlling elevators to take any kind of wheat without that wheat being checked. The hon. member wanted to know whether the Royal Commission also recommended that the silos be placed under the control of the Fremantle Harbour Trust, and that at Geraldton under the Commissioner of Railways, and he asked why that was not done. I point out that that was not possible if uniform charges are sought. The Government would not provide money for an authority at Fremantle, another at Geraldton, another at Albany, and another at Bunbury, unless each authority be made responsible for the payment of interest, sinking fund, maintenance and depreciation charges. The cost at some ports would be too great, and it would be a heavy burden on the outer ports. It would be necessary to impose higher charges at the more difficult ports, and then of course there would be trouble. The farmers would object most strongly. So it does not matter whether the Bill passes or not; one authority must control all terminals. That authority should not be Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., the creature of Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I was referring to the fact that it would be impossible from a business standpoint for the Government to provide money to enable the Bunbury Harbour Board, the Commissioner of Railways at Albany and Geraldton, and the Harbour Trust at Fremantle to act independently in the provision of terminal elevators at those ports because the authorities would have to be responsible for the maintenance of interest and sinking fund, while the outport charges also would be too

heavy. Already, although the Government has provided up-to-date terminal facilities at Bunbury, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has asked for an extra charge to be paid at Bunbury in addition to their other charges. This payment would be in addition to the other charges, which shows that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. could not carry on except at a higher rate than is imposed at Fremantle. I have not agreed to that extra 1s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per ton because the company has not given me any facts in support of the charge. It has merely said, "We cannot undertake the responsibility without the money." In the absence of proof, I am reluctant to agree to that payment. The Government provided the terminal at Bunbury and has been responsible for all the cost. The Leader of the Opposition said that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. had spent £28,000 at Geraldton on equipment it did not want and which was forced upon it. That is not correct.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I never said that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have taken that from your remarks.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said that you insisted upon the money being spent there.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It would be scrapped if you put in the orthodox system.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. applied for permission to erect installations in the Geraldton zone, but the company was told that provision would have to be made at Geraldton for storing wheat. A lease was taken of the Geraldton shed.

Hon. C. G. Latham: For how long?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No time has been fixed. The company wanted it for seven years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I thought the company had not taken a lease.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The company wanted it—

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is a different thing.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The company wanted it for seven years. The Government agreed; but now something else is wanted and the Government will not agree. Who was it said that Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. had spent £28,000 in Geraldton?

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What proof is there of that beyond the mere bald statement?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do you want the vouchers brought along?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There has not been one tittle of proof brought forward that the company spent £28,000 and in my opinion there has not been that expenditure. The Bunbury equipment is much more expensive than that at Geraldton. The Government provided a shed at Geraldton—a fine concrete shed which holds all the storage—at a cost of £13,200. Yet this company insists that it spent £28,000 in equipment at Geraldton. It has not given one tittle of proof of that, but has merely made an arrogant demand on the Government that the lease must be conditional on the Government paying it £28,000 for taking over the equipment. The Government will not do that. Before the Government will agree to anything asked by Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., the Government wants the facts. At Bunbury there is a double installation, one for the terminal and another at the jetty half a mile away. The whole of that cost only £23,720.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What is that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not speaking of the terminals, I am speaking of the equipment.

Mr. Seward: Just a bit of it.

Member: You have shifted it from Fremantle.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is not arguing about the terminal, but the equipment in the terminal.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The equipment at Bunbury is not new.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. C. G. Latham interjected.

Mr. Withers: How do you know?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition only knows what he is told.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You gave me the file to look at.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I gave you the file about the terminal. I am separating the equipment from the terminal. I have had it from the Director of Works—

Hon. C. G. Latham: It cost £60,000.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The terminal and everything else did not cost

£60,000. It cost £50,000. That covers land resumption, railway resumptions, rails and trucks and everything else. Let us separate the terminal from the equipment. There is a large shed at Geraldton, and Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. insists that it spent £28,000 in equipment there. At Bunbury—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Your equipment cost £35,000.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: On equipment at the terminal and on the wharf about half a mile away—

Mr. Withers: A mile away.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Well, a mile away—we spent only £23,720 there. The gantries on the wharf cost £500, the electric mains to the jetty £850, the capstan at the silo £250, truck alterations £3,150, electric cables to the silos £1,800, plant £8,000, weighing equipment £2,150, alterations to jetty and hoppers, £2,200. Over £6,000 was spent on the jetty and the total cost was only £23,000. That leaves £17,000 for equipment in the silo. Yet we are asked to believe that whereas only that amount was spent at Bunbury on a much more up-to-date equipment, Bulk Handling Ltd. spent £28,000 in the shed at Geraldton. I do not believe a word of it and the Government will not agree to be robbed in that manner. I will have more to say about Bulk Handling Ltd. before I have finished. The Government will not agree to a lease conditionally upon the Government paying that money when the equipment is handed over. What we take we shall pay for but we are not going to take the word of Bulk Handling Ltd. about this amount. That is my quarrel with Bulk Handling Ltd.: the company does not put its cards on the table. It puts forth the bald statement that it spent this and that and demands compensation without making any explanation. Before many years have passed, there will be a Royal Commission to inquire into this company and the administration and charges of the associated companies.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A few more Royal Commissions will not hurt.

Mr. Seward: Another desperate attempt to find out something.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I had a look at Geraldton a few weeks ago. There is no comparison between the equipment there and the equipment at Bunbury.

Mr. Patrick: The Geraldton equipment is more efficient.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yet we are told that the company spent £28,000, though not one bit of proof has been brought forward.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The company can handle wheat cheaper there than it can be handled at Bunbury.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It should do so. The shed is on the wharf adjacent to the vessel. In Bunbury the wheat has to be put in the silo and then taken out and trucked to the jetty half a mile away. Yet the equipment at Bunbury is much cheaper than the alleged cost of the equipment at Geraldton. A deputation representing Bulk Handling Ltd. was introduced to the Premier and myself. The company said a seven-years lease of the Geraldton shed was wanted because on that lease money could be raised to equip sidings in the Bunbury zone. The company said that unless it could get that lease it could not secure the money to equip the sidings in the Bunbury zone. The lease has not been fixed up yet because the company wanted £28,000 from the Government at the end of seven years for the equipment. The Government will not agree to that amount. Nevertheless the company got the money for the sidings in the Bunbury zone without securing the lease. What are we to think of people who declare that they cannot do a thing unless they get a lease—who say that the Government is holding them up and that they cannot get money without a certain lease, when all the time they have the money? They were extorting that lease; they were tying the Government's hands on pure misrepresentation. I could get on with this company if it sent along men who spoke fairly and squarely.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is a good thing to have the privilege of Parliament, under which to say such things.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I shall state the facts anywhere. I ask: Was it fair and square for the company to come to us and say, "You are holding us up. Unless we get the lease we cannot finance the establishment of country sidings in the Bunbury zone" when all the time there was apparently nothing in the statement at all? There could not have been anything in the statement because the company went on with the equipment of the Bunbury zone, and the lease has not been fixed up yet.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is usual with your department. It takes months to do anything.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have some further comments to offer.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We will take them as read.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition does not like to hear the truth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is nothing I like more than to have you on your feet.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition does not like the truth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I like you when you are speaking.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition said, "Why does the Government not carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission, that serious consideration be given to the proposal of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited for facilities at Bunbury and Albany?"

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, tell us that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Royal Commission said that "serious consideration should be given." We have given "serious consideration" to it. We have given the matter serious consideration and have decided that the company shall not erect and control the terminals. The Bulk Handling Commission never suggested for a moment that the company should have the authority. The Commission suggested that consideration be given to the matter.

Mr. Patrick: The Commission said it was not an economic work for the Government to undertake.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Is the Government expected slavishly to follow every recommendation made by a Royal Commission? How many Royal Commissions did the Leader of the Opposition and his Government have?

Hon. C. G. Latham: A couple.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Seven.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There were the Collie Commission and the Farmers' Debts Commission—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Was that justified?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What became of the Farmers' Debts Commission?

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was the Farmers' Disabilities Commission.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Amongst the members of the commission were Mr. Hale and a gentleman from Bruce Rock. Then the Mitchell-Latham Government appointed a Royal Commission on Land and Homes. That emanated from a motion from this side of the House. Then there were the Stock Diseases Commission and the Group Settlement Commission. What became of the Group Settlement Commission?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then there was a special commission consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament on bulk handling.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was a select committee. You do not know what you are talking about.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What became of the Farmers' Debts Commission?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Whoever put up your notes should have a little more knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Even though the Royal Commission recommended that the Government might give consideration to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. equipping terminals at Bunbury and I think at Albany—

Mr. Patrick: The commission advised the Government not to do it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In the interests of all parties concerned in wheat in Western Australia, we have decided to do the work, and we are entitled to adopt that attitude. I do not want to say any more about Royal Commissions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, because you get into deep water.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member was in deep water. His Government appointed a Farmers' Debts Commission and did nothing; they appointed a Group Settlement Commission and did nothing. On the matters on which the Opposition now claim to have decided views they had no views at all when the Commission reported. They were unable to make up their minds.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: If you had no views at times the wheatgrowers would be better off.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition said it was two years since the commission reported and that a bulk handling system was just being

installed at Bunbury. We need not retort that the hon. member and his supporters messed about with it for years and got nowhere. The present Government introduced a bulk handling measure last year providing for the company to operate and providing also proper protection for the farmers and proper control. Already we have built a terminal at Bunbury.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In five years.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, in one year.

Mr. Cross: And the hon. member opposite did nothing.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member and his friends did nothing. It makes me laugh.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It took you six years to make up your mind.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Another extraordinary statement made by the Leader of the Opposition was that if the control were placed where the Bill proposed to place it, the cost would be 75 per cent. higher than at present. There is not a tittle of evidence to support that statement. The hon. member has had no experience or he would not have made such a statement. He said there would be a duplication of authority, namely, the acquiring authority. There has been no duplication of authority. This is merely a warehousing scheme. It will not interfere with Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.; it will not interfere with the Harbour Trust or with the Railway Department. It is a warehousing scheme hedged with proper precautions for the protection of the wheat-growers and other interested parties.

Hon. C. G. Latham: For which you will charge extra.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have dealt with the hon. member's statement about its being a full-time job. He repeated that statement. I reply that it will not be a full-time job; it will be a matter of the board sitting only on occasions. Is the job a full-time one for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.?

Hon. C. G. Latham: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then what is the use of saying that what is not a full-time job for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. will be a full-time job for the board?

Hon. C. G. Latham: Because we know you both.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: When Mr. Lindsay introduced his Bill, the hon. member and his friends did not know much about it. They could not agree about it. Yet now they claim to know everything about it. The hon. member said that the farmers would have to pay for the alterations to rolling stock. In New South Wales the farmers paid for all the alterations to rolling stock.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They did nothing of the sort. They did not even pay for the installation.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I say that the farmers in New South Wales paid for the alteration. That statement is contained in the report of the Royal Commission.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It was paid for from Consolidated Revenue.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The statement appears in the report of the Royal Commission.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Then the Commission did not speak the truth.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Of course not! The only man who does speak the truth is the hon. member who is seated opposite me. The hon. member made an extraordinary statement about the railways. He said the railways had taken 9d. per ton extra freight and that this induced the Midland Railway Company to charge 1s. 6d. per ton. That is a bald statement.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But a true statement.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He said the Midland Railway Company would not have asked 1s. 6d. per ton had not the Government Railways charged 9d. per ton. The evidence given before the Royal Commission showed that the charge of 9d. per ton was fully justified. Amongst certain members in this House there appears to be a great desire to take down the State, but when it comes to the Westralian Farmers Ltd. making a big profit out of wheat farmers there is no objection. There is no objection to Westralian Farmers Ltd. making a clear profit of £10,000 on the handling of 11,000,000 bushels of wheat. The Royal Commission proved that that amount of clear profit had been made and said that the profit should be reviewed. Westralian Farmers Ltd. had no right to that profit, but the matter has not been reviewed. Of course it follows that on a bigger harvest a bigger profit would be made.

Is it not extraordinary the lack of patriotism that exists in a matter affecting the State railways as compared with a matter affecting an outside body. Has there been any complaint regarding Westralian Farmers Ltd. making a profit of £10,000?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know that it represented only one-half per cent. on the capital.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government railways are incurring a loss year by year, but there is no suggestion that the people who maintain the railways shall get a fair deal. Yet Westralian Farmers Ltd. may make a profit of £10,000 on 11,000,000 bushels of wheat. The Royal Commission pointed out that that was an unfair profit, and yet the company gets it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: One-half per cent. on the capital.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I read the "Primary Producer" occasionally.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Thank you; that is a compliment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In one statement the Primary Producers' Association claimed credit on the score that railway freights had not been raised. The statement ran, "But for our executive, railway freights would have been increased." There is not a tittle of truth in that statement. The executive of the Primary Producers' Association had not a voice in the matter, and could not have prevented railway freights from being increased. The only people who prevented an increase were the present Government. We turned down a recommended increase on two occasions. When the Royal Commission recommended an increase of freights, the Government said, "No." Yet the Primary Producers' Association said its executive did it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know you brought in the 9d. per ton. Why not tell the truth.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The executive of the Primary Producers' Association had no voice whatever in the matter, and so how could it prevent any increase? If there has been no increase, that has been entirely due to the action of the present Government. When the Midland Railway Company proposed to increase the rates by 1s. 6d., Mr. Poynton was perfectly honest in his statement that he could not do it for less, and the other States said it could not be done.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is there any extra freight in South Australia and Victoria?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Midland farmers voluntarily gave the Midland Railway Company 1s. 6d. per ton and yet, when the State is concerned, members opposite raise their voices against an increase of 9d. per ton. They are very unfair. There is no decency about that at all.

Mr. Patrick: The Midland charge is on a sliding scale.

The Premier: They do not get up to 20,000,000 bushels on that line.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The statement by the Leader of the Opposition about there being no limit to the board's charges was a cool exaggeration, especially in view of the fact that the Government of the day declined to allow the Commissioner of Railways to charge what Midland farmers are paying to the Midland Railway Company. The Government has even seen that the farmers whose wheat is transported over the Government railways pay less than do the Midland farmers who use the Midland Company's line.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yours is purely a stone-wall speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Leader of the Opposition to keep quiet.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition stated that I was using the chance to get something more out of the farmers. I have shown that the Government turned down the Royal Commission's request to increase the freight from 9d. to 1s. 6d. per ton. Let me point out that I am the only one who is protecting the farmers against Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Right through I have resisted efforts by the company to impose extra charges on the farmers. In evidence before the Royal Commission the company said it wanted $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per bushel as a toll to pay off the cost of the installation. That was for the erection of the bins, depreciation and sinking fund. The company got that amount. Then it said it was entitled to 1½d. per ton for general charges. The company got that. Then it came along last year for an increased shipping charge of 1s. 3d. or 1s. 6d. and got 9d. at first and 1s. 3d. subsequently. But the company is not content with that. The company asked to be allowed to increase the shipping charge to 1s. 9d. per ton. That has been refused by me. The company is not

entitled to it and never produced a tittle of evidence to show it was entitled to it. Another proposition put was that the storage charge of one-tenth of a penny per month or part of a month should be ante-dated to the 15th March and run until the date of delivery. If the farmers' wheat was delivered in June, even if the wheat was not in their possession, they wanted to charge as from the 15th March. That request also was refused. A request for a check-weighing charge of .05d. per bushel has also been refused. Then an additional charge was sought of 1d. per bushel on wheat from the previous harvest received after the 15th August. That also was refused.

The Premier: The farmers ought to erect a statue to you.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They ought!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then these people wanted another charge of .125d. per bushel on small parcels under 50 tons. That demand has been refused also. Next they asked for an extra railway charge in respect of wheat delivered to the natural port of a zone after the 30th April. I granted that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not really?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not unreasonable towards them. Last, but not least, they wanted 1¾d. per bushel for wheat delivered to the Bunbury terminal. That is their last request, and they will have to give some proof to get it. Mr. Troy, it was said by the Opposition, was seizing every chance to get something more out of the farmers. I have shown the House that Mr. Troy was preventing the farmers from being exploited. He will prevent them in future from being exploited. I have shown how far these people consider the farmer. Now I have done with the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have not let me alone.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: You have not taken it too well.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I will have the speech printed in pamphlet form for you!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I may see later that this is printed in pamphlet form. Now a word with the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle). I regret to say that the member for Avon is just as inconsistent as he has always been. He said that in 1948 the bulk handling activities in the country would be handed over to the growers, but that there would be an alien board in charge of the

elevators. The member for Avon was never in favour of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. getting the grip they enjoy to-day. He wanted an authority like that created in Sydney, which is now regarded as an alien authority. He said in evidence before the Royal Commission, in reply to questions—

520. By the Chairman: In effect, your objection to that direction is that Westralian Farmers Ltd., being virtually buyers of wheat, should not be interested in the control, through their executive officers, of Co-operative Bulk Handling?—Yes. That is correct.

The hon. member objected to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. having control. Now, because a board is constituted to prevent Co-operative Bulk Handling having this authority, he says it is an alien board. Such an alteration in the course of a few years is significant, and due to his present affiliations. In reply to Mr. Foulkes, Question 564, the hon. member also said—

564. If the system is extended, the number of bushels will be increased and so, also, the amount derived from the toll?—But we cannot see any necessity for the 5s. toll, any necessity for the installations to become the property of the users in six years. We are not enthusiastic over this ownership business. We want control, not ownership. We regard this as a public utility.

Now he calls the proposed control which he then supported an alien control. I quote further from his evidence—

565. Then you wish to have control of the system without the ownership?—We are not enthusiastic for ownership.

I do not want to quote any more of the evidence of the member for Avon, but I thought it necessary to quote those extracts in reply to the statement he has made. He also gave expression to the following:—

That powers proposed for the board are extraordinary. It would be able to over-ride Co-operative Bulk Handling.

How solicitous he is now for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.! In his evidence before the Royal Commission he did not want ownership by that company at all.

Mr. Boyle: I accepted the findings of the Royal Commission.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member then wanted a public utility. He did not then want the ownership of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. The member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick), like the Leader of the Opposition, has put on the Notice Paper certain amendments to which I have given some consideration.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And to which you are going to agree!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendments provide for the control of the terminal at Fremantle.

Mr. Patrick: Why not wait till the Bill is in Committee before you deal with the amendments?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is only as a convenience for Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. The terminal will be there as a convenience for that company. The amendments provide also for the installation of the Fremantle terminal elevator by the Fremantle Harbour Trust. In that case the farmers can get their wheat sent down only by Co-operative Bulk Handling, whereas the Bulk Handling Act now provides that a farmer may rail one-tenth of his marketable crop in any way he wishes. They want that cut out. They deny the farmer the right to sell one-tenth of his own crop or put it into storage.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the Minister replying to points raised during the debate? The member for Greenough has never spoken on the Bill. May I ask whether the Minister is in order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Of course the Minister is not in order in replying to anything that was not raised during the debate.

Mr. Patrick: I never spoke in the debate.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But I am replying to the debate. The member for Greenough would prevent the Geraldton district farmer, after growing his wheat, from carting it to a terminal in Geraldton.

Mr. Patrick: I have never spoken on the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; but I know the hon. member's intention from his amendment, on the Notice Paper.

Opposition Members: Oh!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In the Geraldton district particularly, many farmers cart their wheat in to the terminal. Under the amendment the Geraldton district farmers could not send their wheat in unless they put it into Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. I tell hon. members who are influenced by the rights of Fremantle or its Harbour Trust or the Commissioner of Railways that hon. members opposite only want to make the Fremantle Harbour Trust a convenience, with no rights, no protection, compelled to house any kind of wheat, weevily or otherwise, and then to deliver out good

wheat. There are two or three pages of amendments on the Notice Paper, and when Fremantle members have time they should study those amendments. Members opposite have taken their orders from Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., and they do not mind penalising the farmer in the interests of that company and the associated companies. It has been stated here that Co-operative Bulk Handling does not desire to get control of the port terminals. I have discussed that matter with the company, and I will now quote Mr. Braine's letter written to me, as Minister for Lands, on the 25th March, 1937—

In connection with my conversation on the telephone with you and with the Assistant Under Treasurer, I now confirm that, subject to being able to commence within a very short time, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. could and would be willing to finance and instal suitable port facilities at Bunbury to handle wheat in bulk from the coming harvest provided that the plant, having been financed and erected by it, is left in the control of the company, thus leaving unaltered the wheat handling practice in use for bag handling. My directors do not feel that they should provide money for the erection of a plant to be controlled by others

Hon. C. G. Latham: Would you do it? Anyway, you were doing nothing.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We constructed the Bunbury installation in record time. Therefore we have done something. Members opposite told us the company did not want to control the terminal. However, I have evidence here to the contrary, and I have not stated anything that is untrue. The Government is not anxious that Co-operative Bulk Handling should instal the terminal elevators at any port. In many cases the wheat is not the farmer's wheat when it comes to the port, but belongs to the pool, to Westralian Farmers Ltd., and to the merchants. Of course all are entitled to a fair deal. The Government is out to give everyone a fair deal. Mr. Lindsay, a former Minister for Works, who visited the Eastern States on an inquiry into bulk handling and who introduced a Bulk Handling Act into this House, giving the Pool the monopoly of bulk handling in Western Australia, issued a report which is now on the files. The following is quoted by him from the Sydney Bulk Handling Corporation:—

For the first two years of the scheme the silos were leased to the Pool . . .

That is the farmers' pool in New South Wales.

The result was that the merchants would not use them—would not trust the Pool. When the Government took control the merchants began to come in. The merchants were very bitterly opposed to the scheme at first, but the method was now very popular.

And the merchants were the biggest customers. Then the Assistant Chief Engineer for Railway Construction in Victoria expressed the following opinion:—

He was personally opposed to a privately-controlled monopoly. The Government guarantee regarding weight and quality was essential.

Despite that, members opposite suggest that it does not matter regarding weight and quality. An amendment has been placed on the Notice Paper, the effect of which is that the Fremantle Harbour Trust shall be in charge of the terminal elevators at Fremantle, and accept any wheat that is delivered without inspection, and yet hand out the f.a.q. article.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know that they have done it for the last two years, without any complaints.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have quoted from the report presented by the previous Minister for Works, Mr. Lindsay, and that report was circulated among members of the House. Now to deal with the question of uniformity of charges. I have already stressed the point that the only question that influenced the Government in introducing this legislation was that there should be one competent authority at the ports, who would handle the wheat and give everyone a fair deal, without favouritism to anyone. That was done in order to assure uniformity of charges to all who participate, and that cannot be done by independent bodies at each of the separate ports. Fremantle would secure the greater proportion of the wheat and naturally that would be a more economical port with better facilities available than would be possible at either Bunbury or Albany. The engineer of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, Mr. R. C. Sticht, gave evidence to the Royal Commission that the costs would have to be spread. When giving evidence before the Bulk Handling of Wheat Royal Commission in 1935, Mr. Sticht was asked the following question:—

You have dealt with Geraldton. For Albany I see you have 3.73d. per bushel additional capital cost; that is in your 1932 evidence.

To that Mr. Sticht replied—

The system would cost more than bags at small ports.

Then the Commissioner said—

That being so, you would not recommend the adoption of the bulk system at Albany?

Mr. Sticht replied—

Yes. The handling costs might come higher for bulk than for bags, but the total cost will not be higher than the cost of bags, plus the handling costs.

Then Mr. Sticht was examined with further reference to the bag system as against the bulk system at the small ports, and reference was made to its advocacy for the port of Fremantle. The Commissioner, referring to another witness, said—

He is recommending it on account of the small quantity of wheat available which means that the charge for providing the necessary bulk equipment would be too high.

To that Mr. Sticht replied—

Spread over the whole job, it would not make much difference.

Then he was asked—

But would it be spread, or would each port stand on its own?

To that Mr. Sticht replied—

I do not think the latter course would be adopted.

Mr. Patrick: He was talking about Bunbury.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the following question was put—

The Cunderdin farmer is to pay an extra charge for the benefit of the farmer shipping his wheat at Bunbury. That would be true co-operation, you know?

To that Mr. Sticht replied—

Yes. Going a step further, it might be argued that the farmer at a big siding, where costs are less, should be charged less than the farmer using a small siding. The line has to be drawn somewhere.

Now I propose to deal with Mr. Thomson's evidence.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We are getting a bit tired of all this.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, you are tired of facts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And you can see us being converted by the facts you are producing!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Mr. Thomson gave evidence and dealing with Bunbury and Albany he was asked—

Would not the charges be higher in those districts?

Mr. Thomson replied:—

No, because the cost would be spread over everyone. That would apply at Bunbury and Albany as well as elsewhere.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It always is.

Mr. Patrick: And with the bag system as well.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the question was put:—

Do you think the farmers would agree to that?

To that Mr. Thomson replied:—

I think so. They have never indicated otherwise in the past. It is a matter of policy; they could be charged extra.

Mr. Patrick: What about the cost at all ports compared with the handling of bags?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is evidence that the costs would have to be spread.

Mr. Patrick: And they always have been.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But there is no evidence that the port authority should render the service suggested. It is not to be expected that the community in general should be put to all the expense at Fremantle and then other people have control and make profits, particularly Westralian Farmers Ltd., who make a profit of £10,000 or more every year out of the handling of the wheat. The Government is expected to give cheap services and then enable someone else to make a profit. There is every justification for the Government's attitude regarding the Bill. Then again Mr. Lindsay, who was Minister for Works in the Country Party-Nationalist Government, in his report to the Government said:—

Another reason why the terminals should be controlled by an independent authority is that there are many interests concerned in the handling and selling of wheat in the State, and it would not be in the interests of the industry to allow Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. to control the terminals at the ports.

That is what Mr. Lindsay's report contained, and so I am going to suggest that that is just what is intended. I understand the Bill will be defeated, but that is quite all right. We will have that placed on record.

Mr. Seward: That is the only place where the Bill will do any good.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, it will be much safer on record than in operation.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It will be on record why the Bill was introduced.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You did not get much response from the wheat merchants when you invited them to help you with the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not concerned about the wheat merchants. I am not interested in them.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You invited them to go along to assist you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not associated with them politically or personally. I should say that they are supporters of the Nationalists, if they are supporters of anyone.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is where you ought to be, on the Conservative side.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government stands for fairness to all interests concerned.

Mr. Cross: And it has to look after the farmers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, we have to look after them, for they are in the hands of their friends, in the hands of eight shareholders in this bulk handling business.

Mr. Seward: You know that is only a half-truth.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: And that concern was financed by Westralian Farmers Ltd., who made £10,000 out of the handling of the wheat annually.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You make that statement outside. I will challenge you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Make it outside! It has been made.

Mr. Marshall: This is taking the sting out of their "tales."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Here is the report of the Bulk Handling Commission of 1935 regarding the concern:—

Taking the financial relationship existing between the Westralian Farmers Ltd. and the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia on the one hand, and Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. on the other, the issued and paid-up capital of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is eight shares of £1 each.

Is that not correct?

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was the start of it, but that is not the position to-day; and you know it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The report continues—

The real capital of the company consists of advances from the Westralian Farmers Ltd. and the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia, such advances being secured by running debentures, giving a first charge over the whole of the assets of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. payable on demand, bearing

current bank rate of interest and providing for advances up to a limit of £100,000 (excluding interest) by both the Westralian Farmers Ltd. and the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia.

There are the facts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is so, but that is totally different from what you said.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Those are the facts, and they are based on sworn evidence.

Mr. Seward: Some of the facts.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: And so I say that this concern really belongs to Westralian Farmers Ltd. and the Wheat Pool and the concern is in the hands of eight shareholders who hold eight shares between them of a value of £1 each. And that concern was financed by Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Mr. Cross: And they wanted the monopoly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They did not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But they wanted a profit out of the concern and that in the interests of Westralian Farmers Ltd., which is said to be a co-operative concern, whereas it is not. Further on in the Royal Commission's report it is stated—

In effect, complete control of the operations of the company is vested in the eight directors, hereinbefore referred to, four of whom are nominees of the Trustees of the Wheat Pool of Western Australia, and the other four of the Westralian Farmers Ltd.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was two years ago.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Could any company be more completely involved than Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The position is totally different altogether.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There are the facts.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But that was two years ago, and you know what the position is now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That was on the evidence tendered to the Royal Commission.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know it is not the same to-day.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But I have given the hon. member the facts.

Mr. Seward: Some of them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: And those people are placed in this position and are financed by a company that makes a

clear profit of £10,000 annually on an output of 11,000,000 bushels.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: On an investment involving £8!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: And they will secure increased profits from increased production, and the Royal Commission said that the profits derived were too much; and that is why the Government has acted.

Hon. C. G. Latham: So you have taken the profits.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We do not desire to favour anyone. We desire to set up an independent authority that will give a fair deal to every interest concerned in the State.

Mr. Patrick: So the Fremantle Harbour Trust is not to be trusted.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, that is what the Minister says.

Mr. Marshall: Anyhow, he has taken some of the venom out of your sting.

Mr. Patrick: If the Minister continues for another two hours we may then be converted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) was concerned about principle and gave me a lecture last night. He said, "I fought for years against these boards." I now propose to put some questions to the hon. member. Is he not a supporter of the Dried Fruits Advisory Board? Is that a Government concern? Under that measure a monopoly was given to one section of the people to do what they liked. Was that Government control? No! Is not the member for Guildford-Midland a supporter of that legislation? But a question of high principles has arisen with regard to the Bill under discussion, yet that did not arise with regard to the Dried Fruits Act. Is not the hon. member in favour of the Dairy Products Board, or the Milk Board? When it came to a question of Bulk Handling Ltd. getting a monopoly, he did not oppose it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He did oppose it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member has complained in this House that the Government should do this and that because of a question of high principle. Of course, the hon. member is interested in the affairs of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., who desires to get the monopoly and the privileges that are sought. Why, he was in my office about the matter and supported it, and yet he talks about these high principles!

Will he oppose the Dried Fruits Act? There is no principle at stake there.

Mr. Cross: But a principle will be involved in this!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Even the Leader of the Opposition could not reconcile that. That was a monopoly. Bulk Handling Ltd. also was a monopoly and was reaching out for a still greater monopoly. Then the dairy farmers also have a monopoly to impose a price on the whole country. At the same time, the dried fruits constituted a monopoly. But there is no principle involved in any of those enterprises. So that is all I have to say to that.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are in pretty deep water to-night.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This board is not independent of the Government, but is only semi-independent, for its members will be appointed for three years only. The Commissioner of Railways is appointed for five years, yet he is independent of the Government. As I say, this board will be appointed for only three years. Advances may be made from the Treasury, and the Auditor General must inquire into the board's annual estimates, which must be submitted by the board. Also the board's annual report and balance sheet must be submitted to Parliament. The Under Treasurer may attend all meetings of the board. The sinking fund adjustment must be paid to a special account at the Treasury, and the board has to submit all plans and details to the Governor, who may approve or disapprove of them. In all cases where a contract is over £1,000, the board must get the consent of the Governor. Then the board has to send the copy of the minutes of its meetings to the Minister after each meeting. So what more control than that could Parliament have? Yet Parliament has no control whatever over those other boards to which I have referred. We have heard talk of the Loan Council dictating. But the Loan Council did not dictate on this occasion. This is the first time in the history of the State that the Government has been able to get money direct for such a purpose as this. In this case the Chairman of the Loan Council was dictated to. This will not be the last word about this legislation. If this House does not give the necessary authority now for bulk handling at the ports and for providing a fair deal all round, the day will come when members will regret it. I make that

prophecy and with that I leave the Bill to the House.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	28

Majority against	13
------------------	----	----	----

AYES

Mr. Coverley	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Cross	Mr. Strydom
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Munste	Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Nulsen	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Doyle	Mr. North
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doust	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Heaney	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Mann	Mr. Warner
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Welsh
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the Bill defeated.

BILL—DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON. P. D. FERGUSON (Irwin-Moore) [8.37]: This Bill to amend the Dairy Products Marketing Regulation Act Amendment Bill seeks to add in one or two directions to the powers of the board that controls the activities under this legislation. The extension of these powers has been found necessary, I take it, as the result of the operations of the board and the experience they have gained since the Act was passed. Power is to be given to the board to expend some of the administrative fund in an endeavour to increase the consumption of our dairy products by advertising and other means in order to secure a greater consumption, particularly of butter. As the result of the operations of this board and as the result of the increase in butter production in Western Australia, thereby bringing about the necessity for the export of a certain percentage of our butter, the quality of the product in this State has improved out of

all recognition; not only that portion of butter which is exported, but a large percentage of that portion which is consumed within the State has shown very considerable improvement in quality during recent years. The activities of the board, in my opinion, have had a considerable bearing on that aspect of the industry. I understand that the levy which is imposed by the board for this administrative fund is only three-eighths of one per cent., or 7s. 6d. per £100. That is only a very small percentage. By giving the board power to spend a certain percentage of this levy on a campaign to increase the consumption of butter in this State the money will be put to a very useful purpose. I understand there has been an intensive campaign in the Eastern States in order to bring about this much-desired result and that it has met with considerable success. The boards in the Eastern States having exercised that power to the advantage of all concerned, it naturally follows that we in this State would be wise to give our board the power it now asks for. The Minister mentioned that in Western Australia our average consumption of butter per head of population per annum is only 28 lbs., whereas in New Zealand it is 50 lbs. per head of population, which indicates that we can by suitable means increase the consumption here in Western Australia.

Mr. Cross: Yes, you can if you increase the basic wage also.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: It has to be borne in mind that the consumption of fats is always greater in a colder than in a warmer climate, but notwithstanding that, the consumption in New Zealand is nearly double what it is in Western Australia. I believe that if power be given to the board to expend a percentage of its fund in the direction indicated, only good can result. The other amendment in the measure is somewhat involved. I read it a dozen times before I got the hang of it. I do not know why a Parliamentary draftsman should require a sentence covering the whole of the page which, when it is stripped of its verbage, is not very difficult to understand. The amendment provides that in certain cases the board may use some of its dairy products stabilisation fund for the assistance of the industry and those engaged in the industry. When the drop in the price of butter whilst it is in store is below the board's declared local price, the price the board declares as

being the price for local consumption, if the total amount of the deduction as approved by the board exceeds the advance on the butter, the manufacturer or the dealer will not be called upon to make up the difference. It seems to me this is the crux of the whole Bill. It is a power that should be given to the Board, because it is bound to operate in the interests of the industry as a whole. If, as the Minister said, the board fixed a local price at, say, 120s. per cwt., and the export parity was 110s., the board would then have power to provide the difference of 10s. per cwt. If the deductions as a result of the storage of the commodity exceed the advance, the board need not insist on a refund of the advance. That is the only way by which those who are responsible for the storage of the butter, in the interests of all concerned, can be protected. In addition the board can make up to the manufacturer or the dealer any further loss occasioned by the storage of the butter. I understand quite a lot of charges are occasioned by this storage. The actual cost of the storage in cool store is considerable. In addition, the containers that are suitable for butter for local consumption are unsuitable for butter that is exported, and a special box has to be provided and paid for. Then there is the interest on the money entailed in paying for butter storage. There is the loss occasioned by the possible depreciation of the quality in the butter stored, and there is also the possible loss through a general drop in market values. All these things have to be provided for as deductions. If the costs are less than the advance, the manufacturer or dealer refunds the balance to the board. If the costs are more than the advance, the board pays the manufacturer or dealer the difference between the costs and the amount of the advance. It seems to me that all sections, the producers, manufacturers, dealers, storers and exporters, all concerned in the ramifications of the industry, will be benefited by the increased powers the Bill seeks to give to the board. I think there can be no objection to the measure and I hope the second reading will be carried.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

BILL—MEAT INDUSTRY (TREATMENT WORKS) LICENSING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON. P. D. FERGUSON (Irwin-Moore) [8.52]: This Bill provides for the licensing of treatment works for the treatment of carcasses of cattle and sheep for export. I do not know why pigs are excluded, and presume there will be no objection to including them. It seems to me that the licensing of these plants for the treatment of meat for export is very necessary, and power should be given to the Minister to license them. It is of particular importance to Western Australia in view of the stage we have now reached in our export lamb production. During the time I had the privilege of directing the activities of the Agricultural Department, we were successful in securing the exclusive right to use the "Swandown" brand for our lambs. The result has been that with the activities of the department, and the co-operation of the lamb producers, we have built up an enviable reputation for our fat lambs. Starting on right lines, in the right districts, with careful husbandry on the part of those responsible for the production of lambs, we have been able to place on the markets of the Old Country a lamb that compares very favourably with the choicest New Zealand lambs, and lambs that are in many instances out-classing the best lambs from Victoria and South Australia. The increase in the number of sheep in the agricultural areas during the last five or six years amounts to nearly 1,000,000. Many of these sheep are crossbred ewes that are used for the breeding of export lambs. Sales of lambs in the agricultural areas have been held at frequent intervals, and a big percentage of these lambs has gone direct from the sales to the meat works at Fremantle, thereby obviating the necessity of extra handling at the

ordinary saleyards at Midland Junction. That is a step in the right direction. As the Minister pointed out, nothing wastes so rapidly as a fresh sucker lamb that is taken away from its mother. It is essential that as little delay as possible should occur between the time when the lamb leaves the farm and reaches the slaughter house. Because of that necessity it is essential that the meat works should be brought up to date, and that the Minister should have the right to say whether the works should be licensed for the treatment of stock, particularly lambs, that have to be exported overseas. It is essential also that the plant should be of a high standard. The conveniences provided for the slaughtering of stock should be modern, up to date, hygienic, and suitable in every way. The actual export is a matter for the Commonwealth Government, as the Minister stated. This State, however, must ensure that the premises and facilities provided are suitable in every way. It is inconceivable that we should allow the erection of many small treatment plants in view of the rapid increase in the production of fat lambs. It is only by the provision of works of considerable size and up-to-date equipment that the business can be economically and satisfactorily carried out for the owners of the lambs. Small and unsuitable types of treatment plants should not be allowed. When the demand for lambs in the Old Country is overtaken by the production of Empire lambs, as will be the case in the not distant future, the discerning London buyer will buy only the best type of lamb that is treated in the best manner by the best treatment plants. Because of that it is essential that the plants should be of an improved type and the facilities both modern and up to date. In this country the pastoralists and farmers have provided a lot of money for the erection of the treatment plant at Fremantle, and various Governments have assisted in financing this plant in every way. Further assistance will be required so that the plant is kept up to date. If the Bill becomes law, any person who desires to instal a treatment plant will have to obtain a license from the Minister. The term of the license is three years. Has the Minister given consideration to the possibility of extending that term? No person or firm who desired to invest a considerable amount of capital in the construction of up-to-date treatment works would be justified in doing so on a license of

three years only. I know that the license can be renewed, but it might be an inducement to those who were prepared to spend their capital in this direction if they could get a longer security of tenure. The Minister will also have power to revoke a license if the licensee fails to stand up to the obligations imposed upon him. The three-year term seems rather restrictive. The licensee must treat stock for others at rates prescribed by the Minister, and if he refuses to do so he will be liable to a penalty of £500. There is, therefore, not much likelihood of any licensee, after securing a license, undertaking to do work on behalf of others as well as himself, and expending many thousands of pounds in the erection of treatment works, contravening the terms of the license. He would not embark upon this considerable expenditure unless he intended to carry out the terms of the license to the letter. He would certainly intend to comply with all the conditions and treat stock for other people. The Minister would not be running any risk by increasing the period from three years to five. He would have power at any time to revoke the license, a very necessary provision. It is conceivable that the representatives of outside countries, particularly that country which prides itself on its big financial enterprises, might set about creating a monopoly for the treatment of stock for export from this State. They might do that with a view later on to making considerable profits out of the industry and those engaged in it. It is necessary that the Minister should have power to veto that at any time. The power to revoke a license is very essential. In the interests of the export lamb trade and the stability of Western Australia, we should be able to get rid of all the stock that cannot be consumed locally on a market that is at present very profitable, and which promises to be reasonably remunerative for a number of years. I hope the House will agree to the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HILL (Albany) [9.1]: I congratulate the Minister on introducing the Bill, and on the remarks he made when moving the second reading. I think I can explain why such a Bill is necessary by giving some idea of the difficulties we at Albany have encountered. About 25 years ago a cool store was built there for the frozen lamb trade.

When the store was completed, there were no lambs available. It was then used for fruit, and a couple of years afterwards another cool store was built at Mt. Barker. Our store then became a white elephant. About 15 years ago, a butter company was formed at Albany to take over the cool store and work it in conjunction with the butter factory. The butter company was a co-operative concern, but had all the difficulties of pioneering the industry. I was one of the directors when it failed. Westralian Farmers Ltd. then came in and took over the company and the cool store. For a while it was a success, and another butter company decided to start operations at Albany. Then Westralian Farmers Ltd. withdrew from the butter business and carried on the cool store and maintained it for the fruit export trade at a heavy loss. It was at this stage that the present company made inquiries and negotiated with the Government to take over the cool store and provide facilities for the frozen lamb trade. I congratulate the Minister on making that cool store available on very reasonable terms. Of course with Government facilities it should be a commercial proposition, but at times that is a secondary consideration. What we in Albany have wanted for many years are facilities for the frozen lamb export trade. I hold no brief for the company that has taken over the cool store, but I have very great respect for it. The Minister spoke truly when he said that it had a hard row to hoe. I am afraid it will be some time before that company is fairly on its feet, and as there is a proposal for another cool store, to start operations at the southern end of the State, I welcome the Bill because, if another company did start, it would mean the failure of both. Under the Bill both the industry and the farmers will be well protected, and I cannot see that the measure will do anything but good. The shipping of refrigerated products presents many real difficulties, but there is still the tendency for shipping to say that it will go to Fremantle, in which event others perhaps may do the same. When I was in New South Wales, I saw a vessel loading frozen lambs, and I was surprised at the distance those lambs had travelled before they reached the ship's side. The port of Newcastle is hardly ever used for overseas trade; it all goes to Sydney. The tendency there, too, is to have inland freezing works and abattoirs. This

will come in Western Australia, but at the present time it would be rather premature. A multiplicity of such works, however, will only cause difficulty and hinder trade. I am speaking as one who has had nearly 30 years' experience as an exporter of frozen products. I hope the House will agree to the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.10]: While I offer congratulations to the Government on what might be said to be a sincere effort to centralise the public offices, I cannot whole-heartedly subscribe to the proposals that have been submitted. The decentralisation of the public offices is a disgrace to us. I am doubtful whether anyone outside of those who must be constantly in touch with the public offices would know where to find one-half of them, since they are so scattered from one end of the metropolitan area to the other. Moreover, many of them are housed in most objectionable buildings, objectionable from every point of view. They do not lend themselves to efficiency, nor does the environment render possible good and intelligent service. This is a subject that has been discussed on many occasions since I have been a member of this House. Whether the site proposed by the Government would be suitable for the structure the Government has in view, I am not very sure, but I do not consider that the present Treasury Buildings site is the most appropriate. I do not think we should give any consideration to preserving the building as it stands at the moment. It would be utterly impossible to lease it without thoroughly reconditioning it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Rebuilding it.

Mr. MARSHALL: We could not recondition it to the extent that it would appeal to

anyone who might desire to rent offices in that locality, and if we did so it would be necessary to go to very considerable expense.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: If it had to be re-conditioned, we should recondition it for our own purposes.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so. I do not know of any more suitable position for Government offices, and therefore why should we move from that locality? I have no serious objection to the site mentioned by the Premier when he introduced the Bill, but I do not know why we should think of disposing of the present site. It is really the most central. I do not know why we should even consider leaving it. The most objectionable feature of the Bill, to me, is the suggested disposal of the sites referred to in the Schedule. It would be a most unwise thing to do.

Mr. Lambert: The Government ought really to be buying land.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Treasurer must be aware of the fact that this State will, we hope, one day carry not 450,000 people but 4,500,000. The sites we possess now will then be of immense value to posterity, and as we are asking posterity to shoulder many of our liabilities of to-day, there is no reason why we should not leave them something in the nature of valuable city sites. If the Government desires Parliament to appropriate funds for the purpose of erecting public buildings, we must have before us estimates in detail, even to a penny, showing how it is proposed to expend the money. I can see no difference between the expenditure of revenue and the sale of Government assets. Parliament should at least have a say in the disposal of any of the State's assets. While I may be prepared to trust the present Government I am not unmindful of the fact—though many years may elapse before that happens—that the time will come when it will not be occupying the Treasury benches. There are some Governments of which I have had experience that I would not trust, and if I am permitted to remain here I may have the same experience in the future.

Mr. Thorn: In the near future.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so. If, by accident, the Opposition takes the Treasury benches at the next election we will need to have our eyes open with regard to Bills of this sort.

Mr. Thorn: There are a lot of Bills that we have to keep our eyes on.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not like supporting the second reading. I know that the time is overdue when all Government departments should be centred in one building, a structure that would lend itself to congenial circumstances, and would ensure our getting efficiency from civil servants, and would result in considerable economy. I do not agree, however, that we should part with valuable sites to give effect to that most worthy and desirable objective. I have not yet decided whether to oppose or support the second reading. I will wait to hear what other members have to say. From all that I have heard up to date, however, I cannot do anything but support the second reading.

MR. LAMBERT Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [9.17]: In speaking on the Address-in-reply debate, I made a reference to the inadequacy of our public buildings, but I never contemplated a Bill of this description.

Mr. Marshall: It was due to your suggestion that the Bill was brought down.

Mr. Thorn: Yes, you are responsible.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is beyond my imagination to contemplate a Government of this country seeking authority from Parliament to dispose of very valuable land in the centre of the city of Perth. I am appalled that this is all the public officers of this State can suggest in the way of making provision for public offices.

Mr. Hegney: What about the Observatory site?

Mr. LAMBERT: If I were permitted to make some remarks about those who gave away the site immediately adjacent to the Observatory site for a secondary school building, I should say in the first place that it was probably one of the most unpardonable administrative sins ever committed in this State, and I would have a lot more to add.

Mr. Raphael: You could put the Perth Town Hall there quite easily.

Mr. LAMBERT: So long as you were not there it would be quite all right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: Surely there is another way out of this difficulty. I recognise the problem of financing the building of central administrative offices, but surely this Parliament and public opinion would never sanction the selling of these valuable sites. There

are not too many remaining. One member interjected a moment ago about the Observatory site, and I referred to the site immediately adjacent to it, namely, that occupied by Hale School. It is a most deplorable circumstance that the Premier of the time gave away that site, which will some day be very valuable to Western Australia. In the first place it is not a suitable position on which to erect a secondary school, although I would not suggest that Hale School should not be built reasonably near to the city. The school, however, has no playground, and the scholars have to use portion of King's Park, a Class "A" reserve, as a playground; otherwise the present site would be of no use whatever. That is known to hon. members. It is hard to understand, however, exactly how, without the sacrifice of public assets, we can finance the erection of decent public buildings. However, this is the least desirable of all methods that could be suggested. The City of Perth is not in the most desirable position, but it can never be altered. The city could never be extended across the river to any great extent, and until the site of the central railway system is changed it cannot be established in the opposite direction. I must complain, Mr. Speaker, about the conversation which is taking place around me. If members are going to carry on a conversation—

Mr. Hegney: We are not carrying on any more conversation than you carry on when others are speaking.

Mr. LAMBERT: Well, it is a conversation I carry on, and not a gabble.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAMBERT: I hope that the Bill will be rejected. There is merit in the suggestion that the money in the State Insurance Trust Fund should be utilised for this purpose. Successive Parliaments have not allowed the State to conduct insurance whereby we would probably have not had not a little over £100,000 to-day, but the better part of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 to spend for this or other purposes, but because there are 40 or 45 insurance companies operating.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may not discuss insurance companies under this Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is linked up with the—

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not linked up with the Bill at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: What I am saying is linked up with the Insurance Trust, and if that is not linked up with the insurance companies of this State, nothing else is. It is regrettable that this fund is not ten times as great as it is. I hope the Bill will be defeated. In the Schedule almost every decent block we have is included. The sites of the public offices and the Perth Observatory are included. Consider the outlook of a Government that wants to sell the noblest site we have overlooking the City of Perth. The very suggestion that it should be sold leads me to express the hope that it will not be long before the Government realises its obligations and the obligations of the Commonwealth to conduct its own Observatory. That is not a function of the State, and never has been.

The Premier: Would you sell the site to the Commonwealth?

Mr. LAMBERT: Why? It is not a fit place for an observatory. A quarter of a century ago it was reported as not being a suitable site for an observatory. The observatory should be in the Darling Ranges, not on a site overlooking the City of Perth. It is only the cowardice of successive State Governments that has prevented them from telling the Commonwealth Government that this is no function of ours. It is written into the Commonwealth Constitution that astronomical and observatory work is a function of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. North: Are you building a stone wall around the Observatory site?

Mr. LAMBERT: That is not a site which should be sold. The time will come when a future generation will have to buy the site of Hale School, when it will have to repossess that site for the people of this country. We may as well attempt to sell a portion of King's Park. That would be as justifiable.

Mr. Sleeman: Would you agree to lease it?

Mr. LAMBERT: Neither to lease nor to sell. It is an unthinkable suggestion that the site should be sold or leased. The same could be said of the Agricultural Bank site. This land could never be repurchased except at a most fabulous price. A better system of financing this project would be such as that which was adopted to finance the Goldfields Water Supply scheme at a cost of £3,000,000.

The Premier interjected.

Mr. LAMBERT: It would be all right if you had half the land of Perth, but you have not half the land of Perth. You have only

one central public office, only one Agricultural Bank, and one place in Murray-street. I notice that the land owned by the Railway Department immediately adjoining the State Trading Concerns office is not mentioned here. I should like to know what area of land we have purchased through the Land Purchase Board, and where the money has gone that was obtained by the Land Disposal Board. A return should be laid on the Table of the money spent on acquiring land in Western Australia, and where the money acquired by the Land Disposal Board has gone.

Member: Into the Manganese railway.

The Premier: It has gone into the loan account.

Mr. LAMBERT: That, too, I suggest, is a subterfuge, because if you are to buy land in the first instance under the authority of the Public Works Act and then dispose of it and carry the money into loan account, that is a mere juggling with finance. Parliament has the right to know about the disposal of any land, but I have never seen any return tabled as to the land disposed of by the Land Disposal Board. The Premier might be able to tell me.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier will be quite out of order in discussing that phase at all. The hon. member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: That phase is closely related to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am very sorry that I am unable to agree with the hon. member.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am definitely sorry to find myself running distinctly counter to the policy of the Government in this respect, but we must cry a halt somewhere and a definite halt must be made when the Government seeks permission for boards and advisory bodies to dispose, without the authority of Parliament, of land that could never again be acquired. For that reason I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton—in reply) [9.31]: I listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion on this Bill. Before dealing with the objections that have been raised, it might be fitting if I once again outlined the position and the reasons that actuated the Government in bringing forward this proposal for the consideration of the House. Everybody knows that the accommodation at present available at the Titles Office and the Department of Agriculture is absolutely and

totally inadequate. For many years there has been a crying need for an improvement in the housing of those two departments.

Mr. North: Nearly all of them.

The PREMIER: I agree with the hon. member. When I became Minister for Justice—in 1924, I think—the Titles Office was approaching a state of congestion where it could not adequately perform the duties for which it was created. I visited the office on several occasions and improvised methods here and there to house valuable documents. Finally a stage was reached when it was impossible to deal with those documents in that building and we had to store them elsewhere. Some were taken to the Supreme Court and some to other places. The business that the Titles Office was supposed to carry out could not be done with reasonable expedition and in a businesslike manner. There was a crying need for improvement. As time has gone on, successive Treasurers have not been able to find the requisite money to make an improvement and the inadequate method of dealing with valuable documents has been allowed to reach an almost impossible position. What applies to the Titles Office applies to the Department of Agriculture, though in a far worse degree. That department is admittedly housed in an old wooden building susceptible to fire, and all sorts of valuable documents and records of experiments carried out are housed there. Officers are engaged on research work and compiling all sorts of data of great value to the people of the State, and they are housed in a building totally inadequate. The State should be ashamed of the building. I am.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: We are with you that far.

The PREMIER: That being so, I think the hon. member will be with me all the way. It is all very well for members to say that something should be done, but they have been saying that for about 15 years. We have all admitted that the present building is inadequate and miserable and that some improvement should be made. Representatives of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research have stated definitely, "If you had an up-to-date Department of Agriculture, we would grant you financial assistance and put highly paid officials at your disposal." But after looking at the miserable building in which the department is housed, they said, "If this is the best you can do,

we shall wash our hands of granting any assistance to Western Australia."

Mr. Seward: You do not propose to put that laboratory in those offices, do you?

The PREMIER: No, they would not agree to the laboratory being established there and would not grant any assistance.

Mr. Seward: But you do not mean to put it in the new building?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Seward: That settles me. I vote against the Bill.

The PREMIER: The hon. member hears something, and before he gives the matter any consideration, he retorts, "That settles me."

Mr. Seward: I have been trying to get that information for four years and have hitherto been unable to get it.

The PREMIER: I am not going to discuss what the Government proposes to do in collaboration with the University regarding laboratory work connected with the Department of Agriculture. That matter will be dealt with at the right time. This is not the time to discuss all those irrelevant matters. This is a different matter entirely. Suffice it to say that some research work cannot be carried out there. In the interests of the science of agriculture in this State, on which to a great degree the productivity of the State depends, we must provide adequate facilities for carrying out such work. The present accommodation being totally and absolutely inadequate, what are we going to do? We have been considering the matter for 15 years. Are we going to do something, or are we going to be content to say, "Admittedly conditions are bad, but we do not know what to do and we shall have to give up the idea of making any improvement." That is what we have been doing for so many years.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The provision of a suitable building for the Department of Agriculture is not dependent upon the sale of the Treasury site.

The PREMIER: I do not say it is. The hon. member might be with me by the time I have finished. The Department of Agriculture is crying out for removal to suitable quarters.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Of course it is.

The PREMIER: Then what are we going to do about it? What would any Government do? We have all sorts of problems

connected with the expenditure of public money. If I made a list of all the requests preferred by members and totalled them up, we could spend £20,000,000 and spend it well and perhaps profitably in the interests of the State. But the trouble is we have not got £20,000,000, but we have got this rotten building for housing the Department of Agriculture. We must do something to effect an improvement. We have tried all sorts of expedients and examined all sorts of methods. Successive Treasurers have discussed the pros and cons from every standpoint, and the insistent demand for an alteration of existing conditions continues. We investigated the matter thoroughly to see what could be done. Though certain matters are included in this Bill, we are not necessarily wedded to every item. I maintain that there is merit in the measure in that it proposes to do something that has been outside the power of the Government in the past. That was the only reason for suggesting this desperate remedy, as the Leader of the Opposition, I think, termed it. Research work cannot be carried on in the Department of Agriculture under existing conditions. The officers of the department have been doing excellent work considering the difficulties under which they labour, but if they had congenial surroundings with all the apparatus of an up-to-date department, I think it no exaggeration to say that they could do work ten times as valuable in the interests of the State. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research is anxious and in fact more than anxious to help us. Officers have been sent here to see what could be done to give Western Australia the advantages that would be conferred by the operations of that institution here. They have endeavoured to ascertain whether there was not some way to provide the facilities required for research work, but when they have looked at the Department of Agriculture they have said in effect, "If that is all you have to offer, good-bye." It is within the bounds of probability that immense strides will be made in research into the braxy-like disease and into combating all the pests that trouble the people of every agricultural State. Are we to sit down and say that those pests will come, and that we have no place in which to deal with them because we cannot afford it, and still go

on in the same old way? Or should we say, "We cannot afford to be any longer without the assistance of this research department and must take advantage of what its officers can do." The production of the State could probably be increased two or threefold within 10 or 15 years by such research work, and are we to neglect the opportunity because we might be doing something not quite right in alienating the freehold rights of some portion of the public estate? The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert), in his usual style, said all sorts of things, and then went out without waiting to hear what might be said in reply.

The Minister for Agriculture: Where is he now?

The PREMIER: I do not know; he is not concerned. The problem that confronted the Government was whether to erect a new building for the Department of Agriculture in another part of the city and thereby perpetuate the evil that exists at present. As the member for Murchison expressed it, our public buildings are scattered all over the place, and a guide would have to be engaged to conduct one to all the offices unless one had a very extensive acquaintance with them. Are we going to perpetuate that evil or do what all countries have done—house the departments adequately in a central position in a building that will be an architectural adornment to the city and a convenience to the people, as well as providing hygienic conditions for the staff and permitting efficient control and supervision to be exercised.

Mr. North interjected.

The PREMIER: We have to get some security for the £200,000 and there must be some means to repay it. The Leader of the Opposition said that surely we were not broke, surely we could get the money. No, we are not broke, but we have so many things to do with the small amount of money at our command. I am reminded of the remark of Cecil Rhodes, "So much to do, so little done." That is our position in this great State. I could imagine what would occur if we let the development of the hinterland go to rack and ruin and spent all our money on public buildings in the city. What a howl of indignation would be raised throughout the country if such a policy were adopted! That is not the policy of the

Government. It is our duty to develop the country and assist the production of wealth, which means that everybody to some extent shares in the prosperity created. It would be unthinkable to use all the loan money for the provision of public buildings in the city area. That will not be done. Yet we are faced with the need for providing improved accommodation for public departments.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not to the extent that you must sell everything you have at any price you can get.

The PREMIER: We need not sell everything for this purpose. The Bill does not propose an auction sale to dispose of everything because we are stone-broke and in the depths of despair and cannot get any money.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You want to put the measure on the statute-book, and any incoming Government can do what I suggest might be done. No one knows that better than you know it.

The PREMIER: God help Western Australia if any Government would be so irresponsible as to part with the public estate at bargain prices!

Hon. C. G. Latham: I say it is an irresponsible Government that puts such a Bill on the statute-book.

The PREMIER: It is all very well for the hon. member to have his viewpoint. A Government which has the responsibility of carrying on the affairs of this State cannot permit public office accommodation to remain in its present condition, merely saying, "We will go on as we are." This is one of the main problems of Western Australia.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: You have chosen the worst possible way of solving it.

The PREMIER: The solution that has been adopted for many years is to do nothing. Is that the right way? Are we to continue to sit down doing nothing, or are we to say, "There are expedients some of whose principles we do not altogether agree with, but certainly better than the existing policy of doing nothing"?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I prefer the existing state of affairs to the sale of those properties.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The Government could have spent on office accommodation the £96,000 it sent oversea to pay for trolley buses.

The PREMIER: The Government has come to the conclusion that the wisest and most economical course is to begin with the centralisation of the most important Government offices. The proposal which forms the basis of the Bill, as a commencement, is that new accommodation should be provided for the Titles Offices and the Department of Agriculture. That accommodation would be the first section of what should ultimately be a building sufficiently large to accommodate the majority of the public offices. The member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson) says, "We will go that far with you." I think every hon. member is prepared to do that. However, the difficulty is finance. As the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) says, with centralisation of public offices it will be possible to effect savings in staff. Moreover, it is confidently anticipated that administration will be much more efficient as well as more economical under those circumstances. Most important of all, the public convenience will be served to a much greater extent than it is at present, and public business will be transacted with ever so much greater expedition. The proposed site, the land between the Christian Brothers' College and Government House, has been decried. There is nothing good in the Bill, according to some hon. members; even the site is bad. Because we move an office two or three hundred yards from its present location, the site is no good, inasmuch as it involves two or three hundred yards additional walk as compared with the present site. Would it really be such a tremendous inconvenience for people to walk another couple of hundred yards to do business at the Titles Office?

Hon. C. G. Latham: The population of Perth has moved eastward.

The PREMIER: That is due largely to the block of buildings in the way of the population. Take the old Agricultural Bank. Can anyone assert that that is an edifice of tremendous historical interest and meriting to be preserved for all time? If so, I cannot agree with that view. What is the size of the block on which the Agricultural Bank building is erected?

Mr. Lambert: What about the Barracks? The Barracks possess no historical interest.

The PREMIER: The Barracks have served a useful purpose for many years. Eventually, I suppose, they will have to be shifted, in order that the perspective of Parliament House may be what it should be.

The Barracks, like other antediluvian structures, will have to go on doing their duty the best way they can, though not in the best way for the State. It has been suggested that there is no need to erect new offices, that it should be possible to accommodate all our public officials in the existing Treasury block. It should be unnecessary for me to say that that aspect has been given careful and mature consideration. If it is so obvious, surely any Government or any set of Government officials asked to advise would say, "What is wrong with the present site?" That aspect has been gone into fully. The existing buildings cannot be altered except at tremendous cost. There is the suggestion that a couple of new storeys should be put on the building. That, however, would require cement supports and steel girders. The cost would be more than that of erecting up-to-date offices on another site. An alternative would be to demolish the present buildings and erect an entirely new structure. That would create tremendous administrative difficulties. The officers entrusted with the making of a report inquired first of all whether the present Treasury building could be improved. That is impossible, and therefore we have to look elsewhere.

Mr Doney: What about pulling it down and re-erecting it?

The PREMIER: That would cause immense inconvenience, administratively speaking. Without costly additions, the building would have such an ugly appearance that everybody would exclaim against it. We should erect a building that would be an architectural adornment to the city, and of great value in the years to come. In many capital cities public offices are erected on a frontage to the river which happens to be near the capital city. In my travels I have noticed that public buildings are frequently erected on a large open space opposite a river frontage where such is available. Even at the present time the city of Perth is beautified by the Capitol Theatre and two or three other buildings in its vicinity. A tremendous improvement has been effected there. Public offices fronting the river would be such an adornment to the city as every member would be proud of. If we set out to improve the Treasury building, the cost would be greater than that of a new building, besides which the result would be unsatisfactory. The

erection of a new building on the present site is something we have not the money to do. If it were so easy to do, successive Governments would not have waited to leave it to be done now. It is not easy to do, and it has not been done because money has not been available.

Mr. Lambert: For the Goldfields Water Scheme £3,000,000 was borrowed on a 30-years term, and the money has been repaid. That is finance.

The PREMIER: It is something that has been done. But let the hon. member try to finance public buildings in this city by neglecting to provide facilities for which the people are crying out, and then let him see the criticism he would bring on the Government of the country. Let him tell the people at Southern Cross, "As regards the problems of the pests in this district we will do nothing. Neither will we furnish additional water supplies. But we will erect public buildings in Perth." How would he get on then? He would not dare to put up such a proposition in a country district.

Mr. Doney: If you sell the Treasury site—

The PREMIER: I am not assuming that the Treasury site is to be sold at all.

Mr. Doney: You are making provision for it in the Bill.

The PREMIER: A Government often gets authority to do things that it does not necessarily want to do.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are not going to get authority for this.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has made statements of that kind before, and they have not proved correct.

Mr. Doney: The point is that the Bill makes provision for the sale.

The PREMIER: The Bill provides for something that may be done if a Government has a desirable proposition to put up to members of this House. We are not rushing in to hold an auction sale of these properties.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You will only be there for 12 months, and then somebody else will come in.

The PREMIER: I can visualise many things that may be done in regard to public offices. An hon. member might say, "What is wrong with the Town Hall?" But we would have no authority to negotiate with the Perth City Council.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You can always come to Parliament for authority.

The PREMIER: There might be other propositions so much to the public interest that every member would agree to them. Because people think that nothing will be done in that respect, they say nothing about it. I want to dispel the notion that an auction sale of these properties will be held.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But you provide for it.

The PREMIER: There will be no auction sale with upset prices. We have provided that the conditions governing any sale shall be something definite. Hon. members suggest that an irresponsible Government might be returned to office.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know what can be done under the Bill.

The PREMIER: I know that no Government would ever dare even to contemplate the doing of any such thing.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is surprising what some Governments will do.

The PREMIER: The suggestion is ridiculous. Everybody knows it would not be done. However, if a sound commercial proposition can be put up to which the House would agree, the Government would be quite right in considering it, at all events.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Would the Government bring down a Bill to get authority?

The PREMIER: The Government might bring down proposals to Parliament. It could not hasten to complete all negotiations in connection with such a matter. Anyway, what would be wrong with it if we did so? All we have now is a block of land in the centre of the city on which is erected a most unsuitable set of public buildings. I will not say anything to decry the value, because we may desire to lease the property. If we could get a suitable public building erected in which there would be much better hygienic conditions for the staff, which would be more conveniently situated for the public, and close to the centre of the city, would that not be an improvement, or would Opposition members regard it as a retrograde step?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It would all depend upon the cost.

The PREMIER: Even if it cost a considerable amount? If we could provide accommodation to the extent of three times as much as we have available now, and we could secure that within 200 yards or so of where the present Treasury Buildings are situated, would that not be an improvement?

We would still have the buildings and the land on which those buildings are erected, and we would have the administrative staff housed under conditions that would represent a tremendous improvement.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Whether leased or sold, it would still pay the Government to utilise its real estate.

The PREMIER: We are not in business for dealing in real estate. It is the function of the Government adequately to house the administrative staff, under conditions that are satisfactory and convenient to the public. I am not anxious to sell any of the Government buildings. If, however, some advantageous offer were received that the Government deemed it advisable to accept, why should we not take advantage of it, and bring the proposal before Parliament? As a matter of fact, I do not suppose the present Government will be able to do anything under this particular legislation. It is not proposed to start selling Government property within the next six or eight months.

Mr. Thorn: You know you have made a mistake, and it would be wise to drop the Bill.

The PREMIER: Not at all.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If the Opposition had been in office and had introduced such a Bill, you would have kept us going for a fortnight, and you know it.

The PREMIER: I do not propose to disagree with what the Leader of the Opposition says regarding the powers of the Labour Party to debate measures, but I contend that if we are able to provide the accommodation I suggest on the site proposed, it will be a good deal. What is there sacrosanct about the present buildings? The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) suggested we should not have sold any portion of the land in Perth. If that had not been done in the past, there would not be any Perth at all to-day, but the capital would be somewhere else. As a matter of fact, principles of that sort can be carried too far.

Mr. Patrick: Even in country districts where land was sold, the Government has had to buy land later on.

The PREMIER: And that would not have been done had the Government not been in a position to do so. As a matter of fact, those concerned may have kept themselves accommodation-poor for a hundred years,

because they had not the funds at their disposal to make the necessary change.

Mr. Patrick: I would rather see the Government secure the benefit of the unearned increment than someone else have that advantage.

The PREMIER: So would I. The Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, disposed of part of what was known as the old University site to the Returned Soldiers' League, with the result that the remainder of the land is of no use.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know you do not require any law to allow you to sell that land. It was just ordinary Crown land, and was not a Class "A" or Class "B" reserve.

The PREMIER: If we dispose of any land on which public buildings are erected, we do not desire to take that money into revenue, but to put it back into public buildings. It should be credited to a fund for the purpose of erecting those buildings. Take the Agricultural Department, or the Agricultural Bank. What advantage, from an aesthetic, business, or any other standpoint, attaches to the retention of those buildings?

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: None whatever.

The PREMIER: The retention of the old Agricultural Bank building has held up the commercial development of the city to the eastward. It would be a good thing if that building were removed, and another erected that would add to the commercial dignity of the city.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Quite right.

The PREMIER: I thought I would get the hon. member with me to some extent. Consideration was given to the possibility of erecting additional storeys, but even if we could make some extra provision in connection with the central block of Government buildings, at some stage or other we would have to move further away. It will be impossible to house all the administrative staff required during the next 50 years in that particular block of buildings. In viewing this matter we should take a peep into the future, and I think that if the Government's proposal be agreed to, it will be applauded by future generations. I realise that in taking the step we must see to it that we move wisely. The site proposed will give ample accommodation for the extension of public buildings required for all time.

Mr. Doney: But that is a very long time.

The PREMIER: The block is very large, and will at any rate meet requirements for the next hundred years. If one travels around the world, one will note that in the centre of all big cities there are large open spaces where the people can congregate. In Rome, for instance, Mussolini has an open space three times as big as the one we propose, and he makes his speeches there.

Mr. Styants: And opponents of Governments are generally shot in those open spaces.

The PREMIER: That is quite correct. Some members have suggested that the city will travel westward. For my part, I do not think the commercial expansion of the city will travel any further west than Parliament House, and I think the next trend will be towards the east. Wherever one goes, one notices that where there is a waterfront, public buildings and commercial centres are apt to be located there. In my opinion, that is where the city will ultimately develop. I am sure that one retarding factor in that regard has been the Agricultural Bank with its dead space in the front. There are many aspects favourable to the proposition, but I am not specifically wedded to the proposal that we must sell the land. We can lease some of it with advantage. Those who have read anything about the history of London will know the record of leasehold transactions there. Some people, for instance, leased land 200 years ago, and ultimately it reverted to their descendants, who found themselves in possession of a tremendous amount of capital that had been returned to them.

Mr. Sleeman: That is what we want here.

The PREMIER: If we could get a sufficient return from the leasing of land, we might be able to provide interest on the cost of the erection of public buildings, and that would surely be regarded as satisfactory. I can cite an instance in my own home town of Geraldton where, upwards of 25 years ago, a block of land was leased with the right to erect a building thereon. At the end of the period the owners of the property found themselves in possession of a magnificent hotel that had been built on their block, and it cost them nothing at all.

Mr. Sleeman: We could do the same.

The PREMIER: It will be recognised that there are several alternatives in the Bill. Should a particularly advantageous offer be received that Parliament might

agree to, it can be brought before members, who can take the responsibility for arriving at a decision. Then again, the property might be leased under such conditions that would enable the return to pay interest on the cost of the erection of public buildings. If that happened, we would be so much the better off. However, Parliament will be consulted regarding any such transactions. There will be no hole-in-the-corner method about it, and even if properties are to be sold, they will be sold under public contract or at public auction. I certainly am not anxious to get power to sell the public estate. I want Parliament to be consulted so as to allow members to accept their responsibility. If we could make a better deal by leasing land for 99 years, I would not mind doing that. From what I have been able to note of the progress of Sydney and Melbourne, those cities are rebuilt every 30 or 40 years. Sydney is entirely different from what it was when I was a boy, and, apart from Parliament House and the Government offices, there is hardly any commercial building I recognise.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Their Parliament House is nothing to speak about.

The PREMIER: If there is one standing disgrace to New South Wales, it is its Parliament House.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And they are buying up the most expensive land.

The PREMIER: Our valuable land will be sufficient for many years to come.

Hon. C. G. Latham: This Bill is the most atrocious thing ever introduced into this Parliament.

The PREMIER: Parliament has had to reproach itself, and successive Governments, for not doing something in regard to this project. Are we to sit idly by and do nothing? Only a few weeks ago every member in the House was clamouring that we should do something like this very thing, but no member suggested any method of financing the scheme, except from loan fund. We are not prepared to accept that policy. What would the people of the Great Southern say if we were to borrow £300,000 or £400,000 for public buildings in Perth? They would say, "Look at the expenditure going on in the city while we have not so much as a water supply." The Government would not be so foolish as to attempt to initiate a policy of that kind. In each successive year there is less loan money avail-

able to us as a State. I hope the Bill will provide a means for spending some loan money without depriving of their share of the money those who are dependent on us for work. Some members seem to regard the proposals contained in the Bill rank heresy. However, from a financial standpoint, the proposals are worthy of the approval of the House. Despite what the Leader of the Opposition said, we cannot provide for hospitals under this Bill. I do not wish to discuss the Bill any longer. The proposal contained in it is one under which we can at least make some progress. One of the last eventualities that will be undertaken under this measure will be the selling of our public lands. But we shall have to lease them if we erect public buildings elsewhere, and if we do lease them we can take the money we receive from the lease to pay interest on the cost of new construction. Members can amend the Bill if they wish to do so, but for goodness sake let us get rid of our lassitude and do something in accordance with the desires of the people of the State.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	15
Majority for					11

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Cross	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Doust	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Fox	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Miss Holman	Mr. Troy
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wiso
Mr. Munroe	Mr. Withers
Mr. North	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Nuisen	
Mr. Patrick	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Warner
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Waite
Mr. Latham	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Mann	Mr. Doney
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Appointment of Advisory Committee:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) the words "sale and/or" be struck out.

It would be criminal on the part of Parliament to allow the Government to sell the land mentioned in the Schedule. What I am after is to get into the Bill the principle that the Government shall not have the right to sell the land, but shall merely have power to lease it.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I will support the amendment; indeed I would have moved it if the hon. member had not done so. I do not mind the Government having power to lease the land, say up to 50 years, but I am not prepared to grant the right to sell these valuable blocks. As the Leader of the Opposition frequently says, I do not mind the present Minister being there, but the time may come when the present Minister will not be there. I trust the Committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. CROSS: This clause merely gives power to the advisory committee to advise the Governor as to the sale or leasing of public land. If members opposite wish to strike out the power of sale they can do it in a later clause. The amendment will prevent the advisory committee from giving the Governor advice.

Mr. Marshall: The Government will not want any advice on that point.

Mr. CROSS: Some people are opposed to having any advice tendered to them.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would be ridiculous to leave in the word "sale," if we are going to strike out the power to sell. Are we going to ask the committee to report on the sale of those blocks when we have no intention of allowing them to be sold? If the words were left in, it would be an indication to the Committee that these blocks might perhaps be sold.

Mr. LAMBERT: I support the amendment. The words are unnecessary if power is not going to be given to the Government to sell these blocks.

The PREMIER: I oppose the amendment. It is not the intention of the Government to put this land up for sale at bargain prices. Possibly some advantageous offer may be made to which every member would agree. If members will permit the Government only to lease these blocks, the Government would

then have to come down to Parliament with another Bill to authorise any sale that might be effected. For the Committee to disallow any investigations or any offers to be submitted, or the land to be dealt with in any other way except as a leasing proposition, would be to stultify itself. The Government should have the right to go into any proposition that is made. Should the public offices be shifted, what is going to happen to the land if no one will make an offer for it?

Mr. Hughes: What is to prevent the Government from getting advice from a group of civil servants, Bill or no Bill?

The PREMIER: The Committee would be well advised to leave this clause as printed, so that any offer at all can be dealt with.

Mr. RODOREDA: The Premier's arguments are not convincing. If we pass this amendment it will only take away from the Committee power to advise concerning a sale. That will not prevent anyone from making an offer of purchase.

The PREMIER: We want the Committee to be the intervening body. We do not want to have the direct approach.

Mr. RODOREDA: I see no sense in that. Why cannot intending buyers go direct to the Government?

Mr. SLEEMAN: The Premier says he is agreeable to the sale of some of the land, and that it may be necessary to dispose of it. Those who are opposed to the sale of these blocks cannot possibly vote in favour of the retention of these words.

Mr. McDONALD: The proposal to make some survey of the city with the idea of centralising certain Government offices, and rebuilding others that are inadequately housed, is something which deserves approval, but I am opposed to the sale of certain of our Government blocks.

The PREMIER: What about those which should be sold, such as the Agricultural Bank premises?

Mr. McDONALD: On the second reading I should have expressed my opposition to any blocks being sold without reference to Parliament. Bills come down each year excluding from forest reserves comparatively small sections of land. Nevertheless the approval of Parliament has to be sought for such lands to be alienated from the Crown. Government lands in the metropolitan area are of great potential value. I will support the amendment so that Parliament may de-

cide whether or not these blocks should be alienated from the Crown.

Mr. LAMBERT: It would be deplorable to allow any committee to advise upon the sale of our public estates.

The PREMIER: Your idea is that we are not to sell any land?

Mr. LAMBERT: I would not sell a foot of the public estate. The man who has any conception of selling public estates would be prepared to sell other things.

Mr. HUGHES: What is to prevent the Government from calling together a group of five civil servants, and obtaining recommendations from them as to the sale or lease of any particular part of the public estate, and of the authority of Parliament then being sought to effect such sale or lease?

Mr. Lambert: The sale of Parliament House might be recommended.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I would be willing to allow some of the members to go with it. If it was thought desirable to sell any part of the public estate, permission could be sought by means of a Bill. If we sold any of this land to-day future citizens would have to buy it back at a greatly enhanced price.

Mr. CROSS: I cannot see why the Committee should not have the right to give advice on this question. The State Government may own blocks of land that are quite unsuitable for any Government purpose, and it may be very desirable to sell them. A Bill could then be brought down to authorise the sale.

Mr. SHEARN: I agree with what has been said by the mover of the amendment and I am at a loss to understand why the Premier should be so strenuously opposed to the suggested amendment. Surely advice will be taken by the Premier, and so for that reason I cannot understand why there should be any opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WITHERS: One can hardly support the clause as it stands, although I am not opposed to selling some of the land mentioned in the schedule. The time is not yet ripe for its sale. Personally, I think it is dangerous to mention it in the Bill; I consider the word "sale" should be eliminated. The time will come, I have no doubt, when one or two of the sites mentioned in the schedule will be disposed of because I do not know that they will ever be of any great value from the State's point of view.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Committee should take a broader view of what is likely to happen. I disagree with those members who, while the State is in its infancy, as it is just now, forecast what will or will not happen in 50 years' time. I have been referring all along to the metropolis and not to country blocks that are occasionally sold by the Government. What right has anyone to say that the city will not grow any more? If the railway is moved further north, the land on which the railway property now stands would be of immense value.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: I remember when the block on which Boams is now built was sold for £36.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would never have thought that by looking at the hon. member. Anyway, there we have an old man who has watched the development of this city. Let us look well ahead. What a deplorable state of affairs exists because of the lack of foresight on the part of those who preceded us. Look at the width of Hay-street! Every street in the city ought to have been made as wide as St. George's-terrace. The people of those days had all the older cities on which they could have modelled Perth. Now it is proposed that we shall do something similar by disposing of the few remaining valuable properties that we have. We must assume that the city will develop into a place of great importance and that the property now owned by the Government will increase in value. We cannot forecast what will happen in 50 years' time.

The PREMIER: After all, we are dealing with things as they are. Do we not sell land in mining and agricultural towns every week? It is the Government's deliberate policy to do so. I remember when the member for Murchison made an awful fuss because the Government would not sell blocks at Reedy.

Mr. Marshall: That was a different thing entirely. You are making a statement and you are getting yourself into deep water. Ask the Minister for Lands about it. The cause of all the trouble was the exorbitant price you were asking for land there. It was garotting.

The PREMIER: Everyone talks about the "principle" of getting rid of our public estate, that we must never get rid of the public estate. The hon. member is always talking about our getting into debt

and now that we propose to avoid getting into debt over the public buildings it is suggested should be erected, he objects to the possibility of our making an advantageous sale. Would he prefer that we should keep on paying interest on the money that would have to be borrowed for the buildings? We are selling valuable blocks of land all over the country every day and every week. Some members do not consider the intrinsic value of any proposal but merely discuss the "principle" of getting rid of the public estate, and declare it to be wrong.

Mr. Lambert: It was written into the Labour platform years ago.

The PREMIER: And it was written out again. I have never heard any member protest against selling town or suburban lots or agricultural land or anything of that kind. We are doing it daily.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I cannot understand the Premier making a comparison between the town of Reedy and the capital city. I remember the member for Murchison coming down here very wrath because a blind woman had been prosecuted for squatting on a lease at Reedy. To compare Reedy with Perth is utterly ridiculous. The Bill provides for the disposal of the Observatory site, the Agricultural Bank site, and the old cottage, wherever the old cottage may be. I know the first two are very valuable blocks and for the Premier to say that because something happened at Reedy, we are putting up this opposition, is really too absurd.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not intend to give the Government any authority to sell any land. The few blocks that we have left are Class "A" and Class "B" reserves and they have been reserved for one special purpose, and no Minister of the Crown has any right to sell or lease any of those lands without first coming to Parliament. That was a very wise precaution to take and it was taken so that the people should have conserved certain areas of Crown lands in or around the city. Now we have the Government asking us to give it or any other succeeding Government the right to dispose of the land. All that is to be done is that a committee shall investigate and report. There is nothing said about the committee reporting a second time. A report has to be submitted once and then if the land is not disposed of on the first occasion it may

be sold by private treaty. There lies the danger. So long as I am here, I shall not be a party to disposing of the birthright of the people and I will not allow any committee to do it either. I can well imagine what would have happened if we who are now on this side of the House had attempted to introduce legislation such as this. Why, members opposite would have knocked the House down rather than allow even one clause to go through. If the Premier wants to dispose of any of this land by sale or lease, let him ask for separate authority, but he is not going to have wholesale authority like this. I say I am right in this case, even though I may be in the minority. If this side of the House had brought down a measure of this kind, what would have happened?

The Premier: That does not matter.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If we have to sell land to provide Government offices, then we have become bankrupt. The Government has a perfect right to borrow money to erect public buildings, because such buildings must prove remunerative. Let the Premier tell us who is going to lease those places, and he will then have no trouble. If I were the Premier in this House, following this Government—The member for Northam can giggle, but the member for Northam does not take things seriously in this House. He never has taken them seriously. He never takes anything seriously until the member for East Perth gets up to speak. He does not realise his responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I repeat that if I were Premier I would not want my Government to have power to dispose of land in this way. I did not intend to speak on this matter, but when the member for Northam giggles at my remarks—

Mr. Withers: That was only in reference to your statement about being Premier. You were anticipating.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I have a perfect right to—

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to respect the Chair.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am respecting the Chair. I will speak as long as I like, provided my remarks are relevant to the Bill.

Mr. Marshall: You cannot defy the Chair.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am not defying the Chair. If you were Chairman, I would obey you too.

Mr. Marshall: You had better not defy me.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: There is no justification for putting on the statute-book a law to give the Government this power.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: The Premier put up a long and precious argument in endeavouring to prove to some of the farmer members on this side of the House that they could not get facilities for the Agricultural Department to carry out its work unless he secured permission to sell certain lands. Nothing is further from the truth.

The Premier: Nothing has been done to improve the position otherwise, anyway.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: There is no justification for the suggestion that facilities for the departments requiring them badly cannot be provided unless the permission sought in this Bill to dispose of certain lands is granted.

The Premier: If we do as other people have done in the past, nothing will be done to provide those facilities.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: That is not the right attitude for the Premier to take. Let us be guided by the majority in this House. The House has decided that the second reading should be carried. Now I ask the House to decide that no Government should ever have the right to dispose of this land, but should only have the right to lease it.

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

Ayes 25

Noes 16

Majority for .. . 9

AYES.

Mr. Boyle	Mr. Rodoreda
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Seeman
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Styans
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Warner
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Welsh
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Withers
Mr. North	Mr. Doney
Mr. Patrick	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Doust	Mr. F. O. L. Smith
Mr. Fox	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Troy
Miss Holmes	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wise
Mr. Munroe	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Clause 3—Committee to advise:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "or may of its own motion" be struck out.

Whatever powers we might desire to give to this committee, surely it should not act without the consent of the Governor.

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

Ayes	18
Noes	22

Majority against 4

AYES.

Mr. Boyle
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Hill
Mr. Hughes
Mr. Latham
Mr. Mann
Mr. McDonald
Mr. McLarty

Mr. North
Mr. Patrick
Mr. Sampson
Mr. Seward
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Warner
Mr. Watts
Mr. Welsh
Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Cross
Mr. Doust
Mr. Fox
Mr. Hawke
Miss Holman
Mr. Lambert
Mr. Marshall
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munie
Mr. Nulsen

Mr. Raphael
Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Troy
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wise
Mr. Withers
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 the words "sale and/or" be struck out.

Having decided against giving power to sell, there is no need for retaining those words in this clause.

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

Clause 4—Governor may sell or lease existing lands:

Hon. P. D. FERGUSON: I move an amendment—

That the words "sell all or any of the lands set out in the Schedule to this Act, either by public auction or private contract, on such terms and conditions as he may think fit, or may" be struck out.

Those words deal with the selling of the land.

Amendment put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

- 1, Housing Trust Act Amendment.
- 2, Financial Emergency Tax Assessment Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 3, Money Lenders Act Amendment. Without amendment.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [11.23] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is to continue the Lotteries Control Act which expires on the 31st December. The measure, as introduced in another place by the Chief Secretary, provided that the Act should be made permanent and that the Commissioners should hold office for three years. The Bill as presented to this House is merely a continuance measure, it having been shorn of the other provisions it contained on being introduced. Five years have elapsed since the Commission was constituted with power to conduct lotteries, and members are fully aware of the operations of the Commission and the disbursement of the money, which has been reported to the House at the conclusion of each of the lotteries. The reports on each lottery have been submitted with the report of the Auditor General. It is quite unnecessary for me to traverse the ground in justification of the control of lotteries in this State. As is well known, we do not agree that the method of control laid down in the Act is the one we would select. We prefer the principle of State control along the lines adopted in New South Wales. This Bill will ratify the existing method of control. In Committee I propose to move an amendment of which notice will be given. There is no need to labour the question, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon.

S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [11.26] in moving the second reading said: I shall not detain the House very long in moving the second

reading of the Bill. It has been asked for over the last eight years.

Mr. Doney: By whom?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: By the organisation that controls the existing Act. During the last 18 months it has been asked for by every organisation worth the name in Western Australia.

Mr. Thorn: And by quite a lot of the public, too.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. The Country Party, the Wheatgrowers' Union, the Country Women's Organisation—in fact I do not know of one organisation that has not written requesting the passing of the Bill. The present Act was placed on the statute-book in 1910, or 27 years ago, and there has not been any amendment since. We asked the Pharmaceutical Society to administer the Act on behalf of the State, but the measure has been out of date for the last 12 years. This is not fair to the society, but I am not considering the society only, because it is equally unfair to the people of the State. Though the Bill contains a fair number of clauses there are very few principles involved. One of the main principles will prevent in future the establishment of any additional pharmacies by grocers or large business concerns. The measure, however, will not affect those already in existence. The same thing will apply to Brown's pharmacy and Jones's pharmacy that are in existence to-day. They will still be permitted to continue, much to my regret, but I have not introduced into the measure matters that might prove controversial. If those people are desirous of selling, however, they must sell to a pharmaceutical chemist. They will not be permitted to sell to an unqualified man to carry on in the same way. Those are two of the main principles of the Bill. The measure will prevent the establishment in this State of automatic machines: we are fortunate in that they have not been established here up to date. They have been introduced in other Australian States prior to the passing there of amending legislation of this kind. I know that some people are apprehensive as regards the commercial use of poisons. That use will not be affected except to this extent, that any person who sells poison will, under the Bill, have to become registered and pay a fee.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Will that apply to road boards?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, if they sell poison. The fee will be 5s. annually.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: What if they sell poisons without making profit?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I am not prepared to argue about that, but I will supply the information to the hon. member in the Committee stage. My belief is that under the Bill as drawn, a road board will have to register so that it may be known who buys poisons from it. That is only a fair proposition. All the main poisons used in industry will come under the Ninth Schedule to the Bill. They are exempted. Thus there will be no obstacle other than the payment of the registration fee and the keeping of a register, the information contained in which will have to be supplied to the Pharmaceutical Society. Another leading feature of the Bill is to make it compulsory that when a poison is sold the container must be labelled "Poison." Further, if there is a known antidote to the poison, the name of that antidote must also be stated on the label. That is a feature which has been asked for by a number of organisations, not only for the purpose of saving human life, but also for the purpose of saving lives of stock. One other important principle—important to me at all events—relates to the training of apprentices. It gives the Pharmaceutical Council the right to prevent a chemist from taking an apprentice unless he has the necessary facilities for training. That, again, I think is the right attitude to adopt.

Mr. Raphael: What about premiums?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That aspect will be dealt with under regulations. Premiums will be fixed at a low rate. At present, any chemist in any circumstances can take an apprentice. We know the sorrowful result in some cases. The Bill makes it compulsory for chemists to register annually. That is because power is desired to withdraw a license from a chemist under certain circumstances. It will not be done without giving the chemist opportunity to appeal.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Appeal to whom?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: To the Minister. In no circumstances would I agree to give any organisation the right to take away a man's living unless the man had the right of appeal to some quarter. Outside the points I have mentioned, the Bill contains merely details of amendments of the principal Act not affecting important principles.

It is astounding to note the difference between a State which has enacted similar legislation eight years ago and a State without such legislation in point of accidental deaths from poisoning. I will take the cases of Victoria and Western Australia for last year. Victoria with a population of 1,855,699 last year had 41 accidental deaths from poisoning, or one death in every 42,174 persons. Western Australia with a population of 454,231 had 20 such deaths, or one in every 22,711. Thus proportionately Western Australia had approximately 90 per cent. more deaths from accidental poisoning. I attribute the result in Victoria chiefly to the power to compel people who sell poisonous substances of any kind whatever to label the container "Poison." Western Australia has not that power at present. I know of a case where arsenic and Paris green in the same order were put into paper bags, and both bags burst on the way home amongst other things. One member of the family lost his life, and another member was seriously ill for some considerable time. It is scandalous to think that in a civilised community poisons can be sold under such conditions. Therefore it is time that the principal Act was amended so as to give control over containers and labels in respect of poisons. I do not wish to detain hon. members any longer. My honest belief is that Parliament will pass the Bill without much discussion. I am not wedded to every word of the measure. If any member desires to move a reasonable amendment somewhere, I shall offer no objection. However, it is time we made an effort, in the interests of the people to give a reasonable chance of controlling the sale of poisons in Western Australia. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.

Motion (adjournment) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	26

Majority against .. 12

AYES.	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Patrick
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Latbam	Mr. Warner
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Doust	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Fox	Mr. Steeman
Mr. Hawke	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Miss Holman	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Welsh
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wise
Mr. Munale	Mr. Withers
Mr. North	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

On motion by Mr. Thorn, debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT

(Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [11.45] in moving the second reading said: Some months ago the Government introduced into the Legislative Council a Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act. The Legislative Council appointed a select committee to report upon the Bill, as it also did with regard to the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill. As a result of that report, the Bill was drastically amended by the Council. There are comparatively few clauses left in the Bill. Most of the important provisions in the original Bill have been deleted in consequence of decisions made by members of the Legislative Council. The clauses now left in the Bill are not of any considerable importance, most of them having been framed for the purpose of enabling the processes of arbitration and conciliation to work more rapidly and more smoothly. A majority of the members of the Legislative Council were not sufficiently content with the deletion of the main provisions of the Bill as introduced originally, for they included two or three obnoxious provisions that it is not proposed to agree to. The Bill provides that the accounts of unions must be properly audited once in every year by a duly qualified public accountant and then be lodged with the Registrar of the court within one month of the close of the financial year of the respective unions. An endeavour is made in the Bill to enable conciliation efforts to commence sooner than is possible under Section 63 of the Act as at present worded. Certain slight additional powers are given to the court un-

der Clause 4 of the Bill. Another clause in the Bill aims to include industrial agreements as well as awards under Section 87 of the Act. That section gives the court power to appoint boards of reference for certain purposes. The Bill also provides that the Court may be appealed to in regard to any determination of any board of reference appointed under Section 87 of the Act. Section 90 of the Act deals with the period for which the court may make an award, the maximum period being three years. That section declares that the court may review the provisions of an award and make amendments at any time after the expiration of the first twelve months from the date of the making of the award and after the expiration of any subsequent period of twelve months. In the past the court has interpreted the section to mean that an application to review and amend an award can be made in the eleventh month of the second year. Either party may again go before the court two months later. Therefore, there is at present an absolute right to obtain one amendment in each and every year after the first. The Bill contains a provision that, if passed, will make the interval between each application not less than twelve months, subject to the proviso that no application at all can be made until after the expiration of the first twelve months. In Committee it is intended to make an effort to provide that the court may, when delivering an award, reserve liberty to any party to apply to amend the award in regard to matters to be specifically stated in the order granting such leave, and such order may state the period of time, which may be less than twelve months, within which an application may be made under the order granted by the court. The Bill proposes to widen slightly the jurisdiction of industrial magistrates. It also provides that the section in question shall not apply to any counter-proposals or counter-claims made by the parties. It is obvious that this amendment is proposed for the purpose of saving the considerable amount of time that would have to be taken up if the procedure set out in the section had to be followed. The Bill aims at adding to the functions of industrial boards by giving them power to alter, vary or amend an award. It also provides that local boards may be constituted by the court for the purpose of operating in a

defined portion of the State only. The proposed boards in the exercise of their functions will be limited to matters arising in that portion of the State mentioned in the constitution of such boards. Provision is made in the Bill for the publication of all awards and industrial agreements in the "Industrial Gazette" as well as in the "Government Gazette." This will mean that an "Industrial Gazette" as well as the "Government Gazette" may be produced for the purpose of proving an award. The Bill proposes to repeal section 170 of the Act and to insert a new section in its place. The new section will differ from the old because it will provide that a majority of the parties, instead of all the parties, on each side, may consent in writing to matters in dispute being heard and determined by the President or the Conciliation Commissioners as the case may be. This section of the Act enables the President or the Commissioners to deal with matters in dispute if called upon to do so by the parties concerned. As the present section makes it necessary for all parties to consent to the President or Commissioners hearing or determining the matters in dispute considerable difficulty and delay are met with. The new provision should work more quickly and smoothly because of a majority of the parties concerned being able to invoke the aid of the President or the Commissioners. It is my intention in Committee to move some amendments to the Bill and also to invite members of the Committee to delete certain clauses which we regard as being obnoxious. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.54 p.m.